Code Book

**Abbreviations:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| nom. | Nominal scale (categorical data) | |
| ord. | Ordinal scale (rank order) | |
| interv. | Interval scale (equidistant points between each of the scale elements) | |
| ratio | Ratio scale (equidistant points between each of the scale elements + true zero point) | |
| bin. | Binary variable | |
| **Hierarchy of variables** | | |
| No asterisk | Conceptually less important | |
| \* | Conceptually important | |
| **Validation of author’s impression** | | |
| insufficient evidence | | Impressions of case studies’ authors rely on insufficient information: without providing a clear data-driven justification. |
| informed guess | | Impressions of case studies’ authors rely on sufficient information to make an informed guess. |
| comprehensive, reliable | | Impressions of case studies’ authors rely on sufficient, comprehensive and detailed information: providing a clear data-driven justification. |

**Glossar:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Case | In our research project a case is defined as a dialogue-oriented participation format within a Participatory Budgeting (PB) and Local Agenda 21 (LA 21) procedure. We are only interested in dialogue-oriented formats. PB and LA 21 procedures in one municipality often consist of several cases. |
| Experts | Experts (equal to interviewees) are involved citizens, politicians, providers of external support (e.g. moderator), civil society representatives, administrative staff as well as scientific scholars. |
| Format | Each Participatory Budgeting and Local Agenda 21 procedure consists of a variety of participation formats, e.g. citizen fora, online platforms, public meetings with citizen, surveys. In the literature these formats are labeled with a variety of different terms, e.g. participatory channels, tools, processes. |
| Local Agenda 21 | At the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, Agenda 21 was promoted as the global action program for sustainable development. The purpose of Local Agenda 21 (LA 21) procedures is to encourage local authorities promoting more environmentally, socially and economically sustainable communities together with local civil society and business actors. A variety of participatory formats (see below) has been applied. Local Agenda 21 procedures have no decision-making authority, but can offer advice to the representative bodies, which have the final say. |
| Participatory Budgeting | Participatory Budgeting (PB) was invented in Porto Alegre, Brazil, and spread all over the globe. The purpose is to enable citizens to participate in the debate about how to allocate parts of municipal budget. A variety of participatory formats has been applied. In Germany, Participatory Budgeting procedures have no decision-making authority, but can offer advice to the representative bodies, which have the final say. |
| Procedure | In our codebook a procedure is a Local Agenda 21 and a Participatory Budgeting procedure taking place in a German municipality at a particular period of time, e.g. Participatory Budgeting in Frankfurt 2011-2013. |

Graph: Explaining the usage of the terms procedure, format, case

**Content:**

1. **General Information (independent variable)**
   1. procedure and case
   2. study
2. **Context variables (independent variable)**
   1. municipality\_context
   2. procedure\_context (incl. goals of procedure)
3. **Stakeholders/Actors (independent variable)**
4. **Case design (independent variable)**
   1. goals of case
   2. design of case (more specific)
5. **Results (dependent variable)**
   1. micro-level
   2. meso-level
   3. macro-level

**1. General Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Variable name** | **Scale** | **Variable explanation** | **Variable values** |
| 1 | IDNR | nom. | Identification number | 1, 2, 3, … |
| 2 | ID\_case |  | Identification of case: unique case name (municipal name \_case description) | text area |
| 3 | ID\_coder | nom. | Identification of coder: coder’s initials | 1: MB  2: PH  3: NJ  4: n.n. |
| 4 | date\_coding | date | Date of completion of coding | dd\_mm\_yyyy |
| **procedure and case** | | | | |
| 5 | procedure | nom. | Type of participatory procedure | 1: Participatory Budgeting  2: Local Agenda 21 |
| 6 | \*decision\_council | bin. | City council decision(to conduct PB/LA-21) | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 7 | decision\_council\_d | date | Year of city council decision (to conduct PB/LA-21) | yyyy  99: not applicable |
| 8 | procedure\_format |  | Description of formats applied in procedure | text area |
| 9 | procedure\_formats\_1 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: information: face- to-face meetings | 0: no  1: yes |
| 10 | procedure\_formats\_2 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: information: online | 0: no  1: yes |
