**Codebook for Content Coding**

**Article: Which types of reason-giving and storytelling are good for deliberation? Assessing the discussion dynamics in legislative and citizen forums.**

The unit of analysis is the speech act – every time a participant spoke, his/her speech counted as one speech act, even in case of brief interruptions. To analyse the discussion flow, we employed the concept of Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM), as developed by Steiner and colleagues[[1]](#footnote-1). This approach is attentive to broader forms of communication[[2]](#footnote-2), including storytelling in a more central way.

**Setting**

1. Public Hearing
2. Discussion Group

**Participation**: (length of time)

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

**DTM – Deliberative Transformative Moments**

Each speech act is classified according to one of the following four categories:

1. *DTM 1: The speech act remains at a high level of deliberation:* “This category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level” (Steiner, et al., 2017, p.4). This means that the discursive space is inclusive and the opportunity to articulate diverse opinions is available, participants are respectfully listening to each other and exchanging arguments and experiences to justify their positions, and discussion remains within the topic at stake.

Coding is easiest if a speech acts fulfils all the criteria of the DQI (Deliberative Quality Index), which means that the speaker does not interrupt other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the public good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. The discussion, however, can still continue at a high level of deliberation if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation. For our analysis, the concept of topic has particular importance, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to flow in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other respectfully. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion; yet if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the general issue (adolescent misbehaviour, age of criminal responsibility, the Bill and its consequences) the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

1. *DTM 2: The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low.* “This category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation” (Steiner, et al., 2017, p.4-5). The flow of the discussion is disrupted. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and no new topic related to the lowering the age of criminal responsibility is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the aforementioned process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, there is no open space where other actors can easily continue the discussion in a meaningful way. This situation may include a topic detour and a confrontation that closes the venue to articulating diverse opinions, as well as insults or expressions of disrespect towards other participants or their positions.
2. *DTM 3:* *The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation:* “this category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level” (Steiner et al. 2017, p.5). Discussants do not re-construct the discussion in a deliberative way. This means that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the lowering the age of criminal responsibility process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the lowering of the age of criminal responsibility. Examples are off topic comments and storytelling unrelated to the question under scrutiny, vocalization of expressions of disrespect and efforts to disqualify others. Speech acts may include high incoherence and a lack of clarity.
3. *DTM 4: The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high:* “This category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level” (Steiner et al. 2017, p.5). Participant are able to successfully conduct the discussion with deliberative interaction, by returning to the topic under discussion, presenting a good argument, summarizing the group’s reflection or making new propositions to advance the discussion. In this way, the speech act opens a new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

**Reason-giving**

The speaker does not present any argument (but asks, for example, for additional information)

1. The speaker states a demand without reason (without justification): there is no explanation why x should or should not be done; statement of beliefs or preferences without explanation.
2. The speaker offers a reason (with justification).

**Evidence[[3]](#footnote-3)**

To make an argument comprehensible to others, the speaker needs to offer a conclusion or a demand (something they are arguing about) and provide evidence to support the conclusions. This support can be classified as:

1. Empirical evidence: refers to empirical or quasi-empirical claims about the world, as to bring to the fore information to understand the quality of the conclusion or the demand at stake. Factual evidence includes more generic knowledge about the world. Empirical evidence is not communicated in the first person, thereby it is different from personal experience. Examples are: *“We need tougher criminal law because nowadays young people kill and even burn their victims”*; *“the effects of youngsters in adult prisons are devastating since they get in touch with real criminals”*.
2. Statistic evidence: refers to surveys, probabilistic and numerical statements to justify why (x) should or should not be done. Examples are: *“50% of cases”,* *“200 people”, “the majority of adolescents”, “a growing number of infractions”; “Today, 43% of young offenders repeat an offense, the number of juvenile offenders is growing, and so is the rate of highly violent crimes”*.
3. Research findings: include any claims attributed to a specific study or to “research” in general, whether a source is mentioned or not; systematized knowledge validated in a scientific context. *“A lot of studies show that the main victims of violence in Brazil are the adolescents themselves - especially young people from the suburbs, especially the poor and black people”, “There is no scientific research that proves that increasing the penalty would reduce crime”.*
4. Legal evidence: claims involving valid constitutional or legal norms and legal precedents that apply to particular problems and cases. “*We must consider the state responsibility as decisive; this house (Chamber of Deputies) approved Law No. 12,594, which provides the guidelines for children’s welfare and protection policies!”*
5. Other (please specify).
6. Unclear.

