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## Data (2011-2012)

- Total number of bills - 103346 and 117308
- Total number of wrong bills - 4426 and 4971
"Regional" hypothesis:
- GRP per capita (index price)
- Ethnic composition (rus and titular)
- Distance to Moscow
- Urban population
- Number of organizations
- Status
- "United Russia" votes share, V. Putin votes share
- Effective number of parties, effective number of candidates (both Golosov index)
- Transfers share in regional revenues


## Data (2011-2012)

"Parliamentary" hypothesis:

- Number of deputies
- Number of constant committees
- "United Russia" seats share
- Number of fractions
- Population

Scatterplot "The correlation between the regional legislative activity and the quality of legal acts (2011)"


Scatterplot "The correlation between regional legislative activity and the quality of legal acts (2012)"


## "Heterogeneity of law production space"

1) Intensity of legislative activity in regions
2) Quality of legislative activity in regions

## Total number of inspected bills. "Regional" hypothesis (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $6.069 \mathrm{e}+02$ | $4.378 \mathrm{e}+02$ | 1.386 | 0.170 |
| Status | $-1.284 \mathrm{e}+02$ | $2.190 \mathrm{e}+02$ | -0.586 | 0.559 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $5.201 \mathrm{e}+02$ | $3.887 \mathrm{e}+02$ | 1.338 | 0.185 |
| GRP (price index) | $-8.226 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $7.179 \mathrm{e}-05$ | -1.146 | 0.255 |
| Share of urban population | $4.612 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $5.390 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 0.856 | 0.395 |
| Number of organizations | $2.935 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $4.004 \mathrm{e}-04$ | -0.733 | 0.466 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1964; Adjusted R-squared: 0.1442; p-value: 0.004211

## Total number of bills. "Regional" hypothesis (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | $\mathbf{t}$ value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $6.327 \mathrm{e}+02$ | $5.519 \mathrm{e}+02$ | 1.147 | 0.255 |
| Status | $-1.645 \mathrm{e}+02$ | $2.746 \mathrm{e}+02$ | -0.599 | 0.551 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $6.993 \mathrm{e}+02$ | $4.851 \mathrm{e}+02$ | 1.442 | 0.153 |
| GRP (price index) | $-4.884 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $9.246 \mathrm{e}-05$ | -0.528 | 0.599 |
| Share of urban population | $4.758 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $6.754 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 0.705 | 0.483 |
| Number of organizations | $-4.354 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $4.760 \mathrm{e}-04$ | -0.915 | 0.363 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1958; Adjusted R-squared: 0.1436; p-value: 0.004315

## Total number of bills per deputy. "Regional" hypothesis (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $2.593 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $1.284 \mathrm{e}+01$ | 2.020 | 0.0469 |
| Status | $-1.617 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $6.420 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -2.519 | 0.0138 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-4.061 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.140 \mathrm{e}+01$ | -0.356 | 0.7225 |
| GRP (price index) | $5.912 \mathrm{e}-06$ | $2.105 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 2.809 | 0.0063 |
| Share of urban population | $1.495 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $1.580 \mathrm{e}-01$ | 0.946 | 0.3471 |
| Number of organizations | $-2.337 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $1.174 \mathrm{e}-05$ | -1.990 | 0.0501 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.3414; Adjusted R-squared: 0.2987; p-value: 4.199e-06

## Total number of bills per deputy. "Regional" hypothesis (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $2.628 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $1.277 \mathrm{e}+01$ | 2.058 | 0.0429 |
| Status | $-1.525 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $6.353 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -2.400 | 0.0188 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $2.885 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.122 \mathrm{e}+01$ | 0.257 | 0.7978 |
| GRP (price index) | $1.123 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $2.139 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 5.251 | $1.3 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| Share of urban population | $7.650 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $1.563 \mathrm{e}-01$ | 0.490 | 0.6258 |
| Number of organizations | $-2.492 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $1.101 \mathrm{e}-05$ | -2.263 | 0.0265 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.4831; Adjusted R-squared: 0.4495 ; p-value: 6.116e-10

## Total number of bills. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 1646.501 | 577.720 | 2.850 | 0.00559 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | -1.473 | 3.291 | -0.448 | 0.65571 |
| Number of committees per deputy | -1536.886 | 679.853 | -2.261 | 0.02657 |
| Fractions' number | 27.192 | 80.793 | 0.337 | 0.73735 |
| United Russia's seats share | -230.359 | 427.445 | -0.539 | 0.59148 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.08442; Adjusted R-squared: 0.03746; p-value: 0.1377

## Total number of bills. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | 2071.712 | 852.842 | 2.429 | 0.0174 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | -1.179 | 4.091 | -0.288 | 0.7740 |
| Number of committees per deputy | -1955.767 | 856.953 | -2.282 | 0.0252 |
| Fractions' number | 21.055 | 106.120 | 0.198 | 0.8432 |
| United Russia seats' share | -479.431 | 670.108 | -0.715 | 0.4765 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.08925; Adjusted R-squared: 0.04255; p-value: 0.1169

