What makes a citizen?
A discursive investigation of citizenship and the boundary problem

Von der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften der Universität Stuttgart
zur Erlangung der Würde eines
Doktors der Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften (Dr. rer. pol.)
genehmigte Abhandlung

Vorgelegt von

Franziska Maier

aus Backnang

Hauptberichter: Prof. Dr. André Bächtiger
Mitberichter: Prof. Simon Niemeyer

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 18. August 2022

Institut für Sozialwissenschaften der Universität Stuttgart

2022

Abstract

Citizenship is contested, complex and never finished – but what then makes a citizen? In the context of democratic crises, globalization, technological change and societal polarization, citizenship is under transformation. What it means to people is increasingly differentiated, multifaceted and context-dependent. At the same time, it is important what citizens make of citizenship. Their definitions will be closely connected to core challenges societies face in the context of the mentioned transformations. First, citizenship implies a relationship between citizen and state, and thereby implicates definitions of freedom, self-government, and the relevance and content of political participation. Second, citizenship defines the relationships between citizens, which means that it indicates conflicts around commonality and pluralism, collective decision-making, social cohesion and how to organize a good life together with others.

Despite the big questions that underlie citizenship, bottom-up questions on how citizens themselves define citizenship are relatively understudied. Existing research on this topic often focuses on specific sub-aspects of citizenship or groups of the population. This dissertation takes a deep-dive into citizens' perspectives on citizenship, all the while ensuring that distinct conflicts and commonalities between these perspectives become apparent. The aim is to capture nuanced and holistic perspectives with the help of a discursive methodology. The discursive methodology uses deliberation as a tool of political science research.

To specify the contributions this study makes, the thesis first outlines three challenges of the field that are central to both citizenship and deliberation studies. The methodological challenge outlines the fundamental difficulties of measuring complex concepts empirically. Complexities inherent to citizenship are further exemplified in the theoretical challenge: It introduces the so-called boundary problem, which describes the fundamental democratic problem that arises when residence does not coincide with citizenship status, thereby excluding parts of a state's population from political rights. In introducing the challenge, I display on which grounds political theorists advocate either maintaining a connection between citizenship and political rights or granting political rights based on residence. Among innovative proposals to solve the boundary problem is a so-called boundary-assembly which would define the boundaries of the demos via a deliberative procedure. Within the methodological challenge, I discuss this option in the framework of deliberative democracy studies. In particular, the challenge focuses on the question of whether deliberative democracy is a procedural or a substantive theory of democracy, and in how far this in turn might impact deliberative outcomes. The thesis investigates deliberative outcomes substantively by exploring patterns of deliberative reasons.

Within the research design, I implement the discursive approach by using methods that depict participants' complex perspectives and processes of meaning-making. In particular, the discursive approach uses deliberation as a method of political science. The methodological approach makes use of both subjectivity (which invites the self into the perspectives participants express) and intersubjectivity (which is activated when people deliberate with each other). It also exploits the reflexivity-inducing function of deliberation, which leads to well-considered and thoughtful views even on complex issues.

This thesis uses Germany as a case study. Germany makes for a fascinating example to investigate citizenship concepts due to its specific immigration history, the prevalence of assimilationist and ethnic approaches to naturalization, and complex notions of national pride. Over the last 30 years Germany's citizenship and immigration policy has grappled with pluralism. Increasingly, the de facto

multiculturalism of German society is acknowledged, there is a tendency towards a more liberal naturalization policy, and both political and public discourse focus on the disenfranchisement of non-citizens. This dynamic and complex context makes it particularly interesting to understand how German citizens grapple with citizenship conceptualizations. All elements of the research design are collected within an online survey which was administered to 300 German citizens in the autumn of 2020.

The research design of the thesis applies a mixed method approach: A concourse on citizenship is constructed using citizenship theory and discourses. The concourse is then used to develop a Q-methodological survey, which captures subjective perspectives systematically. Thereafter, participants engage in an online argumentation exercise in which they deliberate on citizenship with the help of a concrete policy case, voting rights for non-citizens. This exercise on non-citizen voting rights is implemented via a survey experiment in which participants receive either an information-deliberation, an information-only, or a control-group treatment. While the information treatment consists of reading pro and contra arguments, the deliberative treatment engages participants in the formulation and exchange of their own reasons. Arguments are exchange in an anonymous online space. Thereby, information and deliberation effects can be measured separately. This deliberative treatment reflects a minimal definition of deliberation because the sole focus is the exchange of reasons. Its advantage is a straightforward design that allows tracing causal effects directly to the exchange of reasons.

Results demonstrate that citizens want connectivity from citizenship: Although there are distinct conflicts between citizenship conceptualizations, all participants embrace ideas of citizenship as obligation, common life, and practice. These results are found both in the investigation of citizenship conceptualizations and in participants' reasoning on foreigner voting rights. In large parts, these reasons clarify why deliberation on non-citizen voting rights leads to an increase in skeptical positions. Despite their rejection of non-citizen voting rights, participants' arguments are balanced and sophisticated. Upon closer inspection, realizing connectivity without illegitimately limiting pluralism is a genuine concern for many participants.

The dissertation makes two innovative contributions to the current state of citizenship research: Firstly, it expands the empirical toolkit of citizenship research by measures that are better able to capture complexity, subjectivity, ambivalence and reason-giving. Secondly, it adds to what we know about perspectives on citizenship. In particular, it includes a broad variety of citizenship concepts in the investigation, and uncovers interactions between different components of citizenship that have previously only been investigated separately.

Further, the dissertation connects the study of deliberative opinion change with an analysis of substantive reasons. Substantive reasons have rarely been used to understand deliberative opinions, although this could make a broad contribution to research on democratic preferences. A deliberative experiment on the boundaries of the demos is suitable to attempting this combination because of its complexity. The design allows studying opinion change and stability, complex perspectives, and argument quality. The dissertation makes a general argument in favor of discursive methods to better capture complex and contextualized opinions in the political sciences.

The results have wide-ranging implications for scholars and practitioners who think about citizenship, migration, political rights, pluralism, and deliberation. They also point towards the necessity of developing innovative concepts for combining commonality and pluralism, collective decision-making and civic obligation. At the same time, the discursive design of the thesis emphasizes the potential of citizens themselves pointing towards creative potentials, new combinations, and potential future avenues of democracies.

Zusammenfassung

Staatsbürgerschaft ist umkämpft, komplex und nie abschließend definierbar – aber was macht dann einen Staatsbürger aus? Im Kontext der Krise der Demokratie, der Globalisierung, dem technologischen Wandel und gesellschaftlicher Polarisierung verändert sich Staatsbürgerschaft. Der Begriff der Staatsbürgerschaft wird zunehmend schwer fassbar, denn individuelle Definitionen werden differenzierter, vielfältiger und kontextabhängiger. Gleichzeitig ist es wichtig, was Staatsbürgerschaft für Staatsbürger*innen bedeutet. Das Konzept ist eng mit den genannten Transformationen verknüpft. Erstens impliziert Staatsbürgerschaft eine Beziehung zwischen Staatsbürger*in und Staat und damit Definitionen von Freiheit, Selbstverwaltung sowie der Relevanz und dem Inhalt politischer Partizipation. Zweitens definiert Staatsbürgerschaft die Beziehungen zwischen Staatsbürger*innen untereinander, wodurch sie Konflikte um Gemeinsamkeit und Pluralismus, kollektive Entscheidungsfindung, sozialen Zusammenhalt und die Organisation eines gemeinsamen guten Lebens aufzeigt.

Trotz der großen Fragen, die der Staatsbürgerschaft zugrunde liegen, sind bottom-up-Untersuchungen, die messen, wie die Staatsbürger*innen selbst die Staatsbürgerschaft definieren, in der existierenden Forschung unterrepräsentiert. Forschungsergebnisse zu diesem Thema geben häufig Einblick in bestimmte Teilaspekte der Staatsbürgerschaft oder in die Perspektiven spezifischer Bevölkerungsgruppen. Diese Dissertation taucht tief in die Perspektiven der Staatsbürger*innen zur Staatsbürgerschaft ein und stellt gleichzeitig sicher, dass spezifische Konflikte und Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen diesen Perspektiven deutlich werden. Ziel ist es, mit Hilfe einer diskursiven Methodik differenzierte und ganzheitliche Perspektiven zu erfassen.

Um die Beiträge dieser Studie zu verdeutlichen, skizziert die Arbeit zunächst drei Herausforderungen des Feldes, die sowohl für die Staatsbürgerschafts- als auch die Deliberationsforschung von zentraler Bedeutung sind. Die methodologische Herausforderung beschreibt die grundsätzlichen Schwierigkeiten bei der Messung komplexer Konzepte der Politikwissenschaft. Die Komplexität von Staatsbürgerschaftskonzepten wird im Rahmen der theoretischen Herausforderung weiter veranschaulicht: Sie führt das sogenannte Grenzproblem ein, welches das grundlegende demokratische Problem beschreibt, das entsteht, wenn der Wohnsitz und die Staatsbürgerschaft von Personen nicht miteinander zusammen fallen und sie dadurch von politischen Rechten ausgeschlossen werden. Die theoretische Herausforderung zeigt auf, aus welchen Gründen die politische Theorie entweder dafür plädiert, die Verbindung zwischen Staatsbürgerschaft und politischen Rechten beizubehalten oder aber sie aufzulösen. Zu den innovativen Vorschlägen zur Lösung des Grenzproblems gehört eine sogenannte „boundary" Versammlung, die die Grenzen der Demos über ein deliberatives Verfahren definieren würde. Innerhalb der prozeduralen Herausforderung diskutiere ich diese Option im Rahmen deliberativer Demokratiestudien. Die Herausforderung konzentriert sich insbesondere auf die Frage, ob die deliberative Demokratie eine prozedurale oder eine substantielle Demokratietheorie ist und inwieweit dies wiederum Auswirkungen auf deliberative Ergebnisse haben könnte. Die Dissertation untersucht deliberative Ergebnisse inhaltlich, indem sie deliberativen Gründe analysiert.

Innerhalb des Forschungsdesigns setze ich einen diskursiven Ansatz um, indem Methoden gewählt werden, die die komplexen Perspektiven und mehrschichtigen Bedeutungen von Staatsbürgerschaft darstellen. Insbesondere nutzt der diskursive Ansatz Deliberation als eine Methode der Politikwissenschaft. Der methodologische Ansatz nutzt sowohl die Subjektivität (die das Selbst in die von den Teilnehmenden geäußerten Perspektiven positioniert) als auch die Intersubjektivität (die

aktiviert wird, wenn Menschen miteinander diskutieren). Es nutzt auch die reflexivitätsinduzierende Funktion der Deliberation, die zu wohlüberlegten und Ansichten auch bei komplexen Themen führt.

Diese Arbeit verwendet Deutschland als Fallstudie. Deutschland ist aufgrund seiner spezifischen Einwanderungsgeschichte, der Verbreitung von assimilationistischen und ethnischen Einbürgerungsansätzen und komplexen Vorstellungen von Nationalstolz ein faszinierendes Beispiel für die Untersuchung von Staatsbürgerschaftskonzepten. In der deutschen Staatsbürgerschafts- und Einwanderungspolitik der letzten 30 Jahre ist der Pluralismus ein zentrales Thema. Zunehmend wird die de facto Multikulturalität der deutschen Gesellschaft anerkannt, es gibt eine Tendenz zu einer liberaleren Einbürgerungspolitik und die Entrechtung von Nichtstaatsangehörigen kommt in politischen und öffentlichen Diskursen zunehmend vor. Aus diesem dynamischen und komplexen Kontext ergibt sich eine geeignete Fallstudie. Alle Elemente des Forschungsdesigns wurden im Rahmen einer Online-Umfrage erhoben, die im Herbst 2020 mit 300 deutschen Staatsbürger*innen durchgeführt wurde.

Das Forschungsdesign der Dissertation wendet einen Mixed-Method-Ansatz an: Auf Basis von Staatsbürgerschaftstheorien und -diskursen wird ein sogenannter Concourse zu deutscher Staatsbürgerschaft konstruiert. Aus dem Concourse wird dann eine Q-methodische Erhebung entwickelt, die subjektive Perspektiven systematisch erfasst. Danach beteiligen sich die Teilnehmenden an einer Online-Argumentationsübung, innerhalb derer sie über Staatsbürgerschaft mit Hilfe eines konkreten politischen Themas, dem Wahlrecht für Nichtbürger*innen, deliberieren. Diese Erhebung wird über ein Survey Experiment durchgeführt, bei dem die Teilnehmenden entweder ein Informations-Deliberations-Treatment, ein Informations-Treatment oder ein Kontrollgruppen-Treatment erhalten. Während das Informations-Treatment darin besteht, Pro- und Contra-Argumente zu lesen, formulieren die Teilnehmenden im Rahmen des deliberativen Treatments ihre eigenen Argumente und tauschen sie mit anderen in einem anonymen deliberativen Raum aus. Hierdurch lassen sich Informations- von Deliberationseffekten trennen. Das deliberative Treatment basiert auf einer minimalen Definition von Deliberation, deren einziger Fokus der Austausch von Gründen ist. Der Vorteil ist ein unkompliziertes Design, das es erlaubt, kausale Effekte direkt auf den Austausch von Argumenten zurückzuführen.

Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass Staatsbürger*innen von der Staatsbürgerschaft eine Verbundenheit erwarten: Obwohl es deutliche Konflikte zwischen den verschiedenen Konzeptualisierungen gibt, unterstützen alle Teilnehmenden die Idee von Staatsbürgerschaft als Verpflichtung, gemeinsames Leben und Praxis. Diese Ergebnisse finden sich sowohl in der Untersuchung von Staatsbürgerschaftskonzepten als auch in den Argumenten der Teilnehmenden zum Ausländerwahlrecht. Diese Gründe verdeutlichen, warum Teilnehmende nach dem deliberativen-Treatment eine stärker skeptische Position zum Ausländerstimmrecht einnehmen. Trotz ihrer Ablehnung des Ausländerstimmrechts sind die Argumente der Teilnehmer ausgewogen und differenziert. Bei näherer Betrachtung deuten die Argumente der Teilnehmenden auch darauf hin, dass es ihnen ein echtes Anliegen ist, Verbundenheit und Pluralismus miteinander zu vereinen.

Die Dissertation leistet zwei innovative Beiträge zum aktuellen Stand der Staatsbürgerschaftsforschung: Erstens erweitert sie das empirische Instrumentarium der Staatsbürgerschaftsforschung zur Erfassung von Komplexität, Subjektivität und Ambivalenz. Zweitens ergänzt sie die existierende Forschung zu Perspektiven auf Staatsbürgerschaft. Eine Vielzahl von Staatsbürgerschaftsdefinitionen werden in die Untersuchung einbezogen, wodurch Zusammenhänge zwischen verschiedenen Teilkomponenten von Staatsbürgerschaft aufgedeckt werden, die bisher nur getrennt untersucht wurden.

Darüber hinaus verbindet die Dissertation die Untersuchung von deliberativen Meinungsänderungen mit einer Analyse von substantiellen Gründen. Substantielle Gründe wurden selten zum besseren

Verständnis deliberativer Meinungen herangezogen, obwohl dies einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Erforschung demokratischer Präferenzen leisten könnte. Ein deliberatives Experiment über die Grenzen des Demos eignet sich für eine solche Analyse von Begründungen aufgrund seiner Komplexität. Das Design ermöglicht die Untersuchung von Meinungsveränderung und -stabilität, komplexen Perspektiven und Argumentationsqualität. Die Dissertation plädiert allgemein für diskursive Methoden zur besseren Erfassung komplexer und kontextualisierter Meinungen in den Politikwissenschaften.

Die Ergebnisse haben weitreichende Auswirkungen auf Forschende und Praktiker*innen, die über Staatsbürgerschaft, Migration, politische Rechte, Pluralismus und Deliberation nachdenken. Sie weisen auf die Notwendigkeit hin, innovative Konzepte zur Verbindung von Gemeinsamkeit und Pluralismus, kollektiver Entscheidungsfindung und politisch-sozialer Verpflichtungen zu entwickeln. Gleichzeitig betont die diskursive Gestaltung der Arbeit das Potenzial der Bürger*innen selbst und weist auf kreative Möglichkeiten, neue Kombinationen und mögliche zukünftige Vorstellungen von Demokratien hin.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures

List of Appendices

1. Introduction and Purpose

"When day comes, we ask ourselves, where can we find light in this never-ending shade?
The loss we carry. A sea we must wade.
We braved the belly of the beast.
We've learned that quiet isn't always peace, and the norms and notions of what "just" is
isn't always justice.
And yet the dawn is ours before we knew it.
Somehow we do it.
Somehow we weathered and witnessed a nation that isn't broken, but simply unfinished."
(From "The Hill we Climb", (Gorman 2021)*)*

Democracy is difficult – this is one of the core ideas in Amanda Gorman's poem written for the inauguration of US President Joe Biden in 2021. She talks about the struggles, counter-movements and disagreements that it will necessarily entail, and concludes that the state of politics and of democracy is "simply unfinished". The poem also allocates the idea of uncertainty and perpetual incompleteness to core concepts of democracy (such as social justice in the above extract), and to the nation. In the context of changing political landscapes, questions arise about how a democratic nation state should look in the 21st century.

These concerns remain commonplace and relevant across Western democracies: For over thirty years, worries have grown over the stability of democracies. This is reflected in discussions around changing forms of political participation, ruptured party landscapes, digitalization, migration, or globalization pressures and transnational interconnectedness. In Europe, these discussions have meant the decline of large parties and the establishment of new ones, the rise of populism, economic and migration crises, and the management of these crises within an integrated European Union. EU multilevel governance adds an additional range of potential responses to the form of the democratic nation today. I argue that many of these transformations can be studied through the lens of citizenship. Citizenship defines the contents of the relationship between citizens, and between citizen and the state. To account for the breadth of transformations that pose questions on how democracies might look in the 21st century, this investigation uses Germany as a case study.

Citizenship is a core concept of democracy that is wound up with the idea of the nation, and that holds the potential to answer several questions on how the nation, democracy, and society ought to look. Citizenship has always been contested and vague, but incredibly relevant to questions of democracy, society, and good life. Different definitions of citizenship imply different conceptions of democracy (Schlenker and Blatter 2014), the state (Kalu 2003), political community and society (Mouffe 1991), an idea of societal life (Tully 2014), and expectations towards new members of political communities (Hampshire 2011). This thesis studies how citizenship is understood and constructed through deliberation with the aim of figuring out how citizens view it as unfinished. In other words, it investigates what citizens

consider the most important aspects of citizenship on which to focus next, or with which to begin again.

The idea that citizenship, too, is unfinished and contested is widespread in the academic literature (Condor 2011; Isin and Nyers 2014; Kiwan 2012; Wotherspoon 2018). Shklar even goes so far as to say that:

> *"There is no notion more central in politics than citizenship, and none more variable in history or contested in theory." (Shklar 1991 p.387)*

This alone makes it an incredibly fascinating subject of study: Investigating citizenship as contested makes it possible to analyze the reasons that underscore conflicting citizenship conceptions. This allows drawing conclusions on deep differences in political opinions and democratic preferences. Additionally, it grants insight into how political communities, solidarities and activities are symbolically constructed and practiced in manifold ways (Wotherspoon 2018). Citizenship is inherently linked to definitions of politics broadly understood.

While a wide array of tools and indices exist to measure differences between citizenship regimes, it is not straightforward how to best capture citizens' bottom-up conceptualizations authentically. Because citizenship is unfinished, it is under constant transformation and contestation. Transformation and contestation also imply a richness and creative potential for alternative conceptions of citizenship. This thesis attempts to capture a dynamic research object without reducing such insights. In this study, I understand citizenship not just as an institutional formation, but as a political practice and meaning made by citizens themselves.

Isin and Nyers make the forceful argument that struggles around citizenship provide insights into political practices, attempts to rebalance power and potential for political change: "Since citizenship involves struggles that are not just about rights and recognition, but about the contested constitution of subjectivity and polities themselves, we argue that citizenship remains a significant site through which to develop a critique of the pessimism about political possibilities" (Isin and Nyers 2014 p.9). I argue that this potential is insufficiently exploited in existing research. By focusing on the bottom-up conceptions that citizens themselves hold, this study aims to contribute to the exploration of that creative potential behind citizenship conceptions.