| 11 | procedure\_formats\_3 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: information: other (flyer, advertisement, etc.) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 12 | procedure\_formats\_4 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: proposal making: face-to-face without dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 13 | procedure\_formats\_5 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: proposal making: face-to-face with dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 14 | procedure\_formats\_6 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: proposal making: online without dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 15 | procedure\_formats\_7 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: proposal making: online with dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 16 | procedure\_formats\_8 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: proposal making: other (mail, phone, etc.) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 17 | procedure\_formats\_9 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: prioritization of proposals: offline voting without dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 18 | procedure\_formats\_10 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: prioritization of proposals: offline with dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 19 | procedure\_formats\_11 | bin. | Formats applied in PB:  prioritization of proposals: online voting without dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 20 | procedure\_formats\_12 | bin. | Formats applied PB:  prioritization of proposals: online voting with dialog | 0: no  1: yes |
| 21 | procedure\_formats\_13 | bin. | Formats applied in PB: prioritization of proposals: other (opinion poll, etc.) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 22 | procedure\_formats\_14 | bin. | Formats applied in LA 21:  discussion of working groups on specific topics (“Arbeitskreis”) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 23 | procedure\_formats\_15 | bin. | Formats applied in LA 21:  discussion in open space groups (so called Forum) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 24 | procedure\_formats\_16 | bin. | Formats applied in LA 21: dialog-oriented decision-making on own projects | 0: no  1: yes |
| 25 | procedure\_formats\_17 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: Accountability meeting | 0: no  1: yes |
| 26 | procedure\_formats\_18 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: surveys | 0: no  1: yes |
| 27 | procedure\_formats\_19 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: advisory board/s (“Beirat”, “Redaktionsgruppe”, “Lenkungs-gremium”, “Projektgruppe”, “Koordinationskreis”) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 28 | procedure\_formats\_20 | bin. | Formats applied in procedure: structural, standardized meetings (future conference, future workshop, consensus conference, world café) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 29 | procedure\_formats\_21 |  | Other formats applied in procedure | text |
| 30 | case | nom. | Case description (object of inquiry/research) | text area  1: proposal making: face-to-face with dialog  2: proposal making: online with dialog  3: prioritization of proposals: offline with dialog  4: prioritization of proposals: online voting with dialog  5: discussion of working groups on specific topics (“Arbeitskreis”)  6: discussion in open space groups (so called Forum)  7: dialog-oriented decision-making on own projects  8: structural, standardized meetings (future conference, future workshop, consensus conference, world café) |
| 31 | procedure \_start | date | Procedure start date | yyyy |
| 32 | procedure \_end | date | Procedure end date (estimated) | yyyy  97: still ongoing at end of study |
| 33 | \*procedure\_ institut | bin. | Degree of procedure institutionalization as planned | 0: nonrecurring  1: continuing |
| 34 | case\_start | date | Case start date | dd\_mm\_yyyy |
| 35 | case\_end | date | Case end date (estimated) | dd\_mm\_yyyy |
| 36 | case\_institut | bin. | Degree of case institutionalization as planned | 0: nonrecurring  1: continuing |
| 37 | \*procedure \_initiator |  | Organization or group initiating the procedure PB/LA-21 (governmental or non-state actor(s)): name + function (as detailed as possible) | text area |
| 38 | procedure \_organiser |  | Organization or group organizing the procedure PB/LA-21 (governmental or non-state actor(s)): name + function (as detailed as possible) | text area |
| **study** | | | | |
| 39 | source\_title |  | Bibliographic citation: title | text area |
| 40 | source\_publisher |  | Bibliographic citation: publisher/editor | text area |
| 41 | source\_URL |  | Bibliographic citation: internet URL with access date | text area  99: not applicable |
| 42 | source\_type | nom. | Type of source | 1: peer-reviewed publication  2: scholarly publication  3: scientific evaluation  4: publication by public participation professionals (e.g. ZEBRALOG)  5: conference paper  6: administration report  7: dissertation  8: diplom/master thesis (etc.)  9: other … named |
| 43 | author |  | Author/s of study | name/s  text area |
| 44 | author\_type | nom. | Background of author/s | 1: scientist  2: professional services staff  3: administrative staff  4: participant 5: student  If other, name it (also authors with multiple backgrounds). |
| 45 | date\_publication | date | Date of publication | dd\_mm\_yyyy |
| 46 | method | nom. | Method of study | 1: qualitativ  2: quantitativ  3: mixed |
| 47 | scientific\_value | ord. | Coder’s impression of scientific value of study   1. Description of case available? 2. Source of data mentioned? 3. Data reliable and valid? 4. Methods of analysis mentioned? 5. Methods of analysis reliable and valid? 6. Results ‘reasonable’ (or rather ad hoc hypothesis)? | 0: limited (1 or 2 indicator(s) are/is mentioned)  1: (3 indicators are mentioned)  2: (4 indicators are mentioned)  3: (5 indicators are mentioned )  4: excellent (all 6 indicators are mentioned) |
| 48 | contact\_person |  | person(s) to contact for interviewing etc. | text area |
| 49 | source\_other\_stud |  | To gain more data: Which other study is used? | text area  96: no other source |
