

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A1. Operationalization and aggregation of discourse quality

	DQI categories	Habermas standards
Justification rationality	<p>(0) The speaker does not present any argument or only says that X should or should not be done, but no reason is given.</p> <p>(1) <i>Inferior Justification</i>: Here a reason Y is given why X should or should not be done, but no linkage is made between X and Y—the inference is incomplete or the argument is merely supported with illustrations.</p> <p>(2) <i>Qualified Justification</i>: A linkage is made why one should expect that X contributes to or detracts from Y. A single complete inference already qualifies for code 2.</p> <p>(3) <i>Sophisticated Justification</i>: At least two complete justifications are given, either two complete justifications for the same demand or complete justifications for two different demands.</p>	<p>(0) max < 3</p> <p>(1) max = 3</p>
Common good orientation	<p>(0) Explicit statement concerning constituency or group interests (<i>own country</i>)</p> <p>(1) No reference: The speaker does not refer to benefits and costs at all</p> <p>(1.5) Explicit statement in terms of both, Europe and own country</p> <p>(2) Explicit statement in terms of a conception of the common good in utilitarian or collective terms (<i>EU, Europe</i>).</p> <p>(3) Explicit statement in terms of the difference principle (<i>solidarity, quality of life, global justice, etc.</i>)</p>	<p>(0) max < 1.5</p> <p>(1) max \geq 1.5</p>
Respect and interactivity	<p>(0) Negative (disrespectful) reference to other participants' arguments.</p> <p>(1) No reference to other participants' arguments.</p> <p>(2) Neutral reference to other participants' arguments.</p> <p>(3) Positive (explicitly respectful) reference to other participants' arguments.</p> <p>(up to three references were coded per statement)</p>	<p>(0) max < 3</p> <p>(1) max = 3</p>
Respect towards groups	<p>(0) <i>No Respect</i>: This code is reserved for speeches in which there are only or predominantly negative statements about the groups.</p> <p>(1) <i>Implicit Respect</i>: No explicitly negative statements can be identified, but neither are there explicit positive statements.</p> <p>(2) <i>Respect (balanced)</i>: Both, positive and negative respect is equally expressed.</p> <p>(3) <i>Explicit Respect</i>: This code is assigned if there is at least one explicitly positive statement about the groups and either are negative statements completely absent or positive statements are clearly dominating the negative statements.</p>	<p>(0) max < 2</p> <p>(1) max \geq 2</p>
Questioning	<p>(0) No (or only rhetorical) question posed</p> <p>(1) Question asked</p>	<p>(0) max = 0</p> <p>(1) max = 1</p>
Story-telling	<p>(0) No story-telling</p> <p>(1) Story-telling</p>	<p>(0) if max = 0</p> <p>(1) if max = 1</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A2: DQI coding examples

Justification rationality (level of justification)	
This indicator captures whether and to what extent speakers provide reasons to back their claims.	
<p>(0) <i>No Justification</i>: The speaker does not present any argument or only says that X should or should not be done, but no reason is given.</p>	<p>a) „Ich hätte eine Frage an die Deutschen. Sind doch die Einwanderer der dritten Generation bereits in Deutschland. Und werden diese dann immer noch als Einwanderer betrachtet, obwohl sie die deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit haben und in Deutschland geboren sind?“ (<i>spanische Frau stellt eine Frage, Gruppe 17</i>) [<i>Deutsche Übersetzung des Originalbeitrages durch EuroPolis Übersetzer</i>]</p> <p>a) „I would like to pose a question to the Germans: Now you have the third generation of immigrants in Germany. Are they still regarded as immigrants despite the fact that they possess the German citizenship and are born in Germany?“ (<i>Spanish women poses a question, group 17</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript; German translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p> <p>b) « Moi je suis pour ça enfin [contrôles rigoureux]. Pour moi c’est bon. » (<i>homme français sans justifier sa position, groupe 4</i>)</p> <p>b) “This is what I favor [strict border controls]. To me, this sounds like a good solution.” (<i>French man does not justify his position, group 4</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript</i>]</p> <p>c) “I think that in Poland, there are not so many immigrants. I guess most of them are coming to my country from Ukraine and Belarus. However, people are also transiting Poland to get to other EU countries that have a better standard of living.” (<i>Polish men describing the immigration situation in his home country, group 16</i>) [<i>English translation from Polish transcript</i>]</p>
<p>(1) <i>Inferior Justification</i>: Here a reason Y is given why X should or should not be done, but the linkage is tenuous</p>	<p>« (...) 15 millions d’immigrés sont venus en Allemagne de manière légale - sans qualification 44 pourcent, sans qualification professionnelle, entre 22 et 40 ans : 44 pourcents, et sans qualification professionnelle en provenance de Turquie : 72 pourcent. Alors, lorsqu’on compare par exemple l’immigration en Australie. Si je veux immigrer en Australie, je dois avoir beaucoup d’argent, je dois prouver que j’ai un employeur en Australie.. Donc il faudrait</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	<p>peut-être voir ce qui se passe en dehors de l'Europe, comment on gère l'immigration dehors de l'Europe. » <i>(homme allemand, groupe 21) [traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d'Europolis]</i></p> <p>“(...) 15 millions of immigrants came to Germany in a legal way. Without qualification 44 percent, without professional qualification, between 22 and 40 years old: 44 percent. And from Turkey, 72 percent arrived without professional qualification. Let's compare this to immigration in Australia: if I want to migrate to Australia, I need to have a lot of money, I need to prove that I do have an employer in Australia.. Therefore, we should maybe turn to countries from outside Europe and see how they handle immigration.” <i>(German men, group 21) [own English translation from French transcript, French translation of the original speech was provided by Europolis translators]</i></p>
<p>(2) <i>Qualified Justification:</i> A linkage is made why one should expect that X contributes to or detracts from Y.</p>	<p>« Le fait qu'ils quittent leur pays c'est déjà triste peut-être. Mais si dans leur propre pays, ils pourraient déjà bénéficier de meilleures conditions de vie, cela irait bien mieux que devoir, comme des réfugiés devoir partir, quitter toute la famille, aller au très grand voyage et partir dans un pays tout à fait étranger. Donc je trouve que les pays de l'Union Européenne devraient, entre eux, centrer d'aide pour essayer de maintenir les gens dans leur propre pays en améliorant justement les conditions de vie dans leur propre pays. Alors donc, cela pourrait éviter le fait de devoir obligatoirement encore émigrer. (...) » <i>(femme allemande, groupe 21) [traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d'Europolis]</i></p> <p>“The fact that they leave their home country is already sad, perhaps. If they could already profit from better living conditions in their own country, this would definitely be better than having to leave the family, undertake a very long journey to a country that is very different from one's own, as the refugees currently do. This is why I think that the countries of the European Union should, among each other, center the aid in order to try to keep the people in their own country by improving the living conditions in the respectable countries. This could prevent them from being forced to emigrate. (...)” <i>(German women, group 21) [own English translation from French transcript, French translation of the original speech was provided by Europolis translators]</i></p>
<p>(3) <i>Sophisticated Justification:</i> A problem is examined in-depth by providing various and well-justified</p>	<p>« Donc d'abord sur le sujet de la confession. C'est ce que je voulais dire tout à l'heure. En disant, est-ce qu'on doit s'adapter parfaitement au pays dont qu'on arrive ou est-ce qu'au contraire, on peut avoir un équilibre? En France, c'est très différent qu'avec l'Espagne, c'est très différent qu'avec la plupart des autres pays européens.</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

arguments. At least two complete justifications are given.

