

THE ECONOMIC FUNCTIONS OF PARLIAMENT AND THE POLITICO-ECONOMIC DIMENSION OF BICAMERALISM IN POST-WAR UKRAINE

Denys Yakovlev¹, Hanna Trushevych², Olena Skalatska³

Abstract. The economic dimension has become one of the key factors during the Russo-Ukrainian war. In the context of the country's future post-war transformation, the issue of Ukraine's economic resilience and financial security in the current phase of the war must be considered. The war has exposed the strengths and weaknesses of Ukraine's post-Soviet economic and political model, characterised by a clash of authoritarian and democratic political trends (with electoral democracy and autocracy prevailing in public policy) and the oligarchisation of the economy. To achieve economic stability, the institutional interaction between Ukraine's executive and legislative branches must be significantly strengthened. Most importantly, parliament's role in economic growth and post-war reconstruction, as well as its institutional interaction with the government and president, need to be reconsidered. The search for effective parliamentary models is associated with the need to strengthen the representation of territorial communities, districts and territories, improve the quality of the legislative process, and establish a balanced system of checks and balances. One possible approach to modernising Ukraine's parliamentary system is to introduce a bicameral model of parliament (bicameralism). This *article aims* to determine the economic functions of parliament and the political and economic dimensions of bicameralism in Ukraine during and after war, based on an analysis of expert assessments of the institutional purpose and functions of the upper house of parliament. The study focuses on the political and economic aspects of the bicameral parliament's activities. The study focuses on the economic functions of parliament and the political and economic dimension of bicameralism in (post-)war Ukraine. The *methodological basis of the research* is a combination of theoretical analysis of scientific approaches to bicameralism and the empirical method of expert polling. The research was conducted in January-February 2026 and comprised over fifty experts, including representatives of political science, constitutional law, local council deputies, public activists, volunteers and veterans of the Russo-Ukrainian war. The research was conducted in the format of an individual questionnaire and included both closed and open questions with the aim of clarifying the experts' attitude to the prospects for introducing a bicameral parliament and the possible functions of the upper house. The *results* of the research indicate that the expert community has a moderately positive, yet cautious, attitude towards the idea of bicameralism. At the same time, experts emphasise the importance of parliament's economic functions and its role in representing the interests of local communities, in order to safeguard their economic interests. While more than half of the respondents support the introduction of a bicameral parliamentary system, a significant proportion of experts consider this feasible only under certain political and institutional conditions. The most important function of the upper house is to represent territories and territorial communities, and to rationalise the legislative process by examining draft laws more thoroughly and preventing populist decisions. Experts pay special attention to the potential role of the upper house in post-war reintegration processes, the economic recovery of territories, and the control of budgetary resource efficiency. The practical significance of the results obtained lies in the possibility of using expert assessments to further

Received on: June 05, 2026 **Accepted on:** August 03, 2026 **Published on:** August 21, 2026

¹ National University "Odesa Law Academy", Ukraine (*corresponding author*)

E-mail: yakovlevdenys@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2828-4669>

Web of Science ResearcherID: <https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/GNO-9727-2022>

² Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine

E-mail: anya.trushevych@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3793-1074>

³ National University "Odesa Law Academy", Ukraine

E-mail: elena-s2008@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1439-8753>



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms
of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0

conceptualise the bicameral parliamentary system in Ukraine, determine the upper house's functional purpose, and develop strategic approaches to modernising Ukrainian parliamentarism in the context of post-war state development.

Keywords: economic stability, the economic interests of communities, the economic functions of parliament, bicameralism, economic policy, economic democracy, the market economy, political representation, the political-economic dimension of bicameralism, constitutional reform, territorial representation, post-war reconstruction, the Russo-Ukrainian war, institutional stability.

