**Online Appendix for the article**

**Division of Labour and Dissenting Voting Behaviour of MPs in a ‘Working Parliament’**

**A1: Measurement and descriptive statistics of the variables**

*Table 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable label** | **Description** | **Operationalisation** | **Mean** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Source** |
| *Dependent variable* | | | | | | |
| Dissent | Does the MP vote against the majority position of his/her party group in a single roll-call vote? | dummy variable (1=dissenting vote,  0=no dissenting vote)  Votes on morality policy issues (own coding) are excluded.  Absences and invalid votes are coded as missing observations (in the main models and all robustness checks except for models R14-R23). | 0.012 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| *Independent variables* | | | | | | |
| Own committee: at the time of the vote | Does the vote concern an issue within the jurisdiction of a committee that an MP is member of at the time of the vote?  Only leading (*federführend*) committees in the decision-making process are considered.  Only ordinary memberships in the respective committee are considered. Apart from that, value 1 for deputy party group leaders with responsibility for the jurisdiction of the committee. Although they usually are only deputy members of the committees they are responsible for, they attend committee meetings whenever necessary (von Oertzen 2006). | dummy variable (1=MP votes on matter of own committee, 0=MP votes on other issue) | 0.054 | 0 | 1 | editorial office of the Datenhandbuch zur Geschichte des Deutschen Bundestages (upon request) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable label** | **Description** | **Operationalisation** | **Mean** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | | **Source** | |
| Own committee: before the time of the vote | Does the vote concern an issue within the jurisdiction of a committee that an MP was member of before the time of the vote?  Previous memberships in the 17th (2009-2013) and 18th (2013-2017) legislative term as well as in the 19th term are considered if the membership ended before the time of the vote.  Only leading (*federführend*) committees in the decision-making process are considered.  Only ordinary memberships in the respective committee are considered. Apart from that, value 1 for deputy party group leaders with responsibility for the jurisdiction of the committee. | dummy variable (1=MP votes on matter of past own committee, 0=MP votes on other issue) | 0.017 | 0 | 1 | | data provided by editorial office of the Datenhandbuch zur Geschichte des Deutschen Bundestages (upon request) | |
| Own committee: including advisory  committees at the time of the vote | Does the vote concern an issue within the jurisdiction of a committee that an MP is member of at the time of the vote?  Leading (*federführend*) as well as advisory (*mitberatend*) committees in the decision-making process are considered.  Only ordinary memberships in the respective committee are considered. Apart from that, value 1 for deputy party group leaders with responsibility for the jurisdiction of the committee. | dummy variable (1=MP votes on matter of own committee, 0=MP votes on other issue) | 0.204 | 0 | 1 | data provided by editorial office of the Datenhandbuch zur Geschichte des Deutschen Bundestages (upon request) | |
| Own committee: including deputy membership at the time of the vote | Does the vote concern an issue within the jurisdiction of a committee that an MP is member of at the time of the vote?  Only leading (*federführend*) committees in the decision-making process are considered.  Ordinary as well as deputy memberships in the respective committee are considered. Apart from that, value 1 for deputy party group leaders with responsibility for the jurisdiction of the committee. | dummy variable (1=MP votes on matter of own committee, 0=MP votes on other issue) | 0.096 | 0 | 1 | data provided by editorial office of the Datenhandbuch zur Geschichte des Deutschen Bundestages (upon request) | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable label** | **Description** | **Operationalisation** | **Mean** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | | **Source** | |
| Own committee: including advisory committees and deputy membership at the time of the vote | Does the vote concern an issue within the jurisdiction of a committee that an MP is member of at the time of the vote?  Leading (*federführend*) as well as advisory (*mitberatend*) committees in the decision-making process are considered.  Ordinary as well as deputy memberships in the respective committee are considered. Apart from that, value 1 for deputy party group leaders with responsibility for the jurisdiction of the committee. | dummy variable (1=MP votes on matter of own committee, 0=MP votes on other issue) | 0.274 | 0 | 1 | data provided by editorial office of the Datenhandbuch zur Geschichte des Deutschen Bundestages (upon request) | |
| Policy spokesperson | Can the MP be regarded as a policy spokesperson for an issue that corresponds with the jurisdiction of at least one standing committee?  For the large parties (CDU/CSU and SPD) and the AfD with working groups resembling exactly the jurisdictions of the Bundestag committees, the leaders of those working groups are considered. For CDU/CSU and SPD, additionally the deputy party group leaders with responsibility for several of those working groups are considered.  For the smaller parties where virtually every MP speaks for small subsets of committee jurisdictions (FDP, Greens, The Left), only the deputy party group leaders are considered as fulfilling the role of policy spokespersons comparable to larger parties (in order to also enable comparisons to ordinary committee members).  This variable does not vary between the single votes as long as MPs keep their spokesperson office. This variable is interacted with the variable ‘Own committee: at the time of the vote’ in order to enable comparisons of the spokespersons’ voting behaviour inside/outside their areas of specialisation. | dummy variable (1=MP holds a policy spokesperson office at the time of the vote, 0=MP does not hold a spokesperson office) | 0.209 | 0 | 1 | | primarily Datenhandbuch zur Geschichte des Deutschen Bundestages (chapter 5.8), secondarily Kürschners Volkshandbuch (various editions during the 19th legislative term), websites and press releases of the party groups | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable label** | **Description** | **Operationalisation** | **Mean** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Source** |