Nous avons une exigence de la laïcité, c'est-à-dire que nous n'avons pas... il y a une pratique religieuse, chrétienne, historique, qui est toujours active mais en place de la laïcité au dessus dans le sens où le culte religieux est de l'endroit privé. Donc, on ne peut pas, par exemple tenir ce discours, de dire que les immigrés qui viennent en France doivent respecter une tradition chrétienne, par exemple. C'est quelque chose qu'on – on peut le dire, mais bon, sauf que dans l'effet, ça ne se présente pas dans les écoles, sauf dans les écoles privés. Mais on n'y est pas confronté. Donc pour moi, la réponse au problème, à l'éventuel problème posé par des immigrés de confession musulmane, elle passe par là en faite, la laïcité c'est ce qui permet de respecter les différences de chacun. Bon, ça c'est peut-être aussi de mes conditions mais quand vous parlez de s'adapter, moi personnellement, je m'adapte assez peux aux traditions français, donc et pourtant, je suis français, je ne vais pas partir de moi. Voilà. Donc cette histoire de se dire qu'on doit se confronter à une certaine culture – (...) Moi personnellement, je ne pense pas que ça serait la bonne réponse, parce qu'il y a trop des différences et je ne pense pas qu'un pays égale une culture en fait. Voilà, personnellement.» (*homme français, groupe 10*)

“First, on the subject of religious denomination. That is what I just wanted to say before. On the question whether one needs to completely adapt to the host country or whether, on the contrary, there could be a balance. In France, the situation is very different from Spain, and different from the majority of European countries. We have the principle of laicism, this means we do not have.. there is religious practice, Christian, historically, which is still active but it is situated below the principle of laicism in the sense that religion is a private affair. This means that we cannot conduct a discourse that demands, for example, that the immigrants coming to France have to respect the Christian tradition. This is something that – one can say that but this does not apply to schools, except to private schools. But we are not confronted with that. For me, the answer to the problem, the eventual problem that Muslim immigrants pose, goes through laicism and this is what allows respecting individual differences. Alright then – this perhaps only applies to me but personally, when you speak of the need for adaptation, I don't adapt myself to the French culture in a sufficient way and I am French nevertheless, and I won't deviate from myself. The story that one needs to conform to a certain culture – (...) Personally, I don't think that this is the right answer because there are too many differences and I don't think that a country equals a culture. That's the way I see it. (...)” (*French man, group 10*) [*own English translation from French transcript*]

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Common good orientation (content of justification)

In the eyes of many deliberative democrats, good reasons should entail a common good orientation (e.g., Rawls 1971). The original DQI measures whether arguments are cast in terms of narrow group or constituency interests, whether there is neutral reference or mixed reference (i.e., reference to both narrow group interest and common good), or whether there is a reference to the common good.

<p>(0) Explicit statement concerning constituency or group interests is made (<i>here: own country</i>)</p>	<p>„(...) Meiner Meinung nach würde ich es sehr begrüßen, wenn wir vermeiden könnten, dass sich das [Einwanderung und damit verbundene Probleme] auch nach Osteuropa ausweitet. (...)“ (<i>litauischer Mann, Gruppe 20</i>) [<i>Deutsche Übersetzung des Originalbeitrages durch EuroPolis Übersetzer</i>]</p> <p>“(...) Personally, I would very much appreciate if we could prevent that this [immigration and connected concerns] also extends to Eastern Europe. (...)” (<i>Lithuanian men, group 20</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript; the German translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p>
<p>(1.5) Explicit statement in terms of both, Europe and own country is made</p>	<p>“To tell you the truth: in Holland, immigration is perceived as something that lingers in the minds of people and that is present in any context of discussion. The EU should take care of it, so that other countries, which do not have that kind of problems yet, such as Poland for instance, would contribute in order that we can solve this problem together. So that at least we could share the knowledge and experience in this matter. I think we should cooperate like that.” (<i>Dutch man, group 23</i>) [<i>own English translation from Polish transcript; the Polish translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p>
<p>(2) Explicit statement in terms of a conception of the common good in utilitarian or collective terms is made (<i>here: EU; Europe</i>)</p>	<p>« (...) Nous avons besoin d’immigrés pour le problème de démographie. Nous devons de plus en plus vieux, en Europe nous avons besoin de beaucoup des personnes. (...) Et bon je reste d’avis dès lors qu’en tant que l’Europe, et c’est pourquoi il faut qu’il est vraiment une politique européenne et non pas par pays comme ça se fait maintenant, parce que sinon on l’en sortira jamais. (...) » (<i>homme hollandais, groupe 3</i>) [<i>traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d’EuroPolis</i>]</p> <p>“(...). We need immigrants in order to solve the demographic problem. We grow older and older in Europe and we need a lot of people. (...) Well, I hold on the position that from a prospective view of Europe, this is why we need a European</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	<p>policy instead of state based solutions like we have them now. If we don't opt for a European solution, we will never overcome this problem. (...)” (<i>Dutch men, group 3</i>) [own English translation from French transcript; the French translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators]</p>
<p>(3) Explicit statement in terms of the difference principle is made (<i>solidarity, quality of life, global justice, etc.</i>)</p>	<p>„Ja ich bin also der Meinung, dass die Aufgabe der EU das eigentlich nicht unbedingt ist, die Länder und die Grenzen dicht zu machen, weil wir müssen das alles ja doch auch ein bisschen globaler sehen, wir sind doch nun einmal eine Welt und die Welt besteht doch nun einmal aus vielen anderen Ländern und wir müssen doch dann auch dafür sorgen, dass es der restlichen Bevölkerung und den anderen Menschen in irgend einer Form gut geht, die wir über all die Jahre ausgebeutet haben. Wir haben doch eine Verpflichtung; also Menschlichkeit ist doch ein ganz oberes Prinzip und ich bin einfach der Meinung, wir können uns nicht abschotten und können einfach unser Süppchen alleine kochen. (...)“ (<i>deutsche Frau, Gruppe 9</i>)</p> <p>“In my opinion, it should not be the task of the EU to close the borders, because we need to consider this from a more global point of view. It's a fact that we are just one world and the world consists of many other countries and we have to see that the rest of the population and the other people that we exploited for so many years are doing well in any way. We do have a responsibility. Humanity is the highest principle and I think that we cannot seal ourselves off and 'cook our soup' unilaterally. (...)” (<i>German women, group 9</i>) [own English translation from German transcript]</p>
<p>Respect and interactivity</p> <p>The updated version of the DQI allows capturing interactivity, a hitherto neglected aspect in the empirical measurement of deliberation. The introduction of a neutral response category ensures that every uptake of others' arguments is encompassed. This includes uptakes in the form of questioning, recapitulations of what others have said, and references to stories. Note that expressing disagreement is not bound to the code of negative respect. As examples (2a) and (3c) demonstrate, disagreement can also be expressed in a neutral or even positive way. However, when people explicitly mentioned that they are in full disagreement with other participants' arguments (without acknowledging the other's position in any respect), this was coded as a disrespectful statement (0a).</p>	
<p>(0) Negative (disrespectful) reference to other participants'</p>	<p>a) « Et que les deux premiers avis, premiers opinions soient favorable à ce que cette politique soit défini par les états et non par l'Union Européenne. <u>Alors je suis tout à fait en désaccord.</u> Je pense que la politique de migration doit être</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

