



## **REFLECTING PARLIAMENTARY PUBLIC OPINION ON GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS AND JUSTICE IN REPRESENTATION: 1982-2023**

### **MİLLETVEKİLİ GENEL SEÇİM SONUÇLARI ÜZERİNDEN HALK İRADESİNİN MECLİSE YANSIMASI VE TEMSİLDE ADALET: 1982-2023**

#### **Abstract**

*Elections and electoral processes in Türkiye are subject to significant scrutiny and are linked to considerable optimism. As a result, voter turnout rates in Türkiye exceed those of countries categorized as developed. This study examines the reflection of voter preferences in parliament as evidenced by the results of parliamentary general elections conducted under the 1982 Constitution, including the year 2023. This study examines the extent to which the existing electoral system and constitution influence the alignment or misalignment of election outcomes with the principle of 'justice in representation.' The analysis encompassed 12 parliamentary general elections conducted during the specified period, assessing not only party votes but also voter turnout rates and the representation of votes relative to voter turnout. Efforts were undertaken to analyze the factors influencing the reflection or non-reflection of votes in parliament and representation, alongside proposed solutions to address these factors. The findings suggest that, despite advancements in equitable representation, the system remains only partially reformed. Proposed solutions involve updating the threshold system, expanding areas such as parliamentary composition, increasing representation rates, and enhancing democratic participation.*

**Keywords:** Political Science, Representative Behaviour, Representative Justice, Turkish Political Life.

#### **Öz**

*Türkiye'nin henüz tam olarak ekonomik, sosyal ve siyasal sorunlarını çözmemiş olması ve gelişmekte olan ülke liginden gelişmiş ülke ligine atlayamamış olması seçimleri ve dolayısı ile liderleri doğrudan önemli konuma getirmektedir. Bu durumun en önemli yansımalarından birisi olarak Türkiye'de seçimler ve seçim süreçleri önemli ölçüde takip edilmekte ve büyük bir umut bağlanmaktadır. Bu durumun bir sonucu olarak da seçimlere katılım oranları gelişmiş ülke olarak adlandırılan ülkelerden daha yüksek bir oranda ortaya çıkmaktadır. İlgili çalışma 1982 Anayasası kapsamında 2023 yılı dahil olmak üzere gerçekleşmiş olan milletvekili genel seçim sonuçları üzerinden seçmen tercihlerinin meclise nasıl yansıdığını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Mevcut seçim sistemi ve anayasanın 'temsilde adalet' kavramına uygun bir biçimde seçim sonuçlarının yansıtıp yansımamasına katkı sağlayıp sağlamadığı incelenmektedir. Bu kapsamda ilgili dönem içerisinde gerçekleşmiş olan 12 milletvekili genel seçimi sonuçları parti oylarından bağımsız olarak katılım oranı ve katılım oranı içerisinde bulunan oyların meclise yansımaları üzerinden değerlendirilmiştir. Bu çerçevede oyların meclise ve dolayısı ile temsiliyete yansıtıp yansımalarının nedenleri anlaşılmaya çalışılmış ve bu nedenlerin ortadan kaldırılmasına yönelik olarak çözüm önerileri ortaya konulmaya çalışılmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlar, temsilde adalet noktasında zaman içerisinde ilerleme olsa da sistem henüz tam olarak yenilenmemiştir. Bunlar arasında baraj sisteminin güncellenmesi,*

**Fırat DEMİRKOL \***

\* Dr. Öğr. Görevlisi, İstanbul  
Nişantaşı Üniversitesi İktisadi, İdari  
ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi  
Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

**E-posta/E-mail:**

firat.demirkol@nisantasi.edu.tr

**Orcid:** 0000-0003-0887-0898

**Başvuru/Submitted:** 29.04.2025

**Kabul/Accepted :** 07.07.2025

*parlamento dağılımında Türk heyetinin açılması gibi alanların genişletilmesi, temsil oranının artırılması ve demokratik katılımın güçlendirilmesi bulunuyor.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Seçmen Davranışı, Siyaset Bilimi, Temsilde Adalet, Türk Siyasi Hayatı.