| Legislative matter  (bill/amendment) | Does the vote concern a document that has direct legal consequences (if adopted)?  The variable is coded by the type of motion as named in the vote title of the respective Bundestag roll-call vote document.  Legislative matter = 1 if vote type is  draft bill (‘Gesetzentwurf’)  amendment (‘Änderungsantrag’)  directive (‘Verordnung’)  Legislative matter = 0 if vote type is  motion (‘Antrag’)  resolution (‘Entschließung’)  appeal (‘Einspruch’)  and others | dummy variable (1=vote on legislative matter, 0=vote on non-legislative matter) | 0.427 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| Issue salience for MP’s party (standardized) | How prominently was the topic of the vote featured in the election manifesto of the MP’s party in the last federal election (2017) - compared to the other parties? | summed percentage like for the unstandardized variable (see above), but then z-standardized.  Interpretation:  Value 0: Issue has, compared to other German parties, an average salience for the MP’s party.  Value 1: Issue has a one standard deviation higher salience for the MP’s party, compared to other parties.  Value -1: Issue has a one standard deviation lower salience for the MP’s party, compared to other parties.  The mean value is different from 0 due to the varying number of observations among the party groups (variable is not weighted by party size or absence rates). | 0.197 | -1.650 | 1.905 | Manifesto Project dataset (Lehmann et al., 2022) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable label** | **Description** | **Operationalisation** | **Mean** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | | **Source** |
| Issue salience for MP’s party (unstandardized) | How prominently was the topic of the vote featured in the election manifesto of the MP’s party in the last federal election (2017)? | summed percentage of ‘quasi-sentences’ related to the jurisdiction of the respective committee in the party manifesto (see table 2 of this appendix for the respective Manifesto items for each committee)  For those committees for which no relevant items could be found, the variable was coded ‘missing’. This reduces the number of observations in model 5 compared to models 1-4. | 8.577 | 0.1 | | 51.561 | Manifesto Project dataset (Lehmann et al., 2022) |
| *Controls* | | | | | | | |
| Mandate type: direct mandate | Was the MP directly elected in the constituency or via party list (irrespective of dual candidacies) in the previous federal election (2017)? | dummy variable (1=district mandate, 0=list mandate) | 0.421 | 0 | 1 | | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| Direct candidacy only | Did the MP run only in the district for election in the last federal election (2017)? | dummy variable (1=direct candidacy only, 0=candidacy on both tiers or list candidacy only) | 0.102 | 0 | 1 | | data provided by federal election commissioner (Bundeswahlleiter) (upon request) |
| List candidacy only | Did the MP run only on the party list for election in the last federal election (2017)? | dummy variable (1=list candidacy only, 0=candidacy on both tiers or direct candidacy only) | 0.034 | 0 | 1 | | data provided by federal election commissioner (Bundeswahlleiter) (upon request) |
| Parliamentary office | Does the MP hold one of the following offices in parliament (at the time of the vote): party group leader, deputy party group leader, whip, member of the executive party group leadership, leader of a Bundestag standing committee, Bundestag president or vice president? | dummy variable (1=parliamentary office, 0=no parliamentary office) | 0.154 | 0 | 1 | | websites of the parliamentary groups; Kürschners Volkshandbuch; MPs’ personal websites |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable label** | **Description** | **Operationalisation** | **Mean** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Source** |
| Executive office | Does the MP hold one of the following offices in the federal government (at the time of the vote): chancellor, minister or junior minister (Parlamentarischer Staatssekretär)? | dummy variable (1=executive office,  0=no executive office) | 0.059 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de); Federal Government and Ministries (www.bundesregierung.de) and Kürschners Volkshandbuch; MPs’ personal websites |
| Parliamentary experience | How long did an MP serve in the German Bundestag until the year of the vote? | number of years (irrespective of how many months/days the MP was member in a given year)  example: first elected in September 2013, vote in January 2020: 7 years | 7.936 | 0 | 49 | own calculation; for MPs first elected before 2013 based on Bergmann et al. 2018 (variables *mandate\_start, mandate\_end*) |
| Age | MP’s age in the year of the vote | number of years between an MP’s birth year and the year of the vote | 51.653 | 25 | 81 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| Female | MP’s sex | dummy variable (1=female; 0=male) | 0.309 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| *Party affiliation* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPD | Is the MP a member of the parliamentary group of the SPD (at the time of the vote)? | dummy variable (1=yes; 0=no) | 0.216 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| FDP | Is the MP a member of the parliamentary group of the FDP (at the time of the vote)? | dummy variable (1=yes; 0=no) | 0.114 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| Greens | Is the MP a member of the parliamentary group of Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (at the time of the vote)? | dummy variable (1=yes; 0=no) | 0.096 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| The Left | Is the MP a member of the parliamentary group of Die Linke (at the time of the vote)? | dummy variable (1=yes; 0=no) | 0.091 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| AfD | Is the MP a member of the parliamentary group of the AfD (at the time of the vote)? | dummy variable (1=yes; 0=no) | 0.125 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |
| Government Party | Is the MP member of the party group of a governing party (at the time of the vote)?  Governing parties: CDU/CSU, SPD | dummy variable (1=yes; 0=no) | 0.574 | 0 | 1 | website of the German Bundestag (www.bundestag.de) |