arguments	<p>définie dans la base par les organes Européens. (...) » (<i>homme portugais répond aux personnes précédentes, groupe 1</i>) [<i>traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d’EuroPolis</i>]</p> <p>a) “And the first two opinions that were expressed were in favor of regulating this policy at the country level instead of the level of the European Union. <u>I am completely opposed to that</u>. I think that in its main features, the European institutions should define the immigration policy. (...)” (<i>Portuguese man responds to previous speakers, group 1</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript; the French translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p> <p>b) « Je ne vois pas au quoi l’immigration illégale pose un problème de logement pour les français ou des choses comme ça. Je crois qu’il ne faut pas faire attention, pas tous mélanger. (...) Je crois que ce n’est pas possible de faire une confusion de cette sorte là. » (<i>homme français répond à la personne précédente, groupe 21</i>)</p> <p>b) “I don’t see in which way illegal immigration presents a problem of housing for the French people. I think we should not pay attention, should not mix everything up. (...) I think it is not possible to confuse things like that.” (<i>French man responds to a previous speaker, group 21</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript</i>]</p>
(2) Neutral reference to other participants’ arguments	<p>a) „Also an der Stelle möchte ich meinen beiden Vorrednern <u>in gewisser Weise widersprechen</u>. (...)“ (<i>deutscher Mann, Gruppe 24</i>)</p> <p>a) “At this point, I would like to <u>contradict</u> the previous speakers <u>to some extent</u>. (...)” (<i>German man, group 24</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript</i>]</p> <p>b) “According to what the previous speaker said, immigrants are coming because there are jobs that Polish people do not want to take, so in my country, the immigrants are coming to take these jobs over. (...)” (<i>Polish women, group 16</i>) [<i>own English translation from Polish transcript</i>]</p>
(3) Positive (explicitly respectful) reference to other participants’ arguments	<p>a) « Je suis tout à fait d’accord avec [l’homme français]. S’il y a des lois, il faut les respecter. (...) » (<i>homme allemand, groupe 4</i>) [<i>traduction française de la contribution originale par les traducteurs d’EuroPolis</i>]</p> <p>a) “I fully agree with [French man]. If there are laws, they need to be respected. (...)” (<i>German man, group 4</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript; the French translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis</i>]</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	<p><i>translators]</i></p> <p>b) « Je pense que la proposition de [l’homme allemand] concernant le traitement différenciel des personnes est très importante. (...) » (<i>homme allemand, groupe 4</i>) [<i>traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d’Europolis</i>]</p> <p>b) “I think that the proposal of [German man] concerning a differentiated treatment of people is very important. (...)” (<i>German man, group 4</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript; the French translation of the original speech was provided by Europolis translators</i>]</p> <p>c) „Zu deinem Kommentar noch; <u>das stimmt, aber</u> das erste ist auch ausschlaggebend; es ist ja auch ein gewisser Prozentsatz da, die wollen sich nicht integrieren. (...)“ (<i>deutscher Mann, Gruppe 9</i>)</p> <p>c) “On your comment: <u>you are right but</u> the first point is crucial as well; there is also a certain amount of people that doesn’t make an effort to integrate. (...)” (<i>German man, group 9</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript</i>]</p>
<p>Respect towards groups (migrants)</p> <p>Respect toward groups implies that participants, either implicitly or explicitly, acknowledge the needs and rights of different social groups. In the context of Europolis discussions on third country migration, migrants from outside the EU are the social group of interest.</p>	
<p>(0) <i>No Respect</i>: This code is reserved for speeches in which there are only or predominantly negative statements about the groups.</p>	<p>a) « L’immigration du 20ème et 21ème siècle, c’est l’immigration des gens des cultures complètement opposées à la nôtre. Et c’est ça le problème. Ces gens-là, ils ne s’attachent pas du tout à notre culture. (...) On a eu des problèmes, ces gens-là sont différents. » (<i>homme français, groupe 4</i>)</p> <p>a) “The immigration of the 20th and 21st century is an immigration of people from cultures that are completely opposed to our. And this is the problem. These people do not adapt at all to our culture. (...) We have had problems – these people are different.” (<i>French man, group 4</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript</i>]</p> <p>b) „(...) Also Leute die nach Europa kommen, wollen zumeist definitiv hier bleiben, nicht irgendwie nur ein Zeitvertrag ableisten und dann wieder weggehen. Sie wollen ins europäische System eintreten. Sie wollen nicht wirklich sich einfügen in die Kultur, aber die wirtschaftlichen Vorteile nutzen und nicht wirklich als Europäer auftreten dann. Das ist</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	<p>sehr schwer, sie dann wieder wegzuschicken, man findet sie kaum. Ja ich weiss, dass es schwierig ist da. Aber ich weiss auch, dass es viele Einwanderer gibt, von denen kommen sogar die meisten als Touristen. Mit einem Monatsvisum und dann bleiben sie hier als illegale Einwanderer. (...)“ (<i>spanischer Mann, Gruppe 19</i>) [<i>Deutsche Übersetzung des Originalbeitrages durch EuroPolis Übersetzer</i>]</p> <p>b) „People that come to Europe intend, most of the times, to stay here on a long-term base. They don’t want a temporal contract that requires them to leave after the contract expires. They want to enter the European system. They don’t make serious efforts to adapt to our culture, but they want to profit from the economic benefits without becoming European. It is difficult to make them leave again because you hardly find them. Yes I know that they have it difficult over there. But I also know that many of the immigrants arrive as tourists with a monthly visa. After the expiration of the visa they just stay and become illegal immigrants. (...)” (<i>Spanish man, group 19</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript; the German translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p>
<p>(2) <i>Respect (balanced)</i>: Both, positive and negative respect is equally expressed.</p>	<p>„(...) Man kann das nicht alles über den Kamm scheren und alle nach einem Schema beurteilen, denn es gibt Einwanderer, die in andere Länder eindringen um vielleicht sich der Arbeit zu entziehen oder sich unrechtmässig zu bereichern durch Diebstahl und so weiter; es sind also Parasiten. Aber es gibt daneben auch Einwanderer, die sich anstrengen um sich den Gegebenheiten und insbesondere auch der Kultur des Landes anzupassen.“ (<i>polnische Frau, Gruppe 9</i>) [<i>Deutsche Übersetzung des Originalbeitrages durch EuroPolis Übersetzer</i>]</p> <p>“(…) There is no way in trying to apply one standard to all. There are immigrants who infiltrate a country, maybe in order to avoid having to work or in order to enrich themselves illegally via theft and so on – these are parasites. On the other hand, there are immigrants that make an effort in order to adapt themselves to the circumstances of a country and in particular to its culture.” (<i>Polish woman, group 9</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript; the German translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p>
<p>(3) <i>Explicit Respect</i>: This code is assigned if there is at least one explicitly positive statement about the groups and either are negative statements completely absent or positive statements are</p>	<p>a) « (...) Je pense même que parmi les autochtones, il y a plus des gens qui ne veulent pas travailler que parmi les immigrants. (...) » (<i>homme hollandais, groupe 3</i>) [<i>traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d’EuroPolis</i>]</p> <p>a) “(...) I think that among the indigenous population, there are more people who don’t want to work than there are among immigrants. (...)” (<i>Dutch man, group 3</i>) [<i>own English translation from French transcript; the French translation</i></p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

