Measuring Deliberation 2.0:

Standards, Discourse Types, and Sequenzialization[1]

André Bächtiger, Susumu Shikano, Seraina Pedrini, und Mirjam Ryser

University of Konstanz and University of Bern

Contact: Andre.Baechtiger@uni-konstanz.de

[1] We thank Jane Mansbridge, Simon Niemeyer, Selen Ayrtman, Bora Kanra, and the participants of the ECPR panel "Experiments with Deliberative Mini-Publics" (ECPR General Conference, Potsdam, September 2009) for extremely helpful comments on this paper.

The empirical turn in deliberative democracy has generated a need for measuring the extent and quality of deliberation by social science methodology. Indeed, there was an increasing proliferation of measurement instruments for "deliberation" in the last years. There are micro- and macro-analytic as well as direct and indirect measures of deliberation (for an overview, see Black et al. 2009). Micro-analytic approaches study the quality of deliberation through closely analyzing the content of participants' comments during the deliberative process. The macro-analytic approach, in turn, asks coders to make summary judgments of the discussion as a whole.[2] Studies using direct measures focus on the actual process of deliberation, while studies using indirect measures assess deliberation based on either antecedents (for instance, by measuring the extent to which conditions necessary for deliberation are met) or outcomes of the discussion (for example, by measuring post-deliberation changes in participants' preferences).

While indirect and macro-analytic measurement strategies have the advantage of speedy data gathering, they also have serious drawbacks. A straightforward drawback to the indirect method of measuring deliberation is that the researcher can only make conclusions regarding the presence or absence of antecedents and cannot speak definitively on whether or not deliberation actually occurred. The problem also arises from the fact that even under ideal institutional conditions, deliberation may not occur. The macro-analytic approach, in turn, suffers from the drawback that it may be hard to obtain sufficiently high inter-coder reliability. This is true for any content analysis, but macro analyses accentuate this problem. Therefore, we think that direct and micro-analytic approaches hold the promise of truly and (more) reliably capturing the content and the dynamics of deliberative processes.

As to direct and micro-analytic approaches, there are three major instruments available: speech act analysis (Holzinger 2001), the Discourse Quality Index (DQI; Steenbergen et al. 2003) and Stromer-Galley's (2007) coding scheme for measuring deliberation's content. These instruments have been applied to a wide variety of settings, including parliamentary debates, expert and citizen fora, as well as experimental communication in deliberative polls (Steiner et al. 2004; Landwehr 2009; Siu 2009). While there is considerable overlap among the three measures for what counts as deliberation, there are also considerable differences among them. Most importantly, all measures involve a number of serious blind spots. We think that by addressing their blind spots and combining their strengths we obtain a broader and more valid measurement of deliberation. The goal of our article is to present such a re-developed measurement.

In the following, we shall focus on revisions in the DQI. Not only has the DQI met with considerable support from deliberative theorists (Habermas 2005; Thompson 2008), it is also the most encompassing and most widely used measure of deliberation. Nonetheless, the DQI has a number of deficits which motivate its re-development.

[2] A very different macro-analytic approach to deliberative processes is to understand discourses as "subjectless" and "decentered" (Dryzek and Fairclough 1992; Parkinson 2009). In this article, however, we only focus on deliberative quality in a single forum, not on the interplay of discursive threads.

A first deficit stems from the fact that the DQI is strongly rooted in the Habermasian logic of communicative action – or what (Bächtiger et al. 2010) call type I deliberation. In this view, deliberation implies a systematic process of policy-making where actors extensively justify their positions and are willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Actors are also expected to be sincere, i.e., that they should not use arguments in a purely opportunistic fashion to "dupe" the audience. The ultimate goal of such discourse is to find a rational consensus on validity claims. The DQI captures type I deliberation via justification rationality, common good orientation, respect and agreement with demands and counterarguments, and constructive politics. While many scholars tend to understand deliberation in terms of rational discourse, several conceptions of deliberative democracy significantly depart from this deliberative program. These conceptions – which (Bächtiger et al. 2010) label type II deliberation - involve a shift away from the idea of purely rational discourse toward a conception of deliberation that incorporates alternative forms of communication (such as story-telling) and embraces self-interested behavior such as bargaining. Thus, type II deliberation takes a more realistic as well as a broader conceptual perspective on political communication. We believe that these conceptual developments in deliberative theory must be reflected in an empirical measurement as well.

A second deficit is a lack of one or more "cut" or "threshold values" for the DQI. In a recent review of empirical contributions to deliberative democracy, Drzyek (2007: 244) notes: "In applying the discourse quality index, it is hard to say whether the deliberation in any of the cases analyzed is actually good enough by any theoretical standards. The index is just a comparative measure." Furthermore, real-world deliberation (at least in the realm of legislatures) does not constitute a uni-dimensional phenomenon as postulated by classic deliberative theory. From such a perspective, the various components of deliberation should form a coherent set, i.e., higher justification rationality should also lead to higher respect and agreement levels. But in the real world, the various DQI components are not strongly correlated (see analyses below). This indicates that deliberation in the real world is a much more complex phenomenon than previously thought.

An elegant way to deal with this complexity and to set cut values for deliberative quality is to aggregate the diverse elements of type I and type II deliberation into *discourse types*. In this regard, Rosenberg (2007) has identified four types of discourses: (1) proto-discourse; (2) conventional discourse, (3) cooperative discourse and (4) collaborative (or, rational) discourse. While proto- and conventional discourses do not entail high quality deliberation, cooperative and collaborative discourses conform to standards of high quality deliberation. We shall complement and refine Rosenberg's categories in order to make them amenable to DQI analysis and to link them with political deliberation.

A third deficit is that existing DQI analyses have assessed the deliberative quality only of entire debates. Yet, no political philosopher would expect that communicative rationality is present throughout the entire communication process (see Goodin 2005). A solution to this problem is the *sequenzialization* of communication processes. The idea is that different modes of communication can occur in different sequences of a communication

process. A sequential perspective of communication processes not only unravels its dynamic nature, it can also be ideally linked to a conception of discourse types. It may even be a precondition for their proper empirical application: since it is not very likely that an entire communication process can be captured by a single discourse type, a sequential strategy might help to unravel the variety of discourse types in a communication process.

The goal of our article is to present a re-developed measurement for analyzing deliberative processes. We start with the different deliberative standards (type I and type II deliberation); these standards are then aggregated into discourse types. In a second step, we provide an illustration of the empirical relevance of the discourse types and our sequenzialization strategy. We focus on two parliamentary debates in the Swiss first chamber in the 1990s.

Setting Deliberative Standards

In a first step, we define a number of standards to evaluate the normative quality of political processes. As mentioned in the introduction, we focus on two types of deliberative standards (reference withheld): Type I standards, which capture rational discourse and Type II standards, which measure alternative forms of communication such as „story-telling" and „deliberative negotiations". We start with the Type I standards. These standards are derived from the original „Discourse Quality Index" (DQI) as elaborated in Steiner et al. (2004); however, these standards are partly refined and modified (Bächtiger et al. 2009).