## Introduction

In modern democracies, electoral processes, which are crucial for meeting popular expectations and demands via representatives, are assessed primarily on two essential characteristics. The first principle is "justice in representation," which underscores political participation and aims to integrate varied demands and aspirations; the second principle is "stability in governance," which guarantees the establishment of a government capable of fulfilling public expectations and demands following each election. While the coexistence of both criteria in voting systems is significant, it seems difficult in practice to achieve an ideal reconciliation of these two principles concurrently. This challenge emerges when these two inversely connected criteria may hinder countries from effectively representing the varied choices of people at the voting box. In practice, although the principle of stability in governance aids in the creation and execution of public policy, it may result in a deviation from equitable representation. Conversely, prioritizing justice in representation within the legislature complicates decision-making and may compromise the principle of stability in governance. The fundamental concern is how to reconcile these two concepts, albeit their challenging integration.

The application of electoral thresholds is not exclusive to Türkiye; it is utilized in other countries, taking in to account the principles of representational justice and stability (see Table 1 and Table 2).

**Table 1. The Legal Electoral Threshold in Majoritarian Electoral Systems**

The Legal Electoral Threshold in Majoritarian Electoral Systems	
Country	Legal Electoral Threshold
Belarus	No
England	No
France	Receiving at least 12.5% of the vote in an electoral district or being one of the top two parties in order to qualify for the second round
The Legal Electoral Threshold in Mixed Electoral Systems	
Country	Legal Electoral Threshold
Albania	A threshold of 2.5% for parties and 4% for electoral alliances
Germany	Achieving at least 5% of the vote at the national level or winning a seat in three electoral districts
Hungary	Obtaining 5% of the vote at the proportional representation level, either to win seats at the proportional representation level or at the national level
Italia	%4
Lithuania	%5
Russia	%5 (When a mixed electoral system is implemented)
Ukraine	%4 (When a mixed electoral system is implemented)

**Table 2. Legal Electoral Threshold in Proportional Representation Systems**

Legal Electoral Threshold in Proportional Representation Systems			
Country	Legal Electoral Threshold	Country	Legal Electoral Threshold
Austria	It is required to win a seat in the lowest-tier electoral district or to obtain at least 4% of the vote at the national level	Latvia	5%
Belgium	A candidate must receive at least 5% of the vote in an electoral district to be eligible for election	Luxembourg	No
Bosnia-Herzegovina	No	North Macedonia	No
Bulgaria	4%	Moldova	6%
Croatia	5%	Russia	7%
Czechia	5%	Norway	4%
Denmark	Parties must either win a seat in a lower-tier electoral district, secure a sufficient level of votes in two out of three constituencies based on the simple quota principle, or obtain at least 2% of the vote at the national level.	Poland	5%
Estonia	5%	Portugal	No
Finland	No	Romania	5%
Iceland	No		
Ireland	No	Slovenia	4%
Netherlands	0,67%	Slovakia	5%
Spain	In order to secure a seat from an electoral district, at least 3% of the votes in that district must be obtained		
Sweden	4% at the national level or 12% in an electoral district	Ukraine	3%
Switzerland	No	Greece	3%

*Source: (Zarić, 2019:253)*

Numerous countries implement diverse rates and systems, as shown in the table above. The table above illustrates the application of diverse rates and systems across multiple countries. Critics argue that the electoral threshold has been employed to specifically exclude far-right parties from parliament and to obstruct the representation of certain political movements deemed 'marginal'.