It is true that political theory from antiquity to modernity has defined citizenship in fundamentally conflicting terms (see e.g. Honohan 2003). Contemporary empirical research has analyzed how citizenship regimes and policies are shaped by complex political, historical and cultural distinctions. It has established that citizenship policies have relevant impact on people's lives. However, it is only more recent investigations which demonstrate how citizens'

own conceptions of citizenship are incredibly varied[1]. With this thesis, I aim to contribute to a growing research field that investigates how exactly citizenship conceptions differ and why. Previous investigations usually use one of two possible research designs to achieve this: Quantitative surveys or qualitative interviews. Both add value and insight into how citizenship is understood, but also have remarkable shortcomings: Given the complexity of citizenship, surveys are unable to sufficiently capture the contested nature of citizenship, and explain the nuances and ambiguities that drive it. Meanwhile, qualitative investigations capture much of this nuance, but their results are often specific to a sub-aspect of citizenship or a societal group. The innovative design I propose in this thesis remedies both points: It captures complexity, but also systematizes viewpoints to better understand core conflicts and most distinct commonalities between citizenship conceptions.

1.1. Research motivation

The basic motivation for this thesis arose from the longstanding debate around the so-called crisis or regression of democracy (Crouch 2004; Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018; Merkel and Kneip 2018). For many years, scholars, commentators and political science students have been trying to pinpoint what it is about democracies that needs fixing. Citizens' distance from the political system and drops in classical modes of political participation have long been discussed as the most notable symptoms (Crouch 2004; Dahrendorf 2003; Wilke 2010). Commonly discussed potential drivers of the crisis are redistribution (Pontusson and Rueda 2010; Voorheis, McCarty, and Shor 2015), or the failure of politics to deliver believable solutions to issues around globalization and digital change (Inglehart and Norris 2016; Rodrik 2016).

As a political science student, I remember a discussion with friends about disillusionment and distance that citizens felt particularly towards EU-politicians who do not speak their language, mostly work in another country, and discuss issues that are perceived as either unimportant (such as the cucumber sizes) or too complex (such as fiscal governance). We discussed how politics could come closer to people, for instance in the form of townhalls, and naturally someone objected that only people who are already interested usually attend them. We never came to a great solution, and someone suggested that there is a proportion of the population who simply does not care and is not capable of understanding political questions. It is a strong objection to this conclusion that drew me towards deliberative democracy.

A particular appeal of deliberative democracy is its underlying assumption of citizens as competent. In the discussion around the crisis of democracy, it is often lamented that citizens' increasing apathy is the driver of democratic decline: In short, the argument is that citizens are simply unmotivated to participate in or even care about politics (Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002). Research on deliberative and participatory democracy has since made a strong case

---

[1] Brubakers' first study of German and French citizenship for example is largely based on the idea that citizens' conceptions of citizenship will be in line with the citizenship regime of their country (Brubaker 1992; Joppke 1995)

against this argument: its results paint a picture of citizens who are motivated (Neblo et al. 2010) and competent (Curato and Niemeyer 2013) to participate. This goes for citizens from all sets of socio-economic backgrounds (Delli Carpini, Cook, and Jacobs 2004). Many who do not vote or seek out formal political platforms are instead engaged in local or informal political initiatives (Eliasoph 1998). These studies do not find that citizens are passive or careless once given opportunities to develop, discuss and voice their political positions (Curato and Niemeyer 2013; Eliasoph 1998; Escobar and Elstub 2017).

The ensuing assumption is that ordinary citizens are indeed motivated to discuss politics, and very much capable of doing so when the circumstances are right. This thesis argues that this is even the case for extremely complex political concepts, like citizenship, or for related dilemmas of political theory. The basic idea is that deliberation leads to meaningful communication on an issue. I implement this idea by using deliberation as a method of political science. Deliberative democracy is talk-centric democracy, in which political decision making is based on public justification (Chambers 2003; Habermas 1995). Research on deliberative democracy has found that deliberation increases the quality of opinion in that it leads to more thoughtful, complex and stable views. Within this study's research design, I take the innovative step of combining citizenship and deliberation research.

The aim of using deliberation as a method is to better understand how individuals think about the world and how that thinking evolves through communication. A core issue like citizenship is subject to human communication all the time, and so people constantly build, reconsider, and add to their opinions on it – from the classic discussion around the kitchen table, over media reports, to televised political debates. Using deliberation as a method captures this multiplicity. It brings people together and invites them to share their views, their reasoning behind it, and the potential tensions they feel on the topic.

1.2. Problem summary: the complexities of citizenship

Several key challenges about politics in contemporary societies can be linked to questions of citizenship. When talking about how to organize democracy, especially in the face of potential democratic decline, two questions often arise: The first question asks how to revitalize democracy. Often, the discussion on revitalizing democracy draws on citizens' attitudes or roles in democracies – after all, democracy is defined by its having citizens who determine its contents (Isakhan 2012). Democratic rights and responsibilities are the outcomes of citizens' struggles for freedom and meaning (Isin and Saward 2011; Shotter 1994). This is also why an increasing number of responses to democratic decline suggests shifting towards a more deliberative democracy which empowers citizens and improves political debate (Dryzek et al. 2019).

The second question is how people can live together well in pluralistic societies. Often the challenge is how to establish communities where people feel connected, safe and socially embedded all the while being inclusive, accommodating of difference and ensuring individual self-fulfillment. Citizenship has an important role to play, as it designates political membership and, in many conceptions, also belonging to a country (Carens 2016). For both of these prominently discussed questions on the future of democracy, citizenship definitions hold different responses. These responses define the role of the citizen in democratic institutions, but they also refer to the relational component of citizenship which defines what citizens expect from each other.

In short, investigating citizenship is insightful because of its multidimensionality. Citizenship describes both the relationships people envisage towards the state and towards each other. Thus, an investigation of citizenship tells us about what people want from democracy, and how people envisage living *together* well in that democracy. I have mentioned that citizenship is under transformation and contestation. These contestations are reflected in both dimensions: in terms of the vertical relationship towards the state, global interconnectedness and multi-level governance call into question the nation state as the exclusive institution of citizenship – citizenship rights are potentially safeguarded on the EU-level or by international courts, and people might feel a sense of belonging towards a city, a region, or the world as a whole. In terms of the horizontal relationship between citizens, these have gained in complexity: Migration movements challenge the level of commonality required between citizens, and transnational solidarity leads to changing or flexible allegiances. In short, citizenship is under transformation.

Understanding how citizens think is all the more relevant given the transformations of national citizenship both within nation states and globally. Article 15 of the Declaration of Human Rights entails a right to citizenship. It manifests the idea of a global system in which individual human rights are protected by culturally homogeneous nation states with straightforward membership schemes: Everyone is the citizen of one state, residence and citizenship are congruent and cultures are shared within national borders (Brubaker 1992). There is a longstanding argument that this idea has always been more ideal than reality (see also Arendt 1951). However, the combinations, contexts and contestations around citizenship have rapidly increased through globalization, the rise of technology, consequent increasing interconnectedness and mobility. This has led to a "multiplicity and contingency" (Schlenker and Blatter 2014 p. 1094) which counteracts these fundamental ideas of nation states and their citizenships.

There is a longstanding debate about the impact of globalization on national citizenship: Will national citizenship remain of primary importance or slowly disappear as it is replaced by European or global membership mechanisms (see e.g. Beck and Sznaider 2010; Koopmans 2012; Soysal 2010, 2012)? Different approaches conceptualize how citizenship or belonging beyond the nation state might look. For the most part, they can be distinguished between those that see an emerging global government with global citizenship on the one hand, and those that see increasing international connectedness, cooperation and responsibility for the individual

without instituting global political institutions. The former envisions a global citizenship that is supported by institutions, while the latter describes a cosmopolitan citizenship that is undermined by action (Hannerz 2005). Largely, the debate around the transnationalization of citizenship acknowledges that complete detachment from roots, culture, national or communal belonging is either unrealistic or even challenging to the maintenance of democracy and solidarity (see e.g. Calhoun 2003a, 2003b; Kallio 2018).

Complex conceptualizations of transnationalism see globalization as flexible, context-dependent, dynamic and multi-level (Bauböck 2010; Bohman 1998; Schlenker and Blatter 2014). Bohman for example conceptualizes globalization as "decentering", and takes this to mean that public spheres become increasingly contested, multi-sited, or large: "it is no longer possible to assume national or cultural sovereignty over publicity (…) While representing new opportunities, such a situation may also give rise to new pressures on citizenship, particularly new and sharper tensions between pluralism and publicity that demand that citizens learn to use their reason publicly in innovative ways" (Bohman 1998 p.199). This demonstrates the pressures, dynamism and complexity that transnational movements add to individual conceptualizations of citizenship: Citizenship may now be taken to mean attachment to multiple communities, it may be practiced in an increasing number of sites, it may take the form of institutionalized politics or more innovative political practices, and the institutions we address or relate to go well beyond our 'own' nation state.

At the same time, the discussion around the multiple levels of citizenship, the possible globalization of citizenship, and increasing mobility might lead to the conclusion that citizenship has become more flexible or accessible. However, citizenship has not necessarily become more open with globalization, at least not equally for all. While originally cast as a global mechanism for guaranteeing individual rights by clearly allocating individuals to a national state, increasingly both political theory and public debate point towards citizenship as a *driver* of inequality. Some observe that citizenship and belonging have not in fact become more easily accessible, but that newly defined and greater hurdles have been put in place that make citizenship *less* accessible (Bassel et al. 2020; Mau 2021). Mau's thoughtful analysis shows that many effects of globalization mean an increase in freedom, mobility and opportunity for those who hold the citizenship of Western countries only. Through securitization of immigration and border control, as well as selective immigration schemes, the mechanism of exclusion connected to citizenship has become more effective and targeted than ever before (Mau 2021). There are several arguments for globalization leading to an increase rather than a decrease of the relevance of national citizenship. "The novelty of the transnational perspective lies exactly in insisting on the role of states in promoting trans-border forms of membership. This only adds complexity to the membership problem," (Dumbrava 2012 p.13). Additionally, the increasing requirement of civic integration tests for naturalization are said to have increased demands on new citizens. While naturalization was originally seen as a path towards integration, integration has now become a requirement – it must precede naturalization (Goodman 2009; Klaver 2009). Because of this, Goodman casts civic integration tests as a relatively effective mode of immigration control, and concludes: "Citizenship may mean less, but it does more." (Goodman 2009 p.12)

These analyses show that globalization changes how citizenship might be perceived and practiced, and what it might mean to citizens' everyday lives. This changing nature of citizenship has been subject to strong normative analysis, while less focus has been placed on empirical analyses of how citizenship is practiced (Schlenker and Blatter 2014). Such analyses are particularly relevant in the context of the EU, which has implemented European citizenship. Previous research points to a complex relationship between national and European identifications: EU and national attachments are sometimes in competition (largely on questions of further EU integration), but more often take the form of nested identities, where greater identification with the nation state also leads to greater identification with the EU (Duchesne and Frognier 2008). These analyses echo the contextual and situational nature of identification and citizenship practices. In this study, I argue that this multiplicity and contingency is reflected in citizens' conceptions: Perceptions of citizenship have a large variety that depends on experiences mediated by culture, mobility, and technology.

Many recent bottom-up investigations of global citizenship observe the emergence of a new social and political cleavage. This cleavage divides those who embrace globalization and cultural diversity from those who wish to protect traditions and communal values against globalization pressures (Zürn and De Wilde 2016). The former are often viewed as winners of globalization, and tend to be better educated, more mobile, and more often part of the elite (Merkel and Zürn 2019). Next to the general approval of globalization, the 'transnational cleavage' is said to add complexity to, rather than to replace, existing cleavages such as class (Häusermann and Kriesi 2015; Hooghe and Marks 2018). This cleavage has been analyzed to lead to divides between citizens both in public discourse and in party systems (Hooghe and Marks 2018). The emergence of the transnational cleavage demonstrates that globalization may fundamentally alter political behavior, political identity, and how people relate to political institutions. In the end, how citizenship regimes and their functions develop in an increasingly global and interconnected world will also depend on individual citizens' perceptions of citizenship. Many scholars propose that more bottom-up and in-depth studies of how this cleavage plays out in individual-level national identities could add insight into the debate (Ecker-Ehrhardt 2012; Teney, Lacewell, and De Wilde 2013). This is a request which the research questions of this project can address.

The above summary shows that citizenship is multifaceted, multi-sited, and under constant transformation. This poses a challenge to capturing what citizenship means to citizens, how it manifests for them, and how they practice it. The development of citizenship in Germany over only the past 30 years demonstrates that liberalization policies were followed by more restrictive policies, and that public discourse is situated at a complex intersection that involves contradictory messaging about immigration, nuanced relationships with national identity and fast-paced European and global developments. This is reflected in a global conversation in which citizenship is sometimes a cosmopolitan project that equalizes and unites people beyond borders, and other times an insurmountable division granting some access to a globalized market and society and excluding others. The above summaries also demonstrate that

citizenship is closely interlinked with pressing policy issues that are highly polarized and thus contested, from social cohesion over immigration to the stability of democracy.

1.3. Research questions of the thesis

This thesis takes an innovative approach at studying citizenship conceptualizations from below. It looks at citizenship conceptualizations in two forms: First, I measure what citizenship means to citizens in encompassing terms. Second, I want to find out which criteria citizens define for belonging to the demos as the political basis for popular sovereignty. Concretely, I explore whether citizens believe that the core right of citizenship – political rights – should remain connected to or separated from the status of citizenship.

The study applies a mixed method design that places citizens' own contestations at its center. The underlying assumption is that citizens are competent at weighing the complexities of citizenship and reckoning with its practical implementations. I implement this by using deliberation as a method. Thereby, the design offers responses to pressing questions both in the fields of citizenship and deliberation. For citizenship studies, the thesis addresses the fact that traditional methodologies have significant limitations for understanding what citizenship means to people, how they practice it, and how it is mobilized in policy debate. For the field of deliberative democracy, the thesis makes explicit the potential of using deliberation as a method, and responds to questions about whether deliberation leads to a particular set of outcomes.

Deliberative democrats have found a wide array of advantages to people making political decisions together in a deliberative process. This holds great potential as a method of political science. Deliberative processes are said to increase autonomy and thereby the authenticity of expressed views. After the US election in 2020, the New York Post ran a story titled "The pollsters were wrong again – why do we listen to them?" (Podhoretz 2020). Many other news outlets published similar stories, and the headlines seem familiar after polling had falsely predicted the election of Hilary Clinton and the failure of the Brexit referendum, both in 2016 (see e.g. Cowling 2016). There are contexts in which traditional methods of political science seem insufficient to explain people's political behaviors. In this context, expanding methods of political science and ensuring that chosen methods accurately place participants into situations of political decision-making and action is an all the more important endeavor. Using deliberation as a method means collecting thoughtful data on how participants view issues after information and reflection. This thesis applies deliberation as a method to remedy some of the mentioned challenges. To study citizenship using an innovative discursive design, and to better understand deliberative mechanisms on issues related to citizenship, this thesis asks three research questions.

The first research question aims to gain a systematic but nuanced overview over how German citizens view the concept of citizenship generally. Most existing research on citizens'

perspectives focuses on sub-aspects of citizenship: on preferences for certain democratic solutions (Wright and Bloemraad 2012), belonging and migration (Ersanilli and Koopmans 2010; Huddleston and Vink 2013), or national identity and pride (Lindstam, Mader, and Schoen 2019; Miller-Idriss and Rothenberg 2012). Very few studies actually draw together all of these different components into an encompassing research design. These studies limit insight into how the aspects of citizenship are interrelated, and into what priority they take in citizens' conceptions and in how far they are ambiguous.

This study captures these aspects: It analyzes both commonalities and differences in German citizens' citizenship conceptualizations. Thereby, it uncovers both areas of consensus and of contention. A response to the research question thereby specifies how exactly citizenship is unfinished. With this aim, the first research question asks:

RQ 1. How do German citizens conceptualize citizenship?

While a response to this research question will entail an encompassing overview of citizenship perspectives from below, its limitation is the abstract nature of citizenship. Citizenship is contingent, evolving, and interrelated with many political issues. Many aspects of citizenship, like conceptions of freedom, equality or sovereignty are themselves highly complex and contested. The question of how abstract citizenship conceptions relate to policy questions is intriguing because citizenship plays a role in contentious questions like political participation and social cohesion (Hampshire 2011), and on discussions on migration and belonging (Ruedin 2015). This leaves open the question of whether and how citizenship conceptualizations will translate into political opinions on citizenship-related policy.

In this study, I use these interconnections to further discuss citizenship conceptualizations in the framework of a concrete policy issue, namely non-citizen voting rights. The democratic challenge of non-citizen disenfranchisement has been broadly discussed in political theory within the so-called boundary problem, and is gaining increasing attention in the public and political debate in Germany. With the transformations of citizenship outlined above in mind, new questions arise on the conditions for political membership. To understand firstly how abstract citizenship conceptualizations translate into opinions on a concrete policy example, and to secondly explore how citizens position themselves in a difficult dilemma on political membership, the second research question asks:

RQ 2. What arguments in favor of and against foreigner voting rights are relevant to German citizens, and how do these differ for those who have deliberated?

A remaining challenge is that citizenship is dynamic. Perceptions of it change over time, so that it is also important to understand what may drive such changes. I argue that using deliberation as a method yields results that will grant insight into how participants reflect and reckon with citizenship, and how their opinions on it are subject to change. Ultimately, deliberation is designed to deal with difficult problems and questions of collective political will (see e.g. Fishkin 2003; Mercier and Landemore 2012). At the same time, the issue of citizenship holds

particular challenges for deliberation: its complexity and interconnection with different value- and policy questions make it potentially difficult to grasp, and to organize a productive exchange of arguments. Empirical studies have shown that deliberation can be particularly challenging on issues that are polarized (Niemeyer 2020), value-laden (Mendelberg 2002), or related to identity (Dryzek 2005). Generally, deliberative experiments place high demands on participants (Bächtiger and Wyss 2013). In this sense, deliberating on the boundaries of the demos is an insightful example to better understand when and how deliberation works.

Several deliberative processes have been held on equally complex issues such as immigration (Lindell et al. 2017) or abortion (Farrell et al. 2020). Though these studies show that deliberation is consistently effective at achieving thoughtful opinion-formation, results are less consistent on deliberative outcomes. Deliberation is widely associated with transformation (see e.g. Burkhalter, Gastil, and Kelshaw 2002; Cohen 1997; Dahlberg 2007): As participants learn, reflect, and articulate their views, these often change. The shape and effect of deliberative opinion transformation has been subject to much debate. While there was originally an assumption that good deliberation should lead to consensus between participants (often in combination with the moderation of opinions towards the middle), many deliberative democrats have since made clear that this is not necessarily the case. Deliberation can instead serve to clarify opinions or better understand conflict (e.g. Bächtiger et al. 2018). There is less certainty on whether deliberation necessitates a specific form of results. Based on deliberative norms like mutual respect and diversity of perspectives, one could assume that deliberative transformation includes a shift of opinions towards equality and inclusivity. However, empirical evidence has not demonstrated that deliberation is systematically progressive (Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010). Instead, deliberative opinion change has been shown to depend on the type of issue, its accessibility and its level of government (Felicetti, Niemeyer, and Curato 2015).

Scholarship on citizens' conceptions of citizenship finds a high influence of the history, culture and political institutions in which citizens live (see e.g. Brubaker 1992). Social psychologists meanwhile connect citizenship with notions of both individual and social identity (see e.g. Brewer 2009). This suggests that citizenship conceptions are deeply rooted in values and socially embedded, which would make them more resistant to change. Such complexities and uncertainties make citizenship-related issues an interesting case for more closely studying deliberative outcomes. Thus, the third research question asks:

RQ 3. How does deliberation affect opinion change on foreigner voting rights?

In particular, this research design has the advantage of not studying opinion transformation alone. It is able to connect opinion transformation with underlying reasoning provided by participants through the two previous research questions. Thereby, it will uncover the underlying mechanisms of deliberative opinion transformation and connect findings on deliberative outcomes with deliberative reasons.

The three research questions combined make for an innovative research design to study both citizenship conceptions and deliberative outcomes. It demonstrates the use of deliberation as a

method, and contributes to the study of deliberation by understanding deliberative outcomes in combination with participants' reasoning. Studying deliberative outcomes is also relevant to policymakers and practitioners, especially as deliberative formats are gaining increasing popularity in practice (OECD 2020). Furthermore, the research questions contribute to the study of citizenship by providing a deepened insight into citizenship perspectives from below, and grasping how citizens define the boundaries of the demos. By focusing on the boundary problem, the investigation can contribute to political theory. Its results also provide insights into citizens' democratic preferences and can thereby inform the study and practice of democratic innovations and democratic design more broadly.

1.4. Overview of the thesis

Challenges from the empirical study of democracy and dilemmas of political theory are both addressed in the run of this thesis. In the subsequent chapters, I combine citizenship and deliberation studies, but go further by also combining theory and empirics and drawing on different methodological traditions. This makes for an innovative design with an interdisciplinary range of findings.