Most descriptive statistics refer to the n=152,022 observations included in models 1-4.  
The descriptive figures for the salience scores refer to the reduced sample (n=122,743) in model 5.

*Table 2: Committees: number of related roll-call votes and Manifesto items*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Committee | Number of roll-call votes (only leading deliberations) | Variables of Manifesto dataset for salience scores |
| Foreign Affairs[[1]](#footnote-1) | 46 | per101 (Foreign Special Relationships: Positive)  per102 (Foreign Special Relationships: Negative)  per103 (Anti-Imperialism)  per104 (Military: Positive)  per105 (Military: Negative)  per106 (Peace)  per107 (Internationalism: Positive)  per109 (Internationalism: Negative) |
| Internal Affairs and Community | 28 | per303 (Governmental and Administrative Efficiency)  per601 (National Way of Life: Positive)  per602 (National Way of Life: Negative)  per605\_1 (Law and Order: Positive)  per605\_2 (Law and Order: Negative)  per607\_2 (Multiculturalism: Immigrants Diversity)  per608\_2 (Multiculturalism: Immigrants Assimilation) |
| Budget[[2]](#footnote-2) | 26 | per402 (Incentives: Positive)  per406 (Protectionism: Positive)  per407 (Protectionism: Negative)  per409 (Keynesian Demand Management)  per414 (Economic Orthodoxy) |
| Finance² | 21 | per402 (Incentives: Positive)  per406 (Protectionism: Positive)  per407 (Protectionism: Negative)  per409 (Keynesian Demand Management)  per414 (Economic Orthodoxy) |
| Health[[3]](#footnote-3) | 18 | per504 (Welfare State Expansion)  per505 (Welfare State Limitation) |
| Legal Affairs and Consumer Protection | 11 | per203 (Constitutionalism: Positive)  per204 (Constitutionalism: Negative)  per403 (Market Regulation)  per603 (Traditional Morality: Positive)  per604 (Traditional Morality: Negative)  per605\_1 (Law and Order: Positive)  per605\_2 (Law and Order: Negative) |
| Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety | 11 | per416\_2 (Sustainability: Positive)  per501 (Environmental Protection) |
| Food and Agriculture | 10 | per703\_1 (Agriculture and Farmers: Positive)  per703\_2 (Agriculture and Farmers: Negative) |
| General Affairs[[4]](#footnote-4) | 10 | *no appropriate Manifesto items* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Labour and Social Affairs | 9 | per405 (Corporatism/Mixed Economy)  per412 (Controlled Economy)  per503 (Equality: Positive)  per504 (Welfare State Expansion)  per505 (Welfare State Limitation)  per701 (Labour Groups: Positive)  per702 (Labour Groups: Negative)  per704 (Middle Class and Professional Groups) |
| Economic Affairs and Energy | 6 | per401 (Free Market Economy)  per402 (Incentives: Positive)  per403 (Market Regulation)  per404 (Economic Planning)  per405 (Corporatism/Mixed Economy)  per406 (Protectionism: Positive)  per407 (Protectionism: Negative)  per408 (Economic Goals)  per409 (Keynesian Demand Management)  per410 (Economic Growth: Positive)  per412 (Controlled Economy)  per413 (Nationalisation)  per414 (Economic Orthodoxy)  per416\_1 (Anti-Growth Economy: Positive) |
| Education, Research and Technology Assessment | 3 | per506 (Education Expansion)  per507 (Education Limitation)  per411 (Technology and Infrastructure: Positive) |
| Defense | 2 | per104 (Military: Positive)  per105 (Military: Negative)  per106 (Peace) |
| Scrutiny of Elections, Immunity and the Rules of Procedure | 2 | *no appropriate Manifesto items* |
| Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth | 1 | per503 (Equality: Positive)  per504 (Welfare State Expansion)  per505 (Welfare State Limitation)  per603 (Traditional Morality: Positive)  per604 (Traditional Morality: Negative)  per606 (Civic Mindedness: Positive)  per706 (Non-economic Demographic Groups) |
| Cultural and Media Affairs | 1 | per502 (Culture: Positive) |
| Human Rights and Humanitarian Aid | 1 | per201\_2 (Human Rights) |
| Transport and Digital Affairs | 1 | per411 (Technology and Infrastructure: Positive) |
| Economic Cooperation and Development | 1 | per103 (Anti-Imperialism)  per107 (Internationalism: Positive)  per109 (Internationalism: Negative)  per201\_2 (Human Rights) |
| Housing[[5]](#footnote-5), Urban Development, Building and Local Government | 1 | per504 (Welfare State Expansion)  per505 (Welfare State Limitation) |
| European Union Affairs | 0 | per108 (European Community/Union: Positive)  per110 (European Community/Union: Negative) |
| Sports[[6]](#footnote-6) | 0 | per502 (Culture: Positive) |
| Tourism | 0 | *no appropriate Manifesto items* |
| Digital Agenda | 0 | *no appropriate Manifesto items* |