| 50 | source\_other\_URL |  | To gain more data: Which website (for PB or LA 21) is used? | text area  96: no other source |
| 51 | source\_other\_exp |  | To gain more data: Which experts were interviewed? | text area  96: no other source |
| 52 | source\_other |  | To gain more data: Which other source is used? | text area  96: no other source |

**2. Context variables**

Standard sources of all context variables: Statistical offices of the Länder or wegweiser-kommune.de

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Variable name** | **Scale** | **Variable explanation** | **Variable values** |
| **municipality\_context** | | | | |
| 53 | federal\_state | nom. | Name of the federal state in which the procedure (PB or LA 21) took place. | 1: Baden-Württemberg  2: Bavaria  3: Berlin  4: Brandenburg  5: Bremen  6: Hamburg  7: Hesse  8: Lower Saxony  9: Mecklenburg-West Pomerania  10: North Rhine-Westphalia  11: Rhineland-Palatinate  12: Saarland  13: Saxony  14: Saxony-Anhalt  15: Schleswig-Holstein  16: Thuringia |
| 54 | \*dem\_type | nom. | Type of democracy of federal state: Concurrence Democracy or Concordance Democracy (see Holtkamp 2008: 121) | 1: Concurrence Democracy  2: Concordance Democracy |
| 55 | loc\_constitution | nom. | Local constitution of federal state (see list). | 1: Süddeutsche Ratsverfassung\_1  2: Süddeutsche Ratsverfassung\_2  3: Süddeutsche Ratsverfassung\_3  4: Süddeutsche Ratsverfassung\_4  5: Süddeutsche Ratsverfassung\_5  6: Süddeutsche Ratsverfassung\_6  7: Magistratsverfassung  99: not applicable |
| 56 | municipal\_name |  | Name of the municipal / city / district in which the procedure (PB or LA 21) took place. | text area |
| ***Note for coder(s): all following figures refer to the year(s) of case*** | | | | |
| 57 | \*municipal\_size | ratio | Municipal population | figure |
| 58 | \*brutto\_product | ratio | Municipal revenues per capita | figure |
| 59 | \*debts | ratio | Municipal debts per capita | figure |
| 60 | \*budget\_fin\_procedure | ratio | Total (financial) budget of procedure (PB or LA 21) (in €) | figure |
| 61 | budget\_fin\_case | ratio | Total (financial) budget of case (in €) | figure |
| 62 | \*unemployment\_rate | ratio | Municipal unemployment rate | figure |
| 63 | foreigners | ratio | Proportion of foreign citizens in municipal / city / district in which the procedure (PB or LA 21) took place. | figure |
| 64 | \*“pressure“ |  | Author‘s/interviewee’s impression of pressure (financial, fragmentation, migration) | text  98: no information available |
| 65 | “pressure“\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 66 | university | bin. | Is there a university or a university of applied science in municipality? | 0: no  1: yes |
| 67 | \*vot\_turnout\_nat | ratio | Municipal voter turnout at last national (Bundestag) elections | figure |
| 68 | \*vot\_turnout\_reg | ratio | Municipal voter turnout at last regional (Landtag) elections | figure |
| 69 | \*vot\_turnout\_council |  | Voter turnout at city council elections since 1990 | text |
| 70 | \*vot\_turnout\_mayor |  | Voter turnout at mayor elections since 1990 | text |
| 71 | \*concept\_participatory | bin. | Is there a participatory concept plan/map (position paper) in municipality? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 72 | concept\_participatory\_year | bin. | Year of participatory concept plan/map (position paper) | yyyy  99: not applicable |
| 73 | \*staff\_special | bin. | Is there special staff concerning civic participation in general (not specifically for procedure)? (Referent für Bürgerbeteiligung, Bürgerbeauftragter) | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 74 | \*“number”\_dialogue-oriented | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: How many dialogue-oriented procedures before? | 0: no procedures  …  4: many procedure  98: no information available |
| 75 | “number”\_dialogue-oriented  \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 76 | \*perceived\_dialogue-oriented | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: How were dialogue-oriented procedures perceived in citizenry? | -2: very negative  …  +2: very positive  98: no information available |
| 77 | perceived\_dialogue-oriented\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 78 | \*participatory\_communes | bin. | Does municipality belong to civitas or other participatory network? (see list) | 0: no  1: yes |
| 79 | \*direct democracy\_experience | ratio | Municipal experience with direct democracy (see [Datenbank lokale direkte Demokratie in Deutschland](http://www.datenbank-buergerbegehren.info/tiki-index.php?page=Datenbank)) | figure (until start of case) |
| 80 | \*associations\_registr | ratio | Number of all registered associations (see register of associations) | if data available:  figure |
| 81 | \*conflict | bin. | Does author/interviewee mention conflict within citizenry? | 0: no  1: yes |
| 82 | conflict\_name |  | Name of conflict in municipality | text area  99: not applicable |
| 83 | \*procedure\_ communic\_actors | bin. | Author’s/interviewee’s impression of communication style between politicians, administration and citizenry (procedure) | 0: conflictual  … 4: cooperative  98: no information available |
| 84 | procedure\_ communic\_actors \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 85 | \*party\_mayor | nom. | Party membership of the mayor | 1: CDU/CSU  2: SPD  3: BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN  4: FDP  5: DIE LINKE  6: Freie Wähler  7: independent  8: other |