Type I Standards

(1) *Equality*. Equality is a fundamental precondition for normatively appropriate deliberation. Equality requires that participants in deliberative processes are "on equal footing" (Chambers 2003: 322), have an equal voice, and are formally equal (Cohen 1989: 22f.). The original DQI captures equality in participation by measuring interruptions that disturb. But that may not be good enough. As Thompson (2008: 507) points out, the participation measure of the DQI does not tap into the dynamics of inclusion and equality in deliberation: "Equal participation requires that no one person or advantaged group completely dominate the reason-giving process, even if the deliberators are not strictly equal in power and prestige." In recent years, one standard for evaluating equal participation in deliberative processes is to focus on the amount and the speaking time by specific social groups (e.g., gender or cultural minorities; see Andersen and Hansen 2007; Siu 2009). However, the norms of deliberation do not require absolute equality in speaking.[3] According to Knight and Johnson (1996), the key criterion for equality in deliberation is equal opportunity of access to political influence and equal capacity to

[3] We thank Jane Mansbridge for alerting us to this point.

advance persuasive claims. While we agree with this position, we think that it is difficult to measure political influence and the capacity to advance persuasive claims on the basis of transcripts only. Therefore, we follow Stromer-Galley (2007) and proxy equality (or, domination) by counting the frequency of participation as well as by counting its volume (measured by the number of words).

(2) *Justification rationality*: In type I deliberation, high justification rationality is a key criterion for high deliberative quality. Since the ideal speech situation itself has no content, one cannot apply external standards to what constitutes a good reason. Hence, the DQI only judges to what extent a speaker gives complete justifications and thus makes his speech accessible to rational critique. It distinguishes between five levels of justification rationality: (0) no justification; (1) inferior justification where the linkage between reasons and conclusion is tenuous (this code also applies if a conclusion is merely supported with illustrations); (2) qualified justification where a linkage between reasons and conclusion is made; (3) sophisticated justification (broad) where at least two complete justifications are given; (4) sophisticated justification (in depth) when at least one justification is explored in-depth, i.e., a problem is examined in a quasi-scientific way from various viewpoints.

(3) *Common good orientation*. The importance of referring to the common good is mainly stressed by deliberative theorists drawing on Rawls. The DQI measures whether arguments are cast in terms of narrow group or constituency interests (0), whether there is neutral reference or mixed reference (i.e., reference to both narrow group interest and common good; 1), or whether there is a reference to the common good. With regard to the common good, we focus both on the common good stated in utilitarian terms, i.e. as the best solution for the greatest number of people (2a) and the common good expressed through the difference principle, i.e. the common good is served when the least advantaged in a society are helped (2b) (Rawls 1971).

(4) *Respect and Agreement*: Further key element of type I deliberation are respect and agreement. Macedo (1999: 10) regards the recognition of the "merit in [the] opponents' claims" as being one of the principal purposes of deliberation. The original DQI measures respect with three dimensions: respect toward groups, demands, and counterarguments. While respect toward groups is sufficiently distinct from the other two dimensions, this is not true for respect toward demands and respect toward counterarguments. Actors can either focus on the merits of arguments related to a demand or they can focus on the merits of a demand directly. But it is difficult to claim that a speaker who solely focuses on the merits of a demand ignores (or denies) arguments related to that demand. Rather, 'economies of speech' may lead actors to focus on either demands or counterarguments. Therefore, analyzing the two dimensions separately might give distorted results for respect, making it sensible to lump respect toward demands and respect toward counterarguments into one category. The new indicator is called "respect toward demands

and counterarguments" and measures whether speakers degrade (0), treat neutrally (1), value (2), or agree (3) with positions and counterarguments.[4]

(5) *Interactivity*. Interactivity means that participants engage with one another. As Goodin (2000: 91) notes, "[t]here must be uptake and engagement – other people must hear or read, internalize and respond" before a process can be judged appropriately deliberative. Despite its crucial importance for deliberative theory, the interaction component of reciprocity has been largely neglected in previous measurement. The original DQI tries to capture interactivity in the respect dimension, namely under the rubric of counterarguments, by counting whether counterarguments are included or ignored. But this measure has not proved to be 'sharp' enough to thoroughly explore patterns of reciprocity in deliberation. Therefore, we need a separate indicator for interactivity assessing whether participants refer to other participants and to other participants' arguments.[5]

(6) *Constructive politics.* This indicator is based upon the principal goal of type I deliberation to reach consensus. We distinguish between four levels of constructivity. Positional politics form the lowest level (0). This is followed by alternative proposals, i.e. proposals that attempt to mediate but that do not fit the current agenda (1). The next category is "consensus appeals" (2). The highest level of constructive politics are mediating proposals (3).

(7) Finally, Habermasian discourse ethics would also require sincerity or truthfulness, which is the absence of deception in expressing intentions. However, to judge whether a speech act is truthful is to make a judgment about a person's true versus stated preferences. This is exceedingly difficult, since the true preferences are not directly observable. The speculative nature of such a judgment is bound to introduce large amounts of (possibly systematic) measurement error. Of course, one possibility to test for truthfulness is to use *perceptions of truthfulness* from the participants' point of view (Bächtiger et al. 2010: 57). But on the basis of transcripts only, measuring sincerity in a valid and reliable way is not possible. Therefore, we drop this criterion from the analysis.

[4] Notice that agreement is only coded if actors justify and positively value the agreement; mere agreements without justification as well as concessions are not coded under this rubric. Finally, in order to keep the analysis manageable, we drop „respect toward groups" in this study.

[5] One might object that respect and interactivity are very strongly correlated in the real world. This is, however, not true: in our sample below, the correlation (Pearson's *r*) between respect and interactivity is .55. One reason is that in competitive debates actors might have a strong incentive to engage with each other's arguments. Therefore, a separate measure for interactivity is justified.

Type II Standards

In the past decade, there have been several attempts to strip deliberation off its rationalist bias. Difference democrats and feminists allege that deliberative theorists' focus on rational, dispassionate discussion creates a stifling uniformity and constrains deliberation (e.g., Sanders 1997). According to Sanders, many (usually) disadvantaged people do not engage in idealized forms of deliberation, which suits only a privileged few. Therefore, difference democrats and feminists stress the need to admit wider forms of communication – such as testimony, storytelling, or rhetoric – to avoid these constraints. Following Mansbridge et al. (2009) self-interest must also have a place in deliberative models: "Including self-interest in deliberative democracy reduces the possibility of exploitation, introduces information that facilitates reasonable solutions and the identification of integrative outcomes, and also motivates vigorous and creative deliberation. Excluding self-interest from deliberative democracy is likely to produce obfuscation." Empirical research also demonstrates that bargaining - representing the central instrument of expressing and accomplishing self-interest in negotiations - and deliberation usually go together in reality (Risse 2004).

Of course, one might argue that the inclusion of type II standards leads to concept-stretching. However, as Neblo (2007) convincingly argues, type II standards are compatible with Habermasian discourse theory: "most arguments for admitting testimony, story-telling and the like begin from concrete questions of institutionalization in which "all else" is expressly unequal. And here, Habermas explicitly countenances moving away from the abstract ideal to accommodate the realities of human psychology, institutional design, and patterns of social inequality." (p. 533) Therefore, the inclusion of alternative forms of communication does not lead to a fundamental cleavage in deliberative theory: "Indeed, this question of alternative forms might be the most fruitful yet for empirical research. While it is apparent that deliberators do vary widely in their ability (and perhaps inclination) to hew to canonical argumentative forms, it is not clear how effective and under what conditions incorporating alternate forms into actual deliberative practices serves the goals of doing so." (Neblo 2007: 533) Finally, as Mansbridge (2007) points out, a type II approach (which she calls "deliberative neo-pluralism") should not dismiss the classic tradition of deliberative democracy. It should "[keep] central the ideals of equal respect and non-domination, but adding to these values a positive valuing of self-interest, an acceptance of frequent conflict in material interest as well as of opinion, and a legitimation of democratic aggregation through some version of equal power." (p. 267). We follow these lines of reasoning and add two elements to the evaluation of deliberative processes, namely "story-telling" and "bargaining".