Türkiye, as a developing nation, has not yet completely resolved its issues. The Republic of Türkiye anticipates that political actors will address its numerous challenges across economic, social, and political domains. It positions politics as central to life, emphasizing the significance of politicians and elections. Due to a lack of confidence in the system, leaders have initiated a significant action. The persistent systemic issue facilitates the establishment or enhancement of democratic institutions via leaders rather than through the system itself. The history of democracy in Türkiye is characterized by a series of shocks (Erdem, 2019). The design of the system, influenced by crises, necessitates that civilians pursue political solutions. Individuals perceived as products of the coup, exhibiting a rudimentary understanding of democracy, have consistently regarded the constitutional developments that followed the coup as deficient. The assessment of legal texts and the formal evaluation of objections to them adhere to a comparable standard

regarding the political legitimacy of constitutions as perceived by the public. The issue of whether democracy and the electorate's will are adequately represented in the political arena has become a significant concern. The democratic spheres that began to diminish following the murder on March 12, 1971, peaked with the implementation of the 1982 Constitution and the 1983 Election Act, which were enacted after the military coup of 1980. The 1982 Constitution did not provide political parties the opportunity to organize within the sectors of women and youth (Ercan, 2016:61). The lifting of the ban on organizing, after a designated period, has considerably impeded political engagement and the public's capacity for self-expression. The implementation of the electoral barrier has emerged as a primary concern, raising significant issues related to justice in representation. The 1982 Constitution established the Election Act, which became effective in 1983 and significantly influenced the political landscape. The stipulation that a political party must surpass a 10% electoral threshold nationwide to gain parliamentary representation has emerged as a significant systemic intervention mechanism (TBMM, 2023b). The reduction of the threshold to 7 percent due to the 2022 legislative amendment continues to raise concerns regarding equitable representation. Currently, certain ideas and representatives perceived as disadvantaged by the system have been excluded from parliament, thereby constricting the democratic avenues for protecting democracy. The change has heightened public interest in elections and led to significantly higher turnout rates in Türkiye, contrasting with low turnout in developed countries (Durul and Doğan, 2019).

The issue of representative justice in Türkiye's elections has frequently faced criticism regarding the electoral barrier and the electoral law overall. This situation has started to influence voter behavior and decisions, resulting in a shift towards parties that are perceived as capable of overcoming the notion of "do not waste the game." Despite the prolonged restrictions on electoral law, efforts have been undertaken to circumvent these barriers through list alliances and independent candidate strategies. The 2018 legislative amendment has enabled parties to circumvent the barrier through alliance voting; however, it continues to present significant challenges for non-allied and independently operating parties (TBMM, 2023b). It is clear that voters supporting these parties face inequitable representation. This study analyzes the outcomes of parliamentary general elections conducted since the implementation of the 1982 Constitution, evaluated through the lens of justice.

## **1. Methodology**

This current study seeks to analyze the manifestation of voter preferences in parliament as evidenced by the outcomes of general parliamentary elections conducted under the 1982 Constitution, extending to the year 2023. This study examines the extent to which the existing electoral system and constitution facilitate the principle of fair representation, evaluating the accuracy of election result representation. In this regard, we have assessed the outcomes of the 12 general parliamentary elections that took place throughout the specified time, irrespective of party votes, focusing on voter turnout and its representation in parliament.

This approach aims to elucidate the factors contributing to the underrepresentation of votes in parliament and suggests remedies to address these issues. The study seeks to determine if the existing election system and constitution conform to the principles of equitable representation and whether modifications are necessary to accurately reflect voter choices in the legislative process.

## **2. The Judiciary and Election System in the State**

Electoral laws and systems are fundamental ideas for the operation of democracy. Formulating election laws ideally steers them towards particular goals. Election rules and the resultant election systems aim to guarantee equitable representation while also stabilizing governance (Tuncer, 2003:167-168). The possibility of these two conceptions coexisting reveals

a considerable ambiguity. The duality between justice and resistance in representation, akin to the balance between security and freedom, is observed at two distinct points on the spectrum. The absence of others precludes discussion of their presence; nevertheless, emphasizing one notion exposes a vulnerability in the other. This situation has repeatedly manifested in Turkish political life, with the principle of justice being disregarded in favor of stability.

Electoral systems are not invariably constructed to ensure optimal representation and cannot assure a completely equitable result. Election votes produce unrepresented ballots, similar to the outcomes of representation, which exceed or fall short of the vote proportions mandated by the system's regulations. This outcome may occur directly via the electoral barrier or as a consequence of the calculation mechanism established by the electoral framework. This circumstance is infrequent in representative systems and more often in systems prioritizing stability (Tuncer, 2003:168).