| 86 | \*party\_council | nom. | Party with relative majority in council (party with most number of seats) | 1: CDU/CSU  2: SPD  3: BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN  4: FDP  5: DIE LINKE  6: Freie Wähler  7: other |
| 87 | council\_election\_last | date | Last council election | yyyy |
| 88 | council\_election\_CDU/CSU | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (CDU/CSU) | figure |
| 89 | council\_election\_SPD | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (SPD) | figure |
| 90 | council\_election\_GRÜNEN | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (DIE GRÜNEN) | figure |
| 91 | council\_election\_FDP | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (FDP) | figure |
| 92 | council\_election\_LINKE | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (DIE LINKE) | figure |
| 93 | council\_election\_FW | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (FREIE WÄHLER) | figure |
| 94 | council\_election\_other | ratio | Last council elections: Number of seats (other) | figure |
| 95 | council\_election\_next | date | Next council election | yyyy |
| 96 | mayor\_election\_next | date | Next election of mayor | yyyy |
| **procedure\_context** | | | | |
| 97 | pilot | bin. | Pilot project (PB or LA-21), particularly supported | name  0: no  98: no information available |
| 98 | procedure\_purpose\_intend |  | Intended purpose of procedure by initiators. | text |
| 99 | procedure\_purpose\_intend\_aut |  | Author’s impression of intended purpose of procedure by initiators. | text |
| 100 | procedure\_partici\_pl | ratio | Planned number of procedure participants | figure  98: no information available |
| 101 | \*procedure\_inform | ratio | Is there an information phase included in procedure (PB or LA 21)? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 102 | procedure\_inform\_channels |  | Which information channels were used? | text  99: not applicable |
| 103 | topic\_specific | bin. | To which specific topics is the participatory procedure (PB or LA 21) limited? | Name topics  0: none  98: no information available |
| 104 | \*support\_federal | bin. | Is participatory procedure (LA 21) supported (financially, infrastructural) by the federal state? | Name support  0: no  98: no information available |
| 105 | \*procedure\_staff | bin. | Is there staff especially for the procedure (PB or LA 21)? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 106 | procedure\_nb\_staff | ratio | Number of staff for the procedure (PB or LA 21) | figure  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 107 | \*procedure\_external\_support | bin. | Procedure (PB or LA 21) was accompanied by external support (professional services, scientific advice) | 0: no external support  1: external support  98: no information available |
| 108 | procedure\_external\_support\_what |  | How did the external support accompanied the procedure (PB or LA 21), e.g. software, moderator? | text  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 109 | procedure\_external\_support\_det |  | Which external support accompanied the procedure (PB or LA 21), e.g. Zebralog? | text  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 110 | \*procedure\_transparency | ratio | Plan for publicly available written documentation about procedure? | 0: no plan  1: plan  98: no information available |
| 111 | \*procedure\_accountability | ord. | Is there a clear plan for accountability? | 0: no plan for accountability  1: basic information on accountability (without scheduled dates)  2: clear plan for accountability (with scheduled dates)  98: no information available |
| 112 | procedure ­\_institute\_first | date | When did the first procedure (PB or LA 21) start? | yyyy |
| 113 | context\_change |  | Author’s impression: Change of context during procedure. | text |

**3. Stakeholders/Actors**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Variable name** | | **Scale** | | **Variable explanation** | | **Variable values** | |
| **Before start of procedure/Before and at council decision** | | | | | | | | | |
| 114 | | \*procedure\_support\_city council | | ratio | | Author’s/interviewee’s impression of degree of procedure support (engagement for procedure) by city council members | | 0: no support  …  4: very strong support  98: no information available | |
| 115 | | procedure\_support\_city council \_autimpression | | ord. | | How valid is author’s impression? | | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable | |
| 116 | | \*procedure\_support\_mayor | | ratio | | Author’s/interviewee’s impression of degree of procedure support by mayor | | 0: no support  …  4: very strong support  98: no information available | |
| 117 | | procedure\_support\_mayor \_autimpression | | ord. | | How valid is author’s impression? | | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable | |
| 118 | | \*procedure\_support\_admin | | ratio | | Author’s/interviewee’s impression of degree of procedure support by administration | | 0: no support  …  4: very strong support  98: no information available | |
| 119 | | procedure\_support\_admin \_autimpression | | ord. | | How valid is author’s impression? | | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable | |
| 120 | | \*procedure\_support\_civilsociety\_loc | | ratio | | Author’s /interviewee’s impression of degree of procedure support by local civil society (local associations) | | 0: no support  …  4: very strong support  98: no information available | |
| 121 | | procedure\_support\_civilsociety\_loc \_autimpression | | ord. | | How valid is author’s impression? | | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable | |
| 122 | | stakeholder\_change | |  | | Author’s impression: Change of stakeholder during procedure. | | text | |
| **During procedure** | | | | | | | | | |
| 123 | | \*procedure\_partici\_mayor | | bin. | | Did mayor participate in procedure? | | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available | |
| 124 | | \*procedure\_partici\_local politicians\_other | | bin. | | Did other local politicians participate in procedure? | | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available | |
| 125 | | \*media\_report | | ratio | | Author’s impression: How intensive did media report on procedure? If information on media report is available but unspecific, use code 2. | | 0: no report  …  4: extensive report  98: no information available | |
| 126 | | media\_report\_autimpression | | ord. | | How valid is author’s impression? | | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable | |
| 127 | | \*media\_report\_how | | ratio | | Author’s impression: How did media report on procedure? | | -2: negative  …  +2: positive | |
| 128 | | media\_report\_how\_autimpression | | ord. | | How valid is author’s impression? | | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable | |

**4. Case design**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Variable name** | **Scale** | **Variable explanation** | **Variable values** |
| **goals of case** | | | | |
| 129 | case\_purpose\_intend |  | Intended purpose of case by initiators. | text |
| 130 | case\_purpose\_intend\_aut |  | Author’s impression of Intended purpose of case by initiators. | text |
| 131 | case\_purpose\_intend\_cod |  | Coder’s impression of Intended purpose of case by initiators. | text |
| **design of case (more specific)** | | | | |
| 132 | \*partici\_select | nom. | Method of participant recruitment | 1: open to all/self-selection  2: targeted recruitment (e.g. appointed, invited)  3: random selection  4: stakeholder recruitment  5: election  If mixed, name all … |
| 133 | \*special\_select | bin. | Instruments to involve the political inactive (is there a direct addressing of certain groups?) | Name instrument 0: no  98: no information available |
| 134 | partici\_demo\_targ | nom. | Targeted participants (demographic) | 1: general public  2: women  3: men  4: elderly  5: youth  6: immigrants  7: low-income earners  8: people with disabilities  9: other …  98: no information available |
| 135 | partici\_targ\_citizen | bin. | Targeted participants: citizen | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 136 | partici\_ targ\_interest | bin. | Targeted participants: interests groups | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 137 | partici\_ targ\_other |  | Targeted participants: other, e.g. stakeholder | text |
| 138 | \*“ease”\_participants |  | Which ways to “ease” participation (child care, ticket) were used? | text |
| 139 | \*moderator | bin. | Is involvement of moderator planned? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 140 | \*case\_inform | bin. | Is there an information phase within case planned? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 141 | case\_inform\_channels |  | Which information channels were planned? | text  99: not applicable |
| 142 | tools\_delib\_online\_software | bin. | Is there a certain software/web platform (blog, wiki) planned? | 0: no  1: yes  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 143 | \*tools\_delib\_online\_rules | bin. | Are there any rules concerning the communication process (netiquette) planned? | 0: no  1: yes  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 144 | \*tools\_delib\_online\_control | bin. | Is control of rules planned? | 0: no  1: yes  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 145 | \*tools\_delib\_face-to-face | bin. | Is there a clear planning within the case design: information, communication, decision finding? | 0: no clear planning  1: clear planning  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 146 | \*case\_partici\_polit\_pl | bin. | Participation of local politicians planned (in case) | 0: no participation planned  1: planned participation  98: no information available |
| 147 | \*case\_partici\_admin | bin. | Participation of administrative staff planned (in case) | 0: no participation planned  1: planned participation  98: no information available |
| 148 | \*case\_external\_support | bin. | External support (professional services, scientific advice) was planned to accompany case. | 0: no external support  1: external support  98: no information available |
| 149 | case \_external\_support\_what |  | Which external support was planned to accompany case, e.g. software, moderator? | text  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 150 | case \_external\_support\_det |  | Who was planned to support case, e.g. Zebralog? | text  99: not applicable  98: no information available |
| 151 | \*case\_transparency | bin. | How well is the plan for publication or public information, e.g. online dates for hearings or press releases? | 0: no plan  …  4: well-designed plan  98: no information available |
| 152 | \*case\_accountability | ord. | Is there a clear plan for accountability? | 0: no plan for accountability  1: basic information on accountability (without scheduled dates)  2: clear plan for accountability (with scheduled dates)  98: no information available |

**5. Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Variable name** | **Scale** | **Variable explanation** | **Variable values** |
| **micro-level** | | | | |