7. Not applicable.

**Warrants**

Warrants are connections to relate evidence and conclusion. Steiner and colleagues (Steiner, et al., 2004) refer to this latter element as “linkage”, i.e., a way to tie together a demand (y) and explain why (x) should or should not be done, within an infrastructure of logical or causal connections. Warrants can be classified as:

1. Conditional: the speaker states a warrant that directly connects evidence to a conclusion, i.e., applying simple logic to show how one situation leads to the other. In this case, “if-then” statements are often used. “*If we set the age of culpability at 16, gangs of organized crime will start recruiting minors aged 14 or 15”. “If we send adolescent to adult prison, they will return to society 20 times worse”.*
2. Analogy: the speaker illustrates his/her logic by comparing a situation to another that might be easier to understand or the speaker uses a metaphor to enable others to grasp an issue that is arguably similar. Examples: *“Fifty years ago, teenagers’ steps were monitored by their parents; and limits were parents’ responsibilities. Now, they have vast access to information through the Internet (...) and vote for the President of Brazil. They do know the difference between right and wrong”*.
3. Value-based: the speaker states a belief or a value to support a conclusion, by making an explicit connection to a moral or ethical background. An example is: “*It would be irresponsible to punish Brazilian youths for the absence of fundamental rights when the state does not provide these rights”. “I’ m a father, a grandfather, and I’m a citizen (…) I want to believe in peace in the future, by having tougher criminal laws”*.
4. Meta-proposal: the speaker refers to a broad policy that can be applied to a wide range of specific policy problems. This sort of warrant has the same function as value statement warrants, but it refers to social, political or economic processes rather than to values. An example is: *“Education is more effective for dealing with young offenders than putting them in jail as punishment”*.
5. Other (please specify).
6. Unclear.

7. Not applicable.

**Functions of Reason-giving:**

1. Clarification: When the speaker states reasons to elucidate a problem, to reach a better definition of the issue or the problem under discussion, or outlines what aspects should be addressed. See the following example: *“I think the law is being misapplied and needs to be reviewed for crimes with greater repercussion in society: homicide and rape. Even though the adolescent is undergoing a self-development process, he knows how serious these things are, he knows what taking a person's life means”.*

2. Search for solution: when the speaker explicitly gives reasons to achieve a solution to a problem or a conflict or explains what should or should not be done to address a problem. Capturing subcategories, requires observing previous speech acts. See the examples:

b.1 Consensual format: when participants aim at understanding each other’s arguments and take these arguments into consideration, including the transformation of preferences, to find a solution. In this case, there is a reciprocal weighing of pros and cons. An example is: *“I follow her view that we should care for young offenders’ welfare. We all dream with a civilization of peace, more egalitarian, right? We need to avoid discriminating young offenders”.*

b.2 Negotiation format: when participants aim at finding a solution which is mutually acceptable, but counter-reasons are not incorporated to transform preferences. In this case, there is no inquiry or scrutiny of the stated reasons. Examples are:

*Speaker 1. I think it is important to consider the way a boy aged 16 has experienced in live. This is my opinion, and this debate is important*

*Speaker 2. The commitment assumed has been maintained. We kept the rules of the provisional measure, because we had almost five thousand and three hundred contracts, these were agreements signed with the States. So, we maintained the commitment.*