Election systems are formulated depending on a nation's specific circumstances and political attributes, employing approaches such as single-degree, two-degree, one-to-two, circular or barrier-free, and list-based majority or national representation. This approach differs based on the importance of the nation's political system and the prevailing circumstances.

The period from 1923 to 1950 in Türkiye is characterized as the one-party period in political life. The 1946 elections, while seemingly multi-party, are deemed unfair due to the existing electoral law and its implementation, as well as the electoral context of the time. Conversely, the 1950 elections are widely viewed as a transition toward a multiparty system. Various electoral systems and governmental models have been evaluated within Türkiye's political framework. The examination of these points reveals the simplicity of the established electoral system, the regulations governing political parties, and the priorities set by the system's founders as outlined in the constitution. The system experiences a conflict between periodic stability and the representation of justice, resulting in an ambiguous decision-making process. An analysis of the electoral systems implemented in Türkiye reveals the following: the list majority procedure, the d'Hondt system with an environmental barrier, the national balance, the non-barrier d'Hondt, the double barrier d'Hondt, the dual barrier d'Hondt combined with containers, and the country barrier associated with the d'Hondt systems (Tuncer, 2003:169).

The national balance sheets system, as previously outlined, prioritizes the principle of fairness. The elections held under this system markedly diminish the probability that the won parties will govern autonomously. This is crucial for fortifying democracy and improving the actualization of equitable representation; nevertheless, it also signifies a vulnerability in governance stability. The list-based majority system exemplifies the notion of administrative stability. Currently, representation is declining; nonetheless, there is an increased probability that the dominant parties will govern independently.

When we look at the elections held between 1950 and 1977, the representation rates of the top-ranked parties are shown below.

**Table 3: 1950-1977 General Election Results and Representation Rate**

Year of election	1st Party	Vote Rate (%)	Representation Rate (%)
1950	DP	52,7	85,2
1954	DP	57,6	92,8
1957	DP	47,9	69,6
1961	CHP	36,7	38,5
1965	AP	52,9	53,3

1969	AP	46,5	56,9
1973	CHP	33,3	41,1
1977	CHP	41,4	47,3

The implementation of electoral barriers along side election systems directly influences the representation of voter preferences and the equitable manifestation of national will. Voting barriers are universally recognized as a mechanism employed inside the electoral systems of all nations. The primary rationale for employing this system is its stability and the efficient management of the barriers. Upon examining the mechanisms for creating electoral barriers, we identify two approaches to address them. These refer to the national barrier and the barrier imposed by a specific electoral district (Sabuncu, 2006:192). The establishment of the disclosed barrier significantly influences the political scene. Elections conducted in Türkiye pursuant to the electoral law established following the ratification of the 1982 Constitution occur under the nation's overarching threshold. The longstanding 10-percent electoral threshold has evolved into a mechanism for obstructing political movements, particularly those deemed marginal or threatening by the establishment, in addition to serving as a pragmatic practice. The restriction of long-term coalitions in the electoral legislation has engendered apprehension that voters will be compelled to favor major parties, as they may perceive their votes as squandered. The legislation aimed specifically to guarantee representation of regional parties in parliament, necessitating that all parties engage with the entirety of Türkiye. This enduring system, which underwent modifications over approximately 35 years, initially permitted political alliances and subsequently lowered the electoral threshold to 7%, so alienating representation from the perspective of fairness. The establishment of the barrier engenders inequities in relative representation, both at the national level and within specific constituencies. (Özbudun, 1995:527).

### **3. A General View To The Council General Elections from 1982 to 2023**

After three years of stringent governance following the 1980 military coup, a constitutional referendum in late 1982 somewhat facilitated normalization, enabling Türkiye to engage in the electoral process. Notwithstanding the prohibition on pre-1980 politicians, the elections instilled optimism for the future as they represented a significant stride towards normality among the populace.

The process began in 1983 with the general election of lawmakers, and until the last election in 2023, there were 12 general elections. Throughout this process, Türkiye's democratic experience and electoral practices have been shaped by the populace through many mechanisms, including local government elections, referendums, and presidential elections, extending beyond mere general elections. Nonetheless, owing to the study's scope, only the outcomes of the parliamentary general election were analyzed.