At the same time, these new combinations are not made for the sake of their innovation alone. They are informed by existing research, and address distinct gaps or challenges. This thesis begins by outlining three challenges of the field that it plans to address and justifies their relevance (Chapter 2). Each challenge is particular to one of the research questions presented above: The methodological challenge outlines the difficulty of existing methods to study systematic citizenship perspectives without overly reducing complexity. It expands on the abovementioned complexities inherent to citizenship perspectives and explains how they complicate good measurement. This challenge motivates the first research question on citizenship conceptualizations. The theoretical challenge outlines the debate on the boundary problem and presents an overview of normative criteria for political membership in a democracy. I present existing proposals for resolving the boundary problem, among them a deliberative approach. In approaching the theoretical challenge, this thesis puts a deliberative proposal into practice on a small scale by conducting a deliberative experiment on foreigner voting rights. Finally, the procedural challenge discusses the question of whether deliberative procedures necessitate certain outcomes, and contextualizes the overarching discussion from deliberative theory and empirical research alike. The challenge motivates the third research question on deliberative opinion change.

With respect to all three challenges, empirical methods are extremely relevant: I take a discursive approach to respond to the host of issues around existing methodological shortcomings, analyzing patterns of reasoning, and investigating deliberative mechanisms. Chapter 3 outlines the methodological approach taken by this thesis in two parts: It first presents the central motivations behind discursive methods by drawing on deliberative theory. This

clarifies why both citizenship and deliberation are well suited to a discursive design, and why in turn a discursive design is especially appropriate for studying citizenship and deliberation *together*. The second part of the chapter introduces the research instruments this thesis uses to implement the discursive design. Concretely, these instruments are two subjective investigations (a social media analysis via Twitter and a Q-methodological study) as well as the construction of a concourse on German citizenship to respond to the first research question. For the second research question, the design uses qualitative analysis of arguments made in an online deliberative exercise, and pro and contra arguments on non-citizen voting rights collected among survey participants. Finally, a more traditional instrument yields responses to the third research questions: A survey experiment explores pre-post positions of participants on non-citizen voting rights. Within this investigation, the design also explores argument quality.

Thereafter, the results to the research questions are presented. In response to the first research question on citizenship conceptualizations, Chapter 4 of this study finds four distinct empirical perspectives on citizenship: critical ethnoculturalists, active democrats, liberal democrats and cosmopolitans. The perspectives differ substantially in the importance they allocate to culture, political participation, trust in government and global connectedness. Yet, they also share interesting commonalities. All perspectives allocate great importance to obligation in their citizenship dimensions, and want connectivity from citizenship. I discuss these results and their implications for refocusing the political conversation on political participation and generating connectivity in contemporary democracies.

The results presented in Chapter 4 are gathered using a Q-methodological survey which measures subjective perspectives on citizenship and systematizes them. The survey draws its contents from a concourse on citizenship. I develop the concourse based on a literature review of conflict lines from citizenship theory and an interpretive analysis of citizenship-related discussions on Twitter.

After exploring abstract citizenship conceptualizations, these ideas are put into a more practical context. Chapter 5 studies opinions and opinion transformations on non-citizen voting rights. The third research question yields a potentially surprising result: Participants who deliberate on non-citizen voting rights become more skeptical of their introduction. Several analyses demonstrate that the participants are able to justify their views with high levels or argumentative quality. This indicates that deliberation does not necessarily lead to progressive outcomes. The exploration of the second research question delivers insight into the potential reasons for this outcome. Participants think that political rights should be connected to obligations. The analysis confirms and deepens the findings from Chapter 4 on the relevance of connectivity. Participants are not per se unwilling to accept that non-citizens vote, but they request criteria beyond residency. Examples for these criteria are taking responsibility for the country and being committed to its future.

The results presented in Chapter 5 are drawn from a survey experiment with an online deliberative exercise. A pre-post survey is administered to participants who receive different treatments based on their allocation to a pure-control, information and deliberation group. The

deliberative treatment, based on a minimal definition of deliberation, involves engaging with reasons in an online space. The chapter first focuses on the third research question on deliberative opinion change. It analyzes participants' positions on foreigner voting rights generally, which is relatively skeptical, and then calculates the effects of the deliberative and information treatment.

In the second part of Chapter 5, I unveil the patterns of reasoning behind this increased skepticism by conducting a qualitative analysis of the arguments made in the deliberative space (by the deliberation group only), as well as pro and contra arguments on non-citizen voting rights put forth by all participants. In evaluating the results, I discuss implications for the research and practice of deliberation, and on the prospects of introducing non-citizen voting rights in Germany.

After presenting the results for each research question individually, an encompassing discussion in Chapter 6 ties together the results and their more wide-ranging implications. First, I summarize and discuss the responses to each of the three research questions. Then, all results are synthesized in order to systematize the patterns of reasoning on citizenship found in this study. This clarifies the main conclusions on participants' citizenship conceptions which entail a rejection of economic criteria, an agreement on obligation and practice-based citizenship, and contestation on the extent of commonality required from citizens. This is a useful starting point for an assessment of the overall contributions of the thesis. To achieve this, I attempt a response to each of the three challenges of the field (presented in Chapter 2). In a conclusion (Chapter 7), I connect the results with contemporary academic and political debates, and point towards areas for future research.

This thesis underlines the remaining importance of national citizenship, and the interest in civic connectivity shared by participants with otherwise diverging views. It demonstrates that citizens themselves have innovative ideas for resolving some of the most pressing issues of our democracy, such as those I have outlined in the beginning of this chapter: Reconciling pluralism and commonality in contemporary democracies, and reinvigorating democratic institutions.

This study will not answer all of the questions I have posed. With citizenship never being finished, they simply cannot offer a final response. In exploring questions like this, responses will remain contingent on time and place. Nonetheless, they clarify issues of political contention as well as areas of common ground. They point towards areas of future research and potential actions for policymakers to better understand and potentially even to resolve democratic crises. Finally, they specify how context and social interactions matter for shaping citizens' views of politics and the world.

Table 1: Overview of the Thesis

Challenge	Research Question	Methods	Main Findings
Methodological	How do German citizens conceptualize citizenship?	▪ Concourse construction (theoretical literature review, interpretive analysis of Twitter Discourse) ▪ Q-methodological survey	▪ Citizenship consists of rights and obligations ▪ Commonality is defined via culture, political practice, laws and institutions, or global connectedness
Theoretical	What arguments in favor of and against foreigner voting rights are relevant to German citizens, and how do these differ for those who have deliberated?	▪ Content analysis of a deliberative exercise, ▪ Content analysis of a pro and contra exercise	▪ Non-citizen voting rights are not rejected per se, but tied to conditions ▪ Conditions are obligation, commonality and shared practice ▪ Considerations are made on how to define commonality pluralistically
Procedural	How does deliberation affect opinion change on foreigner voting rights?	▪ Causal analysis of deliberative survey experiment (effects of deliberation on policy positions and argument quality)	▪ Deliberation leads to more skeptical views on non-citizen voting rights, and higher argument quality ▪ Communitarian deliberation re-enforces the status quo and activates citizenship identity

2.   Challenges of the field

Citizenship is under transformation, both in the context of globalization and given the pressures on crisis-ridden national democracies. In this thesis, I study how citizens conceptualize citizenship, and how they weigh its complexities. To do so, I combine citizenship and deliberation studies. By using deliberation as a method, I investigate how the complexities within citizenship are reckoned with generally, and how they are balanced when it comes to making policy choices.

The approach of this thesis is motivated by three challenges of the field, which this chapter outlines. First, it investigates how citizenship is understood by German citizens. Strong arguments have been made in favor of understanding citizenship conceptualizations from a more citizen-centered perspective, in order to grasp how meaning-making and practices of citizenship shape contemporary ideas of society and democracy. Doing so poses what I call a methodological challenge: the methodologies used to capture citizenship should reflect the fact that citizenship is complex, ambiguous and contextual.

Second, the thesis focuses on a concrete policy issue connected to citizenship, non-citizen voting rights. An increasingly pressing policy question is whether it is legitimate to allocate voting rights based on citizenship, especially in a globalized world. Political theorists have asked similar questions in the context of the so-called boundary problem, which problematizes fundamental questions about who is entitled to political rights within a nation state (or, in the words of political theory, how the boundaries of the demos should be defined). In the theoretical challenge, I sketch how political theory suggests to resolve the boundary problem either by separating political rights from citizenship, or by maintaining their tie. To better grasp what normative considerations resonate with citizens in the real world, the thesis attempts to capture how citizens reason with the boundary problem.

Finally, the third challenge more closely studies deliberative mechanisms in the context of citizenship-related questions. I ask how opinions on the boundary problem might be (trans)formed through a deliberative process. In the procedural challenge, I outline two potential outcomes: If deliberation is progressive, deliberative norms will sensitize participants towards inclusive solutions and thereby prompt them to embrace non-citizen voting rights. Alternatively, deliberation could take a communitarian form. It would then activate citizenship identities and provide justification for the status quo, which will advance skepticism towards non-citizen voting rights.

For both the second and third challenges, I use deliberation as a method. Their results also provide insights for deliberative democracy. The content of deliberative processes has received some attention in deliberative theory, while few empirical investigations evaluate it. The investigation of the procedural challenge contributes to questions around whether the presence of deliberative norms automatically leads to progressive outcomes. Its results contribute to

existing research about how deliberative mechanisms impact deliberative outcomes. Given that deliberative designs are becoming implemented with increasing frequency and in a wide variation of forms and contexts, it is important to think more about their systematic effects on political outcomes. Deliberative democrats have become more reserved about recommending deliberative mini-publics as a 'silver bullet' to political challenges. Rather, they increasingly emphasize that the effectiveness of deliberation will depend on political context, policy issue, or exact implementation, and that this deserves greater reflection (Bächtiger, Setälä, and Grönlund 2014; Farrell 2022; Lafont 2020). By investigating how deliberative mechanisms work, and which considerations they bring to the fore, this thesis contributes to insights on what we can expect from deliberation.

The results of all three challenges have wide-ranging implications: How to justly define belonging and allocate rights has long been part of public discourse, political debate and academic research. As Condor says: "Tacit models and values of citizenship are necessarily implicated in all forms of democratic governance," (Condor 2011 p.194). Because of this implication, the results of this study allude to how we might construct immigration, integration and naturalization policies, and point towards what is important for social cohesion and solidarity in pluralistic societies.

Given the relevance of both the resulting normative and policy questions, the thesis aims to innovate both on methods and contents of democratic theory and empirical democracy research. It innovates by combining approaches and issues: the fields of deliberative democracy and citizenship are combined, theoretical and empirical concepts used together, and abstract questions are asked in combination with concrete ones to diversify on research instruments. This deepens insights and can generate new ideas to challenging problems. In doing so, the thesis focuses on core concepts of politics: democracy and citizenship.

2.1. A Methodological Challenge: Measuring Citizenship as a Contested Concept

Citizenship is a fundamentally contested concept (Condor 2011; Kiwan 2012). Condor even emphasizes that in studying citizenship, it can be useful to understand it as a vague concept, which means not valuing certain sub-aspects of citizenship or specific citizenship formations over others. Instead, vagueness is a part of citizenship and contributes to better understanding it (Condor 2011). Although many specific definitions for citizenship exist, few take into account bottom-up perspectives such as how citizens feel about citizenship, how they practice it and what they connect with it (Lindstam, Mader, and Schoen 2019; Miller-Idriss 2006).

Definitions of citizenship often differentiate between its politico-legal and socio-psychological components (see e.g. Condor and Gibson 2007; Mey 2016; Olsen 2008), where the former points to the protections and rights afforded by political and legal institutions of the state, and

the latter to belonging, identity and social relationships like solidarity. This also means that on the one hand, citizenship has a political and rights-based component which ensures political equality and fundamental rights (Jayasuriya 2005; Ouahes 2017). On the other hand, citizenship is associated with practices that are shaped by social interaction and entail identity, feelings of belonging, and a sense of home or connection with others (E. F. Cohen and Ghosh 2019; Pogonyi 2019; Sindic 2011).

In investigating citizenship from below, I attempt multiple sketches at a definition in the run of this thesis – be it to outline the scope of meanings of citizenship, or to clarify where definitions differ. However, as a basic framework, I follow Isin and Nyers in their broad understanding of citizenship as a composition of rights, duties, and performances. Their combinations, situations, and relevant spaces are constantly evolving, and subject to struggles and multiple interpretations (Isin and Nyers 2014). This echoes in other definitions that see citizenship as a combination of status, rights, practices or identity (Schlenker and Blatter 2014). The definition acknowledges bottom-up perspectives: What citizenship means in which situation will always depend on how individuals and groups make sense of it in that moment. Elsewhere, Isin and Saward emphasize citizenship's *active* component in the form of practices and struggles for rights or recognition (Isin and Saward 2011). This implies that citizenship is dynamic: It is shaped by practice. How citizenship is practiced and by whom is up for contestation. In this sense, citizenship is shaped by individual and collective meaning-making. This applies to both, the relationship between citizen and state, and the relationships between citizens. Citizenship defines the relationship between citizen and state because "it is exactly at the interface relating the individual with a political unit that conceptions of citizenship arise" (Olsen 2008 p.42). At the same time, citizenship reflects citizens' relationship with each other in that it entails "a shared set of expectations about the citizen's role in politics," (Dalton 2008 p.78).

With these definitions in mind, citizenship can mean organizing life together, sharing the background to one's life with others, joint action or solidarity, confrontation and conflict, and in some conceptions also genuine commonality. This thesis actively pursues the relational, or intersubjective, component of citizenship: It tries to understand not just how individual citizens understand citizenship but also how citizens make sense of citizenship *together*. It aims to understand where they have Dalton's shared set of expectations and where their citizenship conceptions are in conflict. By the same token, the thesis begins to build an understanding of what happens when citizens discuss and reflect citizenship conceptions and their policy implications *in dialogue* with each other.

However, public perceptions of citizenship contestations are a challenging subject of study: Questions deeply intertwined identity, such as immigration and European integration have been shown to invoke ambiguity and mixed feelings (Dempster and Hargrave 2017; Duchesne and Frognier 2008). The polarization of public discourse creates an additional methodological challenge: Survey research in such a polarized space may invoke responses that reflect whatever perspective is most salient in the given context (see e.g. Druckman 2004; Gerard and Orive 1987; Niemeyer 2011; Sjöberg 2010; Stoker, Hay, and Barr 2016). Because contexts are ever-changing and dynamic, research results may miss respondents' weighing of reasons, ambivalences, and contextually-invoked yet deeply rooted values. Thereby, they may

insufficiently predict respondents' political behavior. These challenges need to be closely examined in order to devise an adequate research design.

This has several consequences for trying to uncover how citizens think about citizenship and related policy problems: First, contradictions and complexities lead to ambiguous and contradicting views which are difficult to measure. Second, because these challenges are set against polarized political and public debate, symbolic or superficial impressions might be reflected in expressed opinions over reflected and well-considered viewpoints (which are better aligned with a person's values and deeper convictions (see e.g. Niemeyer 2011)). Third, these ambiguities are reflected in complex opinions which may often not be well expressed in the straightforward responses demanded by surveys, including well-established survey items traditionally used to measure citizenship or national identity perceptions. This sub-chapter outlines these methodological challenges.

Citizenship, identity and ambiguity

Opinion ambiguities and instabilities on citizenship can be explained with the help of behavioral psychology: Condor and Gibson argue that democratic citizenship relates to a wide range of issues relevant to social psychology "such as attitudes, identity, [and] the relationship of the individual to the group" (Condor and Gibson 2007 p.116). Citizenship is deeply entangled with identity (Brewer 2009) and has been shown to activate a myriad of forms of identity, such as group identity, group membership, individual identity, or in the form of solidarity (Condor 2011; Gibson and Hamilton 2011). Some investigations even use citizenship and national identity interchangeably, or argue that they cannot be separated empirically (Davidov et al. 2018). This is also relevant because conceptions of identity are seen as hugely influential for political behavior (Hanson and O'Dwyer 2019).

Most contemporary social psychologists do not view identity as stable, but as ever-developing through social interactions and contexts (Black 2008; Stryker and Burke 2000). Research has found a multifaceted self, meaning that several and potentially contradictory identities exist within each individual (Dryzek and Niemeyer 2008). Situational factors influence which identity is most salient at a given moment in time, or on a given issue (Brewer 1993; Pilialoha and Brewer 2006; Stryker and Burke 2000). This is also because different identities (Stryker and Burke 2000) and discourses (Dryzek and Niemeyer 2008) are constantly used to make sense of a diverse set of different experiences. How an identity is made sense of depends for example on other group representatives present (Pilialoha and Brewer 2006) and on the recognition for that particular identity afforded by others (Andreouli and Howarth 2012). In this context, for example Brewer has argued that further explorations are needed to determine what factors make which identities salient (Brewer 2009). Not only identity, but also political attitudes generally are constantly under negotiation, and change with "public discourse, information, and social interactions," (Zimmermann, Heuer, and Mau 2018 p.970)

This means that all three aspects – identities, attitudes and preferences – are under constant negotiation. This negotiation, in turn, forms definitions of citizenship, so that "citizenship is a

phenomenon which is not conjured up ex nihilo, but which emerges, evolves and changes within concrete practices." (Olsen 2008 p.41). Investigations of individuals' conceptions of citizenship confirm that they hold contradictory citizenship conceptions at once (Gibson 2011). Such contradictions are mirrored empirical research results. For example, research on minority rights shows that citizens may support general principles of equality between all social groups, but then be more reserved about the implementation of those principles in concrete policies (Coskun and Foroutan 2016). Investigations on attitudes about refugees have also shown a mix of feelings between guilt, responsibility and fear (Dempster and Hargrave 2017; Gerhards, Hans, and Schupp 2016).

These contradictions inherent to citizenship and related policy issues make it difficult to measure people's attitudes. When measuring how citizens view the world, an assumption is that the preferences issued within a research instrument reflect participants' genuine values, norms and attitudes. Political scientists assume that political preferences are structured by deeper lying core beliefs: "A citizen's set of core political values consists of overarching normative principles and belief assumptions about government, citizenship, and American society" (McCann 1997 p.565). When false or prejudicial information is more readily available, the views people express on citizenship might however not reflect such norms and beliefs accurately.

This is because individuals grappling with internal conflicts exhibit stress and behavioral gaps in attempts to reconcile contradictions (Stryker and Burke 2000). In addition, the more ambivalent individuals feel about an issue, the more vulnerable they are to false or prejudicial information (Zemborain and Johar 2007). Many researchers have discovered the ambivalence of opinions to be a potential driver for inconsistent responses: In the presence of mixed feelings, people give different responses at different times, depending on how they think in that moment or how they are asked (Craig et al. 2005; Zaller and Feldman 1992). When inquired about an issue on which people have not formed a well-considered view, they are likely to rely on whatever is most salient at that time, often leading to expressed views resting on "a thin veil of values, prejudices and hunches." (Stoker, Hay, and Barr 2016 p.5). These insights demonstrate that complexities and ambiguities are challenges to capturing authentic perspectives on citizenship well.

Issues around citizenship – belonging, solidarity, immigration – are subject to highly politicized debates. In such debates, political actors may use symbolism to offer easy solutions to complex problems, which makes it more difficult for citizens to identify the preferences that best align with their interests (Dryzek and Niemeyer 2006; Niemeyer and Jennstal 2018). This on top of the already mentioned ambivalence and vagueness that surround the concept as such can make it all the more challenging for people to authentically express how they view citizenship.

Problems with survey research on citizenship

How then are these issues reflected in traditional survey instruments on citizenship? The ethnic-civic dichotomy is perhaps the most established way to measure perceptions of citizenship, or national identity. Participants rate a range of criteria in terms of their importance to someone

being considered the nationality under question. These are relatively stable in determining two dimensions of citizenship: ethnic views tied to joint ancestry and tradition and civic views related to universal equality and political institutions (Reeskens and Hooghe 2010).

This measure has been criticized broadly: Generally, it is now largely seen as too narrow for country-level analyses (Brubaker 1998). The categories have also been criticized for being used as normative frames of analysis for citizenship regimes, whereby civic identity should be strived towards (Tinsley 2019; Zubrzycki 2002). On an individual level, it has been shown that both ethnic and civic perspectives can be found per country (Hansen and Hesli 2009; Miley 2007). In the German context, research shows that citizens often exhibit some degree of both components combined rather than clearly subscribing to only one of the two (Lindstam, Mader, and Schoen 2019). Finally, only about half of US-Americans subscribe to either ethnic or civic views, meaning that there seem to be many aspects to national identity that the instrument does not capture at all (Hanson and O'Dwyer 2019).

Other results investigate whether the ethnic-civic instrument structures political attitudes: Hansen and Helsi do not find the instrument to be a good predictor of democratic preferences (Hansen and Hesli 2009). Meanwhile, Wright, Citrin and Wand uncover that only an ethnic conception of national identity is a relatively good predictor of attitudes toward immigration, while civic conceptions of national identity correlate with varied views (Wright, Citrin, and Wand 2012). In light of this evidence, there are different recommendations for using the ethnic civic indicator. Some suggest using ethnic and civic conceptions as ideal types from which to compare policy and practice rather than as empirical categories (Zubrzycki 2002), while others suggest that the measure is effective and distinctive for individual-level investigations (Reeskens and Hooghe 2010).