**A2: Descriptive statistics: Votes against the party line**

*Figure 1: Distribution of defection rates (quantiles), by MPs*

**

*Figure 2: Distribution of defection rates (quantiles), by roll-call votes*

**

*Figure 3: Defection rates by party*

**

*Table 3: Topics of the 20 roll-call votes with the highest defection rates*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic of the vote | Date of the vote | Defection rate (%) |
| Military mission Resolute Support (Afghanistan) | 2020/03/13 | 10.11 |
| Military mission Resolute Support (Afghanistan) | 2019/03/21 | 9.47 |
| Introduction of Measles Protection Act (including mandatory vaccination for students) | 2019/11/14 | 9.08 |
| Military mission Resolute Support (Afghanistan) | 2021/03/25 | 7.04 |
| Military mission Atalanta (Somalia) | 2020/05/27 | 6.90 |
| Better Enforcement of Deportations Act | 2019/06/07 | 6.72 |
| Military mission Resolute Support (Afghanistan) | 2017/12/12 | 6.60 |
| Military mission Resolute Support (Afghanistan) | 2018/03/22 | 6.55 |
| Military mission in Iraq | 2017/12/12 | 6.45 |
| Military mission on the evacuation from Afghanistan | 2021/08/25 | 6.19 |
| Military mission Atalanta (Somalia) | 2019/05/09 | 6.08 |
| Military mission Atalanta (Somalia) | 2018/04/26 | 6.07 |
| Amendment of the Animal Welfare Act (including longer permission for castration of piglets without anaesthesia) | 2018/11/29 | 5.71 |
| Population Protection Act in the event of an epidemic situation of national dimension | 2021/04/21 | 4.92 |
| Military mission Atalanta (Somalia) | 2021/04/21 | 4.58 |
| Ratification Act on the EU’s Own Resources Resolution | 2021/03/25 | 4.07 |
| Determination Act on the continuing epidemic situation of national dimension | 2021/08/25 | 3.99 |
| Military mission against the terrorist organisation IS | 2017/12/12 | 3.87 |
| Opening of EU accession negotiations with the Republic of Northern Macedonia | 2019/09/26 | 3.82 |
| Admission of alternative procedures for the nomination of parliamentary candidates due to the Covid-19 pandemic | 2021/01/14 | 3.63 |

**A3: Robustness Checks**

To check the robustness of the results, the models were re-estimated with slight modifications:

1. The MPs’ membership in a particular party group (party dummies) was replaced by the membership in a governing party since the roles of MPs within parliamentary committees differ between government and opposition MPs. The literature found rather ambiguous results for this variable (e.g. André et al., 2015). To prevent collinearity issues, government status and party membership cannot be included simultaneously in the models. After this modification of the models, the coefficients of the independent variables keep their statistical significance, and their size hardly changes (see table 4 of this appendix).
2. The variable ‘mandate type’, i.e. whether an MP actually won a constituency or a list mandate, was replaced by two variables (‘direct candidacy only’ and ‘list candidacy only’) indicating on which tier(s) the MP ran for election – in order to cover another aspect of MPs’ electoral vulnerability (Ohmura, 2014). Again, the statistical significance as well as the substantive effect size of the independent variables hardly changes (see table 5).
3. More fundamentally, we chose more comprehensive measures of MPs’ ‘own’ issues. According to model R11 (see table 6), there is no longer a behavioural difference between topics inside and outside MPs’ area of specialisation if those topics are not measured only by the committee that leads the legislative deliberations but if also advisory committees are considered. In contrast, the effect of ‘own’ committee remains statistically significant if deputy committee memberships are considered in addition to the ordinary membership (model R12). If the broadest operationalisation of MPs’ involvement in the legislative deliberations is chosen, i.e. leading committees and advisory committees *as well as* MPs’ ordinary and deputy memberships (model R13), the effect is again statistically insignificant. Accordingly, the measurement of the ‘division of labour’ effect must be oriented towards the possibility of actually shaping the party line (instead of merely being consulted) for an effect on MPs’ voting behaviour being materialised.
4. Lastly, we changed the measurement of our dependent variable (vote defection). According to the mainstream of the literature (e.g. Benedetto and Hix, 2007; Sieberer and Ohmura, 2019; Willumsen and Öhberg, 2017), we coded an MP’s non-participation in a roll-call vote as a missing observation and excluded the respective cases from the main models of the paper. This relies on our assumption that non-voting can have manifold, mainly non-political reasons (e.g. illness, scheduling reasons, outside activities or pregnancy). However, it could also be argued that non-vote decisions are not random and thus correlated with MPs’ preferences. Two competing claims could be made that have implications for our findings:

On the one hand, it could be argued that in each vote, the responsible committee members as well as those non-committee members who have a dissenting opinion attend a vote, whereas the non-committee members who are not interested in the topic or do not have a dissenting opinion do not attend the vote. Indeed, the absence rates of non-committee members (11.2 percent) are higher than the rate for MPs who are members of the responsible committee (7.5 percent). This view implies that non-participation indicates non-dissent in the first place.

On the other hand, some studies assume or present empirical evidence that non-vote decisions are taken strategically by MPs in order not to disappoint their party principal or to balance competing demands from multiple principals (Ceron, 2015; Fazekas and Hansen, 2022; Rosas et al., 2015). It follows from this that non-participation indicates primarily dissent.

Consequently, we re-estimated our five regression models with MP absences either coded as non-dissent (table 7, models R14-R18) or as dissent (table 8, models R19-R23). The unconditioned effect of committee membership as well as all conditional effects (at the hypothesised values of the respective conditioning variable) keep their direction and statistical significance. However, the coefficients lose about half of their size if absences are coded as dissent. Interestingly, some of the controls (especially holding a government or parliamentary office) also lose their explanatory power in this case. To conclude, even if non-participation might not be a random event or related to our independent variable (voting on a document which was deliberated in a committee which the MP is member of), our substantial conclusions do not depend on the treatment of MP absences.

*Table 4: Robustness Check – Government party instead of party dummies*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (R1) | (R2) | (R3) | (R4) | (R5) |
| *Independent variables* | | | | | |
| Own committee: at the time of the vote | -0.499\*\*\*  (0.137) | -0.506\*\*\*  (0.137) | -0.389\*\*  (0.145) | -0.657\*\*  (0.202) | -0.615\*\*  (0.216) |
| Own committee: before the time of the vote |  | -0.901\*\*  (0.326) |  |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson  (all subjects) |  |  | -0.646\*\*\*  (0.131) |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson x own committee (interaction) |  |  | -0.720  (0.445) |  |  |
| Legislative matter (bill/amendment) |  |  |  | -0.387\*\*\*  (0.053) |  |
| Own committee x legislative matter (interaction) |  |  |  | 0.402  (0.274) |  |
| Issue salience for MP’s party (unstandardized) |  |  |  |  | -0.005  (0.005) |
| Own committee x issue salience (interaction) |  |  |  |  | 0.019  (0.018) |
| *Controls* | | | | | |
| Direct mandate | -0.223  (0.190) | -0.223  (0.190) | -0.262  (0.190) | -0.231  (0.191) | -0.469\*  (0.208) |
| Executive office | -3.677\*\*\*  (0.768) | -3.673\*\*\*  (0.768) | -3.753\*\*\*  (0.768) | -3.679\*\*\*  (0.768) | -3.567\*\*\*  (0.792) |
| Parliamentary office | -0.799\*\*\*  (0.157) | -0.799\*\*\*  (0.157) | -0.670\*\*\*  (0.157) | -0.785\*\*\*  (0.156) | -0.679\*\*\*  (0.180) |
| Parliamentary experience | 0.038\*\*\*  (0.010) | 0.039\*\*\*  (0.010) | 0.038\*\*\*  (0.010) | 0.040\*\*\*  (0.010) | 0.052\*\*\*  (0.011) |
| Gender | 0.164  (0.135) | 0.164  (0.135) | 0.109  (0.135) | 0.161  (0.135) | 0.062  (0.148) |
| Age | 0.014\*  (0.006) | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.014\*  (0.006) | 0.014\*  (0.006) | 0.020\*\*  (0.007) |
| Government party | -1.450\*\*\*  (0.181) | -1.446\*\*\*  (0.181) | -1.484\*\*\*  (0.181) | -1.454\*\*\*  (0.181) | -1.374\*\*\*  (0.194) |
| Intercept | -5.316\*\*\*  (0.320) | -5.304\*\*\*  (0.320) | -5.165\*\*\*  (0.319) | -5.202\*\*\*  (0.321) | -5.766\*\*\*  (0.356) |
| *N* | 152,022 | 152,022 | 152,022 | 152,022 | 122,743 |