(8) *"Story-telling"*: According to Polletta und Lee (2006), "story-telling" is the most important component of alternative forms of communication. They demonstrate that "story-telling" can play a central role in deliberative processes: "we find that narrative's conventional openness to interpretation – in essence, its ambiguity – proved a surprising deliberative resource for people with marginalized points of view." (p. 701)

For story-telling, Stromer-Galley (2007) has developed an indicator labeled "sourcing". We follow this idea and measure whether participants use personal narratives or experiences.

(9) *"Deliberative Negotiations"*: In recent years, Mansbridge (2009) has made a dedicated effort to reconcile deliberation with negotiations and bargaining. She distinguishes between "deliberative" and "non-deliberative" negotiations. Deliberative negotiations highlight the "absence of coercive power, a base solely in mutual justification, as well as reciprocity, mutual respect, freedom, and equality among the partners" (Mansbridge 2009: 34). Absence of coercive power means that actors abstain from force and threats. Conversely, non-deliberative negotiations score low on reciprocity, respect, and equality but high on force, threats and strategic misrepresentations. Mansbridge's distinction helps to parse the continuum between pure arguing and pure bargaining (Risse 2004), which has troubled empirical research on deliberation for a long time.

Empirically, we need to get hold of different forms of bargaining. In this regard, we follow Holzinger (2001) and count whether a speech contains threats or promises. In combination with type I standards (such as justification rationality and respect), this allows to empirically distinguish between "deliberative" and "non-deliberative" forms of negotiation (see next section).

Discourse Types

Recent years have witnessed an increasing demand for setting one or more "cut" or "threshold" values for deliberation. As Black et al. (2009) put it: "analysts may wonder if variables have some threshold level that groups must exceed in order to count as being highly deliberative." To be sure, the original idea behind the DQI was that its diverse components form a coherent set and that this would provide the basis for distinguishing between high and low quality deliberation. The 'coherent set assumption' drew from the classic conception of deliberation, stipulating that the various components of deliberation should reinforce each other – e.g., one way that we show respect is by treating others as rational agents open to justification and persuasion. Goodin (2005) calls this the "unitary deliberator model" where all deliberative virtues are simultaneously and continuously on display. But in the context of parliamentary debates, the various DQI components do not constitute a uni-dimensional phenomenon. A re-analysis of 29 parliamentary debates shows that at the level of speakers, the average (partial) correlation of the various DQI components is only 0.12. At the level of debates, there is a fairly strong correlation between sophisticated justifications and common good orientation (r=.61; p=.01), a medium correlation between respect toward demands/counterarguments and constructivity (r=.39; p=.04), but no or weak correlations between sophisticated justifications and respect toward demands/counterarguments (r=.08; p=.58), sophisticated justifications and constructivity (r=-.04; p=.83), common good orientation and respect toward demands/counterarguments (r=.20; p=.29), and common good orientation and constructivity (r=-.07; p=.73). A factor analysis using four DQI elements – sophisticated

justifications, common good orientation, respect toward demands/counterarguments, and constructivity - extracts two factors at the level of debates: one factor combining sophisticated justifications and common good orientation and one factor combining respect toward demands/counterarguments and constructivity (see table 1).

Table 1: Factor Analysis of Deliberative Components in 29 Parliamentary Debates in Switzerland, United States, and Germany.

	Loading on Factor 1	Loading on Factor 2
Sophisticated Justification	**.89**	.01
Common Good Orientation	**.90**	.00
Respect toward demands/ counterarguments	.11	**.84**
Constructivity	-.10	**.84**
Eigen Value	1.62	1.40

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis. Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization.

The factor analysis indicates that deliberation in the real world is more complex than previously thought. It means that debates may score high on some deliberative standards and low on others. As we shall see below, one reason for this multi-dimensionality of deliberative quality is the public/non-public divide. While public debates accentuate the sophisticated justification/common good dimension, non-public debates accentuate the respect/constructivity dimension. From a theoretical perspective, this is interesting but insufficient, since it does not provide any guidance how to distinguish highly deliberative from less deliberative debates. Of course, one can take the uni-dimensional conception of deliberation as a starting point, define specific threshold values for high quality deliberation on this basis, and then vie out for debates which fulfill these criteria (for a similar approach, see Naurin 2007). Indeed, this strategy is part of the solution that we present below. But as a general approach, this strategy is deficient, for two reasons. First, the uni-dimensional conception where all deliberative components achieve high scores will remain a rare event in the real world (see Goodin 2005). Second, how "deliberative" are debates when some deliberative components achieve target values, while other components do not? Are such debates "partly deliberative" or, "non-deliberative"? Again, if deliberation were a uni-dimensional phenomenon with all deliberative components either scoring high, middle, or low, then we would be in a position to construct a scale and create threshold values for different quality levels of deliberation. But since deliberation is a multidimensional phenomenon empirically, we need a more re-fined and theoretically guided evaluation of deliberative quality.

An elegant way to cope with this complexity and to set cut values for high and low quality deliberation is to aggregate the diverse deliberative standards into different discourse types. Rosenberg (2007) distinguishes among four discourse types: (1) proto-discourse; (2) conventional discourse, (3) cooperative discourse and (4) collaborative (or, rational) discourse. However, Rosenberg's discourse types have been developed in the context of citizen deliberation; moreover, they are not based on a systematized concept of deliberative standards (as presented above). Therefore, we shall complement and refine Rosenberg's discourse types. First, we add the category of "competitive discourse" to the four existing discourse types in order to link them with political deliberation. Second, we make them amenable with the various type I and type II standards of deliberation. Third, the discourse types are complemented by a negotiation counterpart in order to align them with different forms of deliberative and non-deliberative negotiations.

Proto-discourse. Proto-discourse is everyday communication (or, talk) with the goal of providing information and social comfort. Contrary to the other types of discourse, proto-discourse lacks the precondition of focusing on disagreements over validity claims. Proto-discourse features low justification rationality and constructivity, medium levels of respect and interactivity, and high levels of story-telling. Equality may be low since some persons may dominate the proto-discourse. Of course, proto-discourses are not limited to ordinary citizens but can also take place in formal politics. Yet, proto-discourses are very rarely to be found in parliamentary protocols (which we analyze below); therefore, this category is not relevant at this stage of analysis.

Conventional Discourse. Conventional discourses are geared towards problem definition and problem-solving. Contrary to a cooperative discourse, the goal is not to achieve common understanding but to find ways of how to solve the problem effectively. Rosenberg (2007: 11) describes conventional discourses as follows: "The discussion will consist of a succession of concrete contributions that are intended ... to describe, to explain or to evaluate an aspect of the topic at hand." The discussion can entail both cooperative and competitive elements. In Rosenberg's typology, conventional discourses form a 'modal' category. They are characterized by relative low justification rationality and a low common good orientation, a medium level of storytelling, medium levels of respect, interactivity, constructivity, and equality. Conventional discourses also have a negotiation counterpart. This is conventional negotiation, where actors are indifferent vis-à-vis each other and only interested in absolute gains. They have neither an incentive to extensively justify their position nor to praise or degrade other participants' arguments. This is conducive to neutral respect and low justification rationality. In sum, conventional discourses do not correspond to the classic deliberative ideal. They lack the critical standard of high justification rationality, the serious engagement with other positions and arguments, and the search for common understanding.

