



Parliament Watch!

Strengthening political debate and deliberative discourse

The project is funded by the European Union

Index for monitoring the quality of debate in the Assembly

Information about the session and the speakers

1. Date
2. Method for the monitoring of sessions (at the premises of the Assembly, through the Parliamentary TV channel, via video/audio recording or transcript)
3. Name and number of committee or plenary session
4. Topic of discussion
5. Legislative procedure - normal, shortened, urgent
6. Speaker - Member of Parliament – initials, gender, ethnicity, education, political party, political block (position or opposition), constituency
7. Speaker - external participant – initials, institution that represents, gender
8. Type of discussion – speech, reply, counter-reply

Subject of analysis is each and every act of speech (individual speeches, replies and counter-replies) made by speakers present on the session, including Members of Parliament and external participants.

A. Level of argumentation – count the number of arguments in each act of speech

- 1) No argumentation - the speaker does not present any argument in the speech act (example – s/he only asks additional information or just confirms or denies without explanation)
- 2) Weak argumentation – the speaker just indicates that something should or should not be done, that something is a good or bad idea, but does not explain/justify why that should be done.
- 3) One argument – the speaker gives one complete argument/explanation/reason which justifies his/her position why something should or shouldn't be done or why something is good or bad.
- 4) Two or more than two arguments - the speaker uses two or more arguments to justify his/her position

B. Content of justifications of arguments

- 1) Neutral – the speaker does not refer to costs or benefits for any group/pol. party/ethnic community



Parliament Watch!

Strengthening political debate and deliberative discourse

The project is funded by the European Union

- 2) Own group – the speaker refers to costs or benefits for his/her own group/pol. party/ethnic community
- 3) Other groups – the speaker refers to costs or benefits for other groups/pol. parties/ethnic communities
- 4) Common good – the speaker refers to costs or benefits for all citizens/groups/ communities
- 5) Abstract principles – the speaker refers to abstract principles like social justice, peace, freedom, quality of living, equality...

C. Listening

- 1) The speaker ignores arguments and questions addressed to him/her by other participants
- 2) The speaker does not ignore arguments and questions addressed to him/her and gives answers to other participants

D. Force of better argument – note if the arguments presented in the debate affect the speakers to change their positions / views in the debate

- 1) No reference - the speaker does not refer at all to arguments brought by other speakers
- 2) Change of position because of arguments heard during the debate– the speaker indicates changes in his/her position and refers to arguments heard during the debate
- 3) Change of position, but not because of arguments heard during the debate. The speaker indicates changes in his/her position but does not refer to arguments heard during the debate
- 4) No change – the speaker acknowledges worthiness of arguments heard in the debate
- 5) No change – the speaker does not acknowledge worthiness of arguments heard in the debate

E. Stories – note if the speaker uses story/testimony/anecdote/joke in justification of positions

- 1) No story
- 2) Speaker uses story as only justification
- 3) Speaker uses story and connects it with argument
- 4) Story connected with argument reinforces rational justification

F. Respect towards other participants



Parliament Watch!

Strengthening political debate and deliberative discourse
The project is funded by the European Union

- 1) No reference - the speaker does not indicate anything in his/her speech that refers to other participants
- 2) Disrespect - the speaker insults and shows disrespect towards other participants or political parties
- 3) Partial disrespect the speaker in larger part of the speech insults and shows disrespect towards other participants or political parties, but in smaller part behaves neutrally or shows respect towards other participants
- 4) Partial respect - the speaker in larger part is neutral or shows respect towards other participants, but in smaller part shows disrespect towards other participants or political parties.
- 5) Respect - the speaker expresses basic respect towards other participants.
- 6) Explicit respect - the speaker praises other participants

G. Respect towards arguments

- 1) No reference - the speaker does not indicate anything in his/her speech towards arguments of other participants
- 2) Disrespect - the speaker insults and shows disrespect towards arguments of other participants
- 3) Partial disrespect - the speaker in larger part of the speech insults and shows disrespect for the arguments of other participants, but in smaller part assumes a neutral stance or show respect towards arguments of other participants
- 4) Partial respect - the speaker in larger part of the speech is neutral or shows respect towards arguments of other participants, but in smaller part show disrespect towards arguments of other participants.
- 5) Respect - the speaker shows basic respect towards arguments of other participants
- 6) Explicit respect - the speaker praises the arguments put forward by other participants

H. Use of inappropriate language

- 1) The speaker does not use inappropriate/offensive/abusive language
- 2) The speaker uses inappropriate/offensive/abusive language to address other participants
- 3) The speaker uses inappropriate/offensive/abusive language towards arguments of other participants
- 4) Hate speech - the speaker uses inappropriate/offensive/abusive language that insults, belittles, degrades other participants on the basis of their political affiliation, ethnicity, religion, gender...



Parliament Watch!

Strengthening political debate and deliberative discourse

The project is funded by the European Union

I. Interruption - every interruption of the speaker's presentation that lasts longer than a few seconds (5-8 sec.). These include longer heckling or utterances from other participants on the session

- 1) No interruption - Regular speech act
- 2) Interruption - when the speaker is interrupted by other participant with a few utterances
of not more than a few seconds

J. Gestures and body language – note if the speaker uses gestures to support his/her speech and whether with gesticulation eventually sends a message to other participants

- 1) No gestures - the speaker speaks calmly and does not make any gestures
- 2) Gestures in addition to speech – the speaker uses gestures in addition to speech to emphasize his/her argumentation
- 3) Gestures towards other participants – the speaker makes clear, unambiguous and non-offensive gestures toward other participants
- 4) Offensive gestures – the speaker uses explicit and unambiguous offensive gestures toward other participants
- 5) The speech is supplemented with gestures and body language which includes use and display of (to write what, example. T-shirt with political message, banner, flyer, photography, document, other object, animal)

K. Constraints

- 1) No constraints
- 2) The speaker indicates that is constrained by the behavior of other
- 3) Physical constrain – when the speaker indicates or it is visible that s/he is physically obstructed by other participants
- 4) Passive interference – when participants in the room are not trying actively to disrupt the speech but use and display banners, t-shirts with messages, symbols, documents, other objects, animals which aims to affect the discussion

L. Time

Code in minutes and seconds the length of the speech act.



Parliament Watch!

Strengthening political debate and deliberative discourse
The project is funded by the European Union