| 153 | \*knowledge\_issue | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether issue knowledge of participants improved. | 0: no improved knowledge  …  4: substantially improved knowledge  98: no information available |
| 154 | knowledge\_issue\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 155 | \*knowledge\_pol | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether political knowledge of participants improved. | 0: no improved knowledge  …  4: substantially improved knowledge  98: no information available |
| 156 | knowledge\_pol\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 157 | \*efficacy\_internal | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether internal efficacy improved. Internal efficacy covers the individual ability (skills, knowledge and interest) to influence political processes. | 0: no improved internal efficacy  …  4: substantially improved internal efficacy  98: no information available |
| 158 | efficacy\_internal\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 159 | \*efficacy\_external | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether external efficacy improved. External efficacy covers the individual perception of impact on political processes. | 0: no improved external efficacy  …  4: substantially improved external efficacy  98: no information available |
| 160 | efficacy\_external\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 161 | \*tolerance | ratio | Author’s impression whether tolerance of participants improved. | 0: no improved tolerance  …  4: substantially improved tolerance  98: no information available |
| 162 | tolerance\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 163 | \*common good orientation | ratio | Author’s impression whether common good orientation of participants improved. | 0: no improved common good orientation  …  4: substantially improved common good orientation  98: no information available |
| 164 | common good orientation\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 165 | \*acceptance\_dec | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether acceptance of local political decisions improved. | -2: declined acceptance  …  +2: improved acceptance  98: no information available |
| 166 | acceptance\_dec\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 167 | \*acceptance\_trust\_inst | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether acceptance/trust of institutions of representative democracy (mayor, council) improved. | -2: declined acceptance  …  +2: improved acceptance  98: no information available |
| 168 | acceptance\_trust\_inst \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 169 | \*acceptance\_trust\_polit | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression whether acceptance/trust of politicians (mayor\_person, council members) improved. | -2: declined acceptance  …  +2: improved acceptance  98: no information available |
| 170 | acceptance\_trust\_polit \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 171 | \*satisfaction\_case | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression of participants’ satisfaction with case. | 0: not satisfied with case  …  4: really satisfied with case  98: no information available |
| 172 | satisfaction\_case\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 173 | participants\_changes\_other |  | Other changes regarding participants. | text |
| **meso-level** | | | | |
| 174 | group\_interaction |  | Author’s impression: Description of group interaction, e.g. good discussion, building of network or trust. | text |
| 175 | \*delib\_quality\_implement | bin. | Are there any rules concerning the communication process (online, face-to-face deliberation) implemented? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 176 | \*delib\_quality\_interaction | ratio | Author’s impression of quality of deliberation | 0: no deliberation  …  4: very good deliberation  98: no information available |
| 177 | delib\_quality\_interaction \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 178 | \*delib\_quality |  | Author’s impression of deliberative quality. | text |
| 179 | \*delib\_quality\_respect | ratio | Author’s impression of change towards more respectful interactions between participants (see Bächtiger/Wyss 2013) | 0: no change  …  4: lots of change  98: no information available |
| 180 | delib\_quality\_respect \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 181 | \*delib\_quality\_argument | ratio | Author’s impression of change of interactions towards argumentative and not rhetoric. | 0: no change  …  4: lots of change  98: no information available |
| 182 | delib\_quality\_argument \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 183 | \*delib\_quality\_information | ratio | Author’s impression of change of interactions towards objective information (factual) rather than subjective information (opinion, judgment, belief) (see Kolleck). | 0: no change  …  4: lots of change  98: no information available |
| 184 | delib\_quality\_information \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 185 | \*delib\_quality\_value | ratio | Author’s impression of change of interactions towards value based communication (see Kolleck). | 0: no change  …  4: lots of change  98: no information available |
| 186 | delib\_quality\_value \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 187 | \*delib\_quality\_publicspirited | ratio | Author’s impression of opinion change toward more ‘public-spirited view’ (see Mutz 2008: 530) of whole group. | 0: no change  …  4: lots of change  98: no information available |