Competitive Discourse. Competitive discourses comprise two aspects: "debating" (mostly in the public sphere) and "distributive bargaining" (mostly in the non-public sphere). As to debating, Walzer (1999: 171) has provided a useful definition: "a debate is very often a contest between verbal athletes with the object to win the debate. The means are the

exercise of rhetorical skill, the mustering of favorable evidence (and the suppression of unfavorable evidence), and the discrediting of the other debaters." Thus, debating is characterized by low levels of respect (at least not explicit respect and agreement) and low constructivity, but potentially high interactivity, justification rationality, common good orientation, and equality. Debating is also compatible with the "oratory" model of communication or "rhetorical action" where actors are not prepared to change their own beliefs or to be persuaded by the "better argument" but only seek to effectively justify their own standpoint with an external audience (see Schimmelfennig 2001; Bobbio 2008). Yet, the universe of competitive debating is more diverse than captured by this description. On the one hand, there are debates which comprise "catchy soundbites" or illustrations without substantive arguments (leading to a low justification rationality). This variant of debating corresponds to Chambers' (2005) conception of „plebiscitory reason". Here, "arguments … become shallow, poorly reasoned, pandering, or appeal to the worst we have in common" (p. 257). We label this variant of debating – where both respect and justification levels are low – as *"plebiscitory"*. On the other hand, there are also debates where actors engage in fair interaction. This variant of debating approximates Chambers' (2005) conception of "robust reasoning", where actors in public present their positions carefully and with a strong orientation toward the common good. Nonetheless, these discourses remain competitive, which means that explicit respect or agreement will occur only occasionally. We label this version of debating – where justification levels are high and respect levels medium – as *"fair"*. Finally, competitive discourses may also have a negotiation counterpart. In this regard, Naurin (2007: 563) refers to "distributive bargaining" where agreement on preferences and principles is generally ruled out. "Distributive bargaining" involves threats and promises. Moreover, actors are not indifferent vis-à-vis each other. Rather, a relative gains perspective prevails which creates an incentive to discredit the positions and arguments of other participants; consequently, respect levels will be low (see Naurin 2007: 563).

In general, competitive discourses do not conform to classic deliberative ideals (see Bobbio 2008). Even if they maximize justification rationality and common good orientation, they lack a key ingredient of the classic deliberative ideal, namely the search for common understanding as well as a spirit of cooperation. The partial exception is the "fair" variant of competitive discourses. Here, the goal is the extensive exchange of reasons without rhetorical confrontation and without the only goal of "scoring points" with an external audience. In case of "distributive bargaining", agreement – the central goal of classic deliberation - might be eventually forthcoming, but there is no attempt to reach a shared understanding among participants. Therefore, this counts as low deliberative quality.

Cooperative discourse. Cooperative discourse is geared towards common understanding and problem-solving. The goal is agreement among participants. To achieve agreement, the diverse standpoints are thoroughly evaluated and judged on their merit. Cooperative discourse is characterized by a medium to high justification rationality, a high common good orientation, high respect, and a high interactivity and equality level. Justification rationality must not always be very high since productive discussion can entail 'economies of speech'. Cooperative discourse can also involve story-telling so that positions and

arguments can be conveyed in a comprehensible fashion. The negotiation counterpart of cooperative discourses is "integrative bargaining". According to Naurin (2007: 563), integrative bargaining may entail high justification rationality and high levels of respect. While the amount of threats should be minimal (or, non-existent), integrative bargaining can entail a substantial amount of promises. In sum, cooperative discourses feature key elements of what type I scholars would consider high quality deliberation. If we accept Mansbridge's (2009) notion of "deliberative negotiations", then this type of discourse corresponds fully to this ideal.

Rational (collaborative) discourse. Rational (or, collaborative) discourse is the most demanding form of exchange. It is an expression of what type I scholars would see as the ideal of the deliberative process. As Rosenberg (2007: 14) holds: "The assumption is that this presentation and interrogation of claims will involve the free and equal expression of personal views and a respectful consideration of others' perspectives, fairness and the common good. The goal is preference transformation, both personal and collective. It tries to manage disagreement in respectful, productive, and creative ways." Rational discourses are characterized by a high level of justification rationality and common good orientation, high respect, a high interactivity level, high equality as well as a high amount of preference transformations. At the same time, there should be neither threats nor promises. Story-telling, too, should not occur. In sum, rational discourse is construed as an extreme discourse variant. Its main feature is "over-performance" compared to cooperative discourse.

Table 2 summarizes how the different deliberative indicators are aggregated into the five discourse types. Notice the five discourse types are not strictly ordered but that some discourse types maximize the same components of deliberative quality. For instance, we find high justification rationality or high common good orientation both in competitive and rational discourses. As such, we hope to tackle the complexity and multi-dimensionality of real world deliberation both theoretically and empirically.

Table 2: Overview of the discourse types

	Rational Discourse	Cooperative Discourse	Competitive Discourse	Conventional Discourse	Proto-Discourse
Participation Equality	Full	Full	Partial	Partial	None
Justification Rationality	Medium to High	Medium to High	Low or High*	Low to Medium	Low
Common Good Orientation	High	High	High	Medium	Low to Medium
Respect	Very High	High	Low or Medium*	Medium	Medium
Agreement	Very High	High	Low	Medium	Medium
Interactivity	Very High	High	Medium	Low to Medium	Low
Constructivity	Very High	High	Low	Medium	Low
Story-telling	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Bargaining	Not Present	Present (Promises, but very few or no threats)	Present (Promises and threats)	Present (Promises and threats)	Rare (Promises and threats)

Note: * We label competitive discourses as "plebiscitory" when justification rationality and respect levels are low; we label competitive discourses as "fair" when respect is medium and justification rationality is high.

But how to determine the cut values for the different discourses? A starting point are the different standards of the various DQI components. In concrete, we need to set target values for the different deliberative indicators.

First, equality in participation is achieved when the actual amount of participation of different groups (such as women) equals the representative shares of specific groups. The expectation is that the share of participation of these groups should be proportional to their formal standing. For example, if a committee is composed of thirty percent women, they should also have a participation share of thirty percent.[6] In the analyses below, we focus only on the frequency of participation, since the length of participation produced similar results for participation equality.

Second, justification rationality has four levels running from no justification to sophisticated and in-depth justification. In political settings where many professional politicians possess the ability to forward rational arguments, the standard for high levels

[6] Of course, this operationalization does not solve the problem of "external equality" which can be distorted.

of justification rationality can be set at a median level of three (i.e., several complete or in-depth arguments are given on average). In citizen deliberation, however, justification rationality may be lower due to cognitive constraints and limitations. Hence, the standard for high levels of justification rationality in citizen deliberation would be set at a median level of two.[7]

For common good orientation, we focus on the amount of common good references (both references to the common good stated in utilitarian terms and the common good expressed through the difference principle). We expect that in high quality debates, the amount of common good references should be clearly greater than zero.

For respect, we set the target value at a mean of 1. Debates or sequences with means clearly above 1 indicate largely respectful interactions, while debates or sequences with means clearly below 1 indicate largely disrespectful interactions.

Since it is exceedingly difficult to identify opinion change in protocols, we focus only on the amount of agreement (coded as one (agreement) and zero (no agreement)). Here, no clear target value is specified but we would expect that in high quality debates, the amount of agreement should be greater than zero.