<p>clearly dominating the negative statements.</p>	<p><i>of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators]</i></p> <p>b) „(...) Ich denke, niemand verlässt sein Heimatland aus Spass, sondern die Leute machen das aus Not, weil sie nichts mehr haben um zu überleben. Kaum noch etwas zu essen. Sie machen das nicht unbedingt freiwillig. Also das Leben muss schon sehr schlecht sein, es muss einem sehr schlecht gehen, damit man sich dazu entschliesst, seine Heimat zu verlassen und dass es eben auch keinerlei Aussicht auf Besserung gibt, dass sich die Dinge eben nicht kurzfristig im Land verbessern lassen. (...)“ <i>(spanischer Mann, Gruppe 20) [Deutsche Übersetzung des Originalbeitrages durch EuroPolis Übersetzer]</i></p> <p>b) “(...) I think no one leaves his home country just for fun. Rather, people leave because of misery, because they don’t have anything left in order to survive. Hardly anything to eat. They don’t necessarily do that on a voluntary basis. Life must treat one very bad in order to make the decision to leave one’s home country. There must be no prospect of improvement, there must be a certainty that these things will not change for the better in the near future.” <i>(Spanish man, group 20) [own English translation from German transcript; the German translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators]</i></p>
<p>Questioning</p> <p>The updated version of the DQI regards inquisitiveness as an essential aspect of an interactive deliberative process. In the context of EuroPolis, we do not distinguish between informational and critical questions (see Ikuenobe 2001).</p>	
<p>(1) Question asked (informational or critical)</p>	<p>a) „Eine Frage an [deutschen Mann]: In welche Dimension wächst das Problem mit der Abwanderung von Arbeitskräften?“ <i>(deutsche Frau, Gruppe 9)</i></p> <p>a) “I have a question to [German man]: To what extent increases the problem of emigration for working purposes?” <i>(German women, group 9) [own English translation from German transcript]</i></p> <p>b₁) „Ich möchte mal die Dame nebenan fragen, was sie macht, wenn sie ungebetenen Besuch kriegt; wenn sie heimkommt und in ihrer Wohnung ist jemand drin. Was sie dann macht.“ <i>(deutscher Mann, Gruppe 9)</i></p> <p>b₂) „Da würde ich fragen, wie sie die Wohnung, also wirklich intimen Lebensraum, mit dem breiten Raum eines Landes oder einer weiteren Umgebung vergleichen können?“ <i>(deutscher Mann, Gruppe 9)</i></p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	<p>b₁) “I’d like to ask the lady next to me what she would do when she would receive unsolicited visit. When she returns and there is somebody, right inside her apartment. What would she do?” (<i>German man, group 9</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript</i>]</p> <p>b₂) “In this case I’d like to ask you how you can compare an apartment, meaning intimate living space, with a country where there is far more space.” (<i>German man, group 9</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript</i>]</p>
<p>Story-telling</p> <p>According to Polletta und Lee (2006), “story-telling” is the most important component of alternative forms of communication. Therefore, the updated version of the DQI captures the presence of stories. In EuroPolis, story-telling ranges from the description of a situation in one’s home country to the report of a personal narrative.</p>	
<p>(1) Story-telling</p>	<p>a) „(...) In C, da gibt es zum Beispiel ein Ort, da sind in den gleichen Schulen muslimische Kinder und da mussten wir in den Schulen zum Beispiel das ganze Menü in der Kantine ändern, weil sie zum Beispiel kein Schweinefleisch essen. (...)“ (<i>spanische Frau, Gruppe 20</i>) [<i>Deutsche Übersetzung des Originalbeitrages durch EuroPolis Übersetzer</i>]</p> <p>a) “(...) In C for example, there is a place where Muslim children go to the same schools as Spanish children. There, we were forced to change the whole menu of the cafeteria because they don’t eat pork, for example. (...)” (<i>Spanish woman, group 20</i>) [<i>own English translation from German transcript; the German translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators</i>]</p> <p>b) « Je voudrais rapidement réagir, donc j’ai une bonne expérience, c’est-à-dire donc une famille, en provenance de Mongolie, ils sont revenu et donc il y a maintenant une des filles qui a fait un doctorat en langue allemande et donc un autre fils a fait un examen en allemand, donc je ne connais aucune personne où on pourrait dire voilà, il a juste appris par cœur et puis il a oublié tout, pour avoir ce certificat [de nationalité]. Donc j’ai juste eu la chance d’avoir que des bonnes expériences. » (<i>homme allemand, groupe 4</i>) [<i>traduction française de la contribution originale faite par les traducteurs d’EuroPolis</i>]</p> <p>b) “I’d like to quickly reply by providing a positive experience. There is a family, originating from Mongolia, who returned and one of the daughters now has a PhD in German language and one of their sons did an exam in German. This is to say that I don’t know any person from whom I could say that ‘here we go – he just learned it by heart and after</p>