It does seem that the measure is useful in its relative simplicity, empirical stability and clear conflict lines (as long as it is applied to individual-level conceptions rather than the categorization of a policy regime). However, its insight is limited: The fact that many people seem to subscribe to neither measure, and the low predictive power of the civic dimension suggest that the instrument discounts important nuances. Additionally, there is likely ambiguity between the dimensions given that many people subscribe to both categories to some degree. Both of these aspects point towards a level of complexity.

Such complexities are a challenge to political science research, and perhaps a particular challenge to survey research (which is the dominant method of political science (Dryzek 1990)). Classic survey research has often been shown to, in the worst case, measure non-attitudes. Surveys pose an 'opinion-forming imperative' in which participants feel obliged to respond substantially, even if they do not understand the question or have no opinion, leading to random responses (Gerard and Orive 1987). Additionally, the straightforward responses evoked by survey research do not measure the strength of attitudes: No difference is made between people who are certain or uncertain (Sjöberg 2010). This shortcoming has been shown to be an issue for political science, for example in that predictions of vote choice are weakened by feelings of ambivalence toward candidates (Lavine 2001). These challenges may be particularly applicable

to issues as complex as those relating to citizenship. Because it is a contested concept, a straightforward answer is not easily given. In this context, survey responses may deliver an incomplete understanding of identities and perspectives because they may (or may not) be short-lived. A new discourse, conversation, or piece of information could easily sway expressed views, while others might be stable over time.

The problems around survey research are summarized in a more fundamentally and normative critique by Dryzek: He contends that surveys are not suitable to essentially political questions because they can only ever capture "disembodied and constrained beliefs" (Dryzek 1990 p.164). He builds on conceptions of the political among others by Arendt, Habermas and Barber as action- or discourse-oriented. To really understand political perspectives, he argues that it is only in an "expression in political action that (classically) political attitudes and behavior can be discerned. To be called political, cogitation should be related to – and revealed in – action itself or action-oriented debate." (Dryzek 1990 p.715). In other words, participating in a survey is far removed from how political attitudes and behaviors come to the fore 'in the real world'. Dryzek's critique can help to understand the methodological challenge: Many research instruments do not capture decisive aspects of how citizenship is understood, from political practice, over interactions with others to multilayered and potentially contradictory aspects held all at once.

Indeed, there are some results from social psychology that corroborate the situational nature of identity related questions: van Zomeren and colleagues find that collective identities become more salient when they are acted upon and perceived as effective, indicating that collective action is relevant for identity activation (van Zomeren, Leach, and Spears 2010). As de Groot points out, meaning-making on values and identity occurs in continuous interpersonal dialogue, and is supported by narratives (de Groot 2017). Deliberative research also makes reference to communication theories in conceptualizing the self as shaped through dialogue with others (Burkhalter, Gastil, and Kelshaw 2002). It is possible that for concepts that are deeply embedded in intersubjective meaning making, a survey is simply too reduced to capture how people actually feel. At least it might insufficiently captures their full range of considerations.

In short, understanding identity and attitudes in dynamic terms has implications for the ways that political scientists study identity and attitudes. I suggest that a discursive methodology embraces exactly those aspects that pose challenges to measuring attitudes on citizenship. Capturing ambiguities and complexities is useful for discursive analyses because they can help to understand how opinions are formed (and why), and how they change or develop (and why). Ambiguities and complexities in political discussions mean there is a reckoning, or a weighing of arguments.

2.2. A theoretical challenge: the boundary problem

An increasingly relevant question within citizenship studies is who is entitled to political rights in a state. While many citizenship rights have been made available to non-citizen residents (Howard 2009), voting rights remain "as a core right of citizenship" (Song 2009 p.607). Theorists use the word 'demos' to signify the citizens who have the right to vote (see e.g. Ahlhaus 2020; Owen 2018). The so-called boundary problem asks how to legitimately define the boundaries of the demos.

Scholars of democratic theory have long noted that, in a democracy, deciding on membership criteria is circular by nature (Ahlhaus 2020; Dumbrava 2014). Democratic processes determine how and on which basis someone might be admitted to the demos via citizenship. This means that it is current citizens who determine access for future citizens; in other words, those who already have voting rights decide who should get access to voting rights. At the same time, the boundary problem only arises in the first place because there are doubts about whether the status quo correctly defines those who have voting rights. To select those entitled to make the decision, we would again have to ask the question of who should legitimately hold decision-making power. This section gives an overview of the debate on the boundaries of the demos with a particular focus on non-citizen residents. Thereby, it focuses on two opposing suggestions in the debate: Firstly, that voting rights remain tied to citizenship and secondly, that voting rights and citizenship are separated.

Growing attention has been called to the question of how to reconcile the basic right to democratic participation with an increasingly mobile population. Migration leads to the emergence of what Bauböck calls "quasi-citizenship" (Bauböck 2010). The past 30 years have seen an increase in the rights and possibilities for non-resident citizens to vote, while the reverse, namely the rights of non-citizen residents, have received much less political attention (Arrighi 2021). Debates around this question are complex, especially given that (dis)enfranchisement will likely have a significant impact on election outcomes and correspondingly on government policies (Saunders 2012).

Many rights previously reserved for citizens have already been made available to immigrants (Howard 2009). The question is whether voting rights should become accessible to residents in the same way, or whether they are a special right that must be tied to citizenship. A core challenge around the debate on the boundary problem is rooted in the democratic principle that all those subjected to the coercive power of a state should be able to control its laws and institutions. This thesis focuses on the dilemma of people in situations of 'quasi-citizenship' who are not citizens of the states in which they permanently reside.

Theoretical arguments for disconnecting voting rights from citizenship

For theorists who uncouple political rights from the legal status of citizenship, the demos should be constituted either on the basis of the "all affected interests" principle (Dahl 1970; Goodin 2007; Koenig-Archibugi 2011; Song 2009) – "everyone who is affected by the decisions of a

government should have the right to participate in that government" (Goodin 2007 p.51) – or on the basis of the more restrictive principle of non-coercion (Beckman 2009; Dahl 1989; López-Guerra 2005): "everyone subject to law has a categorical right to participate in the process of making laws" (Dahl 1989 p.126).

Many thinkers argue that non-coercion is a particular problem for long-term residents who are permanently subject to laws of an entity they cannot determine (Smith 2008; Theuns 2021). Even in liberal democracies which protect many rights of residents, republican thought sees non-citizen residents as subject to unjustified domination: Whether or not their rights are protected or their wishes taken into account will depend on the benevolence of those others who have the power to vote (Abizadeh 2012; Benton 2010; Owen 2012). In addition, those who live in a country have what Rubio-Marín calls "deep affectedness". Through interpersonal, professional and territorial relationships, they have a stake in the present and future of the place (Rubio-Marín 2000); their place of residence is potentially meaningful for what Smith calls 'constitutive identities' (Smith 2008). This entitles them to political claim-making (Smith 2008), especially given that due to their economic and social contributions, resident immigrants already fulfil many civic obligations (Bender 2021; Carens 1989, 2005). On this basis, enfranchisement realizes both recognition and freedom: It allows residents themselves to decide whether they want to participate depending on their own sense of belonging, while at the same time embracing the possibility that additional attachment is built through participation (Pedroza 2014). These points could be addressed by disconnecting voting rights from the status of citizenship.

Theoretical argument for voting rights based on citizenship

On the other hand, there are a number of theorists who propose to maintain the connection between voting rights and citizenship. Walzer, for example, forcefully defends the right of states to make selective admission decisions in order to preserve their integrity as "communities of character" (Walzer 1983 p.62). Bauböck stipulates that "membership in a democratic polity must have a sticky quality" (Bauböck 2009 p.20). In contrast to the above argument of potential domination, some argue that democratic decisions must always be restrained by the rights of others, and thereby genuine democracy should protect non-voters as well (Saunders 2012).

In this line of thought, connecting voting rights to citizenship is important for cohesion within democratic communities. Cohesion is said to contribute to social trust (Miller 2008) and enable people to become active participants in politics and society (Theuns 2021). In light of these considerations, Miller finds that immigration comes at a cost, and to reduce (or at least control) that cost immigrants must make an active choice in favor of membership (Bauböck 2009). Simply foregoing naturalization would be problematic for non-citizen residents as well because "[w]e are embodied creatures" (Carens 2016 p.210), and require the official recognition of membership by the community in which we live (Carens 2016). This also leads some thinkers to worry that granting voting rights without full citizenship would establish second-class citizenship, which means that foreigners may be entitled to vote without fully belonging to a specific community (Celikates 2012).

Carens goes one step further by advocating that the naturalization of long-term residents is not only a right but an obligation, both for the host country and the immigrant (Carens 1989, 2005). Civic obligation is also emphasized by de Schutter and Ypi in their conception of "mandatory citizenship", which claims that political membership is not only an entitlement but also a burden (De Schutter and Ypi 2015). They see citizenship as including both legal and normative obligations, the full fulfilment of which is only connected within the status of citizenship (Miller 2008; De Schutter and Ypi 2015). This argument is made elsewhere by Stilz, who claims that citizens hold responsibility for the actions of their state (Stilz 2011). A more concrete version of civic obligation can also be found in Miller: "Citizenship is among other things a compact for mutual protection, and so by entering a political community and taking the path to citizenship status a person acquires the obligation to contribute to the community's defence." (Miller 2008 p.383). Granting access to rights without obligations has the problematic implication that some resident citizens hold the full scope of both rights and obligations, whereas other resident non-citizens enjoy rights without being tied to the full range of obligations (De Schutter and Ypi 2015).

More broadly speaking, Song posits that an "expansive citizenship approach assumes that citizenship is an ideal and institution worth preserving" (Song 2009 p.611). She contends that because voting rights are a core component of citizenship, disaggregating them from citizenship reduces the importance of citizenship as such (Song 2009). A similar notion is put forward by those who place value on maintaining the integrity of the components of citizenship – be they different types of rights, or rights and obligations (Celikates 2012; M. Lister 2005). Even when disaggregating voting rights from citizenship is promoted, this is often seen as a temporary solution that allows people access to democratic rights while their naturalization is being processed (Song 2009).

Alternatives to defining the boundaries of the demos

Among the proposals on how to decide on the boundaries of the demos, many approaches emphasize participatory and practice-based conceptions of belonging. For example, Abizadeh proposes a third alternative (next to residence and citizenship), namely the joint exercise of power which requires "participating in the cooperative scheme of public provision" (Abizadeh 2016 p.120), and the solidarity mechanisms attached to it (Abizadeh 2016). A similar argument is made by Song, who argues that contributions to the social scheme of society broadly defined – not just by working and paying taxes, but also by upholding trust, participation and compliance – constitute a form of "fair play" that should allow people to be seen as full members (Song 2016). These approaches also emphasize their suitability to pluralism: Wilcox argues that in order for belonging not to be defined in a value-laden way (which in her view both ethnic and civic criteria of belonging do), belonging to a polity arises through active participation in political institutions. It is thereby defined by the individual actions directly (Wilcox 2004). In addition, defining belonging under conditions of pluralism will always require re-iterations of democratic debate, meaning that definitions of the demos must always be contingent (Theuns 2021).

These approaches point to a possible solution on the boundaries of the demos that takes into account common life, informal or self-defined forms of belonging, and participation in politics, amongst others. The demos here is not only defined by formal criteria, but by practices, cooperation and continuous discourse. Ahlhaus takes these discursive approaches one step further by designing a so-called boundary assembly: She proposes that an assembly of citizens and non-citizen residents decide upon the boundaries of the demos in a deliberative procedure. Interestingly, she argues that a deliberative approach unites both the liberal approach to membership as status, and the agonistic approach to membership as practice in that both status and practice play a role in deliberative procedure (Ahlhaus 2020). I will return to this potential solution in the procedural challenge which investigates deliberative mechanisms on non-citizen voting rights.

The boundary assembly has a lot to offer: It circumvents the circularity problem by including both members and non-members in the decision-making procedure. The approach is unique in that it allows people to define political membership through discourse. By using a deliberative procedure, it allows arguments from both sides to enter a fair and rational discussion between participants. This also reflects the existing participation of non-citizens in social schemes of cooperation. Thus far, such proposals only exist in political theory and have not been explored empirically. Thereby it is an open question how participants might position themselves in such a debate and which arguments they might invoke. To address these questions, this thesis makes a first step at exploring the theoretical scenario of a deliberation on the boundary problem.

2.3. A procedural challenge: Deliberating on the boundaries of the demos

The previous section has explained the boundary problem in political theory and presented a proposal to decide on the boundaries of the demos using a deliberative procedure. This thesis takes a first step towards exploring this possibility empirically by allowing participants to deliberate on foreigner voting rights for residents. Previous empirical results allow only limited predictions on the possible outcome of a boundary assembly. The only deliberative experiment on foreigner voting rights (of which I am aware) is from a relatively small-scale, in-person experiment with Swiss university students; here, deliberation led participants to take a more skeptical position on foreigner voting rights (Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014). Meanwhile, many other prominent examples of deliberative experiments led to deliberating participants taking more progressive positions, for example on women's rights, climate change, or crime (Farrell et al. 2020; Luskin, Fishkin, and Jowell 2002; Sanders 2012). Additionally, one might assume that, due to deliberative norms, deliberation aligns the preferences of discourse participants with progressive aspirations (Neblo 2007). Given this mixed picture, an exploration of deliberative theory might help to further explore whether deliberation should lead to more or less progressive decisions – or whether deliberation is entirely open-ended.

The question of whether deliberative procedure necessitates a certain outcome has not been subject to extensive empirical exploration (for exceptions see Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010), though there is a longstanding debate on the normative nature of deliberative democracy and, by extension, of deliberative procedure. Concretely, Gutmann and Thompson analyze whether deliberative democracy is a substantive (or first-order) or a procedural (or second-order) theory of democracy: While procedural approaches define democracy via just procedures only, substantive definitions outline basic principles which determine or limit the content of democratic decision-making (Gutmann and Thompson 2000). In essence, procedural approaches prioritize individual autonomy through basic guarantees like freedom of speech, religion, and property, while substantive approaches place emphasis on collective will-formation in the form of political self-determination (see also Mouffe 1991; Pedroza 2014). Deliberative democrats have made attempts at defining a democratic theory that combines individual autonomy and collective will-formation in acceptable ways (Chambers 2003). In balancing democracy and rights, their "democratic theory can be described as a rights-friendly theory of robust democracy" (Chambers 2003 p.309). Habermas makes his attempt at reconciliation using the so-called co-originality thesis which claims that individual and public autonomy necessitate each other: In order for collective decision-making and political participation to be fair (and to thereby guarantee public autonomy), all participants must be free and equal individuals; and in order to safeguard just those freedoms, substantive norms must protect them (to ensure private autonomy) (Habermas 2001). Though deliberative democrats define the balance between individual autonomy and collective will-formation in various ways, most agree that deliberative democracy is at least not a purely procedural conception of democracy (see e.g. Dryzek 2000; Gutmann and Thompson 2000; Habermas 2001; Saward 2021).

What then are the norms underlying deliberative democracy? In further developing this balance (between individual autonomy and collective will), most deliberative theorists formulate substantive objectives that can be linked to, or derived from, the ideal process of deliberation. Many democratic theorists are sensitive to the idea that, in pluralistic societies, it will be difficult for all to agree on common moral values. However, deliberative democracy distinguishes itself from an aggregative view of democracy, which simply collects and adds all individual-level interests, in that the emphasis of deliberative democracy is on *collective* decision making (J. Cohen 1997), This is why deliberative democrats are careful in defining what substantive outcomes are deemed democratically acceptable. For example, Cohen contends that "once we assume reasonable pluralism, the protection of the liberties of the moderns turns out to be a necessary though insufficient condition for the only plausible form of political community" (J. Cohen 1997 p.420). In consequence, a condition for deliberative norms is that they are compatible with individual autonomy and pluralism.

For theorists like Cohen and Gutmann and Thompson, those substantive principles are rooted in the idea of mutual justification. Only those reasons are permissible which can be accepted by others, which automatically excludes policies that disadvantage some groups or violate some individuals' integrity. With this in mind, Gutman and Thompson transform the basic procedural criterion of equality into three substantive criteria (namely basic liberty, basic opportunity, and

fair opportunity) (Gutmann and Thompson 2004). Cohen also ties the equal individual autonomy of deliberators to substantive principles on which all can agree, even in a pluralistic society:

> "*by requiring justification on terms acceptable to others, deliberative democracy provides for a form of political autonomy: that all who are governed by collective decisions (...) must find the bases of those decisions acceptable. And in this assurance of political autonomy, deliberative democracy achieves one important element of the ideal of community (...) because the requirement of providing acceptable reasons for the exercise of political power to those who are governed by it - a requirement absent from the aggregative view - expresses the equal membership of all in the sovereign body responsible for authorizing the exercise of that power.*" (J. Cohen 1997 p.416)

In most conceptualizations, outcomes of deliberative democracy are seen to be valuable because they are epistemically superior to outcomes of other democratic practices. The idea is that the specific structure of deliberation leads to more informed citizens. They account for more perspectives and pool ideas between them, and solutions are therefore more thought-through and relevant (see e.g. Barabas 2004; Fishkin and Luskin 2005; Mercier and Landemore 2012). The outcomes of deliberative processes are often defined as going beyond improving the quality of democratic solutions. Instead, they are oriented at more large-scale, civic accomplishments like tolerance towards others (Gutmann and Thompson 1996) or an increase of political activity (Dorr Goold et al. 2012; Kuyper 2018). Many approaches designate deliberative democracy as a path to increasing social justice (see e.g. Young 2000) or, even more prominently, democratic legitimacy (Benhabib 1996; J. Cohen 1989; Lafont 2017; Manin, Stein, and Mansbridge 1987; O'Flynn 2021). While the relationship between democratic process and democratic outcome is a lively debate in deliberative democratic theory, it has received less attention in empirical investigations. Predominantly, the effects of deliberation are measured via investigations of opinion change on an individual or aggregate level (e.g. Fishkin and Luskin 2005; Gastil, Black, and Moscovitz 2008). Thereby, the analysis of deliberative outcomes has largely focused on measuring large-scale effects and opinion transformations.

While this is certainly important, little research has qualified what kind of results deliberation yields (and under which circumstances), and what happens in its process (for exceptions see e.g. Niemeyer, 2011; Niemeyer & Dryzek, 2007). "Researchers have been less interested in deliberation itself than in measuring its effects," (Ryfe 2005 p.54). Critics have suggested that deliberative democrats propose deliberation in order to achieve a particular set of outcomes (Posner 2004), in particular left-leaning policies (Kuran 1998). This criticism, for example by Kuran, is directed at the substantive principles of deliberative democrats, which to him does not permit certain kinds of outcomes (Kuran 1998).

Whether or not this criticism holds in practice has rarely been investigated (for an exception see Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010). Does deliberative democracy prime participants towards a particular set of outcomes? In order to investigate this question within the example of non-citizen voting rights, I use the terminology of progressive deliberation on the one hand, and

communitarian deliberation on the other. Some theories suggest that deliberative democracy leads to progressive outcomes because it inherently programs people towards progressive preferences – it leads to thoughtful and informed, empathetic and other-respecting views. In the progressive view, deliberation is geared towards broadening viewpoints and increases tolerance towards others (Chambers 2003; Gutmann and Thompson 1996). This also increases the propensity of deliberation to increase awareness of social equality (Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010). In these perspectives, deliberation is said to be set up to embrace principles of justice and thereby tend towards liberal results (Forst 2001).

Another set of theories suggests that deliberation is not always progressive, but inherently programmed to reflect the particularistic values and traditions of the community in which it is set. Deliberation in this understanding reflects the specificity of communities. The communitarian view sees deliberation as the situated reasoning on collective issues, meaning that it reveals "a common mind" embedded in history, culture and community (Forst 2001). This would mean that the outcome of deliberation depends on the context and culture of the deliberating community. Scholars who support this view see deliberation as having a priming effect on collective (over individual) concerns (Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010), and being targeted at community (Ryfe 2005).

Previous empirical results seem to point towards the progressive variant. Sanders finds post-deliberative opinions to be "more liberal, green and pro-European" (Sanders 2012 p.639f.). Prominent real-world deliberations on abortion, same sex marriage (Farrell et al. 2020) and climate change (Guibert 2021) led to progressive outcomes; and deliberative experiments often find results in the same direction (see Participedia database at participedia.net). All the while, there are a few counter-examples, such as on same-sex marriage in Poland (Wojcieszak and Price 2010), and for climate skeptics in a deliberation on climate change (Hobson and Niemeyer 2013). In addition, a comparison of outcomes of the deliberative polls conducted by Gastil and colleagues find no consistent tendency towards either liberal or conservative results. They do however find that participants tend to express more liberal points of view generally, but then in their political *decisions* maintain relatively conservative policy alternatives (Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010).