With regard to interactivity, we focus on the number of references toward other people's arguments; in order to make instances comparable, we standardize the number of references references toward other people's arguments by the number of speeches in a debate sequence or in the entire debate. Here, no target value can be specified; we focus only on deviations from the average of the entire debate.

As to constructive politics, we focus on the amount of mediating proposals made in a debate or a sequence (coded as one (mediating proposal) and zero (no mediating proposal)). As with common good orientation and agreement, we would expect that in high quality debates, the amount of mediating proposals should be greater than zero.

For storytelling and bargaining, it is difficult to specify a clear target value; we focus only on the average values of the entire debates and on deviations from these average values in the debate sequences. In rational discourse, we should encounter neither threats nor promises; in cooperative discourses, there may be promises but no threats; in competitive discourses, we expect both threats and promises.

Of course, real world discourses might be more complex than the discourse types sketched above. The different DQI components might form patterns which do not correlate with the five discourse types. For the assignment to one of the discourse types, we deem the *cluster* of the different deliberative components to be crucial. If only one component does not fully conform to our expectations, this will not influence the assignment to one of the discourse types. If several components do not conform to our expectations, then a re-

[7] For citizen deliberation, justification rationality can also be seen as an "emergent property" with justification rationality achieving higher average scores over time.

evaluation is necessary. Finally, this "deterministic" procedure is combined with an independent coder assessment of discourse types (Rosenberg 2007: 144).

Sequenzialization

Negotiation theorists have repeatedly emphasized that negotiations can involve several sequences (e.g., Benz et al. 1992). Some authors make a difference between a production and a distribution phase. The expectation is that in the production phase, there should be more deliberation than in the distribution phase (Risse 2000).[8] Benz (1994) has proposed a "cyclical model" of negotiation processes. Here, negotiation processes can entail positional phases, compromise-oriented phases, and phases geared toward mutual understanding. However, there is no predetermined succession of sequences in that negotiations are expected to move from positional to communicative modes of interactions.

A sequential approach has a number of advantages. First, it can help unravel the dynamic nature of communication processes. Second, it might provide an additional solution for the lack of uni-dimensionality of deliberative quality in previous research. The assumption that entire debates have a high deliberative quality *throughout* is just too strong. If Habermas (1996: 323) is correct that "rational discourses have an improbable character and are like islands in the ocean in everyday praxis" then we might find them in debate sequences rather than in entire debates. Finally, a sequential approach is also consistent a more realistic deliberative program and the related idea of "distributed deliberation" (Goodin 2005). Here, different sequences fulfill different deliberative virtues. For instance, alternative forms of communication could occur in earlier stages of communicative processes to counteract power inequalities. Such inputs would then be integrated into canonical forms of argument in later sequences, involving a systematic weighing of counterarguments and a connection of particular perspectives to more generalizable interests (see Bächtiger et al. 2010).

Process sequences can be captured in two ways: on the one hand, we may focus on sessions on a particular date; on the other hand, one may also focus on "topical sequences" where actors talk about a specific topic.

An Illustration

To illustrate the empirical relevance of the discourse types and the sequenzialization strategy, we focus on two parliamentary debates in the Swiss first chamber in the 1990s. The Swiss parliament represents an excellent locus to study deliberative and non-deliberative communication processes. First, the Swiss political system features an institutionalized consensus system including all major parties in the government. A

[8] There are exceptions to this pattern. In *Gram sabhas* in India and similar institutions in Indonesia the community discusses the rightness of particular distributions more or less at the time of distribution (see Rao 2009).

consensus arrangement with a longer term perspective reduces partisan competition However, coalition arrangements are not automatically geared toward cooperation or deliberation. As Martin and Vanberg (2005: 94) find, coalition parties are engaged in a "mixed motive" game: "On the one hand, they have reason to cooperate with their partners to pursue successful common policies. On the other hand, each party faces strong incentives to move policy in ways that appeal to party members and to the constituencies on which the party relies for support." Thus, coalition settings will highlight competitive discourses as well. Second, the Swiss parliament is embedded in a "non-parliamentary" system: although MPs elect the government, the legislature cannot stage a vote of no confidence during that period. Accordingly, members of Parliament are quite independent in drawing legislation and party discipline is relatively low. This creates an additional space for deliberative action (see Steiner et al. 2004).

We focus on a linguistic debate and a debate on labor law revision in the first chamber of Parliament both in committee debates and plenary sessions.

Language Article. In Switzerland, there are strong historical myths of understanding and respect among the different language groups. Thus, many political actors tend to "depoliticize" linguistic issues, opening up a window for deliberative action. The goal of the new language article was to improve the position of the Romansch language. The government worked out a proposed amendment that made explicit reference both to the principle of freedom of language and the territoriality principle (stipulating that people who belong to another linguistic region must not be instructed in their classes in any other language). "Weakening" the territoriality principle would provide Romansch speakers with more flexibility to preserve their language. However, French- and Italian-speaking deputies argued that codifying the territoriality principle in the Constitution would involve unforeseeable dangers for linguistic peace since German speakers ask for German schools in the French- or Italian-speaking cantons. Finally, a compromise proposal found approval: it provided that none of the principles would be mentioned in the constitution, but that the central state would help endangered linguistic minorities if cantons asked for it. In the first chamber, the bill passed with 152-19 votes.

Labor Law Revision. The labor law revision serves as a contrast case involving strong ideological polarization between left and right wing deputies. Such polarized and electorally salient issues are generally not conducive to high quality deliberation (Steiner et al. 2004). The labor law revision aimed at overhauling certain labor regulations and improving the competitiveness of the Swiss economy. Two articles of the bill were seen as critical during discussions: article 17, dealing with night work for women, and article 20, dealing with work on Sundays and official holidays. The goal of the new Article 17 was to establish gender equality, especially by abolishing the ban for women working at night. The government also proposed a 10 percent time bonus for regular work at night and on Sundays. The bill was challenged by a group of right-wing deputies arguing that the compensation measures were too far-reaching. Left-wing deputies supported the governmental proposal. The goal of the new Article 20 was to have revising trading times with the goal of having longer opening times on Sundays and during holidays. No

compromise could be found, and after the "Swiss federation of trade unions" started collecting signatures for a referendum, most right-wing deputies gave up any search for a compromise. The final vote in the first chamber was 89-80.

Findings

Before we present our findings, two methodological comments are in order. First, the rate of inter-coder reliability for the various deliberative components ranges between good and excellent (see supporting materials). We also obtain high agreement when we compare the "deterministic" assignment of the deliberative standards to the discourse types with independent coder assessment of the discourse types in the various sequences. With two exceptions, these two forms of assessment came to same conclusions. Second, at this stage of research, we captured sequenzialization by focusing on debate sessions rather than trying to identify more fine-tuned "topical sequences".