1. Staging a conflict: when arguments are used to clarify the disagreement between speakers. While divergence in the previous items (a, b) is implicit in the communicative background, here it comes to the forefront and is thematized explicitly in the speaker’s utterance. See the example: *“I’m absolutely contrary to the reduction of the age of criminal responsibility. In 136 penal reforms in the last 40 years, crime has not decreased in Brazil. Passing more laws is not the solution.”*

4. Imposition: When an argument is applied to enforce coercion. An example is: *“It is possible to reduce crime with an efficient police. In São Paulo, we reduced the number of homicides, which is now half the national average. But we need a tougher criminal law, otherwise we'll leave ...[the discussion]”*

5. Other - please specify

6. Unclear

1. Not applicable

**Narrative of Personal Experiences**

Personal narratives can be characterized as “a series of connected statements in which a speaker recalls some past experience in a roughly sequential order” (Black, 2008, p.3).

1. Stories

The speakers narrate a sequence of interconnected actions, with a beginning, middle and end. Telling stories usually demands an interruption in the flux of communication to set up a scene; and the narrative composes a plot that establishes the significance of the related events

1. Experiences in passing

The speakers use experiential knowledge to support a statement, without creating an alternate scene and narration. In contrast to story complex narratives, information is presented without a storyline evolving in time and space. Examples are: *“I worked in a school where adolescents were under socio-educative measures”; “I visited three types of institutions: a socio-educative institution, a female prison and a male prison; and these are very different realities”.*

**Functions of storytelling:**

1. Clarification: when the narrative aims at explaining the specificity of certain realities, experiences or situations. The story is used to articulate identity, commonalities and differences between people and groups, or to establish connections between certain political issues and people’s lives. See the example: *“I had this usual view that the police are bad, brutish, and violent. (...) My first job opportunity was granted by a police lieutenant. That’s when I started to understand the other side of the coin, not just as a community resident, but as a citizen. I think that, when a police officer leaves home, it’s not just a cop who is leaving: it is a human being. A family man who’s leaving his mother, his child, and his wife - to take care of public safety and do a job that he has chosen”.*
2. Disclosure of harm: when the narrative particularly aims at evincing negative experiences and different forms of harms. This type of story often implies clarification dynamics, but in contrast to the previous category, it focuses on domination, abuse, denegation of rights, exploitation, denigration and oppression. See the following examples: *“I work in a children's socio-educative institution and I am an educator. We got there a four- month-old baby badly beaten by his mother. What worries me is that this child will grow up with this trauma and also end up using violence”; “They (the police) treat poor people with ignorance and insults in a totally different way from middle class people. This has happened to me several times. Even though I was well groomed, they prevented me from walking in Savassi; They treated me like trash. Newspapers often show what the police do to poor young people; even if they did nothing wrong, the police beat or shout”. “The female police officer told us to put our hands above our heads and spread our legs. So we did. Now, male cops can't touch a teenager, but they often abuse their power. They abuse their power and I don't think that's right.”*
3. Search for solutions: the story appeals to actions in order to solve a certain problem or conflict. The narrative explicitly offers elements aimed towards a solution of a problem or alludes to what should be or should not be done to address it. Stories of success, i.e., positive management of harm or negative experiences are also included in this category. An example is: “*I think: police humanization needs to happen now. I was ten when I was first slapped in the face by a policeman. I was at home. Well, I felt very angry during my childhood and I can talk about it with total sincerity today and without prejudice. This is the same situation for most poor black slum youths. (…) This happens in the Quarry, Cracolândia (place known for its concentration of crack users). I have experience living with drug and alcohol users at home, so we know how it works. This is my life experience and I have suffered at the hands of the police for 32 years for being black, poor and a slum dweller. So it's humanization now”.*
4. Off topic: When a story is applied without a clear relation to the topic under discussion.

5. Other - please specify.

6. Unclear.

7. Not applicable.
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