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	receiving the [citizenship] certificate, he forgot everything again'. In sum, I only had the chance to make positive experiences." (German man in reply to someone claiming that immigrants attain their citizenship certificate by learning everything required by heart, group 4) [own English translation from French transcript; the French translation of the original speech was provided by EuroPolis translators]
--	---

Note: The audio discussions of the coded groups were available either in French, German, or Polish. For the French and German groups, the coding was based on the transcripts from the audio discussions. Thus, for non-German or non-French speakers (or German speakers in French groups as well as French speakers in German groups), our coding is based on the translation of the original speech act as provided by EuroPolis translators. For the two Polish groups, our coding relies on an English translation of the respective group discussions. In the present Table, our coding is always based on the first example provided in the Table. The English translations of the German and French speeches only serve purposes of coding demonstration.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Inter-coder reliability

Reliability. A test of inter-coder reliability was conducted prior to coding the full database. Three coders independently evaluated 80 speeches after several hours of coder training. Four statistics were calculated: the ratio of coding agreement (RCA; Holsti 1969) which simply indicates the percentage of observations that were coded in the same way by coders for a given indicator; Cohen's (1960) κ ("kappa") and, where appropriate, Spearman's rank correlation (Siegel 1956) and the standardized α (a reliability statistic; see Holsti 1969). These statistics take into account the difference between actual coding agreement and the level of coding agreement that could be expected to occur by chance (see also Steenbergen et al. 2003).

We consider both the overall performance of the DQI and its performance for each of the coding categories. The three coders agreed on average in 85.4% of a total of 480 rendered judgments.¹ The corresponding value for Cohen's Kappa κ amounts to 0.70. Where appropriate, Spearman's r and the standardized α were calculated ($r=0.81$; $\alpha=0.89$). All findings indicate substantial agreement.

Agreement on Specific Categories: Table B1 reports the reliability statistics for specific coding categories. First, consider the level of justification, $RCA=0.65$, which looks respectable at first glance. Taking into consideration that the coders may have agreed by chance alone, we also computed Cohen's κ , which equals 0.52. This is indicative of moderate agreement and clearly misses the benchmark for substantial agreement (Landis and Koch 1977). Since level of justification is an ordinal indicator, it is also useful to consider Spearman's rank correlation, which accounts for the difference in the rank orderings of speeches between coders. Spearman's r equals 0.78, which produce a standardized item α of 0.92. These results indicate that the low coder agreement reported for RCA and Kappa rather resulted from minor discrepancies about which code on the scale should be applied.

¹ For each coding category (level of justification, pursuit of self-interest, EU's interests and world interests, respect toward participants' arguments, and story-telling), 80 judgments were rendered.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A3. Inter-coder agreement per category

	<i>RCA</i>	<i>Kappa</i>	<i>s.e.</i>	<i>Spearman</i>	<i>Alpha</i>
Justification rationality (Level of justification)	0.654	0.516**	0.068	0.778**	0.917
Country interest (Content of justification 0)	0.950	0.721**	0.110		
European Union interests (Content of justification 2)	0.925	0.642**	0.111		
World community interests (Content of justification 3)	0.975	0.592**	0.096		
Respect toward participants' arguments	0.792	0.698**	0.073	0.813**	0.913
Respect toward groups (migrants) ^a	0.850	0.723**	0.113	0.756**	0.833
Story-telling	0.946	0.852**	0.086		

Note: N=80. **p<0.01. ^a This category has been coded at a later point in time. Therefore, a separate reliability test was conducted where two independent coders coded a total number of 40 speeches.

For the content of justification, we ran three different tests since we need to distinguish among references to country interest (1), the European Union (2), and the world community (3). For the first content of justification, the coders agreed in 95% of the time. Taking chance agreement into account, $\kappa=0.72$; this is statistically significant and indicates substantial agreement. For the second content of justification coding, the coders agreed in 92.5% of the cases. However, κ is at 0.64 and only slightly above the benchmark of 0.61 for substantial agreement (Landis and Koch 1977). For the third content of justification coding, the coders agreed in 97.5% of the cases. However, the fact that that $\kappa = 0.59$ indicates that coders only agreed that references to the world community occur rarely, but then disagreed on what finally deserves a positive code. While the scores for the average score hover

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

around the benchmark for substantial agreement, they are more daunting if we consider the wide range of inter-coder agreement among the pairs of coders.

Therefore, we performed another round of coding. After the disagreement for level and content had been settled and disputed cases were recoded, a second reliability test was performed for level and content of justification (Table B2). The re-test indicates substantial coder agreement after re-coding both for level and content of justification.

The reliability of the respect indicator, in turn, was satisfactory. Regarding respect toward other participants' arguments, coders agreed on 79.2% of the codes. Furthermore, $\kappa=0.70$, which is again significant and indicative of substantial agreement. Since the indicator for respect toward participant's arguments is ordinal, Spearman's rank correlation was also computed: $r = 0.81$, which results in an impressive α of 0.91.

The final coding category is story-telling. Here, $RCA = 0.95$, which is indicative of excellent agreement. κ equals .85, which is significant and reflects high levels of agreement.

Table A4: Re-test inter-coder agreement

	<i>RCA</i>	<i>Kappa</i>	<i>s.e.</i>	<i>spearman</i>	<i>alpha</i>
Justification rationality (Level of justification)	0.800	0.725**	0.128	0.942**	0.974
Country interest (Content of justification 0)	0.967	0.917**	0.222		
European Union interests (Content of justification 2)	1.000				
World community interests (Content of justification 3)	1.000				

Note: N=20. **p<0.01.

In sum, these results show that reliable measurement through the DQI in citizen deliberation is possible. Even the worst reliability scores are still respectable, suggesting that different coders looking

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

at the same transcripts will be able to agree on the DQI and its components. This is an important result, as it greatly increases the confidence one can place in the analyses performed with the DQI indicators.