Table 3: Deliberative Standards and Discourse Types – Language Article; First Chamber Committee

	Target Values for High Deliberative Quality	*Debate Average (N=218)*	Session 1 (N=42)	Session 2 (N=31)	Session 3 (N=49)	Session 4 (N=23)	Session 5 (N=11)	Session 6 (N=22)	Session 7 (N=28)	Session 8 (N=12)
Participation Equality for Women	Representational share of women: 27.0 (percentage)	*31.7*	16.7	22.6	24.5	30.4	45.5	36.4	60.7	50.0
Participation Equality for Linguistic Minorities	Representational share of linguistic minorities: 44.6 (percentage)	*46.8*	54.8	61.3	75.5	46.5	36.4	31.8	42.9	25.0
Level of Justification	3 (median)	*3*	3	3	3	3	1.5	2	2	2
Common Good Orientation	>0.0 (percentage)	*22.2*	26.5	19.2	40.9	47.1	0.0	5.0	12.0	0.0
Respect	>1.0 (mean)	*1.3*	1.3	1.9	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
Agreement	>0.0 (percentage)	*10.6*	4.8	38.7	8.2	17.4	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0
Interactivity	No target value (number of references divided by number of speeches)	*0.6*	0.6	1.1	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4
Constructive Politics	>0.0 (percentage)	*7.0*	5.9	19.2	4.6	5.9	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0
Story-telling	No target value (percentage)	*18.8*	33.3	29.0	20.4	17.3	0.0	4.5	7.2	8.3
Bargaining										
Threats	0 (percentage)	*0.5*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0
Promises	No target Value (percentage)	*3.7*	0.0	0.0	4.1	8.7	9.1	0.0	10.7	0.0
Discourse Type		***Cooperative***	**Coope-rative**	**Rational**	**Coope-rative**	**Coope-rative**	**Con-ventional**	**Con-ventional**	**Con-ventional**	**Con-ventional**

Notes: (1) Equality: Number of speeches by members of the group as a percentage of the total number of speeches in the session (1-100). (2) Justification rationality: 0 = no justification; 1 = inferior justification, where the linkage between reasons and conclusion is tenuous (this code also applies if a conclusion is merely supported with illustrations); 2 = qualified justification, where some linkage is made between reasons and conclusion; 3 = sophisticated justification (broad), where at least two complete justifications are given; 4 = sophisticated justification (in depth), where at least two justifications are given and at least one justification is explored in depth, e.g., a problem is examined from various viewpoints. (3) Common good orientation: Number of reference to the common good either in utilitarian terms (the best solution for the greatest number of people) and/or some version of the difference principle (helping the least advantaged) (0-100). (4) Respect and Agreement : Relation of speakers to others' positions and counter-arguments: 0 = degrade; 1 = treat neutrally; 2 = value; 3 = agree. (5) Interactivity: Number of references to other participants and to other participants' arguments as a percentage of the total number of speeches in the session. (6) Constructive politics: Number of mediating proposals (0-100). (7) Storytelling: Number of narrative-like references to one's own experiences as a percentage of the total number of speeches in the session (0-100). (8) Threats: Number as a percentage of the total number of speeches in the session (0-100). (9) Promises: Number as a percentage of the total number of speeches in the session (0-100).

In the first chamber committee debate of the language article, four out of eight sequences qualify as cooperative discourses (and one as rational), while four sequences qualify as conventional discourses (see Table 3). The cooperative discourses feature a high justification rationality (median=3), a strong focus on the common good, respect levels clearly exceeding 1, a substantial amount of agreements (ranging between 4.8 and 17.4 percent), and high interactivity levels (compared to the average of the overall debate)[9], and a high degree of equality for linguistic groups, women and MPs vis-à-vis the government). In case of equality among linguistic groups, we even detect a pattern of minority dominance in the first four sessions before the move to conventional discourse in the later stages of the debate.[10] The amount of storytelling is fairly high in these earlier sequences as well, suggesting that the classic distinction between rational discourse and alternative forms of communication may be overdrawn. Rather, if actors engage in problem-solving activities, they will often refer to their personal experiences (see Poletta and Lee 2006). In the sequence coded as primarily "rational", almost all deliberative indicators outperform compared to target value and the average of the overall debate. For instance, the respect score is 1.9 (while the debate average is 1.3); the amount of agreement is 38.7% (while the debate average is 10.6%); or, the interactivity level is 1.1 (while the debate average is only 0.6); finally, there are neither threats nor promises in this sequence. The discourses coded as "conventional", by contrast, involve lower levels of justification rationality (median=2), less common good orientation, less respect (sliding back to neutral), less agreement, less interactivity, lower rates of constructive politics, and a slight dominance of German speakers.

The sequence of discourse types in the committee debate matches Holzinger's (2001: 418) observation that actors might start off with the goal of common understanding, but then recede to strategic action in the face of irreconcilable differences. Indeed, when no agreement could be found in the rational discourse sequence, the following sequences were concerned with finding a solution to the problem, leading to a distributive solution. While this sequence pattern might look deficient from a classic deliberative perspective, it entails highly desirable properties from the perspective of a more realistic deliberative approach. First, actors engaged in a rational discourse and probed for a rational consensus. Second, they learnt during this process that the two principles of linguistic freedom and territoriality could not be easily reconciled. This insight then led to a distributive solution and an almost unanimous compromise (which Richardson (2002) considers a normatively desirable outcome).

Moreover, by adopting a sequential perspective, we could identify a rational discourse sequence where all deliberative components are correlated and reinforce each other.

[9] In the fourth session, however, the interactivity rate drops considerably to 0.3 (the debate average is 0.6).

[10] In the first session, the participation rate of women does not correspond to their representational share. Yet, since this debate did not touch upon women's interests, we do not strongly interpret this finding.

Thus, a sequenzialization strategy can help to uncover the "unitary deliberator model" or the uni-dimensional ideal of classic deliberative theory where all deliberative virtues are simultaneously on display. Had we only focused on the deliberative quality at the level of the entire debate (which corresponds to a cooperative discourse; see table 3), we would have overlooked that one sequence outperformed this standard and corresponded to a rational discourse.

Table 4: Deliberative Standards and Discourse Types – Language Article; First Chamber Plenary Debate

	Target Values for High Deliberative Quality	*Debate Average (N=76)*	Session 1 (N=53)	Session 2 (N=23)
Participation Equality for Women	Representational share of women: 17.5 (percentage)	*19.4*	17.0	21.7
Participation Equality for Linguistic Minorities	Representational share of linguistic minorities: 28.0 (percentage)	*60.5*	66.0	60.9
Level of Justification	3 (median)	*3*	3	3
Common Good Orientation	>0.0 (percentage)	*60.9*	60.0	63.2
Respect	>1.0 (mean)	*1.1*	1.2	.96
Agreement	>0.0 (percentage)	*5.5*	13.3	5.3
Interactivity	No target value (number of references divided by number of speeches)	*.54*	.57	.48
Constructive Politics	>0.0 (percentage)	*3.1*	2.6	5.3
Story-telling	No target value (percentage)	*30.3*	34.0	21.7
Bargaining				
Threats	0 (percentage)	*0.0*	0.0	0.0
Promises	No target Value (percentage)	*0.0*	0.0	0.0
Discourse Type		***Competitive (fair)***	**Competitive (fair)**	**Competitive (fair)**

Looking at the first chamber plenary debate of the language article in table 4, we have identified two competitive (but fair) discourse sequences. The two sequences feature high justification rationality (median=3) and medium to relatively high respect levels (0.96-1.2).[11] From a quantitative perspective, the first sequence even displays features of a

[11] In both sequences, interactivity levels are relatively low (compared to the other debates we studied; see below). One reason for this relatively low score may be the low polarization level, reducing the incentives

cooperative discourse with high levels of respect (1.2) and agreement (13.3%). Yet, the independent coder assessment did not consider this sequence as cooperative; therefore, we re-coded this as a competitive (but fair) discourse. Nonetheless, the relatively high respect and agreement levels in the first sequence defy claims that deliberation is absent from public parliamentary debates. Of course, public parliamentary debates are not generally geared toward high quality deliberation, but it seems equally wrong to exclude this possibility almost by definition (see Landwehr 2009: 171ff.).