JEL Classification: D72, R58

1. Introduction

The Ukrainian economy is currently experiencing a period of significant economic challenges. In the aftermath of four years of the Russo-Ukrainian war, the primary objective has been to ensure economic stability in Ukraine. The issue of Ukraine's economic stability and financial security in the current phase of the war must be considered within the context of the country's future post-war transformation.

The war has exposed the strengths and weaknesses of Ukraine's post-Soviet economic and political model, characterised by a clash of authoritarian and democratic political trends (with electoral democracy and autocracy prevailing in public policy) and the oligarchisation of the economy.

In order to ensure economic stability, it is essential that institutional interaction between the executive and legislative branches in Ukraine is significantly strengthened. Of particular significance is the re-evaluation of the role of parliament in economic growth, the functions of parliament in post-war reconstruction, and the institutional interaction between parliament, the government, and the president.

The search for effective parliamentary models is linked to the need to strengthen the economic role of local communities and regions by representing their interests in parliament. The political and economic dimensions of parliamentarism lie in improving the quality of the legislative process and establishing a balanced system of checks and balances to foster economic growth. One possible approach to modernising Ukraine's parliamentary system institutionally would be to introduce a bicameral parliamentary model. Ensuring economic stability and the post-war recovery of Ukraine's economy requires parliament to play a stronger role, which requires comprehensive and complex solutions.

Of all the institutions of public power and political representation in Ukraine, perhaps it was parliament that experienced the greatest upheavals in the past. Early elections, long coalition formation and disintegration processes, and vicissitudes regarding the choice of the optimal electoral model did not add stability or contribute to citizens' trust in deputies. Following the Revolution of Dignity, a period of turbulence began

in Ukrainian society, driven by both external factors, such as aggression by the Russian Federation, and internal factors, such as continued democratisation against the backdrop of high-profile corruption scandals. Following the electoral revolution of 2019 and the resounding victory of V. Zelenskyy, the search for new models of economic growth and a new balance of public power meant a reboot and the formation of a mono-majority based on the "Servant of the People" party in parliament. At the same time, public trust in the Ukrainian Supreme Council was constantly decreasing. According to sociological research, trust in parliament was at 12% in 2020, 11% in 2021 and 11% on the eve of the war (Dynamics of trust in social institutions in 2021-2023, 2023). This negatively impacts the role of parliament in ensuring economic stability.

Following the outbreak of war, parliament was sidelined in economic policy and proved incapable of defending public interests. Parliamentary factions became mere observers of President Volodymyr Zelenskyy's leadership in international and economic policy. The President's leadership and that of his office have of course been important factors in the economic stability of Ukrainian society, the successes on the battlefield, and the formation of a coalition of democratic countries providing military and financial support to Ukraine. At the same time, autocratic leadership, despite all its advantages during wartime, also presents new challenges. The role of parliament in a democracy (particularly during wartime) lies in performing legislative, constitutional and representative functions. Parliament must play a leading role not only in ensuring the balance of power and the system of checks and balances. In the context of time constraints caused by the war and an extremely dynamic process of rapid decision-making ('turbo mode'), parliament must become an institution that ensures the rationalisation of policy and the stability of society.

In the context of the ongoing Russo-Ukrainian war, the identification of optimal models for organising parliamentarism is of particular importance. Such models must ensure effective representation of public interests, stability of the legislative process in financing the war, and balance of the system of checks and balances. One such model is the concept

of bicameralism, which involves the functioning of a bicameral parliament as a mechanism for institutional balancing of economic interests between parties and communities, territorial representation, and improving the quality of legislative initiative regarding the economy policy.

The topic of bicameralism has repeatedly been the subject of political manipulation and speculation throughout Ukraine's political history. For example, before adopting the Constitution of Ukraine in 1996, President L. Kuchma blackmailed deputies with a bicameral parliament. It is time, then, to shift the focus of discussions from political manipulation to the role of bicameralism in representing the interests of communities.