| 188 | delib\_quality\_publicspirited \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 189 | deliberation\_change\_other |  | Other changes regarding deliberation. | text |
| 190 | \*partici\_number | ratio | Number of participants in case | Figure  98: no information available |
| 191 | \*inclusion\_sex |  | Case participation by sex. | As indicated in the studies.  text area  98: no information available |
| 192 | \*inclusion\_age |  | Case participation by age. | As indicated in the studies.  text area  98: no information available |
| 193 | \*inclusion\_education |  | Case participation by education. | As indicated in the studies.  text area  98: no information available |
| 194 | \*inclusion\_employment |  | Case participation by employment situation. | As indicated in the studies.  text area  98: no information available |
| 195 | \*inclusion\_immigrants |  | Case participation of immigrants. | As indicated in the studies.  text area  98: no information available |
| 196 | inclusion\_citizen | bin. | Involved participants: citizen | 0: no  1: yes |
| 197 | inclusion\_interest | bin. | Involved participants: interests groups | 0: no  1: yes |
| 198 | inclusion\_other | bin. | Involved participants: other | name  98: no information available |
| 199 | \*inclusion\_estimat\_author |  | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: How inclusive was the case? (estimated) | 0: not inclusive  … 4: inclusive  98: no information available |
| 200 | inclusion\_estimat\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 201 | \*inclusion\_estimat\_coder | ratio | Coder’s impression: How inclusive and representative was the case? (estimated) | 0: not inclusive  … 4: inclusive |
| 202 | \*case\_partici\_mayor | bin. | Did mayor participate in case? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 203 | \*case\_partici\_local politicians\_other | bin. | Did other local politicians participate in case? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 204 | inclusion\_change\_other |  | Other changes regarding inclusion. | text |
| 205 | \*rule\_suggestion\_making |  | Rule for suggestion making (consensus, majority) | 0: consensus  1: majority  98: no information available |
| **macro-level (refers to procedure! Not to case!)** | | | | |
| 206 | \*decision\_policymaker | nom. | How did the policymakers react to procedure results? | 1: policymakers comment on any (top list) proposals  2: policymakers comment on some (top list) proposals  3: policymakers comment whole top list  4: policymakers register the results (without comments)  5: policymakers ignore the results  98: no information available |
| 207 | \*decision\_policymaker\_account | bin. | Is there a documentation of policymaker reactions in accountability report? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available  99: not applicable |
| 208 | \*make\_suggestions\_  aut | nom | Author’s impression: Did procedure make suggestions for policy-making? Concrete suggestions or ‘conceptual’ suggestions (*Leitbilder/Leitlinien*)? | 0: no suggestions for policy-making  1: concrete suggestions for policy-making  2: ‘conceptual’ suggestions for policy-making  3: both, concrete and ‘conceptual’ suggestions for policy-making  98: no information available |
| 209 | make\_suggestions\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 210 | debate\_aut | ratio | Author’s impression: How intensive was the debate in city council? | 0: no debate  …  4: intensive debate  98: no information available |
| 211 | debate\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 212 | \*effect\_policy\_aut | ratio | Author’s /interviewee’s impression: How strong was the effect on policy-making (output)? | 0: no effect  …  4: strong effect  98: no information available |
| 213 | effect\_policy\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 214 | \*change\_aut | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: How strong was the change of outcome (as result of procedure)? | 0: no change  …  4: strong change  98: no information available |
| 215 | change\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 216 | \*long\_responsivity\_aut | bin. | Author’s impression: Did procedure have a long-term effect on responsivity? | 0: no effects  ...  4: strong effects  98: no information available |
| 217 | long\_responsivity\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 218 | experts\_policy\_influence | bin. | Filter question:  Information in study about expert’s perception of policy influence. | 0: no  1: yes ... named |
| 219 | \*make\_suggestions\_exp | ratio | Expert: Did procedure make suggestions for policy-making? Concrete suggestions or ‘conceptual’ suggestions (*Leitbilder/Leitlinien*)? | 0: no suggestions for policy-making  1: concrete suggestions for policy-making  2: ‘conceptual’ suggestions for policy-making  3: both, concrete and ‘conceptual’ suggestions for policy-making  98: no information available |
| 220 | debate\_exp | ratio | Expert: How intensive was the debate in city council? | 0: no debate  …  4: intensive debate  98: no information available |
| 221 | \*effect\_policy\_exp | ratio | Expert: How strong was the effect on policy-making (output)? | 0: no effect  …  4: strong effect  98: no information available |
| 222 | \*change\_exp | ratio | Expert: How strong was the change of outcome (as result of procedure)? | 0: no change  …  4: strong change  98: no information available |
| 223 | \*long\_responsivity\_exp | bin. | Expert: Did procedure have a long-term effect on responsivity? | 0: no effects  ...  4: strong effects  98: no information available |