Table 5: Deliberative Standards and Discourse Types – Labor Law, Committee Debate

	Target Values for High Deliberative Quality	*Debate Average (N=185)*	Session 1 (N=132)	Session 2 (N=32)	Session 3 (N=21)
Participation Equality for Women*	Representational share of women: 10.5 (percentage)	*17.5*	21.2	12.5	4.8
Level of Justification	3 (median)	*2*	2	2	2
Common Good Orientation	>0.0 (percentage)	*7.0*	6.1	3.4	19.0
Respect	>1.0 (mean)	*1.0*	1.1	0.8	1.0
Agreement	>0.0 (percentage)	*3.7*	3.8	0.0	9.5
Interactivity	No target value (number of references divided by number of speeches)	*0.6*	0.5	0.6	0.8
Constructive Politics	>0.0 (percentage)	*4.9*	2.6	13.8	4.8
Story-telling	No target value (percentage)	*4.2*	3.8	3.1	9.5
Bargaining					
Threats	0 (percentage)	*1.6*	0.0	3.1	4.8
Promises	No target value (percentage)	*1.1*	0.0	6.3	0.0
Discourse Type		***Conventional***	**Conventional**	**Competitive**	**Conventional**

Note: * since this debate did not revolve around demands of linguistic minorities, we do not consider this aspect in the evaluation.

The first chamber committee debate on the labor law revision reveals a different picture (see Table 5): here, there are no cooperative or rational discourse sequences; two out of

of participants to contradict other participants' arguments. Notice further that in the competitive (fair) discourse sequence, the level of agreement clearly exceeds 0. But since the respect level is only around 1, we decided not to label this sequence as „cooperative discourse".

three sequences qualify as conventional discourses;[12] one sequence displays features of a competitive discourse with low respect levels (0.8), no constructivity, and involving both threats and promises.

Finally, the first chamber plenary session on the labor law revision nicely displays features of competitive discourses as we tend to find them in the realm of public parliamentary debates (see Table 6): high justification rationality (with one exception, all sequences achieve a median of 3), a high common good orientation, but relatively low respect levels (several sequences have respect scores below 1), low agreement and low constructivity rates.[13]

The first two sequences correspond to the "fair" variant of competitive discourse: respect levels are neutral while justification rationality, common good orientation, and interactivity levels are high. The last sequence has features of the "plebiscitory" variant of competitive discourse: the respect level is extremely low (0.17) while justification rationality slides back to a median of 2 and the level of story-telling (here: illustrations) is fairly high (33.3%). In addition, common good orientation and interactivity achieve very low scores as well. This sequence was indicative of a failed search for compromise in the labor law debate: when it became clear that no agreement could be found, the discussion turned extremely competitive and actors blamed each other for the failure. Notice finally that the participation share of women is only partially given: while the representational share of women is 21.5%, the actual participation drops to less than 10% in two sessions. A tentative explanation might be that women are less willing to participate in competitive debates (see Norris 1996: 93).

[12] The last session displays relatively high levels of common good orientation and agreement (compared to the respective averages of the debate). But since this sequence also entails several threats and respect levels hover at the neutral value of 1, we refrained from labeling it as cooperative".

[13] The percentage figures are somewhat misleading here since it is just one speaker who agrees with or makes a mediating proposal.

Table 6: Deliberative Standards and Discourse Types – Labor Law, Plenary Debate

	Target Values for High Deliberative Quality	*Debate Average (N=88)*	Session 1 (N=47)	Session 2 (N=21)	Session 3 (N=14)	Session 4 (N=6)
Participation Equality for Women*	Representational share of women: 21.5 (percentage)	*12.5*	14.9	9.5	7.1	16.7
Level of Justification	3 (median)	*3*	3	3	3	2
Common Good Orientation	>0.0 (percentage)	*34.7*	46.9	28.6	23.1	16.7
Respect	>1.0 (mean)	*.91*	1.0	1.0	.79	.17
Agreement	>0.0 (percentage)	*3.4*	2.1	4.8	7.1	0.0
Interactivity	No target value (number of references divided by number of speeches)	*0.7*	0.8	0.8	0.6	.17
Constructive Politics	>0.0 (percentage)	*1.4*	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Story-telling	No target value (percentage)	*10.2*	2.1	14.3	21.4	33.3
Bargaining						
Threats	0 (percentage)	*2.3*	0.0	4.8	7.1	0.0
Promises	No target Value (percentage)	*3.4*	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Discourse Type		***Competitive***	**Competitive (fair)**	**Competitive (fair)**	**Competitive**	**Competitive (plebiscitory)**

Note: * since this debate did not revolve around demands of linguistic minorities, we do not consider this aspect in the evaluation.

Conclusions

In this article, we presented a revised and extended measurement for capturing the quality of deliberation. On the basis of two debates in the first chamber of parliament in Switzerland (committee and plenary debates), we demonstrate that diverse deliberative standards – building on classic and expanded forms of deliberation – can be aggregated in different discourse types (rational, cooperative, competitive, and conventional). Our article also provides a solution to the previous lack of uni-dimensionality in empirical deliberation. Uni-dimensionality is important, since classic deliberative theory is based on the idea that ideal deliberation maximizes all components of deliberation (justification rationality, common good orientation, respect, constructive politics) simultaneously. But a re-analysis of parliamentary debates shows that parliamentary deliberation entails two

dimensions, one centering on justification rationality and common good orientation and one centering on respect and constructive politics. This multi-dimensionality of deliberation makes it difficult to determine deliberative quality on a purely empirical basis. Our article solves this problem as follows: first, we derived different discourse types on a theoretical basis allowing to better identify the different faces of deliberation and to determine different quality levels of deliberation. Second, we adopted a sequenzialization strategy coupled with the expectation that ideal deliberation can hardly be found at the level of entire debates. In so doing, we did not only obtain a fuller picture of deliberation and deliberative quality, the sequenzialization strategy also helped to identify one rational discourse sequence where the classic and uni-dimensional ideal of deliberation was on display.

Our re-developed measure provides the spadework for a wide variety of applications. First, it will enable us to explore the relationship between political processes and policy outcomes in a sophisticated fashion. So far, it is still an open question whether and how process features are linked to outcome ideals such as preference transformation (Bächtiger et al. 2010: 53). For instance, does only rational discourse drive preference transformation - or, can other discourse types do the job? Focusing on debate sequences will also allow us to link discourse type and outcomes in a more detailed way. It may allow us to identify the moments when discourse participants experience some form of transformation and relate these transformative moments to the nature of the preceding discourse type. Second, our re-developed measurement is also an appropriate tool for studying deliberation in the civic sphere. While civic deliberation might score lower on certain type I deliberative standards (such as justification rationality), this does not prevent the application of our re-developed measurement. The trick will be to set different target values for specific deliberative standards. This will enable us to reconcile deliberative ideals with varying levels of cognitive attention that participants employ in different communicative environments. As such, our re-developed measurement represents a flexible tool to study the normative and empirical content of a great variety of communication processes.