Although there seems to be a progressive tendency in results overall, this might not hold across formats or for all policy issues. Mercier and Landermore (2012) contend that epistemic standards might differ depending on the situation, and Gerber and colleagues suggest that whether or not deliberation has an effect is issue-specific (Gerber et al. 2014). According to these points, deliberation is dependent on context. In addition, whether or not there is ambiguity of opinions depends on the situation, (Steenbergen and Brewer 2019), and the specific issue (Jackman and Sniderman 2006). This might be especially relevant in this context – after all, as previously established, questions around citizenship and determinations of the boundaries of the demos are especially susceptible to ambiguities.

Additionally, previous results demonstrate that deliberation may alter opinions at different levels or 'depths', for example either in terms of norms or in terms of preferences (Niemeyer

and Dryzek 2007). Jackman and Sniderman note some difficulties in reconciling deliberative outcomes: Deliberation is used to decide on issues on which people disagree, and it is said to lead to more considered opinions. More considered opinions would imply a divergence in post-deliberative opinions, while in practice, deliberation often leads to converging opinions among participants (Jackman and Sniderman 2006). This points towards the possibility that both, considered opinion and converging interests, can be the outcome of deliberation. However, previous research has infrequently made a distinction between the two mechanisms, or analyzed when which outcome occurs.

All three, the methodological, theoretical and procedural challenge allow a unique investigation of citizenship and deliberation together. All three challenges entail studying complex problems, and putting citizens' reactions in the center of that study. With this in mind, the thesis makes several assumptions on citizens' reasoning that are drawn from deliberative democracy. It uses these assumptions to develop an innovative research design that yields creative solutions to hard problems. Because citizenship is a relevant core concept of democracy, such an investigation holds potential for designing and studying democracy that is relevant to scholars of democracy, policymakers and practitioners alike. The next section outlines that potential.

2.4. The proposal of the thesis

This thesis investigates how citizenship and the demos are defined, and how people deliberate on them. Both the fields of citizenship studies and deliberative research are under transformation. For citizenship studies, it is important to investigate how citizens themselves conceptualize citizenship in the 21st century to draw conclusions on their preferences on democracy, globalization and social cohesion. Deliberative designs are increasingly applied in policy-making, but the substance of what people say when they deliberate is underexplored. The proposal of the thesis targets both of these dynamic challenges. What is more, it exploits overlaps and common questions of both fields and uses deliberation as a method to investigate citizenship.

Democratic participation and balancing commonality with pluralism are core challenges of contemporary democracy – these questions are central to the three presented challenges. Addressing the methodological, theoretical and procedural challenge together is mutually beneficial. This sub-section outlines how deliberation is used as a method to address the methodological challenge. In order to respond to complex questions like citizenship and the boundary problem, the design combines theory and empirics, and abstract and concrete questions from both citizenship and deliberation studies. The methodological and procedural challenges both require complex democratic concepts to be made accessible to citizens. This thesis meets that requirement via multitude of methods and approaches. Deliberation and citizenship studies share common challenges: both struggle with inclusion, balancing commonality and pluralism, and defining a basis on which citizens can engage in collective decision-making. Studying these challenges together holds creative potential. In making

creative combinations to study core concepts of democracy, the thesis demonstrates that ordinary citizens are not only capable of reflecting on and reasoning about complex core questions of democratic theory; what is more, they already and routinely do.

Using deliberation as a method

In order to investigate deliberative outcomes, the research design uses a *minimal* definition of deliberation as reason-giving as well as engaging with and reflecting on counterarguments (Bächtiger & Parkinson 2019). Social dynamics, narratives and storytelling have been recognized as important aspects of deliberation – some would argue that they make deliberation more conducive to empathy and mutual understanding (Black 2008; Muradova 2021). I do not contest this, and find it important for real-world deliberation. However, when studying deliberation in experiments, it is important to be able to trace effects to one specific mechanism. Implementing deliberation in this reduced form allows connecting effects directly to *deliberative reasoning*.

Because deliberation can exist in so many forms, some have expressed the potential danger of concept stretching (Owen and Smith 2015). To avoid this, scholars have attempted to more clearly define the different kinds of deliberation and deliberative mechanisms within the context of the systemic turn (Bächtiger and Parkinson 2019; Saward 2021). In line with these definitions, I argue that more fully understanding the mechanisms of deliberation, and deliberation's impact on opinion formation, requires clarity in the research design: In a controlled experimental setting, there is the possibility to define and isolate specific aspects of deliberation. Doing so can help understand which aspects of deliberation, or which deliberative designs, might lead to which effects.

In the context of this study, causal deliberative effects can be traced directly to deliberative reasoning composed of intersubjectivity and reflexivity. I deepen this investigation of deliberative reasoning by analyzing the content of reasons. Analyzing deliberative reasons also exploits the effects of deliberation on the quality of opinion. By using deliberation as a method to study citizenship perspectives, the thesis gathers data that is more reflected (Setälä & Herne 2014), less biased (Mercier and Landermore 2012), and strongly oriented towards participants' normative principles (e.g. Niemeyer 2011).

Combining research instruments

To innovate on future conceptions and practices of democracy, this thesis proposes combining theoretical with empirical concepts and as abstract with concrete questions. These new combinations are useful for driving democratic innovations.

The thesis combines citizenship theory with bottom-up perspectives on citizenship, and normative discussions of the boundary problem with its empirical investigation. Its design asks citizens to engage with normative questions alongside policy issues. By doing so, the thesis aims to ask similar questions with different research instruments. It is in the tradition of

deliberative research to use a diverse set of methods (Curato et al. 2017). Thereby, the thesis also brings together democratic theory and the empirical study of democracy in the spirit of thinkers who argue that both normative concepts and empirical findings inform and enrich each other (Saward 2021). The research design demonstrates a way to both observe public opinion and connect its observation with normative ideals, and vice versa. Investigating substantive reasons in deliberation also responds to recent calls for and attempts at establishing a stronger connection between deliberative norms and deliberative practice (Ahlhaus 2020; Niemeyer 2011). With this in mind, the thesis aims to contribute not only to empirical insights on citizenship and deliberation, but also to democratic theory.

The idea of citizens as politically competent has led some deliberative democrats to focus on democratizing democratic innovations. An important concern of this project is democratizing core concepts of political science (see e.g. Dean, Gagnon, and Asenbaum 2019; Saward 2021). Deliberation allows reflected, nuanced and pluralistic conversations on fundamental issues. Using the advantages of deliberation to study citizenship conceptions contributes invaluable insights on how to construct stronger democratic and societal institutions. In particular, this is because citizenship relates to issues that are strictly political: How we define citizenship, and what role citizenship plays in the organization of democracy and society is not a mere technical question. It is a matter deeply entangled with values, identities, and individual and common conceptions of the good life. In short, it being a contested concept means that there is no right or best definition, but a range of competing legitimate definitions, which, depending on political context and policy question, we have to weigh against each other.

In this sense, this research project focuses on a core concept of democracy through the lens of different fields of democracy research, using a variety of research instruments, and combining both empirical research and democratic theory. Saward argues that

> *"I would maintain that we can only build on today's innovative democratic ideas by spinning a range of threads into a new, overarching perspective on democracy which reflects social complexity, including the complexity in the meaning of democracy itself" (Saward 2003 p.162).*

The combination of fields and designs in this thesis reflects this multifaceted approach. Additionally, the core elements of the methodological approach, (inter)subjectivity and reflexivity, allow for complexity and nuance in this study's results. The aim is to gather fresh and deepened insights into how good democracies might look under the condition of pluralism.

As a solution to accommodating pluralism, difference democrats advocate combining approaches. Difference feminists suggest a synthesis between citizenship theories to allow for both emancipation and pluralism. They propose this balance by combining liberal and republican models (R. Lister 1997), or achieving both recognition and redistribution (Fraser 1998). Lister calls attention to the emancipatory potential of universalism, which should pay active attention to difference within the framework of her "universalism which stands in creative tension to diversity and difference" (R. Lister 1997 p.39). The idea is that participatory

approaches from republicanism can strengthen citizens' voice and accountability claims, while at the same time liberal approaches protect difference and individual freedoms. This is just one example of the potential of creative combinations for reconciling commonality and pluralism. This thesis works with different theoretical approaches of citizenship to allow for such solutions.

Inclusion and pluralism as common challenges in deliberation and citizenship research

Next to the combinations of theory with empirics, and of abstract with concrete questions, this study also brings together to research fields: deliberative democracy and citizenship. The fields of deliberative democracy and citizenship touch upon similar challenges like inclusion and pluralism. Their overlaps are presented in this section in order to support the idea that both fields can inform and expand the other.

A first common issue of deliberative democracy and citizenship research is inclusion. Questions around who should be included normatively, and who can be included practically are shared by deliberative and citizenship research. Simultaneously, both fields have different lenses through which they study these questions: Inclusion is a central normative ideal in deliberative democracy (J. Cohen 1997; Ryfe 2005), and investigations of the boundary problem in citizenship studies are largely normative. Experiences of deliberation in the real world show that achieving inclusion remains challenging in practice. First, it is simply difficult to reach all those who might be affected, and in the end deliberative processes may reach those who are already politically involved (Ryfe 2005). Second, making sure all those present are given equal voice and recognition is a challenge to not only symbolically, but also substantively including all affected interests (Curato, Hammond, and Min 2019). These challenges are also in parts acknowledged by political theorists evaluating the boundary problem (see e.g. Goodin 2007; Saunders 2012).

With these overlaps in minds, bringing both research fields together has the potential to develop new frameworks or discover creative results with the potential to resolve open questions. In particular, the empirical insights on deliberation hold potential for overcoming the challenges inherent to the boundary problem (see e.g. Ahlhaus 2020). Many have argued that deliberation is particularly suitable to difficult problems, to "thorny problems" (Dorr Goold et al. 2012), "questions of opposing norms or values" (Manin, Stein, and Mansbridge 1987) and "moral dilemmas" (Mendelberg 2002). This thesis provides further empirical insight into how deliberation specifically, and a discursive methodology generally, are useful for investigating complex problems.

A second relevant common challenge shared by deliberative and citizenship research is the reconciliation of commonality and pluralism. Citizenship studies include longstanding debates on the degree and type of commonality that can be requested from fellow citizens without imposing illegitimate limitations on the pluralism of ethnicities, religions or lifestyles (see e.g. Kymlicka 1995; Parekh 2000). The boundary problem is a good example of this conflict

because it poses the question of who should be included in processes of collective political decision-making.

In the debate around commonality and pluralism, many theorists call for citizen-centered and discursive solutions. Tully claims that a "democratization of struggles over recognition is required not only by the reciprocal or mutual character of recognition, but also by the principle of democracy itself" (Tully 2000 p.475). He views citizens themselves defining the basic tenets of their democracies as an important requirement for self-governance. This necessitates establishing democratic-decision making on these concepts as a regular practice (Tully 2000). In this research project, citizens themselves define citizenship in conversation with each other.

The idea of citizens defining citizenship *together* echoes deliberative theory's specific response to the challenge of pluralism. It is in contrast to aggregate models of democracy which reflect an individualist perspective on democratic decision-making: Choices are made by each individual, and all individual choices are added. Meanwhile deliberative democratic theory is talk-centric. People make decisions together through conversation (Chambers 2003), and thereby intersubjectively produce public reasons for political decisions (Dahlberg 2007). In Chambers' words, "[a] legitimate political order is one that could be justified to all those living under its laws" (Chambers 2003 p.308). In this sense, deliberation offers a justificatory response to the challenge of pluralism because justification makes decisions acceptable to all.

A third common concern between deliberative democracy and citizenship is on joint decision-making, which again is exemplified in the boundary problem. Thinking about both the boundary problem and deliberative democracy poses fundamental questions about the process of political decision making. They ask what people require to *make decisions together*. Deliberative processes have been said to be especially well suited to "questions of collective political will" (Fishkin 2003 p.132) because they allow weighing diverging values and interests. Deliberation also exposes shared knowledge and meaning (Dryzek 2005; Pitts et al. 2017). As an essentially contested concept, citizenship has a multiplicity of meanings both between individuals, and within individuals between contexts. Accessing shared knowledge or latent shared meaning is particularly important to an exploration of citizenship because "the electorate [,] is made up of interrelating and interdependent citizens" (Huckfeldt and Sprague 1995 p.8). Problems around deliberation and the demos share these intersubjective and relational components.

An important goal of this thesis is to use deliberation in order to understand how citizens themselves reckon with the complex and challenging debates outlined in this chapter. Understanding how citizens think about citizenship can help us imagine what citizenship might look like in the future. At the same time, understanding how citizens think about citizenship is helpful for analyzing the nature and motivating force behind citizenship today: Why would citizens oppose easier access to naturalization for example, or why might they favor open borders? Changes in citizenship policy are often slow; and these results might help us understand on which factors changes or constances hinge. Lastly, these results bear relevance to previously outlined concepts that are related to citizenship. They are likely to be connected to preferences on migration, democracy, solidarity and other core concepts of democracy.

It is important to note that democratizing concepts of political theory is not just a theoretical exercise. It has the potential to deliver innovative solutions on issues where they are urgently needed. I argue that it is useful to look for solutions by investigating core concepts of political science, in order to give insight into what people want from the basic tenets of our democracy, and how those expectations are being met insufficiently in current political systems. Investigating core concepts of democracy allows uncovering the tensions within them – such as the tension between pluralism and commonality in concepts of citizenship – and understanding where people disagree and where they agree. For this, deliberation can be an ideal method of political science.

3. Methodological Approach

In response to the challenges of the field, the previous chapter proposes to use deliberation as a method and combine research instruments to investigate citizenship. The citizen is at the center of this investigation. In this thesis, I contribute to democratic approaches to democratic theory by studying citizenship conceptualizations and their reasoning on the boundary problem from below. In doing this, I develop an innovative discursive research design to study citizenship and mechanisms of deliberation. While the research design takes a discursive methodological approach, it combines discursive elements with a more established method of political science, namely a survey experiment. This mixed method approach allows looking at data from different angles (see also Neblo 2009), and thereby deepens the understanding of the topics under investigation.

In this chapter, I present the methodological approach. The chapter has four parts: The first part outlines why the methodological approach of this thesis is discursive, and in how far it is suitable for responding to the challenges outlined in Chapter 2. The discursive methodological approach places its emphasis on subjectivity and intersubjectivity, as well as on exploiting the deliberative function of reasoning. The second part details how the research design measures citizenship conceptualizations from below using a concourse and a Q-methodological survey. The third section explains how deliberation is used to explore opinion change and substantive reasoning on foreigner voting rights. Lastly, the chapter presents limitations of the research design. A conclusion summarizes the methodological its contributions to the research questions of this thesis within the context of the outlined challenges of the field.

3.1. A discursive methodological approach

The discursive methodological approach uses research designs from two methodological traditions. First, deliberative research designs and second, subjective research designs. Some studies have previously advocated in favor of using deliberation as a method of political science (Zimmermann, Heuer, and Mau 2018) or as a dialogic tool for increasing understanding for a diverse set of viewpoints (Kim and Kim 2008; Lafont 2017). Past investigations have underlined the benefits of using subjective research to study citizenship and national identity (see e.g. Duchesne and Frognier 2008; Kallio 2018). In particular, discursive methods have been designated to be useful to the study of contested concepts (Wallaschek 2020), and new cleavages (Bornschier et al. 2021). Both deliberation and subjective methods (like a Q-methodological survey) are discursive, though they have rarely been combined (for exceptions see Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007).

To go beyond opinions shaped by symbolism, and dig deeper into the complexities of opinions Stoker and Barr suggest a "process as citizens as individuals revising and developing their own views as they debate and engage with others and 'think out loud' in public. This form of socially

mediated yet individual deliberation is insufficiently explored in contemporary political science." (Stoker, Hay, and Barr 2016 p.18) This is a gap the methodological approach and research design presented here attempt to fill. The research design exploits the advantages established by previously implemented deliberative and subjective methods. I present these advantages under two main themes: subjectivity and intersubjectivity, and the deliberative function of reasons. Next, I outline how each of these components advances a discursive methodological approach and how each offers a useful response to the challenges outlined in Chapter 2.

Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity

A subjective investigation is particularly useful for exploring the contested concept of citizenship. Several studies have explored subjectivities with similar methods on similarly complex issues, such as democracy (Carlin 2018; Dryzek and Berejikian 1993), patriotism (Anderson et al. 1997; Hanson and O'Dwyer 2019; Sullivan et al. 2015), meanings of good citizenship in the US (Theiss-Morse 1993), and citizenship identity in the UK (Hylton, Kisby, and Goddard 2018). Additionally, exploring subjectivities on complex issues has been suggested by researchers on topics closely connected to citizenship such as the transnational divide (Teney, Lacewell, and De Wilde 2013) or European identity (Bruter 2003).

Studying subjectivity means inviting the self into the investigation. It gives participants the space to make sense of a topic, and thereby encourages drawing on individual meanings, viewpoints and identities. A subjective investigation takes a bottom-up approach: It is first and foremost the participants, rather than the researcher, who define the most relevant aspects of a research topic (Watts and Stenner 2014). A bottom-up approach is suitable to the challenges of this thesis because it is focused on citizens' definitions on both citizenship (within the methodological challenge) and the boundary problem (within the theoretical challenge).

Subjectivities consist of individual preferences and their underlying beliefs and values (Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007). In this sense, they allow drawing on a broad set of aspects in expressing one's views. Next to individual values, subjectivities are shaped by social norms and embedded in social facts (see e.g. Eschweiler 2013; Watts and Stenner 2014)). This is relevant because, as established previously, social norms, identities, and social interactions determine how citizenship is understood and practiced. In particular when it comes to the theoretical challenge of this thesis, the boundary problem, this is useful. It allows participants to position themselves, their lives, identities, and daily routines within a complex problem of political theory. It asks them to reflect on the expectations they have of others in social and political settings, thereby making the political question of foreigner voting rights (more) practically applicable.

While some understandings of subjectivity are purely individual (e.g. in connection with individual rationality or independence of thought), most definitions draw on social context. The assumption is that subjectivity cannot be separated from meaning or action that is shared with those around us (Biesta 2007); this is particularly the case for Hannah Arendt's understanding

for whom subjectivity is "a quality of human interaction" (Biesta p.744). This thinking is also at the core of deliberative theory: Subjectivities are deeply shaped and transformed by intersubjective interaction (Rosenberg 2005). The previously outlined critique of survey research being unable to capture action-orientation in political behavior is echoed in ideas from discursive psychology (Gibson 2011). One of its main principles is action-orientation:

> "Discourse is the primary medium for social action; in speaking we blame, justify, invite, compliment and so on. Hence to separate talk and action as psychologists commonly do (for example in distinctions such as attitudes vs. behaviour) is to set up a false dichotomy, and to overlook the ways in which talk achieves things in itself" (Potter and Wiggins 2008 p.77).

Intersubjectivity also plays an important part in definitions of citizenship. After all, "the electorate is made up of interrelating and interdependent citizens" (Schmitt-Beck and Lup 2013). Citizenship is founded on mutual recognition, meaning that interaction with and acknowledgement by others are essential to it (Crossley 2001). Here, too, we might draw on Hannah Arendt: We become citizens when what we say is recognized and receives a response by others (Arendt 1958). For Crossley "[f]ull citizenship (…) is the political embodiment of intersubjective possibilities" (Crossley 1996 p.150). Because a discursive approach allows for subjectivity, it activates the relational component of citizenship in a way that other methods do not. As Carlin puts it, "allowing subjectivity to enter the analysis gives researchers an idea of how crucial a given item is for comparing individuals' belief systems." (Carlin 2018 p.419). A discursive design responds to methodological challenges of identifying distinct conflict lines between understandings of citizenship and political rights.

Additionally, deliberation can organize subjectivities by systematizing values and preferences. Dryzek and Niemeyer's concept of intersubjective rationality is the idea "that any pair of deliberators with similar subjective positions – in that they agree on values and beliefs – ought also to agree on preferences." (Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007 p.507). Deliberation is simultaneously based on and generative for shared understandings of the world. In consequence, a subjective approach can measure shared understandings of concepts, and give insight into the process behind them. Studying deliberation allows capturing technical and value-laden reasons, analyzing the strength of opinions and their reasoning, and analyzing when and why minds are changed. Thereby, it gives access to shared understandings and into how they are developed. This is particularly helpful to addressing the procedural challenge: The transformation of opinions can be measured and investigated.