In Ukraine's scientific and expert community, the role of the bicameral parliament is becoming increasingly relevant due to the need to reconsider the structure of public institutions in the post-war period. In order to assess the prospects for the functioning of the bicameral parliament, it is necessary to conduct an empirical analysis of experts' views on the functions, role and institutional significance of the upper house in ensuring economic stability.

To determine the role of bicameralism in post-war Ukraine, an expert survey was conducted. The respondents' answers demonstrate a clear tendency to view the upper house as an institution primarily designed to ensure territorial representation, strike a balance between political and economic democracy, improve the quality of the legislative process, and promote the formation of rational economic policy.

It should be noted that bicameralism can strengthen parliament's role in representing the economic interests of communities. It can complement party representation, whereby political groups have become fully-fledged political actors defending the economic interests of party sponsors and ideological visions in order to win elections. This process has undergone institutionalisation in Ukraine. However, personalised political projects are still trying to gain parliamentary representation through political parties. Nevertheless, the economic interests of communities have remained on the margins of public policy in Ukraine.

The formation of the upper house certainly has the potential to be a rational response to the economic stability of communities. Alongside political parties distorted by oligarchic capital and discredited by corruption scandals, a new network of civic activists, military personnel, volunteers and bloggers is emerging in Ukraine (Yakovlev, Trushevych & Diachenko, 2025).

A separate block of research results concerns the potential role of the upper house in post-war reintegration processes and the reconstruction of the state's economic system. In this context, respondents associate its activities with representing the economic

interests of affected territories and social groups, providing legislative support for economic recovery programmes and developing regional economic clusters. They also associate it with parliamentary control over the effective use of financial resources aimed at reconstruction and providing social support to the population.

The results obtained allow one to outline not only the expert community's attitude towards the prospects of introducing bicameralism in Ukraine, but also the key functional expectations associated with the upper house of parliament's activities in protecting communities' economic interests.

The article aims to determine the economic functions of parliament and the political and economic dimensions of bicameralism in post-war Ukraine, drawing on the findings of expert research.

2. Literature Review

For quite some time, representatives in the fields of economic theory, public policy and political thought have been actively researching bicameralism and the economic functions of the upper house. Klaus von Beyme focuses on parliamentary functions. The researcher draws attention to five functions, three of which – the expressive, educational and information functions – are associated with the relationship between deputies and their voters. In modern typologies, these are combined under the heading of 'representation and articulation of interests'. The educational function has passed from parties to the media. The legislative function was the last to change, although, in surveys, citizens showed that they primarily associate parliaments with legislative power (Beyme, 2000).

Arend Lijphart examines consensus democracy, the role of the upper house and regional representation (Lijphart, 2012). George Tsebelis explores the upper house's role as a mechanism of checks and balances, and its impact on decision-making (Tsebelis, 2002). Giovanni Sartori analyses parliamentary institutional design, as well as the advantages and risks of a bicameral system (Sartori, 1997). Meg Russell examines contemporary models of upper chambers and bicameralism reform (Russell, 2013), while Gerhard Loewenberg, Samuel Patterson and Malcolm Jewell conduct a comparative analysis of legislative bodies and parliamentary functions (Loewenberg, Patterson & Jewell, 2002).

Roel Meijer is studying the usefulness of upper houses in modern parliamentary systems. He focuses his research on the factors that make an upper house effective, and the reasons why countries abolish or recreate them. His work aims to shed light on the theoretical aspects of how upper houses function.

He concludes that upper houses can be beneficial, particularly in large countries with regional minorities, provided they are granted substantial powers. In smaller countries or countries with weaker upper houses, however, they can still play an important reflexive or less significant legislative role. The research found no argument or causal relationship suggesting the need to abolish an upper house. Reasons for reform have been identified within domestic and extra-political categories, as well as the 'rational choice' and 'institutionalism' categories (Meijer, 2015).

