## General instructions

The ensuing guidelines offer detailed guidance on how to write country-chapters for “The Politics of Legislative Debate” volume. These guidelines result of our discussions in Mannheim. Overall, we decided that, given the complexity and heterogeneity of the countries covered in our book, we need to give authors the leeway to explore country-specific details. Note, however, that each chapter needs to follow a set of analysis, which is common to all chapters to ensure comparability.

1. Please drop ALL speeches of less than 50 words from your analysis. If there is any reason to include speeches shorter than 50 words, please justify it in the manuscript.
2. Please include ALL speeches (regardless of their nature) in the analysis. In some countries, there are reasons to include only a certain type of speech (e.g., bill debates). We are happy to accommodate chapters where the authors do not use all debates, provided that there is a good justification in the text.
3. In terms of window of observation/time period under study: we don’t have a particular guideline for this. Please use the window of observation that you believe is more representative of the politics of legislative debate in your country. Ideally we would like each chapter to include several legislative periods, but we are pragmatic here, considering data availability.
4. What counts as a debate? Please concatenate all interventions that MPs make in a debate, even if the MP speaks multiple times in the said debate.
5. Please respect the headings that we show in this template. Feel free to create subheadings but do use the headings that we have to ensure comparability.
6. Please use MS Word documents to deliver your chapters. OUP requires that, in edited volumes, all chapters must be delivered using Word format.
7. Do NOT include hypotheses in the chapters. There will be theoretical chapters discussing the literature and offering propositions. In the final draft, you can refer the theoretical discussion to those chapters. The only expectations that should be described more thoroughly in the country chapters would refer to country-specific predictions.
8. Word limit: 7500-8000 (max) words, including footnotes, tables, figures. References do count towards the word limit.
9. Include a 150-words abstract plus 5 keywords.
10. Use the Harvard reference style, according to OUP guidelines.

Please feel free to email the editors if you have specific queries about your chapters.

## AUTHOR NAME(S)

# CHAPTER TITLE

## **Introduction [max 500 words]**

-describe what the chapter is about, key findings, and distinctive features of the country

## **Institutional and party system background [ca 500-1000 words]**

In this section, you need to address the basic institutional design of your country.

Please cover, at least, the following points:

1. Describe the institutional system: executive-legislative relations; balance of power between executive and legislative branches. Does the executive dominate?
2. Parties and party system: describe the most important parties in the window of observation of the chapter. Discuss party system features. Are there dominant parties? Are there extreme left or right parties? Are the latter considered outsider parties?
3. Discuss the organization of parliamentary party groups/legislative parties. The balance of power between frontbenchers (leadership) and backbenchers.
4. Electoral system: discuss personal vote-seeking incentives. Frame this in a way that answers the questions: is the electoral system party-centered or candidate-centered? Discuss existing empirical work about your country that deals with home style. Discuss the ballot structure and how it allows voters to reward/punish individual legislators. Conclude point by referring to the importance of the ‘party brand’ as an electoral asset? Is the party brand important for vote-seeking (e.g. in CLPR, such as Portugal, Spain or Norway) or is the party brand of less importance (e.g. in Irish STV)?
5. How important is party unity/cohesion for electoral success? Do institutional rules make party leaders value unity or can they allow MPs to dissent?

## **The institutional setting of legislative debate [ca 1500 words]**

In this section, we need to set the rules of the game for legislative debates. As we have seen in our workshop, there is a high heterogeneity in the institutional setting of legislative debates. Producing a thorough discussion of formal and informal rules across a wide-range of countries is a valuable contribution of the volume to the discipline. Please try to answer the following questions in your country chapter:

1. Who can allocate speaking time to individual MPs? Who controls the legislative agenda – government, parties, MPs, some legislative structure specifically in charge with agenda-setting? In answering this question, you should aim to discuss both formal rules (constitutional rules, rules of procedure), party internal rules (if they exist), and informal rules.
2. Do individual MPs have a guaranteed right to participate in a debate without party leadership permission? If yes, how much time and in which type of debate?
3. How is the debate structured? What are the rules of engagement? Do MPs engage in back-and-forth talk? By contrast, do MPs deliver a debate without interruptions?
4. Do particular subsets of MPs (e.g. spokesperson or committee members) have formal rights that entitle them to take the floor?
5. What are the existing types of debates? Please select the 5 most important types of debates and produce a table where you cover the name of the debate (in English and the native language of the country), its goals, particular organization rules to that kind of debate, and the total number of minutes that rules assign to each debate.

To conclude this section, please classify the country along Proksch and Slapin’s (2015) contribution. The authors suggest that there are two extreme poles, depending on rules of procedure and electoral system organization. As described by Proksch and Slapin (2015: 96), in some systems, individual MPs are ‘guaranteed access to speaking time’, and ‘backbenchers are granted equal time as party leaders’. In other systems, the rules severely restrict individuals’ access to the floor and parties draft speakers lists, which gives party leaders much more control on this question. A number of countries fall, however, somewhere between these two extreme categories, giving some opportunity for individual MPs to access the floor, but favoring party lists. Please classify your country accordingly. If your country was included in Proksch and Slapin’s study, please refer to this classification when discussing your country’s institutional setting.

## **What is the role of intra- and interparty politics in legislative debates? [ca 2500]**

In this empirical section, we want you to explore how intra and interparty, as well as individual features, play a role in determining the likelihood that MPs take the floor (and how often they will take the floor).