The deliberative function of reasoning

Within this design, deliberation is used to explore subjectivity and intersubjectivity, but also to gather insight into well-reflected viewpoints. This is possible even though I use a minimal definition of deliberation for the experimental set-up of this study. In this definition, deliberation is "mutual communication that involves weighing and reflecting on preferences, values and interests regarding matters of common concern" (Mansbridge, 2015 p.27; see also

Bächtiger & Parkinson, 2019). In consequence, the main function of deliberation is engagement with reasons. The process of "weighing and reflecting" has several benefits that respond to the challenges of the field: It allows participants to explain their views and underlying values, activates a mechanism of social learning, and enables participants to more deeply reflect on their own standpoint, thereby enhancing individual autonomy. In this sub-section, I outline how this is achieved through deliberation.

Forst has called deliberation "the rule of reasons" (Forst, 2001). Deliberation means giving reasons, as well as evaluating and responding to the reasoning of others. "The point of reason-giving is to explain to others why you hold a particular position, which requires reasoning to be explicit" (Adams 2014 p.3). Thereby, a research design that encourages reason-giving allows participants to explain *why they hold the viewpoints that they do*. This explicit justification reveals priorities in determining a political position. It allows identifying which issues are most relevant to participants, and where they see cause for either worry or optimism. This delivers context and a deepened understanding of individual viewpoints, a useful methodological advantage.

In Dryzek's conception, justifications can be made on different levels: An argument can allude to policy preference as well as to underlying norms (Dryzek, 2000). By studying the content of deliberation, we thereby not just understand *preferences* but also the *normative grounds* that are their basis. This means that deliberation grants an insight into deeply rooted values and value systems, worldviews and ways of life rather than only isolated policy preferences. This is an advantage over survey instruments, and matches with the previously mentioned space for participants to express subjectivity.

The exchange of reasons, or the access one gains to others view of the world via their reasoning, deepens understanding and allows intersubjective meaning-making, or as Kanra puts it: "individuals learn how to tackle the fragmented nature of the social world in reciprocal relations with others," (Kanra 2009 p.10). By reasoning together, political questions are no longer abstract, and allow drawing on concrete social facts or histories (Benhabib 1996; Kanra 2009).

Observing participants' weighing of reasons is relevant based on the particular challenges of the field: By inspecting the boundary problem, I am asking participants to consider a moral dilemma in democratic theory. Value-laden topics can be particularly difficult to formulate arguments on (Mendelberg 2002). Given the many different aspects of the boundary problem, it is unlikely that participants will absolutely favor one or the other side, but rather good reasons can be found for different solutions. Coming up with a solution might require making scenarios explicit or defining criteria for when which solution is best. By allowing participants to invoke context and explain their reasoning, these considerations become measurable. Argumentation exercises also allow measuring the strength of opinion. The design thereby responds to the complexity of citizenship and the boundary problem.

The process of reason-giving is also relevant to deliberative democrats because they believe, and have found, the exchange of reasons to lead to changes in *quality* of opinion. This is based

on two types of inputs participants receive in the run of deliberation. Firstly, deliberators gain new information and broaden their horizons. Deliberative processes often include an input of information or expertise, which is why it is commonplace to separate the effects of information and of deliberation on political opinions (see e.g. Fishkin and Luskin 2005). Secondly, informed reasoning rests not just on insight into relevant technical information, but also into different experiences and viewpoints.

In short, the quality of opinion improves because deliberation is not just a practice of political decision-making, it is also a mechanism for social learning (Kanra 2005): "The social learning stage of deliberation is, therefore, a hermeneutic practice primarily oriented to understanding," (Kanra 2005 p.516). This is why scholars of deliberative democracy stipulate that discourse generates reflexivity (Dryzek and Pickering 2017). It allows a complex process of sense-making and consideration of political options and their consequences not just for oneself, but also for society as a whole.

In hearing the arguments of others and formulating their own views, participants are put in a position to examine their opinions more closely, to be confronted with conflicting values (Manin, Stein, and Mansbridge 1987) and, in consequence, to better align their interests with their values (Neblo 2007; Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007; Zimmermann, Heuer, and Mau 2018). Because it aligns interests with values, some argue deliberation increases participants' political autonomy (Manin, Stein, and Mansbridge 1987). Dryzek calls deliberation "a continued quest for democratic authenticity" (Dryzek 2000 p.8) – deliberation is about finding, specifying, clarifying or correcting one's own position just as much as it is about finding agreement with others.

It is important to point out that despite its focus on collective aspects (intersubjective exchange, formulating arguments so they might be understood and accepted by others, and even the common good), deliberative democrats strongly emphasize the relevance of self-interest, personal will and autonomy (J. Cohen 1997; Mansbridge et al. 2010) (Chambers 2011). Individuals have conflictual and complex sets of preferences (see also Neblo 2007; Niemeyer 2011), and these can be clarified in the process of deliberation (Manin, Stein, and Mansbridge 1987). In this sense, autonomy is social. It can be developed through the interaction with others (Warren 1992). On an individual level, people must remain free to evaluate and then accept or reject the reasonings of others (Manin, Stein, and Mansbridge 1987).

Many observations on the value of deliberation rest on this autonomy-enhancing result of reflexivity. Post-deliberative opinions have been found to be firmer, more stable (Bächtiger and Parkinson 2019), less influenced by symbolic manipulation (Bächtiger and Parkinson 2019; Niemeyer 2011), and more differentiated (Gastil and Dillard 1999). Thus, using deliberation as a method of political science will lead to "more thoughtful data" (Rothwell, Anderson, and Botkin 2015 p.2) (see also Cooke 2000; Niemeyer 2011). This is especially relevant in this investigation, given that symbolic manipulations are particularly prevalent on polarized political issues (see e.g. Niemeyer 2020) such as citizenship (Vink and Bauböck 2013). The

generation of such thoughtful data is advantageous to the outlined challenges in that it allows studying nuanced and considered opinions on citizenship in-depth.

3.2.   Implementation of the research design

As outlined above, the discursive methodological approach of this thesis exploits subjectivity and intersubjectivity. It makes use of the reflectivity-enhancing function of deliberation to gather more thoughtful data. Through the research design, I attempt to measure considered and nuanced opinions, and use the tools that deliberative democracy researchers have found suitable to this purpose. The aim is to gather thoughtful but holistic data on citizenship, to understand deliberative mechanisms in the context of foreigner voting rights, and to gather insight into participants' reasoning. In this section I detail how the research design implements this discursive approach.

The research design consists of three main elements: First, the Q-methodological survey asks participants to sort statements in order to construct their own citizenship definitions. It investigates how participants think about citizenship in abstract terms. The results of the Q-methodological survey are used to answer research question 1 on individual and collective citizenship conceptualizations among German citizens. Second, participants engage with foreigner voting rights, a policy question that invokes many conflicts connected to citizenship. They first give their position on foreigner voting rights, then participate in a treatment based on randomly allocated treatment groups, and then give their position again. The results are used to investigate whether and how deliberation transforms positions on foreigner voting rights (research question 3). Thereafter, an argumentation exercise asks all participants to list reasons in favor of and against introducing foreigner voting rights. Results are used to answer research question 2, which is aimed at better understanding participants' substantive reasoning on foreigner voting rights, and to explain potential opinion changes through deliberation.

The research design is implemented via an online exercise. Participants completed all elements in one sitting to minimize attrition. The investigation was in the field from 22nd September – 8th October 2020. Participants were recruited via an online access panel, and compensated for their participation. Overall, 294 responses included a valid response to the Q-methodological survey, and 286 participants positioned themselves on foreigner voting rights before and after treatment. Among these, 272 gave at least one reason during the argumentation exercise. The survey also captured socio-demographic and political data.

In addition, the survey was set up to receive feedback from participants. An avatar named 'Sophie' led participants through the survey and gave instructions. In addition, participants were invited to make remarks at several points in the survey within open-response fields. After completing the Q-sort, participants were asked to rate the understandability of the statements and invited to make additional comments on their sort. During the survey experiment, they

could expand upon why they changed their views. In combination, the avatar and the opportunities to make remarks were targeted at an engaging survey design that allows for encompassing ways to express viewpoints.

Investigation of citizenship concepts

The first element of the research design consists of the development of a concourse for citizenship, which is used to design and administer a Q-methodological survey. The concourse is constructed by drawing on political theories of citizenship on the one hand, and subjective perspectives on German citizenship on the other hand. In this section I explain each of these elements, and justify their role for a discursive research design: I outline, first the concept of concourse; second, the theoretical and empirical contributions to the concourse that I use; and third, the Q-methodological survey.

Within this investigation, subjective perspectives on citizenship are identified in two steps: An interpretive analysis of social media conversations on citizenship provides a first insight into subjective perspectives on citizenship. To deepen insights into meaningful conflict lines, bottom-up perspectives on citizenship are then investigated more systematically by conducting a Q-methodological survey. Q-methodology is an approach to study subjectivity in a structured and replicable format (Davis and Michelle 2011).

The concept of concourse originates with the developers of Q-methodology. It describes a universe of statements that captures different aspects and understandings of an issue. How an individual reacts to each statement will depend on experience and context just as much as on beliefs and expertise (Stephenson 1986). In this light, the term concourse is "to remind us that the concern is with conversational possibilities, not merely informational" (Stephenson 1986, p.44).

Q-methodology is centered around communication. It is based on the idea that, among the many things that people know, remember, have experienced or think on an issue, it is significant which of these things they express in conversation (Stephenson 1986). It focuses on how "forms of communication form and maintain the culture of a society – and one would add, the subjectivity of an individual" (Stephenson 1986 p.41). Communication is important in that it shapes individual and social interactions. The aspects people communicate when they talk about a concept reveals what that concept means to people; at the same time, it shapes that concept.

Ideally, a concourse covers the full universe of perspectives on a concept (Exel and Graaf 2005). I approach this as an ideal that motivates a maximum effort to not overlook viewpoints. To ensure an encompassing concourse, I draw on both theory and empirics, then cross-check its elements with previous empirical studies and conduct a pre-survey. However, I follow Sneegas in acknowledging that it is not possible to capture every single perspective, and that, rather, the results of a concourse (or a Q-methodological analysis) will always be based on partial, contingent, and situated knowledge and encounters (Sneegas 2020).

In describing the wide variety of conversations that can be had on an issue, "the concourse is the very stuff of life, from the playful banter of lovers or friends to the heady discussions of philosophers and scientists" (Nikraftar and Shokri 2014, p.362). To capture these different settings, I populate the concourse on citizenship by drawing on two sources: citizenship theory and the discourse on citizenship on Twitter. Most often, the statements of a concourse are generated based on empirical data to reflect public discourse on an issue (see e.g. Hobson and Niemeyer 2013). At the same time, many draw on theory either to develop their statements (Anderson et al. 1997), or to categorize their statements (Franchino and Zuchhini 2015). While empirical data helps draw on those issues that will most resonate with participants, and with public meaning-making as a whole, theoretical sources help focus the statements and ensure that different concepts are reflected in it (Anderson et al. 1997). Several Q-methodological studies use both theoretical and empirical sources in their concourse development (e.g. Davis and Michelle 2011; Fontein-Kuipers 2016).

Both sources contribute to an encompassing concourse that reflects how citizens talk about citizenship 'in the real world'. In selecting the sources, both mainstream and marginal viewpoints must be included, and they must be formulated in a way that is understandable and accessible to people. This requires the concourse to be rooted in knowledge or conversations of which participants are aware (Nikraftar and Shokri 2014).

The concourse should be reflective of the most distinctive conflicts on citizenship. With this in mind, citizenship theory lends a clear structure to the concourse. Citizenship theories can be seen as ideal types that have informed how politics and society are organized. It has been suggested that they can be a useful basis against which to compare real-world perspectives (Oldfield 1990). I achieve this comparison by identifying major conflict lines in citizenship theory. According to Cohen and Ghosh, outlining different citizenship models is useful because "each model serves to provide specific justifications for constructing laws regarding citizenship and for building norms around citizenship in particular contexts" (E. F. Cohen and Ghosh 2019 p.48). From this perspective, using citizenship theory ensures that the concepts historically linked to citizenship are not overlooked. A range of aspects such as rights and duties, commonality and identity, or political practice and belonging provide the basic structure of the concourse. To include them, I review the literature on citizenship theories, identify conflicts between normative approaches to citizenship, and group these conflicts into categories.

The investigation of empirical discourse on the other hand captures bottom-up, subjective perspectives. A social network, and Twitter in particular, is conducive to exploring bottom-up perspectives for two main reasons: First, on Twitter participants not only share but also make sense of and interpret information (Maireder and Ausserhofer 2014). Such meaning-making is particularly relevant for capturing subjective perspectives. In the setting of a social network, meaning-making also has an intersubjective component in that it happens in negotiation with others (Maireder and Ausserhofer 2014). It should be noted that only a select sub-group of the population engages in such meaning-making on Twitter. All the while, online activity has been shown to lead to information gains for users and non-users alike (Partheymüller and Faas 2015), meaning that there is an extent to which the common knowledge generated online is carried

into broader public debates. Second, Twitter taps into alternative discourses (Kwon et al. 2016), and offers access to a wide range of viewpoints and conversations between them (boyd 2010). The potential of Twitter to give a platform to minority voices has also been demonstrated in Germany (Berg, König, and Koster 2020). This makes it an efficient way to capture discourses and interpretations that are removed from top-down conceptions. Although Twitter does not yield a representative overview of viewpoints, it expands the concourse to a wider range of conversations on citizenship.

After the concourse is close to complete, two measures are taken to ensure that the emerging concourse resonates with survey participants. First, I cross-check the results from both sources with previous empirical research results on the mentioned topics. Findings from the last 20 years are taken into account to ensure relative relevance to questions asked today. This allows grasping previous results on bottom-up citizenship conceptions, thereby providing an additional way of making sure the concourse resonates with people. Second, a small pre-survey with 13 participants helped to gather feedback on statement formulation and select those statements that seemed most relevant to pre-study participants.

The underlying assumption of a concourse is that social facts in the form of shared knowledge and meanings shape our perceptions of the world. Q-methodology makes such knowledge empirically observable (Watts and Stenner 2014). This is particularly useful to issues of political opinion which are socially constructed and subject to meaning-making in exchange with others (Hanson and O'Dwyer 2019). Past research concludes that Q-methodological surveys can produce unexpected results that deviate from previously known definitions of a concept (Eden, Donaldson, and Walker 2005; Pelletier et al. 1999). These characteristics make it particularly suitable to the study of citizenship as a dynamic and contested concept. Additionally, the method does the complexity of citizenship justice because it allows capturing viewpoint "holistically and to a high level of qualitative detail" (Watts and Stenner 2014 p.4).

The goal of analyzing a Q-methodological survey is to identify emerging perspectives, which are composed of several items (in the form of statements). Q-methodology "is primarily concerned not with the attitudinal variables but with the attitudinal patterns within and across individuals" (Pelletier et al. 1999 p.139). While Q-methodological surveys capture individual viewpoints, the analysis emphasizes collective patterns (Pelletier et al. 1999; Watts and Stenner 2014). Concretely, this means that similar viewpoints (understood as similar response patterns across statements) are clustered. The Q-survey reflects citizenships' relational component because its goal is identifying commonalities and divergences between a group of participants.

The items which make up a Q-methodological survey (the Q-statements) are drawn from the concourse. In the survey, participants place statements on a quasi-normal distribution. The sorting process asks participants to select statements they agree or disagree with most strongly, but also to sort out those statements that are not part of their definitions (Watts and Stenner 2014). This sorting process allows meaning-making from the bottom-up: The researcher only offers a range of possible meanings, but it is the participants who use them to construct their own definitions (Anderson et al. 1997). They do this by weighing different aspects of

citizenship against each other. In this sense, the discursivity of Q-methodology mirrors the complexities of social life (Dryzek 1990). It will "allow individuals to reveal their belief systems behaviorally" (Carlin 2018 p.400), and thereby has an action-oriented component.

The design reflects the elements of the discursive approach: (inter)subjectivity and weighing reasons. In response to the methodological challenge of measuring citizenship conceptions, the discursive approach draws on subjectivity. Thereby, it allows participants to draw on identities, personal histories and notions of the self in explaining what citizenship means to them. The approach is contextual: Both the Twitter analysis and the Q-methodological study do not yield representative results, and are contingent on the place and time of the investigation. However, they are rich in terms of complexity and the weighing of different perspectives. Finally, the approach draws on reflexivity in that it is action-invoking. Participants themselves make meaning of concepts, build their own definitions and are able to react in nuanced ways.

Investigations of deliberation on foreigner voting rights

After investigating abstract citizenship conceptualizations, the investigation focuses on a concrete policy proposal. This deepens the previous investigation because it uses a concrete example to reflect on the relatively abstract concept of citizenship. The idea of granting non-citizen residents voting rights mobilizes many conflicts surrounding citizenship (such as belonging, commonality, economic contributions, loyalty, rights and responsibilities; see also Chapter 4). In this design, participants are asked to engage with a proposal that grants non-citizens encompassing political rights after five years of residence, which is also the regular residence requirement for naturalization in Germany.

The research design analyzes opinion change, quality of opinion and substantive reasons. It uses an online argumentation exercise to analyze whether and how opinions on citizenship change when people deliberate on them. First, a pre-post survey allows a causal analysis of opinion change through deliberation. Second, participants list reasons in favor of and against introducing foreigner voting rights. This allows a causal analysis of the quality of opinions, and a qualitative analysis of substantive reasons. With this design, the proposal also explores deliberation online, a growing field of research (see end of this chapter for an exploration of the advantages and benefits of a virtual design on deliberation).

Classical theories of deliberative democracy see consensus as a necessary outcome of deliberation. Pluralist contributions especially have advocated that deliberation can also fulfill deliberative norms when it results in disagreement. For example, deliberation might lead to the clarification of conflict, and re-enforce participants' perceptions of their own positions in such a conflict (Mansbridge et al. 2010; Martí 2017). In line with this, the idea behind this research design is that the minimal deliberative set-up can lead to good deliberation, and that good deliberation, in turn, can lead to consensus or clarification. In short, I do assume that good deliberation can produce either, consensus or clarification.

To implement the survey experiment, participants are assigned randomly to three groups, an information-deliberation group, an information-only group and a true control group. The information-deliberation group receives information and then deliberates on the proposal, the information-only group receives the same information but does not deliberate, and the true control group receives only a placebo treatment. This setup allows disentangling information from deliberation effects (Esterling 2011) through a separate measurement of information gains, i.e. the closer insight into the policy, and deliberation, i.e. the active discussion of the policy. A similar deliberative design has been used previously to investigate considered opinion on democratic preferences (Goldberg, Wyss, and Bächtiger 2020).

Within the deliberative treatment participants deliberate only on a small scale and in a highly controlled context: They engage with two threads of arguments which are manipulated to look like arguments by other participants. To achieve this, each argument from the information treatment is rephrased into colloquial language or applied to an example. A counter-argument to each of these arguments is formulated, again based on the information treatment. In the experimental design, the argument and counter-argument are presented as a conversation between other participants. Participants are given the information that their response can be displayed for other participants in the same way (though this is not actually done)[2]. The main idea behind this design is twofold: First, it allows a highly controlled setting for the core deliberative function of engaging with reasons. Second, it gives participants the impression that they are in conversation with others, and thereby activates intersubjective thinking.

The concept behind this experimental design allows deliberating participants to express subjectively held perspectives, and to think about the intersubjective component of citizenship. Reasoning with others (who potentially think differently) gives participants an additional format in which to think about citizenship. This is because collective reasoning and decision-making is also a component of citizenship. Within the mock deliberative space, participants practice this component of citizenship, and can thus think about potential preconditions for collective decision-making in a more action-oriented way. The goal of the deliberative treatment is thus targeted at participants further developing their own position through their practical engagement with reasons.

Kuyper categorizes the instrumental benefits of deliberation into three levels: By and large, micro results constitute individual level effects, meso results aggregate effects on the group level, and macro results effects on democratic systems (Kuyper 2018). In the study of deliberation, micro-level results have mainly been analyzed in terms of opinion formation and opinion change (Fishkin and Luskin 2005). But how exactly people deliberate – what they say, to whom, and when – has been subject to less investigation. Though some analyses have ventured more deeply into argumentation, for example by analyzing deliberative or epistemic quality (Steenbergen et al. 2003), understanding what kind of arguments actually change minds (Gerber et al. 2014), or differentiating the types of opinion change through deliberation (Jackman and Sniderman 2006), Kuyper maintains that the exact mechanisms of deliberation

---

[2] Participants were however offered the opportunity to request that all arguments made within the mock deliberative forum sent to them via e-mail.

deserve a closer investigation, given that "it is unclear what aspect of deliberation is doing the causal work" (Kuyper 2018 p.7). In this context, a specific concern is that substantive rationales have received too little attention in deliberative research.

This research design places a stronger emphasis on what is said in the process of deliberation, in order to open up the 'black box' of deliberative opinion change. To gain deeper insight into why deliberating participants experience opinion shifts, substantive arguments are analyzed. The arguments made in favor of and against voting rights are subjected to qualitative analysis.