| 224 | facts\_policy\_influence | bin. | Filter question:  Additional information about hard facts on policy influence | 0: no  1: yes |
| 225 | \*make\_suggestions\_fac | ratio | Hard facts: Did procedure make suggestions? Concrete suggestions or ‘conceptual’”? | 0: no suggestions  1: concrete suggestions  2: ‘conceptual’  98: no information available |
| 226 | debate\_fac | ratio | Hard facts: How intensive was the debate in city council? | 0: no debate  …  4: intensive debate  98: no information available |
| 227 | \*effect\_policy\_fac | ratio | Hard facts: How strong was the effect on policy-making (output)? | 0: no effect  …  4: strong effect  98: no information available |
| 228 | \*change\_fac | ratio | Hard facts: How strong was the change of outcome (as result of procedure)? | 0: no change  …  4: strong change  98: no information available |
| 229 | \*acceptance\_figure | ratio | For PB: How many proposals were accepted (transformed in policies) by policymakers? | figure  97: still ongoing at end of study  98: no information available  99: not applicable |
| 230 | \*implementation\_figure | ratio | For PB: How many proposals were implemented? | figure  97: still ongoing at end of study  98: no information available  99: not applicable |
| 231 | \*acceptance\_conceptual | bin. | For LA 21: Did policymakers accept conceptual suggestions? | 0: no 1: yes 97: still ongoing at end of study  98: no information available  99: not applicable |
| 232 | \*implementation\_conceptual | bin. | For LA 21: Were conceptual suggestions implemented? | 0: no 1: yes 97: still ongoing at end of study  98: no information available  99: not applicable |
| 233 | \*implementation\_estimat | ratio | Author’s impression: How was policy (based on dialog-oriented suggestions) implemented? | 0: no implementation  …  4: strong implementation  97: still ongoing at end of study  98: no information available |
| 234 | implementation\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 235 | influence\_decision\_other |  | Which other influence is mentioned? | text area |
| 236 | procedure\_proceed | bin. | Did the procedure proceed? | 0: no  1: yes |
| 237 | procedure\_new\_participatory | bin. | Did the procedure results implement new or innovative participatory formats? | 0: no  1: yes  98: no information available |
| 238 | procedure\_new\_participatory\_det |  | Which new or innovative participatory formats were implemented? | text  99: not applicable |
| 239 | \*identification\_aut | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: Change of citizens’ identification with municipality (as a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21)). | -2: much less identification  …  +2: much more identification  98: no information available |
| 240 | identification\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 241 | \*transparency\_aut | ratio | Author’s impression: Change of transparency of political decision-making. As a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21): political decision-making … | -2: is much less transparent  …  +2: is much more transparent  98: no information available |
| 242 | transparency\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 243 | \*local political interest\_aut | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: Change of citizens’ interest in local politics (as a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21)). | -2: much less political interest  …  +2: much more political interest  98: no information available |
| 244 | local political interest\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 245 | \*civic engagement\_aut | ratio | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: Change of citizens’ engagement (as a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21)). | -2: much less civic engagement  +2: much more civic engagement  98: no information available |
| 246 | civic engagement\_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 247 | experts\_changes\_citizenry | bin. | Filter question:  Information in study about expert’s perception of changes within citizenry. | 0: no  1: yes |
| 248 | \*identification\_exp | ratio | Expert: Change of citizens’ identification with municipality (as a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21)). | -2: much less identification  …  +2: much more identification  98: no information available |
| 249 | \*transparency\_exp | ratio | Expert: Change of transparency of political decision-making. As a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21): political decision-making … | -2: is much less transparent  …  +2: is much more transparent  98: no information available |
| 250 | \*local political interest\_exp | ratio | Expert: Change of citizens’ interest in local politics (as a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21)). | -2: much less political interest  …  +2: much more political interest  98: no information available |
| 251 | \*civic engagement\_exp | ratio | Expert: Change of citizens’ engagement (as a result of the procedure (PB or LA-21)). | -2: much less civic engagement  +2: much more civic engagement  98: no information available |
| 252 | \*local\_sustainable\_develop | ord. | Author’s/interviewee’s impression: Local sustainable development | 0: no sustainable development  1: sustainable development to a certain degree  2: sustainable development  98: no information available |
| 253 | local\_sustainable\_develop \_autimpression | ord. | How valid is author’s impression? | 0: insufficient evidence  1: informed guess  2: comprehensive, reliable  99: not applicable |
| 254 | results\_other |  | Any other results on procedure/case. | text |