Logit coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

Levels of significance: \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

*Table 5: Robustness Check – Candidacy mode instead of mandate type*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (R6) | (R7) | (R8) | (R9) | (R10) |
| *Independent variables* | | | | | |
| Own committee: at the time of the vote | -0.499\*\*\*  (0.137) | -0.507\*\*\*  (0.137) | -0.391\*\*  (0.145) | -0.658\*\*  (0.202) | -0.619\*\*  (0.217) |
| Own committee: before the time of the vote |  | -0.901\*\*  (0.326) |  |  |  |
| Policy Spokesperson  (all subjects) |  |  | -0.682\*\*\*  (0.135) |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson x own committee (interaction) |  |  | -0.708  (0.445) |  |  |
| Legislative matter (bill/amendment) |  |  |  | -0.387\*\*\*  (0.053) |  |
| Own committee x legislative matter (interaction) |  |  |  | 0.404  (0.274) |  |
| Issue salience for MP’s party (unstandardized) |  |  |  |  | -0.005  (0.005) |
| Own committee x issue salience (interaction) |  |  |  |  | 0.019  (0.019) |
| *Controls* | | | | | |
| Direct candidacy only | -0.025  (0.258) | -0.031  (0.258) | -0.031  (0.258) | -0.026  (0.259) | 0.051  (0.285) |
| List candidacy only | -0.476  (0.325) | -0.477  (0.325) | -0.395  (0.324) | -0.471  (0.325) | -0.315  (0.346) |
| Executive office | -3.690\*\*\*  (0.765) | -3.685\*\*\*  (0.766) | -3.807\*\*\*  (0.766) | -3.693\*\*\*  (0.766) | -3.583\*\*\*  (0.787) |
| Parliamentary office | -0.809\*\*\*  (0.155) | -0.809\*\*\*  (0.155) | -0.682\*\*\*  (0.155) | -0.796\*\*\*  (0.154) | -0.707\*\*\*  (0.178) |
| Parliamentary experience | 0.041\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.042\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.046\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.043\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.057\*\*\*  (0.012) |
| Gender | 0.205  (0.140) | 0.203  (0.140) | 0.191  (0.140) | 0.205  (0.140) | 0.148  (0.153) |
| Age | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.018\*\*  (0.007) |
| Party: CDU/CSU | baseline category | | | | |
| Party: SPD | 0.386\*  (0.197) | 0.385  (0.197) | 0.428\*  (0.197) | 0.390\*  (0.197) | 0.587\*\*  (0.217) |
| Party: FDP | 1.589\*\*\*  (0.224) | 1.581\*\*\*  (0.224) | 1.895\*\*\*  (0.232) | 1.605\*\*\*  (0.224) | 1.719\*\*\*  (0.250) |
| Party: Greens | 2.078\*\*\*  (0.220) | 2.075\*\*\*  (0.220) | 2.031\*\*\*  (0.220) | 2.082\*\*\*  (0.221) | 2.229\*\*\*  (0.242) |
| Party: The Left | 1.181\*\*\*  (0.230) | 1.177\*\*\*  (0.230) | 1.145\*\*\*  (0.229) | 1.186\*\*\*  (0.230) | 1.240\*\*\*  (0.254) |
| Party: AfD | 2.072\*\*\*  (0.229) | 2.063\*\*\*  (0.229) | 2.172\*\*\*  (0.230) | 2.087\*\*\*  (0.230) | 2.354\*\*\*  (0.253) |
| Intercept | -7.036\*\*\*  (0.347) | -7.018\*\*\*  (0.346) | -6.997\*\*\*  (0.346) | -6.933\*\*\*  (0.348) | -7.648\*\*\*  (0.394) |
| *N* | 152,022 | 152,022 | 152,022 | 152,022 | 122,743 |