- The inaugural general election, conducted in 1983, was regarded as a significant advancement from a procedure characterized by bans and the prevailing ordinary system. The election recorded a turnout of 92.3%, with parties and independent candidates (YSK, 1983) accounting for all legitimate votes in parliament. A significant outcome of this election was Turgut Özal's ascension to power and the perception of the Motherland Party (ANAP) as a proponent of civil policy by the populace. The political party and candidate endorsed by President Kenan Evren, who orchestrated the 1980 military coup, did not succeed in the election. This triumph has been deemed a manifestation of the public's democratic reaction to the coup and the ensuing proceedings.



- The subsequent election occurred in 1987, four years thereafter. The turnout rate in this election rose by 1 percentage point to 92.3%. Özal and ANAP maintained power despite a decline of approximately 9 percent. Turkish politics has experienced the repercussions of the dam since this election, resulting in 19.81 percent of the voting parties being unrepresented in parliament (YSK, 1987). It is essential to acknowledge the popular vote that resulted in the lifting of political bans in 1987. This vote facilitated Türkiye's entry into the structured political landscape of the 1990s and concurrently removed political bans imposed by the coup administration. Özal, who sought to participate in the referendum, experienced his first electoral defeat (Demirkol, 2022:131-132).

- The evolution of domestic and international policy culminated in the 1991 legislative general elections, during which Türkiye saw a phase of political turmoil due to the reemergence of previous politicians in the political landscape (Demirkol, 2022:131-135). Despite a decrease in turnout from about 10 percent to 83.9 percent, the impact of their coalitions has resulted in a significant reduction in current votes outside parliament to 0.57 percent (Sabuncu, 2006:192-193; YSK, 1991).

- In the 1995 general parliamentary elections, the turnout rate remained unchanged at 85.2% compared to four years prior. Nevertheless, as the collaboration between the SHP and the DEP had no favorable political outcomes, the parties contested the elections independently, resulting in the current percentage of votes excluded from parliament increasing to 14.45% (YSK, 1995).

- After the postmodern coup on 28 February, Türkiye encountered a renewed 'democracy balance', as the military once again influenced its political landscape. The minority government, which succeeded the administration overthrown in the 1995 election and was established under Prime Minister Ecevit, experienced a successful phase in combating terrorism. Prior to the early 1999 elections, it initiated an operation to apprehend and prosecute the leader of a divisive terrorist organization in Kenya. After two major breakthroughs in the republic's history, 87.02% of the electorate engaged in the pronounced nationalist sentiments and democratic interference process. In this election, five parties were elected to the people's assembly, with 3.02% of valid votes not represented in the Assembly (YSK, 1999).

- Following the 1999 elections, Türkiye entered a challenging period. The new government of Türkiye is thought to have enhanced its capacity to address economic and social issues due to a decrease in terrorist incidents. A robust security presence is anticipated as the country moves into the 2000s, particularly following the late 1990s, marked by notable advancements and democratization efforts. Subsequently, the DSP-MHP-ANAP government, which assumed power following the 1999 elections, encountered one of the most significant earthquakes in the Republic's history approximately three months later, succeeded by the second-largest earthquake three months post-election. The culmination of changing priorities and economic and social issues occurred during the 2001 economic crisis. The government, having faced challenges for 3.5 years, opted to conduct early elections in November 2002 due to escalating health issues of Prime Minister Ecevit and the fragmentation of the DSP. Furthermore, only two parties, the Ak Party and CHP, exceeded the electoral threshold and gained entry into parliament, securing 46.33% of valid votes, while 10% of the electorate remained unrepresented in the assembly (YKS, 2002). The results indicate significant issues regarding voter participation and representation. The legitimacy of the Justice and Development Party's representation during its initial term has been debated by the opposition (Bahçeçi, 2005:373-375). The 2002 elections marked a significant turning point in Turkish political life, resulting in the dissolution of all parliamentary parties from the previous term by the electorate, without the involvement of power-sharing arrangements or coalitions.