3.3.   Limitations of the research design

The presented research design has multiple advantages, which I have outlined in the beginning of this chapter and throughout the text. Naturally, the design also has some limitations. Q-methodological surveys are not representative; results can only depict an individual's perspective in the context of the specific time and situation of the investigation. Additionally, this Q-methodological survey is unique in two aspects. First, only a few Q-methodological studies (e.g. Pelletier et al. 1999) have worked with a large number of participants before. A large number of participants leads to inflated Eigenvalues (Zabala, Sandbrook, and Mukherjee 2018), so these were not used for choosing a fitting number of factors. Additionally, quite many of the participants' Q-sorts did not loading significantly onto any of the identified factors. This means they cannot be clearly allocated to one of the presented citizenship conceptualizations. Thus, it is possible that there are further conceptions of citizenship or further complexities that were not fully captured in this investigation.

Second, many scholars conduct Q-methodological surveys face-to-face to gather an impression of how participants engage with and explain their sorting process. This insight was limited in the presented study. However, 50,0% of participants rated the statements as very understandable, and 49,3% as partially understandable. When asked to comment on their sort, a small number of participants said they found the survey a good way to communicate their perspective on citizenship. Some said they had to read statements several times or think about them to form an opinion, especially since some statements offered room for different interpretations. The majority however did not comment on their sort.

For the deliberative exercise, this research design uses a minimal definition of deliberation (see Chapter 2). Keeping the deliberative treatment minimal (with participants only being asked to reflect on and react to pre-scripted comments) allows testing the effects of deliberative engagement in a clean way. In standard deliberative settings, the iterated nature of a communication process may produce dynamics that violate the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) and impair our ability to draw causal inferences (see Esterling 2018). By the same token, the fixed setup (involving full balance of pro and con arguments) also suppresses undesired group dynamics, a problem that can occur in some deliberative formats (such as 'free' discussion with no facilitation and no deliberative norms) (Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014).

Additionally, the research design bears the advantages and disadvantages typical for online deliberation. It is seen as an advantage that anonymity in online designs (which is applied here) suppresses social dynamics and cue-taking (Asenbaum 2018; Esterling 2018), thereby leading to a more egalitarian discussion (Zhang, Cao, and Ngoc 2013). This is also in line with findings according to which online environments make people more comfortable to provide their true opinions and express disagreement (Zhang, Cao, and Ngoc 2013). In addition, formulating ideas is potentially facilitated by asking participants to put them into writing (Price 2009). The drawback is, of course, that the virtual setup does not represent a fully-fledged deliberative setting where participants engage in an extended and dynamic process of a "give-and-take" of reason (Tanasoca 2020). Nonetheless, our setup fulfils minimal deliberative requirements (Mansbridge 2015). However, recent thinking in deliberative theory (see e.g. Bächtiger and Parkinson 2019) does not make the dynamic aspect a *necessary* condition for the deliberative engagement.

Generally, I should note that I take a relatively careful first attempt at a discursive methodology. In this design, I combine innovative discursive methods with established traditional ones. This is a useful first step because it demonstrates the effectiveness of discursive methods, and their versatility. However, it is imaginable to extend the discursive methodology by implementing similar investigations with greater scope, both for the investigation of citizenship and for using deliberation as a method.

The bottom-up investigation on citizenship draws on citizens' meaning making using the social media analysis and the Q-methodological survey. However, it could be expanded by discussing Q-methodological statements in qualitative interviews, allowing participants to make comments throughout their Q-methodological survey, or even using innovative designs that allow participants to engage with a Q-methodological design in a group within a workshop setting (see e.g. Yoshizawa et al. 2016)

The online deliberative exercise, too, was relatively limited in scope. Within a larger project, participants could have deliberated on foreigner voting rights not just for one session but for a longer duration of time, and with a larger set of arguments or sub-aspects of the problem. Such a design could also be expanded for an asynchronous deliberative online forum, in which participants engage with each other's arguments rather than artificial ones.

This outlook in itself already demonstrates the potential behind the methodology presented here. Despite its limitations, the research design presents a unique combination of methods, some of them innovative and others traditional. The research design thus contributes in substance to political theory, to empirical results on citizenship and deliberation, and to insights into methods of political science.

3.4. Chapter summary: the benefits of the methodological approach

Within this thesis, I respond to the outlined methodological, theoretical and procedural challenges by using a discursive methodological approach. The approach is discursive because it uses deliberation as a method, and adds other discursive design elements, namely a social media analysis, a Q-methodological survey and an engaging overall survey design that gives space to participants' comments.

The design is built on subjectivity and intersubjectivity, both of which are activated within a deliberative setting: Participants express their perspectives and engage with those of others. A minimal deliberative design focuses on reasoning, and the reflection that reasoning induces. I argue that when deliberation is implemented in a minimal design, and largely based on a simulated conversation, it still allows gathering thoughtful data. This is because participants gain new information, access different perspectives, and deeply reflect (and potentially revise or clarify) their own view.

In summary, the discursive design is paramount to responding to the research questions of this thesis within the context of the outlined challenges. The concourse and Q-methodological survey encompass a holistic analysis of participants' views on citizenship. The concourse captures the breadth of conversations about citizenship both in political theory and in an online space, thereby providing for an overview of perspectives in both theoretical and empirical terms. Subsequently, the Q-methodological survey addresses research question 1 which asks about citizens' perspectives on citizenship. It responds to the methodological challenge of the thesis because it allows measuring citizenship in a way that is encompassing and subjective.

The deliberative pre-post design makes use of subjectivity and invokes context because it asks a deliberating treatment group to formulate their own arguments on foreigner voting rights. It exploits the reflexivity- and autonomy-enhancing functions of deliberation. Both an information- and a deliberation-information group gain access to different perspectives on the issue by reading arguments. Deliberating participants additionally must reflect on their own position when engaging in an argumentative exchange. Thereby, participants gain a better understanding of the topic, weigh reasons and more closely consider their own position and its underlying preferences and norms. Analyzing this process allows responding to the procedural challenge by studying deliberative opinion change (research question 3).

The second research question investigated in this chapter asks how citizens themselves reckon with the boundary problem of political theory. Investigating this question makes a contribution to the theoretical challenge of this thesis. It provides an analysis of where citizens themselves stand on the boundary problem, and indicates what results might be expected from those designs that have suggested 'settling' the boundary problem within a deliberative design.

The design used to investigate citizens' substantive reasoning on the boundary problem invokes subjectivity and context using reasons: Participants provide pro and contra reasons from their own perspectives, and these are then subjected to qualitative analysis. The design invokes reflexivity because it asks participants to reflect on their motivation for rejecting or endorsing foreigner voting rights as well as underlying contexts or values. It actively invites participants to consider both the pro and the contra side, thereby also providing a measure of opinion ambivalence.

# 4.	What does citizenship mean to Germans today? Investigating citizenship perspectives from the bottom up[3]

Citizenship is a core concept of democratic theory. Its conceptualization and its practice impact how and by whom political decisions are made, determine democratic institutions and outline governance and societal relationships. Among political scientists, citizenship has always been understood to be contested and dynamic: "Citizenship (…) is never finished" (Clarke et al. 2014). However, the controversial debate on what citizenship entails, and why and when it should (or should not) matter mostly stays in the realm of democratic theorists, and is rarely subject to investigations with citizens themselves. Allowing citizens to carefully weigh different aspects of citizenship against each other, and to evaluate the potential future forms of citizenship can make an enriching contribution to our understanding of the corresponding debates in democratic theory.

Investigating perspectives on a wide range of citizenship aspects provides insight into which (potentially contradictory) convictions matter most to citizens, which are most accessible, and how the different aspects fit together into holistic subjective perspectives. The methodological challenge of this thesis clarified that this comes with inherent challenges. Perspectives on citizenship are likely to rest on priorities about a range of complex issues from immigration to participation. Additionally, citizenship is deeply entangled with notions of identity and belonging. To understand what people make of citizenship, we not only need to understand opinions on a range of issues and their prioritization. We also need to understand how the self is situated and constructed within these issues.

In this chapter, I measure perspectives on citizenship from the bottom up. It investigates the first research question of the thesis: How do German citizens conceptualize citizenship? The approach to answering this question reflects the discursive approach of the thesis. It assumes that citizenship conceptions are complex and multifaceted, and that there are both commonalities and conflicts between different conceptions. Citizens are seen as competent at reflecting on and re-iterating philosophical concepts. This does not exclude that they (much like political theorists) have views that are ambiguous. The approach values both reducing complexity to identify disagreement and inspecting the complexities of subjectivity. It uses Q-methodology as a 'middle path' that combines advantages from quantitative and qualitative research into citizenship conceptions.

---

[3] Note: Many contents of this chapter are based on an article published in Political Research Exchange (Maier, 2020)

The chapter proceeds as follows: First, to contextualize the findings I begin with a short introduction to citizenship policy and conceptions in the country case, Germany. Then, I construct a concourse on German citizenship. The concourse draws from systematized political theoretical ideas on citizenship, and a discursive analysis of citizenship in Germany via Twitter. It serves as a basis for the second analytical part of the chapter, a Q-methodological survey which I conducted with a sample of 300 German citizens. The analysis of the Q-methodological survey leads to four perspectives on citizenship: critical ethnoculturalists, active democrats, liberal democrats and cosmopolitans. Because they are based on the concourse, these perspectives represent encompassing yet differentiated conceptualizations of how citizenship can be understood. Socio-demographic and political profiles for each perspective give further insight into who holds which view. The Q-methodological results are then mapped onto positions on national identity in order to qualify what Q-methodology adds to existing measures. Lastly, a discussion evaluates the most distinct commonalities and conflicts between perspectives before I summarize the chapter.

4.1. Germany as a country case: German citizenship under transformation

I examine citizenship in the context of Germany. This country case is a fascinating example of how citizenship is indeed dynamic and contested – and how its perceptions can change over time. Based on its history and development of national citizenship, Germany was long designated a country where nationhood was viewed as "particularist, organic, differentialist and Volk-centred" (Brubaker 1992 p.386). Because the German nation is constituted through the combination of several federal states, with a long history of shifting boundaries, ethnocultural aspects were seen as being in tension with political aspects of citizenship (Brubaker 1992). Since the 1990s, German citizenship has undergone several legal and discursive transformations, culminating in the present citizenship regime that is slightly more liberal but remains restrictive. The further liberalization of citizenship is on the agenda of the new government coalition that entered office in December 2021.

After long and highly politicized discussions, a large-scale citizenship reform facilitated access to German citizenship in 2000, which many observers viewed as a move towards a more civic conception of German citizenship (Howard 2009). Reforms included lowering the residency requirement, introducing birthright citizenship (for children of at least one parent with an eight-year residence and unlimited residence permission), and the reduction of fees for naturalization. Though dual citizenship was made possible in a limited number of cases, the original proposal's introduction of full-scale dual citizenship failed politically due to opposition by the conservative party (Hoffmann 2004).

This contested path of opening German citizenship can be paralleled to Germany's immigration history. When immigration increased during the recruitment of so-called guest-workers in the 1960s, Germany's immigration policy was one of cultural separation: It did not give guest

workers rights or prospects of naturalization, and made no demands of cultural assimilation (Brubaker 2001; Koopmans et al. 2005). Instead, education in homeland languages or religions was offered (Schmidtke 2021). In line with this, German governments negated Germany being an "immigration country" until the mid 1990s. Central immigration policies were missing until the introduction of an Immigration Law in 2005, which institutionalized measures like language education for migrants (Schmidtke 2021; Zimmermann, Constant, and Gataullina 2009). Despite the reforms on immigration and citizenship, naturalizations rates remained well under the expected numbers (Zimmermann, Constant, and Gataullina 2009). A central strategic approach and resources to genuinely encourage naturalizations remained missing. Instead, federal states continue to take vastly different approaches to integration (i.e. in seeing immigration as an individual responsibility of the migrant versus seeing it as a political responsibility) and this, in turn, is reflected in different naturalization rates per federal state (Schmidtke 2021).

It should be noted that shortly after liberalizing naturalization requirements, Germany introduced a language and culture test as a prerequisite to naturalization. The effect on naturalization rates was negative, in particular for those with lower education, the elderly, women, and refugees (van Oers 2020). Studies show that higher educated, non-Muslim and younger immigrants are more likely to naturalize – although willingness to naturalize is equally high among lower educated and Muslim immigrants (Zimmermann, Constant, and Gataullina 2009). This means that naturalization opportunities are unequally distributed for migrants, depending on personal profile and place of residence. These hesitant policies are also relevant because "administrative practice can act as a 'signaling' function that can reshape immigrants' underlying interests and social identity." (Huddleston 2020 p.16) Germany's immigration policy may fundamentally have impacted the public understanding of immigrants, and immigrants' self-understanding in German society.

Additionally, the hesitancy to self-define as an immigration country and adopt an immigration strategy may remain present in public discourse and attitudes, leading to a complex understanding of living together in Germany still today. This is demonstrated for example in the so-called lead culture debate which first arose as a response to citizenship liberalization. The lead culture requirement can be seen as an electoral counterstrategy to naturalization liberalization: Pautz interprets the origins of the debate to rest on the concept of an essentialist and static culture, including the demand that cultures should not intermingle. In the 2000s, different definitions of lead culture emerged, some more demanding of migrants and more conservative, others more oriented towards constitutional patriotism[4]; all definitions however share that they cast cultural commonality as a requirement for common citizenship (Pautz 2005). The term lead culture made a comeback in the debate during the large refugee influx to Germany in 2015, which led to a renewed debate on the extent and content of commonality expected from immigrants, with vastly different perspectives (Abadi et al. 2016; Joppke 2018). This demonstrates what Wasmer means when she describes German debate and public opinion on multiculturalism as ambiguous and conflictual (Wasmer and Koch 2000).

---

[4] Constitutional patriotism is the idea that loyalty and common ground between citizens in a liberal democracy can be generated through a shared commitment to constitutional principles (see e.g. Fine and Smith 2003).

Next to the complex developments on citizenship policy and multiculturalism, Germany is also an especially interesting case due to changes in national pride and perceptions of national identity. A seminal analysis by Miller-Idriss finds that Germans have an inherently complex relationship with pride: It is often allocated to specific institutions or achievements of the country, or rejected altogether (Miller-Idriss and Rothenberg 2012). The experiences of the Holocaust and its aftermath – including its role in political education in Germany – make for a distanced relationships of most Germans towards notions of national pride, a so-called 'muted national pride' (Buck and Geissel 2009; Moffitt, Juang, and Syed 2018). In consequence, Miller-Idriss finds that many of her German interview partners in the beginning of the 2000s either relied on racial queues when defining who is and is not German, or separated citizenship status from ethnic German-ness (Miller-Idriss 2006). This demonstrates that political and ethnic aspects of citizenship remain in tension.

This somewhat unique relationship with national pride makes it all the more challenging to study German national identity. Political scientists now largely recommend using a different terminology to measure national pride in Germany (e.g. by using language that avoids the word pride, such as 'I love Germany' (see e.g. Foroutan et al. 2014)). However, the notion of 'muted national pride' also adds layers of complexity to the study of migration in Germany: The integration and allegiance of immigrants is requested within this very specific frame of muted national pride. This makes it all the more difficult to understand the exact content of demands towards immigrants (Moffitt, Juang, and Syed 2018). Meanwhile, more recent studies have shown that the early 2000s saw a new and growing self-confidence with German national pride demonstrated for example in the increased use of national symbols, in particular the German flag, as well as geopolitical developments such as a more prominent, self-confident and even leadership role of Germany in international politics (Mader 2016).

This means Germany makes for a unique and dynamic case study: There are many existing complexities reflected in citizenship law, the country's approach towards migration, multiculturalism and integration, and its specific relationship with national pride. Additionally, these existing complexities have shifted and continue to shift rapidly, making a renewed and deepened study all the more relevant. On top of the specificities of the German case, national citizenship overall is subject to a range of transformations. Globalization and re-nationalization, changing formal and substantive access to citizenship, and questions around the fundamental fairness and equality underlying the concept of a global order of nation states impacts how individuals feel about citizenship today (see also Chapter 1).

4.2. Constructing a concourse on citizenship

Constructing a concourse on citizenship is the first step of this research project towards understanding what citizenship means in Germany today in a wide array of variations and terms. The focus is on how citizens, not scientists, understand the concept. Sullivan and colleagues

formulate that the goal of Q-methodology is "to establish the conceptual and cognitive boundaries within which patriotism can be said to be meaningfully understood" (Sullivan et al 2015 p.206). The idea is to define the scope of what citizenship means by understanding the different ways citizenship is made sense of, and to systematize where perspectives align and where they differ.

To populate the concourse, I draw on theory and empirics, the combination of which ensures that the concourse is well structured, covers relevant concepts, and resonates with subjective views (for a full justification of the sources, see Chapter 3). There are three steps to constructing the concourse on citizenship: First, I identify conflict lines in citizenship theory. I group those conflict lines into overarching categories. Second, I conduct a social media analysis on German-speaking tweets on citizenship. And third, I ensure that the aspects collected using the theoretical and empirical investigations will actually resonate with people. To do so, I cross-check their content with the results of previous empirical analyses and conduct a pre-study.

Literature review: theoretical conflict lines on citizenship

In a first step, the literature review identifies formative conflict lines in citizenship theory. I review the literature on citizenship theories, identify conflicts between normative approaches to citizenship, and group these conflicts into categories. To achieve this, I draw on citizenship theories from classic liberalism, liberal multiculturalism, republicanism, communitarianism, cosmopolitanism, and multiculturalism. Each of these theoretical approaches is encompassing and complex. Even though different citizenship theories often have overlaps between them, outlining different citizenship models remains useful because "each model serves to provide some specific justifications for constructing laws regarding citizenship and for building norms around citizenship in particular contexts" (Cohen and Ghosh 2019 p.48) Focusing on the most relevant conflicts between theories thereby clarifies the conversations that they imply.

For example, consider the abovementioned example of defining a German lead culture. A lead culture rests on the idea that citizenship requires citizens to have something in common. Commonality has a thin definition in liberalism, where citizens must only share their subscription to common laws. Republican or communitarian approaches have a much thicker definition that includes common political activity, ways of thinking, or socialization (Taylor 1994). These theoretical approaches define different extents, but also different types of commonalities. How commonality is defined depends on the extent to which culture forms part of citizenship theories, and on whether these theories understand identity as static or fluid, and as socially or individually construed (Kalu 2003). In turn, understandings of identity and culture are relevant to how theories define the content and application of justice to individuals and communities across the world (Tully 2014). The conflicts that emerge from these approaches are summarized below under the categories 'universal vs. relative justice', 'global and informal justice', 'basis of common life', and 'culture and identity'.

There is a wide range of further core political questions for which normative ideas on citizenship are relevant. Chapter 5 will outline a further example by showing how different

citizenship theories might lead to different solutions to the boundary problem. This shows that conflicts between citizenship theories are meaningful to a wide range of issues. The conflict lines highlight where theoretical conceptions define citizenship in fundamentally different ways. In reviewing a wide range of literature on the abovementioned theories, I identify the following conflict lines in eight categories:

Universal vs. relative justice: Universal conceptions of justice understand a set of liberal rights to be applicable always and all over the world. Relative justice conceptions take justice to be dependent on factors like regional context, substantive equality for minority groups, and popular opinion (see e.g. Forst 1996; Kiwan 2012; Kymlicka 1995; Lister 1997; Sandel 1999; Tully 2014; Turner 1993).

Global and informal justice: Justice conceptions might advocate for a judicial space beyond the nation-state (see e.g. Carter, 2006; Tully, 2000). Alternatively, they may rely more heavily on social control and practice than on formalized justice (see e.g. Etzioni 2014).

Socio-economic equality: All approaches understand financial equality as relevant to overall equality between citizens, though different citizenship conceptions define different goals of financial equality (e.g. equal participation (see e.g. Lovett 2010) or individual liberty (see e.g. Marshall 1950)). This implies different extents to which financial equality should be accomplished (see e.g. Jayasuriya 2005).

Non-intervention and non-domination: Liberal citizenship conceptions focus on individual freedom which is achieved through minimal state intervention (see e.g. Zuckert 2007). Republican conceptions focus on the freedom of citizens from each other, with the aim of no citizen dominating another (or having the opportunity to) (see e.g. Grégoire 2014; Pettit 2013).

Individual and societal interests: Liberal citizenship conceptions prioritize the individual and its needs (see e.g. Silva 2012; Wallace 1999), while republican approaches prioritize societal needs (see e.g. Dagger 2002; Pettit 2013). Approaches differ in the extent to which individual pursuits should be limited by societal decisions.

Obligation: While civic obligation is an important virtue and requirement for good democracy in republicanism and communitarianism (see e.g. Arendt 1958; Reiner 2011; Selznick 1995), obligations are minimal and civic participation optional in liberal approaches (see e.g. Galston 2002; Kühler and Jelinek 2010).