## Total number of bills per deputy. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr (>\|t|) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | 56.72401 | 13.86665 | 4.091 | 0.000104 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | -0.45433 | 0.07928 | -5.731 | $1.8 \mathrm{e}-07$ |
| Number of committees | -1.14998 | 0.48279 | -2.382 | 0.019658 |
| Fractions' number | 0.17972 | 2.07257 | 0.087 | 0.931123 |
| United Russia's seats share | 4.28118 | 11.14160 | 0.384 | 0.701838 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.4093; Adjusted R-squared: 0.379; p-value: 2.059e-08

## Total number of bills per deputy. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|\mathbf{t \|}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | 69.4762 | 18.6945 | 3.716 | 0.000378 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | -0.4579 | 0.0913 | -5.016 | $3.24 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| Number of committees | -1.2589 | 0.5615 | -2.242 | 0.027793 |
| Fractions' number | -0.1252 | 2.4850 | -0.050 | 0.959933 |
| United Russia seats' share | -5.5220 | 16.0067 | -0.345 | 0.731038 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.3745; Adjusted R-squared: 0.3424; p-value: 1.767e-07

# Incongruous bills' share. "Regional" hypothesis (with voting for United Russia) (2011) 

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $8.944 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $3.848 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 2.325 | 0.0227 |
| Distance from the federal center | $3.595 \mathrm{e}-06$ | $1.864 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 1.929 | 0.0574 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-4.112 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $3.038 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -1.353 | 0.1799 |
| United Russia's votes share | $-2.452 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $3.354 \mathrm{e}-04$ | -0.731 | 0.4670 |
| Status | $-2.147 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $1.400 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.153 | 0.8785 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-2.385 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.081 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -1.146 | 0.2554 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.08548; Adjusted R-squared: 0.0261; p-value: 0.2197

# Incongruous bills' share. "Regional" hypothesis (with the effective number of parties) (2011) 

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathrm{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $-4.163 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $9.314 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.447 | 0.6561 |
| Distance from the federal center | $3.971 \mathrm{e}-06$ | $1.847 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 2.150 | 0.0347 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-3.676 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.546 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -1.444 | 0.1529 |
| Effective number of parties in 2011 elections | $1.106 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $9.042 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 1.223 | 0.2252 |
| Status | $-1.010 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $1.381 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.073 | 0.9419 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-2.626 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.017 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -1.302 | 0.1969 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.09668; Adjusted R-squared: 0.03802; p-value: 0.1574

## Incongruous bills' share. "Regional" hypothesis (with voting for V. Putin) (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $6.133 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $5.083 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 1.207 | 0.231 |
| Distance from the federal center | $2.587 \mathrm{e}-06$ | $1.714 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 1.509 | 0.135 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-1.865 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.874 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.649 | 0.518 |
| Putin votes share | $-1.213 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $4.978 \mathrm{e}-04$ | -0.244 | 0.808 |
| Status | $2.980 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $1.306 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 0.228 | 0.820 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-3.828 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $1.897 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.202 | 0.841 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.056; Adjusted R-squared: -0.005302; p-value: 0.4769

## Incongruous bills' share. "Regional" hypothesis

(with the effective number of candidates) (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $-1.545 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $8.681 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -0.178 | 0.859 |
| Distance from the federal center | $2.629 \mathrm{e}-06$ | $1.709 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 1.539 | 0.128 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-1.711 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.554 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.670 | 0.505 |
| Effective number of candidates in 2012 elections | $2.047 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $8.677 \mathrm{e}-01$ | 0.236 | 0.814 |
| Status | $3.361 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $1.286 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 0.261 | 0.794 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-4.322 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $1.875 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.230 | 0.818 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.05595; Adjusted R-squared: -0.005351; p-value: 0.4774

## Total number of incongruous bills per deputy. "Regional" hypothesis (with voting for United Russia) (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $4.522 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.731 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 2.612 | 0.01081 |
| Distance from the federal center | $2.259 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $8.386 \mathrm{e}-05$ | 2.694 | 0.00867 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-2.806 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.367 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -2.052 | 0.04352 |
| United Russia's votes share | $-1.457 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $1.509 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -0.965 | 0.33751 |
| Status | $-1.518 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $6.301 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -2.409 | 0.01840 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-7.988 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $9.364 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -0.853 | 0.39629 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1763; Adjusted R-squared: $0.1228 ; p$-value: 0.00946

## Total number of incongruous bills per deputy. "Regional" hypothesis (with the effective number of parties) (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $1.151 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $4.235 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 0.272 | 0.78647 |
| Distance from the federal center | $2.396 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $8.399 \mathrm{e}-05$ | 2.853 | 0.00556 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-2.198 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.158 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -1.899 | 0.06136 |
| Effective number of parties in 2011 elections | $2.119 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $4.111 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 0.515 | 0.60773 |
| Status | $-1.445 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $6.279 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -2.301 | 0.02412 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-9.821 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $9.173 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -1.071 | 0.28768 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1692; Adjusted R-squared: 0.1153 ; p-value: 0.01248