- Following a phase of significant, unilateral authority, Türkiye conducted the 2007 elections, which featured an exceptional presidential election and a dispute about the 367 parliamentary votes. The electoral turnout rate was 84.25%, although the current parliamentary votes decreased markedly to 13.03% (YSK, 2007). A notable feature of representation in these elections is the influx of deputies entering parliament as independent MP candidates. Following the collaboration between the DEP and SHP during the 1991 elections, candidates from parties previously dissolved due to systemic obstacles successfully sought to contest as independent candidates in this instance. This approach has led to the enactment of a law in 1983 that undermines the 10% electoral threshold by a group regarded as discontented with the system. The votes, concentrated in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolian regions and previously unrepresented in parliament, have commenced representation, but not proportionately.

- The success of the 2010 referendum led to substantial support for the Ak Party from diverse societal segments. Concurrently, the opposition party is gearing up for the 2011 election with renewed motivation, influenced by shifts in government and leadership within the CHP. Amid increasing political tensions and mutual expectations, voter turnout has not significantly risen; rather, it has decreased by approximately 1% compared to the previous election, standing at 83.16%. The independent advocacy solution, established in 2007, has been further organized, with both the ruling and main opposition parties enhancing the process, resulting in a reduction of the out-of-parliament vote to 4.61% (YSK, 2011). The 2007 elections demonstrate that an increase in the representation rate of an alternative party prior to entering parliament suggests that the barrier issues faced by parties outside of parliament lead voters to favor the ruling and main opposition parties, which do not encounter such barriers. The data indicates that voting is primarily strategic, rather than driven by emotional or ideological factors.

- The year 2015 marked one of the most complex electoral periods for Türkiye. This year's elections have resulted in the formation of an electoral government for the first time, necessitating renewed elections due to the inability to establish a government. In the June 2015 elections, the Ak Party was unable to independently form a government for the first time in 13 years, attributed to various factors: the effects of the opening process, the increasing nationalist sentiment, the emergence of the HDP, and Erdoğan's resignation from his position as party chairman. The HDP, achieving an 83.92 percent turnout, shifted from its strategy of independent candidates to participate in the election with party candidates, thereby risking the electoral barrier. The Ak Party consequently lost the majority of councillors required for unilateral governance, with the current out-of-parliament vote recorded at 4.77% (YSK, 2015 June). The current situation, characterized by a government crisis, an increase in terrorist incidents, the government's suspension of the opening process in response to a nationalist surge, and the security and terrorism agenda that arose in November 2015 following five months of intensified tension, has regained attention. The MHP, which garnered nationalist reaction votes, and the HDP, which amplified the effects of the opening, experienced a decline of approximately 1.5 points, resulting in a total of 85.23%. In contrast, the Ak Party, despite public warnings in the initial election, achieved a 9-point increase in votes and regained power independently. The current out-of-parliament voting rate has decreased to 2.52% (YSK, 2015 November).

- The 2018 elections marked the beginning of a new process for Türkiye. The presidential system of Turkey, characterized as a Turkish-type presidency, first underwent elections following the July 15 coup attempt and the subsequent constitutional referendum, which facilitated a transition to this system. The election was founded on a rigorous separation of powers, with the legislature elected independently, thereby permitting legal alliances for the first time. In the initial round of the presidential election, President Erdoğan was declared the winner as the candidate of the Ak Party. A new situation has emerged regarding the parliamentary elections. The July 15 coup attempt and the subsequent referendum process shifted Turkish politics closer to the nationalist wing, including parties like the MHP and the BBP, while the Ak Party participated in



a single-candidate parliamentary election. The opposition entered the presidential election for the first round with its own candidates but joined the election of the National Assembly as an alliance. The primary advantage of alliances for the parties is the removal of the electoral barrier, allowing them to participate in voting even if the coalition's overall performance exceeds the threshold. In 2018, the electoral process yielded a turnout rate of 86.22%, with 0.69% of valid votes excluded from parliamentary representation (YSK, 2018). This representation has arisen from the impact of alliances. In addition to major party candidates like the DP and the BBP, alliance votes have facilitated the participation of parties that have previously failed to meet the electoral threshold, allowing them to be represented in parliament with their logos.