Logit coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

Levels of significance: \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

*Table 6: Robustness Check – broader measurements of committee membership*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (R11) | (R12) | (R13) |
| *Independent variables* | | | |
| Own committee: including advisory committees at the time of the vote | 0.087  (0.062) |  |  |
| Own committee: including deputy membership at the time of the vote |  | -0.405\*\*\*  (0.097) |  |
| Own committee: including advisory committees and deputy membership at the time of the vote |  |  | 0.005  (0.056) |
| *Controls* | | | |
| Direct mandate | 0.048  (0.224) | 0.045  (0.224) | 0.047  (0.224) |
| Executive office | -3.639\*\*\*  (0.766) | -3.700\*\*\*  (0.766) | -3.660\*\*\*  (0.766) |
| Parliamentary office | -0.813\*\*\*  (0.156) | -0.808\*\*\*  (0.155) | -0.812\*\*\*  (0.156) |
| Parliamentary experience | 0.041\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.042\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.041\*\*\*  (0.011) |
| Gender | 0.191  (0.140) | 0.191  (0.140) | 0.191  (0.140) |
| Age | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.013\*  (0.006) | 0.013\*  (0.006) |
| Party: CDU/CSU | baseline category | | |
| Party: SPD | 0.426  (0.224) | 0.423  (0.224) | 0.425  (0.224) |
| Party: FDP | 1.638\*\*\*  (0.295) | 1.640\*\*\*  (0.295) | 1.641\*\*\*  (0.295) |
| Party: Greens | 2.143\*\*\*  (0.290) | 2.136\*\*\*  (0.290) | 2.141\*\*\*  (0.290) |
| Party: The Left | 1.215\*\*\*  (0.289) | 1.210\*\*\*  (0.288) | 1.214\*\*\*  (0.289) |
| Party: AfD | 2.043\*\*\*  (0.290) | 2.045\*\*\*  (0.290) | 2.044\*\*\*  (0.290) |
| Intercept | -7.152\*\*\*  (0.403) | -7.111\*\*\*  (0.403) | -7.139\*\*\*  (0.403) |
| *N* | 152,022 | 152,022 | 152,022 |

Logit coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

Levels of significance: \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

*Table 7: Robustness Check – MP absences coded as non-dissent*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (R14) | (R15) | (R16) | (R17) | (R18) |
| *Independent variables* | | | | | |
| Own committee: at the time of the vote | -0.461\*\*\*  (0.136) | -0.468\*\*\*  (0.136) | -0.347\*  (0.144) | -0.626\*\*  (0.202) | -0.582\*\*  (0.217) |
| Own committee: before the time of the vote |  | -0.873\*\*  (0.325) |  |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson  (all subjects) |  |  | -0.658\*\*\*  (0.134) |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson x own committee (interaction) |  |  | -0.745  (0.445) |  |  |
| Legislative matter  (bill/amendment) |  |  |  | -0.369\*\*\*  (0.052) |  |
| Own committee x legislative matter (interaction) |  |  |  | 0.413  (0.274) |  |
| Issue salience for MP’s party (unstandardised) |  |  |  |  | -0.005  (0.005) |
| Own committee x issue salience (interaction) |  |  |  |  | 0.019  (0.019) |
| *Control variables* | | | | | |
| Direct mandate | 0.266  (0.214) | 0.264  (0.214) | 0.270  (0.214) | 0.258  (0.214) | -0.121  (0.240) |
| Executive office | -3.696\*\*\*  (0.762) | -3.692\*\*\*  (0.762) | -3.808\*\*\*  (0.763) | -3.700\*\*\*  (0.762) | -3.629\*\*\*  (0.781) |
| Parliamentary office | -0.781\*\*\*  (0.153) | -0.779\*\*\*  (0.153) | -0.660\*\*\*  (0.154) | -0.767\*\*\*  (0.152) | -0.671\*\*\*  (0.174) |
| Parliamentary experience | 0.035\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.036\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.039\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.037\*\*\*  (0.011) | 0.053\*\*\*  (0.012) |
| Gender (female) | 0.169  (0.137) | 0.167  (0.137) | 0.160  (0.137) | 0.168  (0.137) | 0.108  (0.150) |
| Age | 0.012\*  (0.006) | 0.012  (0.006) | 0.012  (0.006) | 0.012\*  (0.006) | 0.016\*  (0.007) |
| Party: CDU/CSU | reference category | | | | |
| Party: SPD | 0.732\*\*\*  (0.209) | 0.729\*\*\*  (0.209) | 0.773\*\*\*  (0.209) | 0.728\*\*\*  (0.209) | 0.467  (0.243) |
| Party: FDP | 1.863\*\*\*  (0.284) | 1.854\*\*\*  (0.284) | 2.162\*\*\*  (0.292) | 1.867\*\*\*  (0.285) | 1.512\*\*\*  (0.317) |
| Party: Greens | 2.403\*\*\*  (0.280) | 2.399\*\*\*  (0.280) | 2.362\*\*\*  (0.280) | 2.399\*\*\*  (0.280) | 2.068\*\*\*  (0.308) |
| Party: The Left | 1.373\*\*\*  (0.279) | 1.367\*\*\*  (0.279) | 1.347\*\*\*  (0.279) | 1.368\*\*\*  (0.279) | 0.984\*\*  (0.309) |
| Party: AfD | 2.231\*\*\*  (0.278) | 2.221\*\*\*  (0.278) | 2.346\*\*\*  (0.280) | 2.236\*\*\*  (0.278) | 2.049\*\*\*  (0.311) |
| Intercept | -7.366\*\*\*  (0.394) | -7.348\*\*\*  (0.393) | -7.328\*\*\*  (0.393) | -7.252\*\*\*  (0.394) | -7.460\*\*\*  (0.439) |
| *N* | 170,841 | 170,841 | 170,841 | 170,841 | 136,601 |