## Total number of incongruous bills per deputy. "Regional" hypothesis (with voting for V. Putin) (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | 8.2496506 | 2.9790508 | 2.769 | 0.00704 |
| Distance from the federal center | 0.0002328 | 0.0001004 | 2.318 | 0.02312 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | -3.9929564 | 1.6841695 | -2.371 | 0.02025 |
| Putin votes share | -0.0493606 | 0.0291725 | -1.692 | 0.09468 |
| Status | -1.7302300 | 0.7651146 | -2.261 | 0.02656 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | -1.1858571 | 1.1115769 | -1.067 | 0.28938 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1652; Adjusted R-squared: 0.111; p-value: 0.01457

## Total number of incongruous bills per deputy. "Regional" hypothesis <br> (with the effective number of candidates) (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | $\mathbf{t}$ value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $-5.470 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $5.138 \mathrm{e}+01$ | -1.065 | 0.2904 |
| Distance from the federal center | $2.489 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $1.011 \mathrm{e}-04$ | 2.462 | 0.0161 |
| Regional ethnic composition (Russian) | $-3.033 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.511 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -2.007 | 0.0483 |
| Effective number of candidates in 2012 elections | $5.845 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $5.136 \mathrm{e}+01$ | 1.138 | 0.2586 |
| Status | $-1.549 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $7.610 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -2.036 | 0.0452 |
| Transfers share in regional revenues | $-1.417 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.110 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -1.276 | 0.2057 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1485; Adjusted R-squared: 0.09321 ; p-value: 0.02728

## Incongruous bills' share. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $2.017 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.804 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 0.719 | 0.47406 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | $4.567 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $2.402 \mathrm{e}-04$ | 1.901 | 0.06100 |
| Committee number per deputy | $1.377 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $4.343 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 3.170 | 0.00219 |
| Fractions' number | $-8.275 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $4.410 \mathrm{e}-03$ | -1.876 | 0.06441 |
| Citizens' number per deputy | $-1.922 \mathrm{e}-07$ | $8.830 \mathrm{e}-08$ | -2.176 | 0.03259 |
| Inspected bills' number per deputy | $4.748 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $2.500 \mathrm{e}-04$ | 1.899 | 0.06129 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1952; Adjusted R-squared: 0.1429; p-value: 0.004432

## Incongruous bills' share. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $2.465 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $2.474 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 0.996 | 0.32222 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | $2.008 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $2.104 \mathrm{e}-04$ | 0.954 | 0.34298 |
| Number of committees per deputy | $1.330 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $4.028 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 3.303 | 0.00145 |
| Fractions' number | $-4.187 \mathrm{e}-03$ | $3.862 \mathrm{e}-03$ | -1.084 | 0.28166 |
| Citizens' number per deputy | $-1.705 \mathrm{e}-07$ | $7.958 \mathrm{e}-08$ | -2.142 | 0.03532 |
| Inspected bills' number per deputy | $2.111 \mathrm{e}-04$ | $2.015 \mathrm{e}-04$ | 1.047 | 0.29815 |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.1769; Adjusted R-squared: 0.1234; p-value: 0.009265

## Total number of incongruous bills per deputy. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2011)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $-1.402 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $9.864 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -1.421 | 0.15924 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | $1.500 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $8.450 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 1.775 | 0.07986 |
| Committee number per deputy | $7.826 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.528 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 5.123 | $2.17 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| Fractions' number | $-1.808 \mathrm{e}-01$ | $1.551 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -1.166 | 0.24741 |
| Citizens' number per deputy | $-1.015 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $3.106 \mathrm{e}-06$ | -3.267 | 0.00162 |
| Inspected bills' number per deputy | $5.709 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $8.795 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 6.492 | $7.50 \mathrm{e}-09$ |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.557; Adjusted R-squared: 0.5282; p-value: 1.97e-12

## Total number of incongruous bills per deputy. "Parliamentary" hypothesis (2012)

| Variables | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr $(>\|t\|)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Intercept) | $-2.239 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.066 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -2.100 | 0.03898 |
| Size of the parliament (number of deputies) | $1.477 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $9.008 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 1.639 | 0.10525 |
| Number of committees per deputy | $1.000 \mathrm{e}+01$ | $1.694 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 5.905 | $9.00 \mathrm{e}-08$ |
| Fractions' number | $-7.015 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $1.680 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -0.417 | 0.67748 |
| Citizens' number per deputy | $-1.173 \mathrm{e}-05$ | $3.459 \mathrm{e}-06$ | -3.390 | 0.00111 |
| Inspected bills' number per deputy | $5.885 \mathrm{e}-02$ | $8.761 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 6.717 | $2.84 \mathrm{e}-09$ |

Number of cases: 83
Multiple R-squared: 0.5992; Adjusted R-squared: 0.5731; p-value: 4.643e-14

## Correlation between total number of bills per deputy and total number of wrong bills per deputy

| 2011 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total number of bills per deputy | p-value |
| Total number of incongruous bills per <br> deputy | 0.615 | $6.185 \mathrm{e}-10$ |
|  | Total number of bills per deputy | p-value |