- The selection of the second option within the updated system has occurred following the completion of both the legislative and implementation phases in 2023. This election period's most significant innovation is the decrease of the electoral threshold to 7%. This time, the recalibration of parliamentary vote calculations has diminished the prospects for low-vote parties to secure their deputies, resulting in their votes inadvertently bolstering the major parties within the alliance. The Alliance of Nations, led by the CHP and the Anamuhalefet party, has opted to participate in the elections with a unified list that includes four smaller parties, excluding itself, in conjunction with the second major party of the alliance, the Good Party, across 17 districts. The opposition strategically consolidated into a unified list, whereas the alliance bloc spearheaded by the Ak Party included a vote for limited parties like Hüdapar and DSP. In contrast, other alliance members, including MHP, BBP, and the Party of Rejuvenated Prosperity, participated in the election under their own names and logos. The presidential election proceeded to a second round for the first time, influenced by the economic crisis and discussions surrounding immigration. Meanwhile, parliamentary participation in the general election was recorded at 87.05% (YSK, 2023). The election results indicated a notable achievement for the seven parties that remained, while the BBP did not share in this success, as the votes of eight parties were directly represented in parliament. In addition to these parties, voters from the Ak Party, CHP, and YSP lists, as well as DEVA, Future, HUDAPAR, DSP, Democratic Party, Saadet Party, Party of Democratic Regions, HDP, Labour Party, and Türkiye's Exchange Party lists have secured the opportunity to have representatives in parliament. The unification of the Future and Saadet party MPs into groups under the Saadet Party, along with the Turkish Exchange Party's affiliation with the CHP, has led to the representation of 15 parties in parliament based on the election outcomes (TBMM, 2023a). The out-of-the-parliament voting ratio reached 4.92 percent in 2018, even with the diverse number of representatives involved (YSK, 2023).

## **Conclusion**

Today's societies primarily rely on legislative activity to establish the rules of common life. Legislative activity, considered one of the most fundamental indicators of democracy, also means monitoring and setting the framework for its implementation. In this context, it is crucial that the legislative activity fairly reflects the votes of the electorate. The aforementioned review framework has yielded relevant findings.

- The electoral barrier poses a problem in terms of representative justice for Türkiye.
- The liberation of the alliances eliminates the electorate's fear that the game will be wasted but has not yet succeeded in achieving sufficient representation of justice.
- The reduction of the general electoral barrier to 7% is not a positive development, but it is not sufficient.

The following aspects are expected to contribute to the examinations carried out in the interests of justice in the country's subsequent proceedings.

- Decrease the election barrier.
- Implementation of the electoral barrier should occur within specific electoral districts rather than nationwide, focusing on subregional or more localized areas.
- The appointment of 100 out of the 600 deputies to the Turkish parliament, along with extending legislative representation to candidates and parties for every 1% of votes received, will occur independently.
- The elimination of design efforts that were intended to promote political stability is a result of the direct election of the executive body and its dismissal by Parliament.