To be sure, we do not claim that the re-developed DQI is the panacea for measuring deliberative quality. Mucciaroni and Quirk (2010; 2006), for instance, argue that DQI analyses focus on a debate's compliance with a set of "plays-well-with-others" indicators. In their view, such an approach is deficient since it neglects the substantive consideration of policy issues and the related informational quality of a debate. To assess the intelligence of debate, they focus on the accuracy and realism of legislators' claims about the effects of policies. Naurin 2007; 2010), in turn, argues that the key for discriminating between deliberation and bargaining is to focus on the intentions behind giving reasons He provides a number of specific questions that allows researchers to separate arguing from bargaining in survey research. Finally, Parkinson (2009) claims that a DQI-style approach does not capture "the spirit of the public sphere-oriented accounts of macro deliberative democracy". As an alternative, he suggests that researchers should focus on discourses and their uptake and transformation in politics. These are important criticisms which relate to the re-developed version of the DQI as well. But the two alternative ways of capturing

deliberative quality are far from being unproblematic. First, the informational approach to deliberative quality suggested by Mucciaroni and Quirk (2006) does not focus on preference transformation, a key feature of any deliberative approach. Here, the level of respect – which Mucciaroni and Quirk (2010) consider an inconsequential aspect of a "plays-well-with-others" approach – can be indicative of transformative political action. In an experimental study, Schneiderhan and Khan (2008) found that the more inclusive (or, respectful) the discussion groups were, the more likely participants were to change their position. Spörndli (2004) obtains similar results for the parliamentary realm. Second, Naurin's survey-based focus on intentions may suffer from the problem of social desirability while simultaneously ignoring deliberative dynamics. As Halpern and McLaverty (2008) convincingly demonstrate, initially self-interested actors with bargaining intentions might be turned into truly deliberative actors during the process. A sequentialized DQI-analysis is in an excellent position to capture such dynamics. Third, the discursive approach proposed by Parkinson (2009) is vulnerable to the strategic dimensions of framing. Participants with better framing skills may have no difficulty asserting their strategic interests during the deliberation and alter discursive frames in desired directions. As such, a focus on the procedural norms of deliberation as captured by the DQI (and its re-developed version) is far from being misguided. Nonetheless, we think that a productive avenue for future research is the combination of the diverse approaches to deliberative quality. In this regard, we might explore, for instance, whether and how the procedural norms of deliberation are related to the informational quality of a debate, to participants' intentions, and to the uptake and transformation of discourses.

References

Bächtiger, André, Shawn Rosenberg, Seraina Pedrini, Mirjam Ryser, Molly Patterson, and Marco R. Steenbergen. 2009. Discourse Quality Index 2: An updated measurement instrument for deliberative processes. Paper prepared to the ECPR General Conference, September 10-12, 2009, Potsdam.

Bächtiger, André, Niemeyer, Simon, Neblo, Michael, Steenbergen, Marco R.. and Jürg Steiner. 2010. Disentangling Diversity in Deliberative Democracy: Competing Theories, their Empirical Blind-spots, and Complementarities. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 18: 32-63.

Benz, Arthur. 1994. Kooperative Verwaltung. Funktionen, Voraussetzungen, Folgen, Baden-Baden.

Black, Laura W., Stephanie Burkhalter, John Gastil, Jennifer Stromer-Galley. 2009. Methods for Analyzing and Measuring Group Deliberation, in L. Holbert (ed.), Sourcebook of Political Communication Research: Methods, Measures, and Analytical Techniques. New York: Routledge.

Bobbio, Luigi. 2008. Types of Deliberation. Mimeo, University of Torino.

Chambers, Simone 2005. Measuring Publicity's Effect: Reconciling Empirical Research and Normative Theory. *Acta Politica* 40, 255-266.

Dryzek, John S. 2007. Theory, Evidence, and the Tasks of Deliberation, Pp 237–250 in Shawn Rosenberg (ed.), Deliberation, Participation and Democracy: Can the People Govern? London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Goodin, Robert E. 2005. Sequencing deliberative moments. *Acta Politica* 40, 182–196.

Goodin, Robert E. 2006. Talking politics: perils and promise. *European Journal of Political Research* 45, 235–61.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1992. Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2005. Concluding comments on empirical approaches to deliberative politics. Acta Politica 40, 384–92.

Holzinger, Katharina. 2001. Kommunikationsmodi und Handlungstypen in den Internationalen Beziehungen. Anmerkungen zu einigen irreführenden Dichotomien. *Politische Vierteljahreschrift 42, 414-446.*

Landwehr, Claudia. 2009. *Political Conflict and Political Preferences. Communicative Interaction between Facts, Norms, and Interests*. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Macedo, Stephen. 1999. Introduction. In: Macedo, Stephen (ed.). Deliberative Politics. Essays on 'Democracy and Disagreement'. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mansbridge, Jane, James Bohman, Simone Chambers, David Estlund, Andreas Follesdal, Archon Fung, Cristina Lafont, Bernard Manin, and José Luis Martí. 2009. The Place of Self-Interest in Deliberative Democracy. *Journal of Political Philosophy* (Forthcoming).

Mansbridge, Jane. 2009. Deliberative and Non-deliberative Negotiations. HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series.

Martin and Vanberg 2005. Coalition policymaking and legislative review. *American Political Science Review* 99: 93-106.

Mucciaroni, Gary and Paul J. Quirk. 2010. Rhetoric and Reality: Going Beyond Discourse Ethics in Assessing Legislative Deliberation. Forthcoming *Legisprudence*.

Naurin, Daniel. 2007. Why Give Reason? Measuring Arguing and Bargaining in Survey Research. *Swiss Political Science Review* 13: 559–575.

Norris, Pippa. 1996. Women Politicians: Transforming Westminster? *Parliamentary Affairs* 49: 89-102.

Parkinson, John and Alex Bavister-Gould. 2009 Judging Marco-Deliberative Quality. Paper presented to the Democracy and the Deliberative Society Conference, University of Yor, 24-26 June 2009.

Polletta, Francesca and John Lee. 2006. Is Telling Stories Good For Democracy? Rhetoric in Public Deliberation after 9/11. *American Sociological Review* 71: 699-723.

Rawls, John. 1971. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Richardson, Henry. 2002. *Democratic Autonomy: Public Reasoning about the Ends of Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Risse, Thomas. 2004. Global Governance and Communicative Action. *Government and Opposition* 39, 288–313.

Rosenberg, Shawn W. 2007. Types of Discourse and the Democracy of Deliberation. Pp 130–158 in Shawn Rosenberg (ed.), Deliberation, Participation and Democracy: Can the People Govern? London: Palgrave-Macmillan

Sanders, Lynn. 1997. Against Deliberation. *Political Theory* 25, 347–76.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2001. The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union. *International Organization* 55: 47-80.

Schneiderhan, Erik and Shamus Khan. 2008. Reasons and inclusion. the foundation of deliberation. *Sociological Theory* 26:1–24.

Siu, Alice. 2009. Look Who's Talking: Deliberation and Social Influence. Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in Toronto, Canada.

Spörndli, Markus. 2004. *Diskurs und Entscheidung. Eine empirische Analyse kommunikativen Handelns im deutschen Vermittlungsausschuss*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Steiner, Jürg, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli and Marco R. Steenbergen 2004. *Deliberative Politics in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steenbergen, Marco R., André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli and Jürg Steiner. 2003. Measuring political deliberation. A Discourse Quality Index. *Comparative European Politics* 1, 21–48.

Stromer-Galley, Jennifer. 2007. Measuring deliberation's content: A coding scheme. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 3, Article 12.

Thompson, Dennis F. 2008. Deliberative Democratic Theory and Empirical Political Science, *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, 497–520.

Walzer, Michael. 1999. Deliberation, and What Else? In: Stephen Macedo (ed.) *Deliberative Politics. Essays on 'Democracy and Disagreement'*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.