W. Elliot Bulmer is working on a study of the role of Westminster model constitutions in determining the composition of parliaments around the world. In particular, it looks at the procedure for electing members of parliament, the requirements for candidates, and the grounds for depriving them of their powers. It also examines the length of time that these powers are held for. The study highlights the functions that parliament should perform in a Westminster-style democracy and how, in such a model, parliament does not exercise active governance but rather forms and dissolves governments. The study also examines parliament's duty to determine who will have the power to make decisions or set the terms of policymaking (Bulmer, 2020).

John Uhr and John Wanna identify and analyse the primary functions and responsibilities of parliament. They consider the relationship between parliament and the evolving nature of government, identifying new demands placed upon parliament, such as social diversity and executive federalism. Their research outlines a range of possible strategies for parliamentary reform, focusing on three dimensions that reflect the interests of society, the executive, and parliament itself. Parliament is formally superior to the courts, ministries, ministers, commissions and authorities. However, in some state parliaments, the ability to hold the executive to account may be virtually non-existent. Parliament provides political parties and their members with an opportunity to express themselves and compete for attention. A major criticism of majoritarian and adversarial parliaments is that they are politically divisive, which undermines coherence and 'good governance' (Uhr & Wanna, 2001).

In terms of post-war political representation in Ukraine, Yakovlev, Trushevykh and Diachenko's research looks at party and civic participation. They found that internally displaced persons shifted their focus of trust from political parties to civic initiatives (Yakovlev, Trushevykh & Diachenko, 2025). The authors also analyse the economic resilience of territorial communities during the Russo-Ukrainian war and identify the civic mobilisation of social groups such as volunteers and IDPs (Yakovlev, Trushevykh & Diachenko, 2025).

3. Methodology

The research was carried out between January and February 2026. It covered more than fifty experts, including political science and constitutional law academics, city and regional council deputies, public activists, volunteers and veterans of the Russo-Ukrainian war. This sample structure ensured a combination of scientific and practical expertise in public administration, parliamentarism, and public policy. The involvement of specialists experienced in both research and local self-government, the public sector, and state-building processes helped develop a comprehensive understanding of the role of bicameralism in post-war Ukraine.

The research was conducted using individual expert questionnaires, which required each respondent to provide a personal response. This approach avoided the effects of group dynamics and mutual influence typical of collective discussions or focus groups. Consequently, the results more accurately reflect the individual professional assessments of the experts regarding the potential advantages, risks, and parameters of the bicameral parliamentary model in Ukraine.

As part of the study, experts were asked to answer a series of closed and open questions designed to reveal their views on the role of bicameralism. Respondents were asked to express their views on the following questions: 'What functions should the upper house of parliament primarily focus on?', 'Is the post-war period in Ukraine favourable for carrying out constitutional reform with the introduction of bicameralism?', and 'What role could the upper house play in the reintegration of de-occupied territories, veterans, and internally displaced persons?'. This enabled the level of support for individual institutional decisions to be recorded, as well as the experts' opinion on the functional role of the bicameral parliament during the post-war transformation of the Ukrainian state to be explored.

4. The Upper House of Parliament: Economic Functions of Community and Protection of the Communities' Interest

Experts identified the key functions of the upper house of parliament, as well as its priority roles within the public authority system. From the experts' point of view, the main task of the upper house is to represent communities and protect their economic interests. This function was identified as the most important by 48.3% of respondents. This corresponds to the traditional concept of bicameralism. According to this, the upper house is designed to ensure the institutional representation of communities and territorial communities. In this model, the upper house balances national party representation, which is implemented through the lower house of parliament. Bicameralism

is an important mechanism for articulating and presenting the economic interests of communities. This function of the upper house is particularly relevant in states where decentralisation, the increased efficiency of regional policy, and the development of local self-government play an important role.

In this model, the upper house balances national party representation, which is implemented through the lower house of parliament. Bicameralism is an important mechanism for articulating and presenting the economic interests of communities. This function of the upper house is particularly relevant in states where decentralisation, the increased efficiency of regional policy, and the development of local self-government play an important role. In this context, parliament acts as a key institution of economic democracy, striking a balance between national interests and the needs of individual regions and local communities. In Ukraine's post-war reconstruction, these economic functions are becoming increasingly important, as the effectiveness of infrastructure restoration, economic activity stimulation, and international financial aid attraction depend on the quality of legislative decisions.