REFERENCES

- Holsti, Ole R. 1969. *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Landis, J. Richard and Gary G. Koch. 1977. "The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data." *Biometrics* 33:159–174.
- Siegel, Sidney. 1956. *Non-parametric Statistics for the Social Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Steenbergen, Marco, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, and Jürg Steiner. 2003. "Measuring Political Deliberation: A Discourse Quality Index." *Comparative European Politics* 1:21–48.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A5. Group composition

Group No.	Nationalities ^a	N	% women	% working class	Mean education ^b	Mean age	Mean knowledge ^c	Mean salience ^d	Mean interest ^e
1	3 French (we), 6 Portuguese (se), 5 Romanian	14	36%	15.4%	22.3	42.8	0.9	6.9	5.5
2	8 French (we), 7 Hungarian (cee)	15	47%	20%	20.8	53.0	1.1	5.5	6.1
3	2 Belgian (we), 7 Dutch (we), 6 French (we)	15	33%	13.3%	22.0	51.6	1.0	4.8	6.5
4	1 Austrian (we), 6 French (we), 7 German (we)	14	43%	7.7%	19.8	57.6	0.9	5.6	7.6
9	1 Austrian (we), 6 German (we), 7 Polish (cee), 1 Polish/German (cee)	15	53%	26.7%	18.8	44.4	1.3	5.4	6.3
10	1 Belgian (we), 6 French (we), 7 Spanish (se)	14	50%	21.4%	20.5	51.6	1.1	6.1	6.8
16	9 Polish (cee), 6 Slovenian (cee)	15	40%	20%	20.1	42.5	0.6	5.7	5.5
17	1 Austrian (we), 6 German (we), 8 Spanish (se)	15	47%	20%	22.1	44.3	1.1	5.5	6.5
19	5 Danish (we), 4 German (we), 7 Spanish (se)	16	44%	12%	21.1	48.3	1.3	6.4	7.3
20	1 Austrian (we), 5 German (we), 5 Lithuanian (cee), 5 Spanish (se)	16	56%	13.3%	17.9	53.9	0.9	6.0	6.4
21	1 Austrian (we), 7 French (we), 6 German (we), 1 Luxemburg (we)	15	67%	0%	21.7	50.2	1.5	5.5	6.4
23	2 Belgian (we), 5 Dutch (we), 7 Polish (cee)	14	36%	13.7%	20.6	46.9	1.1	4.9	5.9
24	1 Austrian (we), 1 Cypriot (se), 8 German (we), 3 Greece (se)	13	46%	10.4%	23.2	54.7	1.1	6.1	7.7

Note: ^a (cee) Central and Eastern European countries; (se) Southern European countries; (we) Western European countries. ^b Measured in years of age when main education ended. ^c Amount of correct answers to three knowledge questions on immigration (for more information, see Table XY below). ^d Salience of the immigration problem on an 11-point scale from 0 “no problem at all” to 10 “the most serious problem we face”. ^e Interest in politics ranges from 0 “not at all” to 10 “passionately”. Besides affiliation to European region, none of the variables show a significant Anova test on a level of $p < 0.1$ or less.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A6. Reaching the deliberative quality threshold (per group and indicator)

Group No.	Sophisticated justification		Common good orientation		Respect towards other participants		Respect towards groups		Questioning		Storytelling	
	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>
1	6.8%	23.1%	23.7%	69.2%	16.9%	46.2%	28.8%	69.2%	13.6%	46.2%	42.4%	76.9%
2	14.8%	46.7%	14.8%	40.0%	22.2%	53.3%	22.2%	46.7%	13.0%	40.0%	47.2%	73.3%
3	15.1%	50.0%	17.0%	42.9%	20.8%	50.0%	15.1%	50.0%	13.2%	50.0%	28.3%	42.9%
4	12.0%	50.0%	11.0%	64.3%	23.0%	64.3%	21.0%	85.7%	16.0%	50.0%	23.2%	71.4%
9	9.3%	46.2%	5.4%	30.8%	16.3%	69.2%	7.0%	46.2%	9.3%	46.2%	33.3%	84.6%
10	7.4%	28.6%	16.7%	57.1%	22.2%	64.3%	20.4%	57.1%	14.8%	35.7%	38.9%	64.3%
16	6.2%	30.8%	12.4%	46.2%	11.3%	38.5%	24.7%	61.5%	10.3%	38.5%	27.8%	92.3%
17	16.3%	26.7%	39.5%	60.0%	32.6%	46.7%	37.2%	53.3%	14.0%	33.3%	30.2%	46.7%
19	6.7%	25.0%	8.9%	31.3%	21.1%	50.0%	14.4%	62.5%	11.1%	37.5%	30.0%	81.3%
20	34.4%	46.2%	46.9%	53.8%	15.6%	38.5%	18.8%	23.1%	12.1%	23.1%	56.3%	46.2%
21	10.8%	35.7%	16.9%	50.0%	20.0%	64.3%	23.1%	64.3%	7.7%	28.6%	29.7%	78.6%
23	5.7%	42.9%	12.4%	42.9%	14.3%	71.4%	10.5%	50.0%	17.1%	50.0%	28.6%	92.9%
24	8.1%	25.0%	22.6%	50.0%	14.5%	58.3%	19.4%	50.0%	14.5%	41.7%	33.9%	66.7%
Average	10.2%	36.7%	15.7%	48.9%	18.2%	55.0%	18.6%	55.6%	12.7%	40.0%	32.7%	70.6%

Notes: “Speeches” refers to the percentage of utterances fulfilling the high quality threshold. “Speakers” refers to the percentage of speakers that fulfilled the standard *at least once*. For more information on the threshold (Habermas standard), see Table A1. Top values per column are highlighted in bold.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A7. Low deliberative performance (per group and indicator)

Group No.	Self-interest		Negative respect towards other participants		Negative respect towards groups		Inferior justification	
	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>	<i>speeches</i>	<i>speakers</i>
1	10.2%	38.5%	8.5%	38.5%	23.7%	61.5%	62.7%	84.6%
2	11.1%	33.3%	5.6%	13.3%	3.7%	13.3%	53.7%	86.7%
3	5.7%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%	28.6%	41.5%	71.4%
4	5.0%	28.6%	7.0%	21.4%	7.0%	35.7%	61.0%	85.7%
9	6.2%	38.5%	8.5%	46.2%	7.8%	46.2%	62.0%	92.3%
10	22.2%	50.0%	3.7%	7.1%	13.0%	14.3%	66.7%	85.7%
16	12.4%	61.5%	5.2%	30.8%	2.1%	15.4%	54.6%	92.3%
17	9.3%	26.7%	4.7%	13.3%	27.9%	46.7%	41.9%	73.3%
19	6.7%	18.8%	2.2%	12.5%	4.4%	18.8%	71.1%	93.8%
20	9.4%	15.4%	9.4%	23.1%	15.6%	23.1%	25.0%	38.5%
21	4.6%	14.3%	6.2%	28.6%	6.2%	21.4%	63.1%	100.0%
23	7.6%	50.0%	2.9%	21.4%	2.9%	21.4%	61.9%	100.0%
24	6.9%	41.7%	3.2%	16.7%	9.7%	33.3%	48.4%	83.3%
Average	8.5%	33.3%	5.2%	20.6%	8.5%	28.9%	57.7%	83.9%

Notes: “Speeches” refers to the percentage of utterances that displayed low deliberative quality on the given indicators.

