

Report Summary

Parliamentary Cohesion and Political Positioning in the Jordanian Parliament

A Comparative Analysis of the 2026 General Budget Debate Speeches

Al-Hayat Center – RASED

December 2025

This content was produced within the project “Strengthening Parliamentary Accountability and Inclusive Dialogue in Jordan”, implemented by Al-Hayat Center – RASED, with the support of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Amman.

The views and content expressed herein are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Amman.

1. Executive Summary

This report presents a comparative analysis of parliamentary cohesion and political positioning within five major parliamentary blocs in Jordan's House of Representatives, based on the speeches delivered during the debates on the **2026 General Budget**. The budget debate is treated as a key indicator of bloc maturity, as it combines economic policy choices, political language, and the relationship between Parliament and the Government.

The report aims to assess the development of party-based and bloc-based parliamentary work, measure political predictability inside Parliament, and understand the different forms of opposition and reform within Jordan's constitutional monarchy.

The analysis finds clear differences in internal cohesion among the parliamentary blocs. The blocs ranked from highest to lowest in terms of cohesion are: **Islamic Action Front, National Charter Party, Azm Bloc, Mubadara Bloc, and Union of Centrist Parties / National Islamic Party.**

2. Objectives of the Report

The report seeks to:

1. Evaluate the maturity of parliamentary and party-based bloc work.
2. Measure the political predictability of parliamentary blocs.
3. Understand patterns of opposition and reform within the constitutional framework.

4. Analyze how parliamentary blocs position themselves in relation to the state, government, and reform agenda.
5. Identify the relationship between internal cohesion, political discourse, and legislative effectiveness.

3. Methodology

The report uses a mixed analytical framework combining **quantitative and qualitative analysis**. It relies on two main indicators:

1. Parliamentary Cohesion Index / 35

This measures the internal consistency of each bloc, including technical cohesion, shared diagnosis of economic challenges, policy priorities, and political messaging.

2. Political System Positioning Index – PSPI / 15

This measures how each bloc positions itself within the political system, including its reference to constitutional legitimacy, state institutions, the monarchy, and whether its discourse is reformist, loyalist, institutional opposition, or protest-oriented.

The report uses each bloc's official speech as a **baseline** and compares individual MPs' speeches against it to identify levels of alignment, divergence, and internal variation.

4. Main Findings by Parliamentary Bloc

4.1 National Charter Party Bloc

The National Charter Party Bloc shows a **good to high level of internal cohesion**, with an average cohesion score of **27.1/35** and a PSPI score of **11.0/15**.

The bloc is classified as a **loyal reformist bloc**, meaning it supports the constitutional and state framework while presenting policy criticism aimed at improving government performance. Its internal diversity is considered functional rather than contradictory.

The main challenge for the bloc is managing the balance between institutional reform discourse and more socially pressured, livelihood-based rhetoric.

4.2 Islamic Action Front Bloc

The Islamic Action Front Bloc shows one of the highest levels of parliamentary cohesion, with an average cohesion score of **27.3/35** and a PSPI score of **10.18/15**.

The bloc is classified as an **institutional opposition bloc operating from within the system**. Its speeches combine sharp criticism of government policies with respect for the constitutional framework.

The report finds that the bloc has a strong ability to organize diverse voices under one political ceiling, making it one of the most politically predictable blocs in Parliament.

4.3 Azm Parliamentary Bloc

Azm Bloc records a medium-to-good level of cohesion, with an average cohesion score of **24.5/35** and the highest PSPI score among the blocs at **11.3/15**.

The bloc is classified as a **reformist economic bloc**. Its leadership speech presents a clear economic reform narrative focusing on public revenues, expenditure structure, debt, taxation, and the gap between the Economic Modernization Vision and the actual budget.

However, the report notes that not all MPs were equally able to translate the bloc's economic baseline into their individual speeches. The bloc's main challenge is organizational: turning its leadership narrative into a binding reference for all members.

4.4 Mubadara Bloc

Mubadara Bloc is classified as a **programmatic reform bloc**, with an average cohesion score of **23.7/35** and a PSPI score of **10.0/15**.

The bloc has a strong reformist and policy-oriented core, especially among its leading MPs. However, the report identifies a gap between the bloc's programmatic leadership discourse and some individual speeches that shifted toward local, service-based, or emotional rhetoric.

The report concludes that Mubadara's weakness is not political, but organizational and communicative. It needs stronger message discipline and clearer internal alignment around its baseline speech.

4.5 Union of Centrist Parties / National Islamic Party Bloc

This bloc records the lowest cohesion among the five blocs, with an average cohesion score of **21.8/35** and a PSPI score of **7.8/15**.

The bloc is classified as a **loose reform coalition**. It maintains a clear national and non-confrontational political ceiling, but suffers from high internal rhetorical dispersion.

Its speeches are dominated by service-based, local-development, and livelihood concerns, while fewer MPs engage deeply with macroeconomic or structural budget issues.

The report identifies the bloc's main challenge as the weak transformation of the leadership speech into a shared political and policy reference for all members.

5. Comparative Analysis

The report shows that parliamentary cohesion is not determined by the number of MPs in a bloc, nor by the sharpness of its rhetoric. Instead, cohesion depends mainly on:

1. The clarity of the bloc's political identity.
2. The existence of a strong leadership baseline.
3. The ability to manage diversity without losing message discipline.
4. The extent to which MPs translate the bloc's official position into individual speeches.

The strongest blocs in terms of political predictability are the **Islamic Action Front** and the **National Charter Party**, while **Azm** and **Mubadara** show medium levels of cohesion with strong potential for development. The **Union of Centrist Parties / National Islamic Party** remains the most loosely organized bloc.

6. Key Conclusions

The report concludes that the Jordanian Parliament is witnessing a noticeable development in bloc-based parliamentary work. Parliamentary blocs are becoming more identifiable in terms of political identity, discourse, and patterns of reform or opposition.

The differences among blocs are not differences of legitimacy or loyalty, but rather differences in organization, message discipline, and the ability to manage internal diversity.

The report also finds that the language used in budget debate speeches is a strong indicator of bloc maturity. More cohesive blocs are better able to turn diversity into a political resource, while less cohesive blocs risk turning diversity into dispersion.

7. Recommendations

The report recommends:

1. Strengthening internal reference frameworks within parliamentary blocs.
2. Developing tools to manage rhetorical diversity and turn it into political strength.
3. Enhancing economic and budgetary analysis among MPs.
4. Building stronger mechanisms for collective bloc positions before major debates.
5. Conducting similar studies annually to track the development of parliamentary cohesion and political positioning over time.

8. Final Summary

Overall, the report shows that the 2026 General Budget debates provided a strong lens for understanding the maturity of parliamentary blocs in Jordan. The Parliament is moving toward more organized bloc-based work, but the level of cohesion varies significantly. The most effective blocs are those that combine political clarity, internal discipline, and the ability to express reform or opposition within the constitutional framework.