In this context, establishing an upper house of parliament could significantly enhance the performance of economic functions by formalising the territorial aspect of economic policy. The upper house could represent the economic interests of the regions, ensuring a more balanced approach to allocating budgetary resources, formulating state development programmes, and supporting affected communities.

Furthermore, it can serve as an additional mechanism for reviewing economic draft legislation, particularly that concerning inter-budgetary relations, regional policy, and the investment climate. Enhancing the upper house's oversight of the use of reconstruction funds would increase transparency and reduce the risk of funds being used inefficiently. Consequently, the upper house of parliament could become a vital institutional tool for promoting economic equilibrium, encouraging regional development, and enhancing the effectiveness of state economic policy during the (post-)war period.

A total of 17.3% of respondents associate the activities of the upper house with containing the populism of the lower house. This reflects another aspect of the theoretical understanding of bicameralism: the upper house's ability to improve the quality of the legislative process. The upper house acts as a kind of institutional 'filter'. It carries out expert examination of draft laws, preventing the adoption of decisions that are made too quickly or are politically or party-motivated, and ensuring legislative activity is more balanced.

According to 13.8% of experts, the upper house plays an important role in constitutional control. Although this function traditionally belongs to constitutional bodies, such as constitutional courts, in some political

systems, upper houses are granted additional powers to guarantee the stability of the constitutional order (Voychuk, 2024). These powers manifest themselves in special procedures for revising the constitution, participation in forming constitutional control bodies, and enhanced oversight of legislative initiatives' compliance with the state's fundamental law.

Notably, 6.9% of respondents cited the functions of representing individual social groups and arbitration between government branches. Currently, experts do not view the upper house as an institution representing corporations or social groups. Nor is it perceived as a separate mechanism of institutional mediation between the legislative, executive and judicial branches. Such functions in the Ukrainian political system are likely to be associated with other institutions or existing mechanisms of checks and balances.

In a broader analytical context, the survey results suggest that experts tend to adopt a territorial approach when considering the role of the upper house. For the majority of experts, bicameralism is associated with the need to strengthen the representation of territorial communities, districts, and territories in Ukraine's Supreme Council. This is particularly pertinent in the context of decentralisation reforms, the development of local self-government, and establishing an effective model of interaction between the central government and the regions. Therefore, in an expert environment, the upper house of parliament is defined as an institution that represents territorial communities, districts and territories, and increases the efficiency of interaction between the Supreme Council and these communities.

Although other functions, such as the 'legislative filter' and additional guarantees of constitutional stability, are recognised as important, they have much less support and are perceived as secondary to the upper house's main representative role.

Firstly, it is advisable to view the upper house as an institution that represents communities. In this context, its primary role is to facilitate the involvement of communities in the development of public policy. This involves considering draft laws relating to administrative and territorial structures, inter-budgetary relations, regional development, and decentralisation. The upper house could act as an institutional mechanism to coordinate the interests of the central government, territorial communities, districts, and territories. This would prevent imbalances in the distribution of symbolic and financial resources.

Secondly, the upper house could rationalise the legislative activity of the Supreme Council of Ukraine. It could examine draft laws, particularly those with long-term socio-economic consequences or relating to the constitutional process, electoral legislation, and so on. In this way, it could act as a legislative 'filter', improving the quality of laws and preventing the rapid adoption of politically motivated decisions,

thus ensuring a more stable legislative environment. An important aspect of the upper house's institutional role is its participation in ensuring constitutional stability. This may involve taking part in special procedures for amending the constitution, appointing officials to constitutional bodies, or giving preliminary consideration to legislative initiatives of constitutional significance.