“Speakers” refers to the percentage of speakers that showed low deliberative performance *at least once*. For more information on the indicators, see Table A1. Top values per column are highlighted in bold.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A8. Comparison of selected sample to the rest of the groups

	Selected Sample (N=191)		Rest (N=157)		<i>t-test</i>
	<i>Mean (Std.)</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean (Std.)</i>	<i>N</i>	
<i>Women</i> 1=female; 0=male	0.46 (0.50)	191	0.49 (0.50)	157	0.55
<i>Age</i> Year of birth	1959.4 (16.67)	191	1961.9 (16.63)	156	1.41
<i>Education</i> Age in year when main education ended	20.88 (4.59)	171	19.91 (4.08)	133	-1.91 ⁺
<i>Working-class</i> 1=yes; 0=no	0.22 (0.41)	187	0.26 (0.44)	155	0.96
<i>Protestant</i> 1=yes; 0=no	0.12 (0.33)	191	0.10 (0.30)	157	-0.54
<i>Catholic</i> 1=yes; 0=no	0.48 (0.50)	191	0.48 (0.50)	157	-0.07
<i>Religiosity</i> Apart from weddings or funerals, about how often do you attend religious services? Scale ranging from (1) "more than once a week" to (8) "never".	5.29 (2.36)	191	4.78 (2.29)	157	-2.03*
<i>Ideology</i> In political matters people talk of "the left" and "the right". What is your position? Please indicate your views using any number on a scale where '0' means "left" and '10' means "right."	4.91 (2.72)	184	5.32 (2.52)	146	1.42
<i>Knowledge T2</i> Amount of correct answers to the three knowledge questions on immigration available in the questionnaire. The questions asked for the definition of Blue Card workers, the role of the EU in	1.07 (0.89)	191	1.02 (0.92)	157	-0.56

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

the current immigration policy and for a figure of the number of immigrants currently living in the EU. For each of the questions, the participants could choose out of four possible options and an additional “don’t know” category.					
<i>Interest in politics T2</i>					
On a scale from 0 to 10, where '0' is "not at all", '10' is "passionately", and '5' is "exactly in the middle", how interested or not would you say you generally are in politics?	6.48 (2.22)	188	6.19 (2.53)	155	-1.11
<i>Saliency T2</i>					
On a scale from 0 to 10, where '0' is "no problem at all", '10' is "the most serious problem we face", and '5' is "exactly in the middle", how serious a problem or not would you say immigration is?	5.72 (2.40)	187	6.61 (2.47)	153	3.39***
<i>Opinion on item “European involvement in immigration affairs” T2</i>					
On a scale from 0 to 10, where '0' means "entirely by the individual Member States ", '10' means "entirely at the EU level", and '5' is "exactly in the middle", at what level do you think decisions should be made in the area of immigration? ^a	4.84 (3.02)	184	5.12 (3.07)	153	0.85
<i>Immigration Position T2</i>					
Continuous pro-immigration score ranging from 0 to 10, constructed from a batch of 12 questions asking respondents about their attitudes toward immigrants in general and, more specific, about third country immigration to the EU (wave 2). Missing values were replaced by mean imputation.	5.74 (1.51)	191	5.35 (1.55)	157	-2.41*

Notes: All variables are retrieved from the EuroPolis questionnaire dataset. T2 indicate questionnaire responses right at the start of the three-day event in Brussels, T3 indicate questionnaire responses right at the end of the three-day event. ^a For the sake of interpretability, the poles of the original question have been exchanged in this paper. This is the reversed version of the question. T-test: ⁺p<0.1, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A9. Antecedents of deliberative quality (including control for translated speeches)

	Model 1		Model 2	
Gender	-0.107	(0.124)	-0.167	(0.123)
Education	0.009	(0.014)	0.006	(0.013)
Working class	-0.384	(0.149)	**	0.055 (0.203)
Age	-0.007	(0.004)	+	-0.006 (0.004) +
Eastern Europeans (EE)	-0.192	(0.197)		0.085 (0.212)
Southern Europeans (SE)	-0.168	(0.195)		0.050 (0.218)
Saliency	-0.049	(0.025)	+	-0.050 (0.025) *
Knowledge (T2)	0.091	(0.068)		0.118 (0.066) +
Interest in politics	0.052	(0.030)	+	0.049 (0.030) +
Translated speech	-0.057	(0.168)		-0.134 (0.166)
SE*working class				-0.723 (0.345) *
CEE*working class				-1.080 (0.360) **
Constant	0.355	(0.484)		0.425 (0.472)
Std. Group Level	0.000			0.000
	(0.000)	***		(0.000) ***
Std. Individual Level	0.747			0.727
	(0.043)	***		(0.042) ***
N Individuals	163			163
N Groups	13			13

Notes: Multilevel linear models (REML) with standard errors in parentheses. Translated speech takes in the value of (1) when we did not code from the original speech of a person but from the translation instead, and a value of (0) in cases where we were able to code from their original speech. + $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A10. Operationalization of models replicating Sanders (2012)

<i>Dependent variables</i>	
Immigration position (T3) ^a	Continuous pro-immigration score ranging from 0 to 10, constructed from a batch of 12 questions asking respondents about their attitudes toward immigrants in general and, more specific, about third country immigration to the EU (T3). Missing values were replaced by mean imputation.
Change in immigration position ^a	Absolute change in immigration position between wave 3 and wave 2. Since the absolute amount of opinion change is right-skewed, we operationalized the magnitude of change as the logarithm of absolute opinion change.
<i>Individual level predictors</i>	
Immigration position (T2) ^a	Continuous pro-immigration score ranging from 0 to 10, constructed from a batch of 12 questions asking respondents about their attitudes toward immigrants in general and, more specific, about third country immigration to the EU (T2). Missing values were replaced by mean imputation.
Gender	(1) female; (0) male
Age	Age in years
Education	Age in years when main education ended
Working class	(1) belonging to working class; (0) not belonging to working class
Religion	Categorical variable: (0) other religion; (1) protestant; (2) catholic
Religiosity	Apart from weddings or funerals, about how often do you attend religious services? Scale ranging from (1) "more than once a week" to (8) "never".
Left-right ideology	In political matters people talk of "the left" and "the right". What is your position? Scale ranging from (0) "left" to (10) "right". In addition, the models included a square term of the variable.
Vote intention for elections to the European Parliament ^a	Categorical variable: Intending to vote for a right (1), left (2) or (0) other/none party group at the 2009 elections to the European Parliament (T2). Left groups include PES, Far Left or Green, right groups EPP, Far Right or Libertas.
Knowledge change ^{a, b}	Knowledge change between T3 and T2; based on three knowledge questions on immigration available in the questionnaire. The questions asked for the definition of Blue Card workers, the role of the EU in the current immigration policy and for a figure of the number of immigrants currently living in the EU. For each of the questions, the participants could choose out of four possible options and an additional "don't know" category.
Social conformity pressure (above) ^a	Absolute extent to which respondents that were more immigrant friendly than the average group member scored above the immigration position of the group mean (T2).
Social conformity pressure (below) ^a	Absolute extent to which respondents that were less immigrant friendly than the average group member scored below the immigration position of the group mean (T2).
Clarify thinking – experts (T3)	On a 0 to 10 scale, where (0) means "a complete waste of time", (10) means "extremely useful" and (5) is "exactly in the middle", how useful

