**Appendices**

**Appendix A. Coding Rules and Frequently Appearing Welfare Keywords in Taiwan**

1. **Coding Rules**

Following the definition that this paper adopts, each submitted bill is coded as either “social welfare” or “others” based on the primary emphasis bill’s title and key summaries in official government documents (based on the information retrieved from Deliberation Summary and Legislation Search) by Legislative Yuan for Taiwan. Such coding makes both the social welfare and other categories mutually exclusive and totally exhaustive.

Each bill was hand-coded based on the original language, without translation into English. However, the analysis lacks an inter-coder reliability check at this stage.

In cases where there were several changes proposed that covered both social welfare issues as well as other issues within a bill (less than 3 percent of the coding included bills like this), these were coded as “social welfare issues.” In case there were multiple directions to changes on social welfare issues, e.g. expansion and retrenchment, within a sponsored bill (less than 5 percent of the coding included bills like this), the coding was based on the change that each official summary primarily emphasizes in its opening lines.

1. **Frequently Appearing Welfare Keywords in Taiwan (in Chinese)**

公教人員保險, 口腔健康, 國軍退伍軍人褔利, 國民年金, 農民健康保險, 勞工保險, 勞工退休金, 老年農民福利, 老人福利, 婦女福利, 社會救助, 性別工作平等, 身心障礙者,權益保障, 兒童及少年福利, 癌症防治, 原住民族教育, 長期照顧服務, 全民健康保險, 政務人員退職撫卹, 終身學習, 職業災害勞工保, 就業保險, 後天免疫缺乏症候群防治

**Appendix B. Coding Significance and Direction of Social Welfare Change**

1. **Definition of significant welfare changes**

Defining legislative significance is a complex task that is sometimes easier to recognize than to define (Cameron, 2000). So far, in defining the significance of each bill, legislative studies scholars have often used multiple atheoretical criteria. These range from simple things such as size or length of legislation, media saliency, the retrospective judgement of specialists, or key publications including a list of “significant” laws (Mayhew, 2005; Norton, 1991; Tsebelis). Instead of relying on external proxies to define what is “significant”, the coding of “significance” is manually coded based on specific contents directly pertinent to core theoretical concerns of welfare studies.

For future comparability’s sake, I referred to what established welfare studies projects conventionally have focused on. For instance, one of the biggest data-collection projects in welfare studies field is the Comparative Welfare Entitlement Data project by Scruggs, Jahn, and Kuitto (website: http://cwed2.org/). Their data collection focuses on dimensions such as coverage, qualification period, replacement rate, the ratio of employee contribution, retirement age, or benefit duration. Although the continuous nature of these dimensions does not easily lend itself to a simple categorization, I divided significance of bills between “significant” and “non-significant” for simplicity’s sake as follows. The “significant” includes most of the aspects that students of welfare states analyze as their key targets.

1. **Frequently appearing categories of “significant” welfare changes**
2. Providing services, e.g. medical, education, job-search, nursery, elderly care, inoculation, communication
3. Establishing/unifying organization/organizations for recipients
4. Widening the scope of recipients
5. Increasing the amount of subsidy/compensation
6. Extending the benefit receiving period
7. Relaxing the benefit receiving conditions, e.g. contribution period, benefit receiving period
8. Legalizing quota, e.g. mandatory women/disabled people employment
9. **Frequently appearing categories of “insignificant” welfare changes**
10. Stylistic changes, e.g. making legal languages more accessible
11. Automatic abolitions (e.g. removing a bill that became redundant after enacting a more inclusive one)
12. Implementation details
13. Rearranging welfare-related organizations
14. Prescribing rights and duties, i.e. framework acts
15. Increasing administrative efficiency for registration
16. Increasing accessibility, e.g. selling drugs in convenient stores
17. Proclaiming discrimination and injustice prevention
18. **Direction: Expansion, retrenchment no changes**

With regards to the contents of expansion and retrenchment, this paper builds on the work by Klitgaard and Elmelund‐Præstekær (2013: 60). According to Klitgaard and Elmelund‐Præstekær, laws are recognized as retrenchments if they intend to reduce the extent and/or quality of the welfare programme, the financial viability and/or political and administrative capacity to pursue policies of expansion in the future. Laws are seen as expansions if they intend to increase the extent and/or quality of the programme, the financial viability, and/or political and administrative capacity to pursue expansion in the future. For this paper, each direction can is defined as follows:

1. **Expansion**: If a bill is about accompanying specific measure/measures listed in the aforementioned “significant/insignificant welfare changes”
2. **Retrenchment:** 1) If a bill is about revoking specific measure/measures created to realize any change aspect listed in the aforementioned “welfare changes”; 2) If a bill is about accompanying specific measure/measures to prevent any aforementioned “significant/insignificant welfare changes”, e.g. narrowing the definition of pension beneficiaries; 3) If a bill is about accompanying specific measure/measures opposite to any aforementioned “welfare changes” for certain actors, e.g. tighter regulation of childcare eligibility check
3. **No-direction:** If a change does not indicate any expansion or retrenchment, it is coded as no-direction.

**Appendix C. Key Variable Statistics**

1. **Variable statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Type | Mean | Min | Max | Standard  Deviation | Source |
| Bill Success Status | Binary  (Failure 0 Success 1) | 34.31 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 | Legislative Yuan Legislation Search |
| Social-Welfare Bill | Binary  (Other 0, Welfare 1) | 24.2 | 0 | 1 | 0.43 | Legislative Yuan Legislation Search |
| Electoral Democracy Level | Continuous | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.81 | 0.13 | Varieties of Democracy |
| Legislative Branch | Binary  (Executive 0, Legislative 1) | 0.75 | 0 | 1 | 0.43 | Legislative Yuan Legislation Search |
| Election Period | Binary  (Others 0, Election 1) | 0.32 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 | Election Study Center at National Chengchi University |

1. **Links to the Data Sources** 
   1. Election Study Center at National Chengchi University: <https://esc.nccu.edu.tw/main.php>
   2. Legislative Yuan Legislation Search:

https://lis.ly.gov.tw/lydbc/lydbkmout

* 1. Varieties of Democracy

<https://www.v-dem.net/en/>)