One area of activity could be participating in the development of the state's strategic policy, particularly with regard to post-war reconstruction, regional development, and the reintegration of de-occupied territories. The upper house could take the lead in developing public policies focused on economic recovery and the social integration of veterans and internally displaced persons, as well as stimulating investment in war-affected territories, districts and territorial communities.

Another area of the upper house's activity is its control function. This involves monitoring the implementation of state programmes and the efficiency with which budget resources are used. In the context of large-scale financial flows related to post-war reconstruction, including assistance from partners, the upper house could play a key role in providing parliamentary oversight of the transparency of fund distribution, the activities of state reconstruction funds, and the implementation of regional development programmes.

Therefore, analysing the survey results alongside theoretical approaches to bicameralism enables one to determine a potential model for how the Upper House of Parliament in Ukraine could function.

This model could perform a range of interrelated functions, including the representation of territories, districts and territorial communities; the rationalisation of the legislative process; the strategic planning of public policy; parliamentary control; and the institutional support of constitutional stability.

The Upper House can ensure the effectiveness of the bicameral parliamentary system and improve the quality of public administration during Ukraine's post-war transformation.

5. 'Is It Not the Time Now?' The Post-War Period and the Bicameralism Model

An analysis of the responses to the question regarding the feasibility of establishing a bicameral parliament during the post-war period reveals the complex and multifaceted nature of expert evaluations. The distribution of answers indicates a lack of consensus within the expert community, as well as an interest in the potential institutional transformation of Ukraine's parliamentary system.

In response to the question about the feasibility of the upper house, the largest share of respondents (41.4%) chose the answer option 'only under certain conditions'. This can be interpreted as a manifestation of a pragmatic and rational approach to constitutional modernisation of state institutions. While the expert community does not reject the possibility of introducing bicameralism, it does not consider it to be an end in itself. Rather, it is seen as a tool whose effectiveness depends directly on the political, legal and institutional context. In this sense, the experts' position reflects the awareness that any reform must be the result of systematic preparation and include a clear definition of the powers of the parliamentary houses, the mechanisms by which they interact, and the procedures for their formation. Both expert and broad public discussion of the idea of a bicameral parliament are necessary to ensure economic stability and (post-) war recovery of communities.

Additionally, the significant proportion of answers indicating that such a reform would only be feasible under certain conditions may suggest that experts have several reservations about its practical implementation. These include maintaining the manageability of the state system in the context of post-war transformation, avoiding the excessive complication of the legislative process and ensuring the financial and administrative feasibility of establishing an upper house.

Meanwhile, 34.5% of respondents believed that the post-war period would be favourable for introducing a bicameral parliament. This view is rooted in the common perception of post-conflict periods as a 'window of opportunity' for significant institutional reforms. The historical experience of many states shows that the end of large-scale political crises or wars is often accompanied by constitutional reforms aimed at strengthening democratic institutions, increasing representation, and creating a more effective economic system.

In this context, bicameralism can be considered a means of institutional stabilisation and a mechanism to ensure more balanced representation of various territorial and social interests. For a state undergoing post-war reconstruction and the reintegration of de-occupied territories, expanding representation mechanisms and regional participation in decision-making may be particularly important. This is why some experts believe that a bicameral parliament could strengthen the territorial dimension of parliamentary representation, as well as the connection between the central government, territories, districts, and territorial communities for economic development.

At the same time, almost a quarter of respondents (24.1%) expressed the view that the post-war period is not conducive to carrying out such constitutional reforms. This position has a rational basis and can be

explained by a number of objective factors. Firstly, the high level of political and socio-economic uncertainty that typically follows the end of hostilities must be taken into account. Currently, state resources are primarily focused on restoring infrastructure, the economy, the security system, and the social protection of the population. This may mean that large-scale institutional reforms are not given as much priority.