Logit coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

Levels of significance: \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

*Table 8: Robustness Check – MP absences coded as dissent*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (R19) | (R20) | (R21) | (R22) | (R23) |
| *Independent variables* | | | | | |
| Own committee: at the time of the vote | -0.336\*\*\*  (0.043) | -0.339\*\*\*  (0.043) | -0.319\*\*\*  (0.049) | -0.404\*\*\*  (0.059) | -0.392\*\*\*  (0.073) |
| Own committee: before the time of the vote |  | -0.250\*\*\*  (0.068) |  |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson  (all subjects) |  |  | -0.412\*\*\*  (0.055) |  |  |
| Policy spokesperson x own committee (interaction) |  |  | -0.044  (0.102) |  |  |
| Legislative matter  (bill/amendment) |  |  |  | -0.191\*\*\*  (0.017) |  |
| Own committee x legislative matter (interaction) |  |  |  | 0.165  (0.086) |  |
| Issue salience for MP’s party (unstandardised) |  |  |  |  | -0.002  (0.001) |
| Own committee x issue salience (interaction) |  |  |  |  | 0.012  (0.006) |
| *Control variables* | | | | | |
| Direct mandate | -1.797\*\*\*  (0.153) | -1.800\*\*\*  (0.154) | -1.793\*\*\*  (0.153) | -1.817\*\*\*  (0.154) | 0.017  (0.138) |
| Executive office | 0.089  (0.111) | 0.088  (0.111) | 0.044  (0.112) | 0.089  (0.111) | 0.367\*\*  (0.138) |
| Parliamentary office | -0.132\*  (0.065) | -0.132\*  (0.065) | -0.030  (0.066) | -0.124  (0.065) | 0.006  (0.072) |
| Parliamentary experience | 0.063\*\*\*  (0.007) | 0.063\*\*\*  (0.007) | 0.066\*\*\*  (0.007) | 0.066\*\*\*  (0.007) | 0.052\*\*\*  (0.007) |
| Gender (female) | 0.012  (0.119) | 0.011  (0.119) | 0.002  (0.119) | 0.011  (0.120) | 0.226\*  (0.094) |
| Age | 0.027\*\*\*  (0.006) | 0.027\*\*\*  (0.006) | 0.027\*\*\*  (0.005) | 0.028\*\*\*  (0.006) | 0.014\*\*  (0.004) |
| Party: CDU/CSU | reference category | | | | |
| Party: SPD | -1.283\*\*\*  (0.150) | -1.286\*\*\*  (0.150) | -1.250\*\*\*  (0.150) | -1.297\*\*\*  (0.151) | 0.441\*\*  (0.134) |
| Party: FDP | -1.057\*\*\*  (0.212) | -1.066\*\*\*  (0.212) | -0.864\*\*\*  (0.213) | -1.060\*\*\*  (0.213) | 1.043\*\*\*  (0.190) |
| Party: Greens | -1.292\*\*\*  (0.224) | -1.297\*\*\*  (0.224) | -1.314\*\*\*  (0.224) | -1.307\*\*\*  (0.225) | 0.857\*\*\*  (0.192) |
| Party: The Left | -0.991\*\*\*  (0.218) | -0.997\*\*\*  (0.218) | -1.006\*\*\*  (0.218) | -1.007\*\*\*  (0.220) | 0.996\*\*\*  (0.188) |
| Party: AfD | -2.138\*\*\*  (0.157) | -2.150\*\*\*  (0.157) | -2.051\*\*\*  (0.156) | -2.151\*\*\*  (0.157) | 1.359\*\*\*  (0.188) |
| Intercept | -2.683\*\*\*  (0.303) | -2.668\*\*\*  (0.303) | -2.671\*\*\*  (0.303) | -2.643\*\*\*  (0.305) | -4.250\*\*\*  (0.258) |
| *N* | 170,841 | 170,841 | 170,841 | 170,841 | 136,601 |

Logit coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

Levels of significance: \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001
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1. Votes on military missions abroad are usually taken by roll-call (which explains the high number of motions compared to other issues). Thereby, the Foreign Affairs committee (not the Defense committee) leads the legislative deliberations on those matters. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The same Manifesto items are considered for the Budget and the Finance committee because both share the responsibility for the jurisdiction of the Federal Ministry of Finance. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. There is no separate manifesto item for health. However, ‘health care’ is mentioned in a list of policies which were summarised under ‘welfare state’. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The General Affairs Committee (*Hauptausschuss*) replaced all regular standing committees until their investiture on January 17, 2018. No Manifesto items could be assigned to it, as this committee has dealt with all issues that were put to the vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. There is no separate Manifesto item for housing. However, ‘social housing’ is mentioned in a list of policies which were summarised under ‘welfare state’. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. There is no separate Manifesto item for sports. However, ‘sports’ and ‘public sport clubs’ are mentioned in the description of the ‘culture’ item. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)