## References

- Bahçeçi, B. (2005). 1982 Anayasası Döneminde Çoğulcu Demokrasi Açısından Milletvekili Seçimi Hukukunda Karşılaşılan Sorunlar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 54 (2), 365–396.
- Demirkol, F. (2022). *Liberal Demokrasi ve Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (2003–2018)*. Nobel Bilimsel Eserler.
- Durul, T. ve Doğan, S. (2019, Nisan 25). Dünyada Seçimlere Katılım Düşük Seyrediyor. *Anadolu Ajansı*. Retrieved June 15, 2023, from <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/dunyada-secimlere-katilim-dusuk-seyrediyor/1462264>
- Ercan, M. S. (2016). Anayasa Mahkemesi Kararları Işığında Siyasal Parti Yasakları. *İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1), 49–70.
- Erdem, T. (2019, Temmuz 15). Türkiye’de Darbe Ve Müdahalelerin Kısa Tarihi. Stratejik Düşünce Enstitüsü. Retrieved June 23, 2023, from <https://www.sde.org.tr/tevfik-erdem/genel/turkiyede-darbe-ve-mudahalelerin-kisa-tarihi-kose-yazisi-10443>
- Özbudun, E. (1995). Seçim Sistemleri ve Türkiye. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44(2), 521–539.
- Sabuncu, Y. (2006). Seçim Barajları ve Siyasal Sonuçları. *Anayasa Yargısı*, 23, 191–197.
- Sayın, A. (2022, Mart 31). Seçim Yasası: Baraj Yüzde 7’ye İndi, Seçim Kurullarında Kıdemli Hâkimin Görev Almasına Son Verildi. *BBC Türkçe*. Retrieved July 10, 2023, from <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-turkiye-60925836>
- Tuncer, E. (2003). Türkiye’de seçim uygulamaları/sorunlar ışığında temsilde adalet - yönetimde istikrar ilkelerinin işlevselliği. In E. Tuncer (Ed.). *Osmanlı’dan günümüze seçimler (1877–2002)* (pp. 167–182). Tesav Yayınları.
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (TBMM). (2023a). 28. Dönem Milletvekili Sandalye Dağılımı. Retrieved July 30, 2023, from <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sandalyedagilimi>
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (TBMM). (2023b). Milletvekili Seçim Kanunu. Retrieved May 20, 2023, from <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuatmetin/1.5.2839.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (1983). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 1983. Retrieved April 20, 2023, from <http://www.ysk.gov.tr/ysk/content/conn/YSKUCM/path/Contribution%20Folders/SecmenIslemleri/Secimler/1983-2007-MVSecimleri/Turkiye.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (1987). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 1987. Retrieved May 18, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/ysk/content/conn/YSKUCM/path/Contribution%20Folders/SecmenIslemleri/Secimler/1983-2007-MVSecimleri/Turkiye.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (1991). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 1991. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/Milletvekili/1983-2007/Turkiye.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (1995). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 1995. Retrieved May 2, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/Milletvekili/1983-2007/Turkiye.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (1999). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 1999. Retrieved June 18, 2023, from <https://web.archive.org/web/20150402150011/http://www.ysk.gov.tr/ysk/content/conn/YSKUCM/path/Contribution%20Folders/SecmenIslemleri/Secimler/1983-2007-MVSecimleri/Turkiye.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2002). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 2002. Retrieved June 16, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/2002MilletvekiliSecimi/gumrukdahil/gumrukdahilgrafik.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2007). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 2007. Retrieved June 20, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/2007MilletvekiliSecimi/gumrukdahil/gumrukdahilgrafik.pdf>

- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2011). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 2011. Retrieved June 22, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/2011MilletvekiliSecimi/gumrukdahil/gumrukdahil.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2015, June). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları Haziran 2015. Retrieved June 20, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/Milletvekili/7Haziran2015/KesinSecimSonuclari/ResmiGazete/D.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2015, November). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları Kasım 2015. Retrieved June 21, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/Milletvekili/1Kasim2015/KesinSecimSonuclari/96-D.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2018). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 2018. Retrieved June 20, 2023, from <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/24Haziran2018/KesinSecimSonuclari/2018MV-96C.pdf>
- Yüksek Seçim Kurulu (YSK). (2023). Milletvekili Genel Seçim Sonuçları 2023. Retrieved July 1, 2023, from [https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/14Mayis2023/KesinSecimSonuclari/SIYASI\\_PARTILERIN\\_CIKARDIKLARI\\_MILLETVEKILI\\_VE\\_BAGIMSIZLARIN\\_SAYISI\\_MM25.pdf](https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/dosyalar/docs/14Mayis2023/KesinSecimSonuclari/SIYASI_PARTILERIN_CIKARDIKLARI_MILLETVEKILI_VE_BAGIMSIZLARIN_SAYISI_MM25.pdf)
- Zariç, S. (2019). Türkiye'de Seçim Barajı ve Avrupa Ülkelerinde Durum. Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, (37), 247-259.