In addition, some experts' scepticism may be related to the potential risk of political destabilisation arising from deep constitutional changes during a period when the political system is still in recovery. Introducing a bicameral parliament would involve complex restructuring of the legislative process, revision of the procedures for interaction between state authorities, and formation of new political accountability mechanisms. Without a sufficiently broad political consensus, such changes could lead to institutional conflicts or further complicate the decision-making process.

The survey results indicate a predominantly positive yet circumspect stance towards the prospect of constitutional reform and the introduction of bicameralism. The expert community does not deny the potential feasibility of such a transformation, but considers its implementation to be a process that should occur gradually and subject to a number of prerequisites.

In summary, the data obtained indicates that the issue of the timeframe and political expediency of introducing a bicameral parliament in Ukraine is still open to further scientific and public discussion. Most experts believe that such a reform would only be effective if accompanied by a comprehensive institutional project, broad political support, and a clear understanding of its role in the system of public power. In this context, the post-war period should be viewed not so much as a favourable time for reforms, but rather as a potential window of opportunity whose implementation will depend on the strategic vision for the future development of Ukrainian parliamentarism.

6. The Role of the Upper House in Post-War Reconstruction: An Expert View

In response to the open-ended question regarding the possible role of the upper house of parliament in two aspects of Ukraine's post-war recovery – the processes of community economic development and reintegration – the respondents demonstrated a fairly wide range of approaches and assessments. Analysing the responses enables one to identify several key areas of content within which the expert community understands the potential functions of this institution. At the same time, a significant proportion of the responses focus not only on the political and institutional aspects of the upper house's activities, but also on how

it could contribute to solving social and economic problems.

Firstly, respondents often mention the importance of representing the interests of territories, districts and territorial communities that have suffered the most from the war. This primarily concerns de-occupied regions and communities that have suffered significant destruction, as well as social groups such as veterans of the Russo-Ukrainian War, internally displaced persons, and those living in occupied territories for long periods of time. In this particular context, the upper house is defined as an institutional mechanism that is capable of ensuring a more balanced consideration of the interests of different regions and social groups in the process of formulating public policy. This approach is of critical importance for the social and political stability of society, as it facilitates the integration of demographic groups that may experience elevated levels of social vulnerability or marginalisation into the political process.

The second important area is legislative support for reconstruction and reintegration processes. Some respondents emphasise the need for a comprehensive regulatory framework to restore social infrastructure, stimulate the economic development of affected territories, and create effective social protection mechanisms. In particular, the responses highlight the need for legislative regulation of social support issues for veterans, programmes to help internally displaced persons return to their places of permanent residence, and the development of housing programmes. They also emphasise the importance of stimulating investment in the reconstruction of destroyed economic and industrial infrastructure. In this sense, the upper house can serve as a platform for a more in-depth study of the socio-economic aspects of public policy, which is particularly important given the large-scale post-war reconstruction and search for an effective model of economic growth.

In general, analysis of the responses indicates that respondents consider the potential role of the upper house in reintegration processes mainly in three interrelated dimensions: representative, legislative, and control. At the same time, the majority of responses emphasise the socio-economic aspects of its activities, particularly the reconstruction of territories, support for affected social groups, the development of the regional economy, and the control of recovery resource usage. Therefore, experts believe that the upper house could act as both an institutional element of the parliamentary system and an important tool for shaping a more balanced socio-economic policy in the post-war period.

7. Conclusions

The attitude of experts towards the introduction of a bicameral parliament in Ukraine is ambivalent. In the

survey, 51.7% of experts expressed a positive attitude towards bicameralism. Conversely, 48.3% of experts adopted a critical or cautious stance. This configuration of responses signifies the absence of a formed public consensus and the necessity to continue scientific research and public discussions. The structure of the experts' responses indicates that the absolute rejection of the new institution is insignificant (13.8%), while the main mass of critically minded respondents chose the wording 'it is not the time now'.