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

	or not were each of the following elements in clarifying your thinking about these issues? <i>Participating in the plenary session with experts</i>
Clarify thinking – politicians (T3)	(...) <i>Participating in the plenary session with politicians</i>
Clarify thinking – other participants (T3)	(...) <i>Meeting and talking to other participants outside of the formal discussions</i>
Clarify thinking – briefing material (T3)	(...) <i>The briefing document</i>
Communicative influence (above) ^c	Absolute amount to which respondents that were more immigrant friendly than the (mean of) the deliberative highly skilled in the group scored above the immigration position of the latter (T2). We consider the 10 percent of all participants who scored highest on our latent variable of deliberative quality (i.e., participants above the 90 th percentile on the ideal points scale) as high-skilled deliberators. ^d
Communicative influence (below) ^c	Absolute amount to which respondents that were less immigrant friendly than the (mean of) the deliberative highly skilled in the group scored below the immigration position of the latter (T2). We consider the 10 percent of all participants who scored highest on our latent variable of deliberative quality (i.e., participants above the 90 th percentile on the ideal points scale) as high-skilled deliberators. ^d

Group level predictor

Deliberative quality – level of justification ^c	Average level of justification rationality per speech that was provided in the respective small group discussion.
--	---

Notes: ^a Unlike Sanders (2012), we took indicators measured at wave 2 and 3 instead of 1 and 4, respectively. ^b Given our focus on wave 2 and 3, we constructed our variable out of three knowledge question on immigration. Sander's index is composed out of change in knowledge based on two questions each on immigration, climate change and the European Union. ^c These variables have been added to Sander's model. All other variables were retrieved (and modified) from the EuroPolis data set. T2 indicate questionnaire responses right at the start of the three-day event in Brussels, T3 indicate questionnaire responses right at the end of the three-day event. Unless otherwise indicated, variables were taken from T1. Also note that our models were estimated only for a subsample while Sanders (2012) incorporates the whole EuroPolis test group. ^d This procedure leads to the exclusion of discussion group 20 with 14 participants since no high-skilled deliberators were present in this group.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A11. Determinants of opinion change on immigration position (replicating Sanders)

	Immigration position (wave 3)		Absolute opinion change (immigration)	
<i>Individual Level Determinants</i>				
Immigration position (wave 2)	0.962	(0.119) ***		
Gender	0.030	(0.076)	0.050	(0.035)
Age	0.003	(0.002)	0.000	(0.001)
Education	0.034	(0.043)	-0.011	(0.020)
Working class	-0.118	(0.093)	-0.034	(0.042)
Catholic	-0.187	(0.100) +	-0.070	(0.045)
Protestant	-0.010	(0.137)	-0.086	(0.062)
Religiosity	-0.009	(0.020)	-0.012	(0.009)
Left-right ideology	0.039	(0.047)	-0.016	(0.021)
Left-right squared	-0.003	(0.004)	0.001	(0.002)
Clarify thinking - other participants	0.029	(0.020)	-0.001	(0.009)
Clarify thinking - experts	0.017	(0.024)	0.008	(0.011)
Clarify thinking - politicians	0.010	(0.021)	0.004	(0.010)
Clarify thinking - briefing material	-0.041	(0.022) +	0.000	(0.010)
Knowledge change	0.076	(0.039) +	-0.012	(0.018)
Social conformity pressure (above)	0.003	(0.126)	-0.018	(0.024)
Social conformity pressure (below)	0.089	(0.130)	0.035	(0.023)
Left Party	0.060	(0.096)	-0.055	(0.044)
Right Party	-0.241	(0.100) *	-0.078	(0.046) +
Constant	-0.049	(0.788)	0.219	(0.173)
<i>Group Level Determinants</i>				
Deliberative quality - level of justification	0.008	(0.178)	0.130	(0.066) *
Std. Group Level	0.095	(0.064)	0.000	(0.000)
Std. Individual Level	0.455	(0.027)	0.211	(0.012)
N Individuals	174		174	
N Groups	13		13	

Note: Multilevel linear models (REML) with standard errors in parentheses. For operationalization, see Table A9. + $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Deliberative Abilities and Deliberative Influence in a Transnational Deliberative Poll (EuroPolis)

Table A12. Determinants of opinion change on immigration position (communicative influence)

	Immigration position (wave 3)	
Immigration position (wave 2)	0.939 (0.125)	***
Gender	0.035 (0.077)	
Age	0.002 (0.002)	
Education	0.060 (0.045)	
Working class	-0.086 (0.097)	
Catholic	-0.163 (0.102)	
Protestant	0.053 (0.139)	
Religiosity	-0.003 (0.021)	
Left-right ideology	-0.002 (0.050)	
Left-right squared	0.001 (0.005)	
Clarify thinking - other participants	0.017 (0.020)	
Clarify thinking - experts	0.013 (0.024)	
Clarify thinking - politicians	0.006 (0.022)	
Clarify thinking - briefing material	-0.048 (0.022)	*
Knowledge change	0.099 (0.041)	*
Social conformity pressure (above)	0.036 (0.127)	
Social conformity pressure (below)	-0.005 (0.136)	
Left Party	0.040 (0.100)	
Right Party	-0.161 (0.102)	
Communicative influence (above)	0.044 (0.056)	
Communicative influence (below)	0.062 (0.039)	
Constant	0.236 (0.831)	
Std. Group Level	0.100 (0.065)	
Std. Individual Level	0.436 (0.027)	
N Individuals	160	
N Groups	12	

Note: Multilevel linear models (REML) with standard errors in parentheses.

For operationalization, see Table A9. ⁺ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.