The section is divided into subsections. The first uses descriptive statistics and bivariate analysis. The second turns to multivariate analysis.

Please note that the contents of this section are rigid. Please save important aspects that are relevant to your case to a subsequent section on ‘Country Specific Matters’.

*Descriptive Analysis:*

Please begin this subsection with a descriptive statistics table, including both DVs and all independent variables. Please include Mean, Std. Dv., Min, Max

Bivariate Analysis: Here, we cover two individual aspects. For each of these aspects, please produce a figure and discuss it. The editors will be sending you a do-file to harmonize the aspect of the figures across the volume. The following features should be discussed here:

1. Gender: what is the impact of gender in floor access? Do women have access to the floor that is commensurate to their numerical presence in the legislative party? Operationalize gender as a dummy variable: Women takes the value of 1, and Men 0. Please use this coding also in the multivariate analysis (several drafts coded male MPs with 1 and female MPs with zero).
2. Seniority: what is the impact of career stage in the likelihood of accessing the floor? Do more senior legislators get more access to the floor because they have offered party leaders signals of their work as party agents? Operationalize Seniority as a continuous variable that measures the number of years the MP has spent in the legislature.

*Multivariate Analysis:*

In this subsection, we run multivariate analysis explaining the determinants of participation in legislative debates. Before we go into the details of the analysis, let’s pause to discuss the unit of observation. As a rule of thumb, the unit of observation (each row in the data matrix) should be the MP over legislative term. However, some of you expressed the desire to have more disaggregated levels of analysis. For example, to observe the MP per day, MP per month, MP per legislative session. We are happy with the choice that you make, provided that you explain it in a clear way to help the readership making sense of it.

In this section, we want you to run models using two different dependent variables:

1. Number of speeches that a legislator delivered in the time unit you defined (presumably, for most of you, the legislative term). In doing so, use a negative binomial regression.
2. Number of words divided by exposure (see below how to operationalize) that a legislator delivered in the time unit you defined (presumably, for the most of you, the legislative term). In doing so, use an OLS.
3. For both cases, please included fixed-effects for the time period of interest (e.g., for the legislative term or the legislative session, depending on your choice).
4. Please include standard errors clustered at the legislator level.

What are the independent variables that you should use? As we talked over the workshop, in this section we need you to make models that are the same (or at least very similar) for all countries. In the country-specific section, you are free to make model extensions to account for country specification

In this section, please include the following covariates:

1. Gender – dummy variable that takes a value of 1 for Women and 0 for Men
2. Party Size – continuous variable that measures the absolute number of members of the legislative party
3. Seniority – continuous variable that measures the number of years the legislator has been in the parliament
4. Age
5. Age Squared
6. Party Family (Dummy variables, using one of party families as reference category)
7. Committee Chair – dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the MP holds a committee chair and 0 for all others
8. Minister – dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the MP is a minister and 0 otherwise
9. Government party member – dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the MP belongs to a legislative party that belongs the government and 0 otherwise. Note that we only consider parties that are formally in a coalition (i.e., have members in the executive). Supporting parties, e.g. contract parliamentarism, do not count towards government parties.
10. Legislative Party Leadership – dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the MP belongs to the leadership of the parliamentary party group
11. Party Leader – dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the MP is the party leader and 0 otherwise
12. Exposure (logged) – continuous variable that measures the percentage of time in which the MP held to her seat in parliament during the unit of time defined in your chapter. For example, if you are using a MP-legislative term unit of observation, in this variable you need to include the percentage of time during the legislative term in which the MP was in the parliament. If MP was in parliament for whole session that would be 1. If the MP joined the parliament later, it could be .7 or .8. If you are using month as the time unit, the same rationale applies. The logged version should \*only\* be included in the count models (negative binomial).

How to build the DV for the OLS models:

Where the outcome is the number of Words, you should use Exposure as the denominator to create a ratio. The said ratio should consist of the "total number of words legislator i delivered during legislative term t/percentage of time legislator i sat in legislative term t”.

The rationale behind this measure is that we want to capture the time that each legislator sits in parliament during a given session. Obviously, a legislator who sits for the duration of the terms has higher chances of taking the floor than a legislator that takes her sit in the middle of the term.

Don’t forget to include Term FE, plus clustered standard errors at the MP level.

Please produce a table including both the negative binomial models and the OLS. For negative binomial models, please report the AIC.

Please include up to 5 models in the tables. Consider using a step-wise approach to regression by including covariates into the equation that make most sense in your context.

Ultimately, we need 2 final models, where all variables are included – one where the dependent variable is the Number of Speeches and the other where the dependent variable is the Number of Words.

As a default we consider the following variables as explanatory:

1. Gender
2. Seniority
3. Committee Chairs
4. Minister
5. Government party member
6. Legislative Party Leadership
7. Party Leader

The following variables are considered controls:

1. Age
2. Age Squared
3. Party Family
4. Exposure (logged)

Please feel free to use variables interchangeably between the two categories depending on the context.

Please plot marginal effects using the **full specification** of the negative binomial model. In the said plot, please include explanatory variables only. Controls variables can be omitted.

**Country-Specific Section [ca 1000 words]**

In this section, you can feel free to make model extensions that have interest in the light of the chapter you are exploring. Please do not forget to explain the variables in use, as well as why they are important for your country. Include a table of results plus a plot for marginal effects.

## **Conclusions [ca 500 words]**

* concluding discussion of general patterns of speechmaking (institutions and empirical results in terms of background variables)