Experts define the role of the upper house as follows: 1) representing territories, districts, and territorial communities, and 2) rationalising the legislative process. Almost half of the respondents (48.3%) consider the representation of territories, districts, and territorial communities to be the upper house's primary function. This view aligns with the classical model of bicameralism, which emphasises balanced representation between political parties in the lower house and territories and communities in the upper house. Another significant factor is the focus of expert attention on curbing the populism of the lower house and constitutional control, which emphasises the experts' desire to make the legislative process more rational. In contrast, arbitration between the branches of public power received minimal support. According to the authors, this suggests that community interests are considered a higher priority than the functions of political mediation in modern Ukrainian public policy. In this regard, the upper house in Ukraine could represent territories, districts, and territorial communities while also rationalising the legislative activities of the Supreme Council of Ukraine and providing strategic planning for public policy in the event of post-war reconstruction, as well as parliamentary control.

In the author's opinion, the results regarding the potential role of the upper house in the processes

of post-war reintegration and the state's economic recovery are particularly important. Experts highlight the need to combine three functions in these processes: representation, legislation and oversight. The upper house could provide institutional representation for de-occupied territories, veterans, and internally displaced persons. It could also promote the adoption of effective social protection and regional economic development laws, and monitor the use of budgetary resources. This combination enables the upper house to be viewed as a potential tool for social and economic stabilisation, with the ability to formulate long-term reconstruction and integration policies.

From an economic perspective, the significant potential of the upper house in promoting the effective use of budget resources and supporting the development of territories, districts, and territorial communities should be noted. Some respondents emphasise the important role of the upper house in the legislative regulation of reconstruction processes, controlling the distribution of financial resources, and promoting the interests of territories and social groups. This approach reflects a desire to combine representation, control, and strategic planning.

The results obtained indicate that the bicameral parliamentary model is fairly widely supported in Ukraine's expert environment. However, its implementation requires a comprehensive approach, combining theoretically grounded modelling of powers and socio-economic priorities of territories, districts and territorial communities with the active promotion of public dialogue. Only under these conditions can a bicameral system become an effective tool for stabilisation and the representation of economic interests at community level, as well as for the post-war development of the state.

References:

- Beyme, K. (2000). Functions of Parliaments. *Parliamentary Democracy*. (pp. 72-107).
- Bulmer, W. Elliot (2020). Parliament I: Functions, Powers and Composition. *Westminster and the World*, 8, 135–176. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781529200638.ch008>
- Dynamics of trust in social institutions in 2021-2023. (2023, December 10). *Kyiv International Institute of Sociology*. <https://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=1335&page=1>
- Lijphart, A. (2012). Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
- Loewenberg, G., Patterson, S. C., & Jewell, M. E. (2002). Handbook of legislative research. Harvard University Press.
- Meijer, R. (2015). *Upper Houses in Bicameral Parliaments: Roles, Reforms & Trends*. Radboud University.
- Russell, M. (2013). The contemporary House of Lords: Westminster bicameralism revived. Oxford University Press.
- Sartori, G. (1997). Comparative constitutional engineering: An inquiry into structures, incentives and outcomes (2nd ed.). Macmillan Press.
- Tsebelis, G. (2002). Veto players: How political institutions work. Princeton University Press.
- Uhr, J., & Wanna, J. (2001). The future roles of parliament. *Institutions on the edge?* (p. 35).
- Voychuk, A. (2024). System of Checks and Balances in a Parliamentary Republic. *Current issues in philosophy and sociology*, 37, 219–223.

Yakovlev, D., Trushevyh, H., & Diachenko, O. (2025). Civil Engagement vs. Party Participation: New Forms of Political Interaction of Ukrainians (Survey of Internally Displaced Persons). *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 11(2), 338–345. <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2025-11-2-338-345>

Yakovlev, D., Trushevyh, H., & Diachenko, O. (2025). Local Political Activity in Ukraine: “Displaced”; Middle Class and Democracy (Survey of Internally Displaced Persons). *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 11(5), 47–54. <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2025-11-5-47-54>