Basis of common life: While liberal approaches see endorsing basic laws as the only commonality that citizens share, with individuals pursuing their own and plural ideas of the good life (see e.g. Erez 2017), republican and communitarian approaches aim for a more substantive common ground on which citizens agree to build their lives (see e.g. Thompson 2017). Multicultural approaches endorse commonality through common political practice (see e.g. Parekh 2016; Taylor 1994).

Culture and identity: While identity is fluid and culture multifaceted for some conceptions of citizenship, identity and culture are seen as static in others (see e.g. Kalu 2003; Stevenson 1997, 2003). Conceptions differ in terms of the extent to which they

view a common culture as relevant for individual identity and common citizenship (see e.g. Forst 1996; Kymlicka 1995; Selznick 1995).

Table 2: Conflict lines in citizenship theory

Category	Conflict Lines	Main sources
Rights and Justice	Universal justice vs. relative justice	Forst 1996, Kiwan 2012, Kymlicka 1995, Lister 1997, Sandel 1999, Tully 2014, Turner 1993
	Global and informal justice	Carter 2006, Etzioni 2014, Tully 2014
Social and Financial Justice	Socio-economic equality	Lovett 2010, Marshall 1950, Jayasuriya 2005
Individual and Social Freedom	Non-intervention and non-domination	Zuckert 2007, Pettit 2013, Grégoire 2014
	Individual and societal interests	Dagger 2002, Pettit 2013, Silva 2012, Wallace 1999
Obligation and Participation	Obligation	Arendt 1958, Galston 2002, Kühler & Jelinek 2010, Reiner 2011, Selznick 1995, Taylor 1994
Culture and Identity	Basis of common life	Erez 2017, Parekh 2016, Taylor 1994, Thompson 2017
	Identity and culture	Kalu 2003, Kymlicka 1995, Forst 1996, Selznick 1995, Stevenson 1997, Stevenson 2003

Interpretive social media analysis using Twitter: empirical conflict lines on citizenship

In a second step, I conduct a discourse analysis on Twitter to identify conflict lines between subjective perspectives on citizenship. Tweets were downloaded weekly with the help of the Twitter API between March 9th and May 10th, 2020. Each weekly download consisted of the 10,000 most recent tweets that mentioned one of a range of keywords. The search was based on eight keywords, including misspellings. While the keyword definition is informed by the conflict lines from theory, I make a conscious attempt to understand how people themselves shape discussions around citizenship. To achieve this, the list of keywords consists of general terms around citizenship, policy areas that mobilize thoughts on citizenship, and two concrete policy proposals from German public debate which can be tied to citizenship. Keywords on general terms around citizenship are *citizenship* and *civic obligation*. Selected policy areas that invoke contestation on citizenship are *immigration*, *integration*, *asylum*, and *refugees*. Two current debates with public traction in Germany are used as keywords: *lead culture* and *compulsory year of service*[5].

---

[5] In 2020, a widely debated proposal to strengthen social cohesion was introducing a compulsory year of service for the community for all Germans when they turn 18 (see e.g. Braw 2020).

The search based on those eight keywords led to a total of 104.759 downloaded tweets (without duplicates). Tweets were filtered based on their relevance to citizenship. This resulted in a total of 1.160 tweets subject to content analysis using a data close reading approach to social media as proposed by Gerbaudo. It is based on close reading typical to interpretive text analysis, amended to suit the particularities of social media conversations (Gerbaudo 2016). By reading the data in three steps, different layers of meaning are uncovered: first, the topics and language used in the tweet itself; second the context or concrete conversation in which the tweet was sent; third, the broader environment of the discussion on social media. All of these are relevant for understanding a tweet and identifying the conflicts at stake (Gerbaudo 2016). Initially, I read tweets as rows, each devoid of context, to identify topics broadly. Then, tweets were put into the context of conversations by exploring attached links or responses. Finally, I looked at the broader context of the tweets by exploring political events around the time (for example, a regional election in the federal state of Bavaria or the onset of the coronavirus pandemic).

Table 3: Conflict lines from social media analysis on Twitter

Category	Conflict Lines	No. Tweets
Justice Concepts	Citizenship as a purely legal status	36
	Universal and unconditional rights (also to citizenship)	35
	Relative justice	10
	European and global justice	54
Equality	Immigration as an economic threat	71
	(Good) citizenship is tied to economic and financial criteria and contributions	61
Liberal Citizenship	Controlling function of citizens towards government	73
	Ideas of an autonomous and competent citizen	32
	Against thick obligation	30
	Liberal pluralism	22
Obligation and Participation	Citizenship as social engagement and (common) civic practice	88
	Civic obligation to ensure all follow laws, immigration as a security risk	92
	Political participation as an obligation	47
	Differentiated responsibilities	12
Cultural Conditionality	Protection of German culture and tradition	88
	Citizenship requires loyalty to Germany (only)	49
	Citizenship should be tied to ethnicity (for most citizens)/ nationality and citizenship are different	25
Global and Multicultural Citizenship	Geographic idea of common life and citizenship, Germany as an immigration country requires expansion of belonging	33
	Against lead culture/ in favor of multiculturalism	31
	EU or global citizenship and cosmopolitan culture	34
	Against nationalism, discussing patriotism	52

Based on the close reading of the data, 965 tweets were grouped by relevant conflict lines on citizenship. Those categories can be summarized as follows[6]:

Justice concepts: Tweets emphasize the universal and unconditional nature of human rights. Many references Germany's special responsibility for upholding human rights as a consequence of Nazism. There are many definitions of citizenship as an unconditional and legal status. At the same time, some tweets demand a stronger orientation of German legislation towards public opinion, or for the law to reflect national culture more strongly, thereby invoking concepts of relative justice. Many tweets demand more EU-level policy solutions or global schemes of justice. This is often combined with the idea that national citizenship is fundamentally unfair.

Equality: Many tweets emphasize an economic conditionality for citizenship. This includes tweets that connect citizenship to taking care of oneself and paying taxes – regardless of where one lives or works. Economic factors are often connected to viewing migration as a financial threat to the nation. Tweets range from migrants exploiting social welfare systems to demanding that migration criteria be based on job prospects or finances.

Liberal citizenship: Tweets define the role of the citizen as being critical of government action, and being able to think for oneself. Thick civic duties are opposed, often on the grounds of individual autonomy or limiting state intervention. At the same time, ideas from liberal pluralism are invoked, such as the obligation to tolerate different views or to protect basic democratic freedoms.

Obligation and participation: Many tweets endorse civic obligation in connection to two types of activity: First, obligation is connected to participation in elections through voting or volunteering as an election official. Second, obligation is tied to broad civil engagement, like everyday acts of helping others, volunteering, or speaking out against hatred. Other tweets frame obligation more authoritatively: They invoke an obligation to follow the law (and even commands) and to take action when others break it. Some understand keeping public order as a specifically German duty. Other tweets advocate for differentiated civic responsibilities based on individual capacities or economic status.

Cultural conditionality: Tweets put a common culture, or a lead culture at the center of their citizenship definitions, and advocate the protection of German culture. In this context, they often demand the integration or assimilation of migrants and interpret German culture as Christian. Some connect citizenship to loyalty, often in the context of rejecting multiple citizenships. There is quite a broad discussion between tweets about the degree to which citizenship and nationality are separate or whether they should be (more) congruent.

Global and multicultural citizenship: Tweets understand citizenship as geographical belonging, often pointing out that non-nationals already partake in and contribute to the German state. They emphasize European or multicultural values. Citizenship and

---

[6] See Appendix 1 for a more elaborate summary table on the tweets collected, their content, and the quantity of tweets on each conflict line.

national identity both are seen as open and dynamic; the concept of a unitary lead culture is criticized. Tweets discuss the difference between nationalism and patriotism, sometimes endorsing patriotism.

Ensuring an encompassing concourse

The two components of the concourse – citizenship theory and subjective perspectives on citizenship on Twitter – demonstrate quite some overlaps. Before finalizing the concourse, one last investigation compares the results from this analysis with findings from empirical studies about individual perspectives on the six sub-aspects of citizenship. This is meant to determine which points might be especially relevant because they have also come up in previous research. When constructing the concourse, this provides guidance in determining which aspects should be included, and which should not. This review also situates the concourse in existing research.

Because individual understandings might change over time and with shifting discourses (Watts and Stenner 2014), I focus on relatively recent results from the last 15 years which analyze perspectives in Germany. I attempt to find empirical results for each of the six sub-aspects on citizenship; however, there are hardly empirical investigations of individuals' views on rights and justice, or of individual and social freedom.

In terms of social and financial justice, previous investigations demonstrate that economic conditions are important to understandings of German citizenship. Financial independence (especially from the state) is an often-invoked criterion for good citizenship (Buck and Geissel 2009; Miller-Idriss 2006), and evaluations of migrants are heavily impacted by whether or not they have a job or employment prospects (Czymara and Schmidt-Catran 2016). This indicates that financial or economic factors should play a role in the concourse.

For the dimension on participation and civic obligation, previous empirical results point towards Germans preferring representative models of democracy, with some deliberative elements for very specific policy areas (Goldberg, Wyss, and Bächtiger 2020; Weisskircher and Hutter 2019), indicating that strongly participatory or direct democratic solutions might not resonate. All the while, voluntary engagement in Germany has constantly risen over the past years, with the largest group of volunteers being active in sports clubs (Forsa/ SAS 2013), so that active engagement that is not necessarily political but targeted at social interactions seems important. These differences make it interesting for the concourse to display different kinds of (social or political) engagement and their relevance to citizenship.

There are relatively rich empirical studies on conceptions of culture and identity in Germany, especially in connection with immigration. In terms of culture or national identity, empirical investigations show that citizenship perceptions based on ancestry remain widespread in Germany (Lindstam, Mader, and Schoen 2019; Mäs, Mühler, and Opp 2005) – sometimes also in implicit or unconscious terms (Miller-Idriss 2006; Moffitt, Juang, and Syed 2018). Solidarity is often based on common culture (Wallaschek 2020). Results have also found ambiguous preferences on accommodations for the largest religious minority in Germany, Muslims

(Foroutan et al. 2014). This makes it relevant for the concourse to focus on the different meanings of cultural commonalities for citizenship.

As already mentioned, measuring German national pride is particularly complicated. Investigations focus on happiness with life or democracy in Germany instead (Buck and Geissel 2009; Miller-Idriss and Rothenberg 2012). Those that ask about love for Germany (rather than pride) find relatively high confirmation by German citizens (85%) (Foroutan et al. 2014). Additionally, some Germans perceive the limitations to expressing national pride to be to the detriment of social cohesion (Juhász and Abold 2007). These results indicate that some notion of pride seems relevant to citizenship conceptions, but the concourse should frame it accordingly.

Research demonstrates that in particular Germans with a migration background hold complex notions of belonging, often choosing not to identify as Germans, identifying with their city instead, or conceptualizing citizenship in more pragmatic and less emotional terms in order to be able to combine it with multiple identities (Goel 2006; Merten 2013; Miller-Idriss 2006). Based on these results, it would be relevant for the concourse to understand in how far belonging is even conceptualized based on citizenship status, and whether geographical presence matters as well.

4.3. Result 1: A Concourse on German citizenship in 2020

In the last step, I draw on the identified conflict lines from citizenship theory and the Twitter discourse to construct the final concourse. Conflict lines from citizenship theory provide the basic structure for the concourse. Then, results from the analysis of conversations about citizenship on Twitter are sorted along the conflict lines identified in theoretical approaches. Previous empirical results serve as guidance in selecting relevant conflicts and formulations. I group the conflict lines into five categories for the overall concourse.

Most of the conflict lines identified in normative definitions are reflected in those which appear in the Twitter discourse. Tweets include statements on the universal or unconditional nature of citizenship (rights and justice), on the extent of loyalty or commitment required to become a citizen (culture and identity), and on the importance of practice (obligation and participation) or financial contribution to the state (social and financial justice). Only the normative conflict between non-domination and non-intervention is added to the concourse without having been found in the Twitter conversations. Table 4 displays the categories and conflict lines of the concourse on citizenship.

This is not to say that this is the only possible categorization. In the end, the categories represent one way of structuring the concourse. The main variables of the concourse remain the conflict lines part of each category, and these should be in focus. A different approach to the concourse

might warrant a different categorization. Although a concourse is meant to cover the full range of perspectives on an issue, I acknowledge that it can never be fully exhaustive. There may always be aspects that are overlooked or categories that could have been formed differently. I suggest using this concourse as a starting point to begin work that evolves and adapts through further discussion and research.

Table 4: Concourse on citizenship

Category	Conflict Lines
Justice Concepts	Universal and relative justice
	Informal justice
	European and global justice
Social and Financial equality	Socio-economic equality
	Socio-economic responsibility
	Global justice
Individual and Social freedom	Non-intervention and non-domination
	Individual and societal interests
	Liberal citizenship
Obligation and Participation	Civic obligation
	Participation forms
Culture and Identity	Basis of common life
	Cultural conditionality
	Global and multicultural citizenship

Note: This table displays a summary of both conflict lines from citizenship theory and from the discourse analysis on Twitter.

In this paper, I apply the developed concourse to conduct a Q-methodological study. However, the concourse also serves as a comprehensive overview of conflict lines on citizenship across different spaces. A concourse can be used to identify potential conflict lines on a policy issue in an encompassing way. I give a brief example of this in Chapter 5 when I use the concourse to discuss how differing viewpoints on citizenship might lead to different solutions to the boundary problem.

4.4. Q-methodological survey: Measuring perspectives on citizenship in Germany

The concourse provides a systematic overview of aspects relevant to how citizenship is perceived in Germany. In the next step, I use a Q-methodological survey to better understand how these aspects interact within individuals' citizenship perspectives. This demonstrates which aspects matter to whom, and in how far aspects might be in conflict or compatible with each other. After a quick explanation of how the Q-methodological survey builds on the concourse, I present its results. The survey yields four distinct citizenship perspectives: critical ethnoculturalists, active democrats, liberals and cosmopolitans. Each citizenship perspective is

described based on its response pattern within the survey. Thereafter, I give further insight into each perspective by exploring the socio-demographic composition, political attitudes and perceptions of national identity of participants subscribing to each perspective.

Selection of Q-statements

Although some recommend that Q-surveys use a minimum of 25 Q-statements, it has been pointed out that the exact number will always depend on the study at hand (Watts and Stenner 2014). This survey includes a slightly lower but more manageable number of 24 Q-statements for two key reasons: It measures the perspectives of ordinary citizens in Germany, and it is set up online to reach a wider variety of people. Both of these conditions, having ordinary citizens reflect on the complexities of citizenship, and doing so in an online setting, require significant concentration from participants.

As a first step, I issue several Q-statements based on the concourse on citizenship. This in itself is a lengthy process, because it requires phrasing the conflict lines in everyday language. (Theiss-Morse 1993). I draw heavily on how conflicts on citizenship are invoked and discussed on Twitter to compose statements that reflect everyday talk about citizenship. Previous empirical results are also used as a guidance to invoke issues or examples that will resonate with participants. In a second step, I randomly draw 24 Q-statements from the overall set of statements. I apply some limitations to this selection: Statements are drawn to represent the categories equally, in relative terms[7]. The final Q-set includes three to eight conflict lines from each category.

Finally, I put the Q-set to a practical empirical test to evaluate whether the concourse resonates with people, whether it is understandable, and whether it is broad enough to be able to map distinct perspectives on citizenship. To achieve this, I ran an online pre-survey based on the concourse which yielded 33 valid responses. Participants of the pre-test were invited to give feedback on their sorting experience, the statements, and the overall survey. Based on the results, the Q-statements were reviewed again and participants' feedback was incorporated. For example, some expressed uncertainty on how to interpret the statements or noted words or phrases that they did not understand. Some respondents suggested including examples in the statements to help them respond more concretely. This was reflected in the final set of statements, also to address the fact that conflict lines surrounding citizenship are complex and abstract, which may render them difficult to access for ordinary citizens. Third, the revised statements were reviewed with another academic and presented to some participants of the pre-test and ordinary citizens who had not been part of the pre-test. Based on this review, the Q-statements were finalized. The final set of Q-statements is displayed in Table 5.

---

[7] This means that more statements were drawn from categories which included more conflict lines in the concourse.

Table 5: List of Q-statements based on their corresponding category and sub-category in the concourse

Category	Sub-Category	Q-statements
Rights and Justice	Citizenship as a universal status	Some rights are so generally applicable that they should be implemented all over the world and for every individual.
	Universal human rights	Germany has a special historical responsibility for human rights.
	Differentiated rights	For some societal groups (e.g. people with different ethnicities or religions) special rights are necessary so that their standpoint is not overlooked by the majority.
	European citizenship	It would be good if more decisions were made on the European level.
Social and Financial Justice	Individual financial independence from the state	Every person is responsible for their own economic situation.
	Competition for welfare	I am worried that German citizens have to compete with immigrants for social welfare (e.g. employment benefits or pensions).
	National citizenship as unjust	The concept of national citizenship is fundamentally unjust.
Individual and Social Freedom	Non-intervention	The state too often limits my personal freedom.
	Priority of individual vs. of community	The individual, not the community should be the first priority of our state.
	Freedom through community	If we know our roots, we have a better orientation in the world.
	Liberal criticism of the state	Citizens always have to be observant and critical towards the state.
Obligation and Participation	Participation as individual excellence	People learn a lot from political participation, for example about themselves, their skills, and society.
	Minimal responsibility	It is no problem at all if only some people want to participate politically in our state.
	Informal participation or practice as good citizenship	Civic engagement for a good cause (e.g. voluntary engagement in a football club) is just as important as political participation (e.g. protesting or voting.)
	Rights should not outweigh responsibilities	For me, being a citizen does not only mean having rights but also having obligations toward the state and society.
	Wish for increased political and voluntary participation	I would like for more people in Germany to become active in politics or society.
Culture and Identity	Thin commonality	Citizens do not have to have anything in common aside from accepting common rights and democracy.
	Culture as private	Culture and religion are private matters and should not be part of political discussions or decisions.
	Cosmopolitan connection	There is just as much that connects me with people from other countries as with people from my own country.
	Assimilationism	If people want to live in Germany they should adapt to German customs and traditions.
	(German) patriotism	I am proud of the German democracy.
	Geographical belonging	A person belongs in Germany if they live here, even if they do not have German citizenship.
	Protection of German (lead) culture	German culture must be protected.
	Cosmopolitan citizenship	We have to understand ourselves as citizens of the world first and foremost.

Design of the Q-methodological survey

In this research design, participants ranked the 24 Q-statements on a Likert scale first and then sorted them in the Q-methodological design displayed in Table 6. This design was implemented via several multiple-choice questions (depending on the column of the normal distribution participants sorted for, they could select one, three, or five statements). For the two outermost

columns of the distribution, the displayed statements that participants could select from were limited for easier handling: Only statements that evoked a positive or negative reaction in the Likert-scale rating of all statements were displayed. This prevented participants from becoming overwhelmed by the high number of statements.

Table 6: The quasi-normal distribution used for the Q-sorting procedure

Position	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
	Strongly disagree						*Strongly agree*
No. of Statements	(1)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(5)	(3)	(1)

Note: a similar table to display the Q-sorting structure is used in Hylton et al., 2018

Analysis of the Q-methodological survey

Overall, 294 responses included a valid Q-sort. All respondents hold German citizenship, with 3,2 % holding an additional citizenship. They are between 18 – 78 years old (with a mean age of 47,8 years) and in relatively equal parts female (52,0 %) and male (47,6%)[8]. About a quarter has a higher education degree (24,1%), one-third has completed vocational training (30,6%), and the remainder has completed high school. About a quarter (23,5%) has a migration background[9], and a quarter (24,9%) is from East Germany.

The results were analyzed using the "qmethod" package for R. The analysis is based on a correlation of Q-sorts using the Pearson's coefficient. The data is then reduced by extracting a number of factors through principal component analysis, with each factor designating a similar sorting pattern (Zabala 2014). The extent to which participants subscribe to a factor is calculated through factor loadings[10] (see Appendix 2). Participants whose Q-sort loads significantly onto an extracted factor are interpreted as subscribing to that factor (Watts and Stenner 2014).

The process of conducting a Q-method analysis also includes selecting an appropriate number of factors. Researchers have emphasized the importance of taking both statistical and content-based markers into account in selecting the final number of factors (Watts and Stenner 2014). The solution using four emerging factors yielded the highest percentage of variance explained by all factors (47,4%). Solutions using two and three factors had a slightly higher number of sorts that load significantly onto a factor (25 more sorts for both solutions). I compared the interpretations of the results using two, three, and four factors to select the final result using four factors. This solution displays broader insight into different conceptions of citizenship, which is one of the aims of this study.

---

[8] The remaining participants identified as neither female nor male.
[9] Respondents are identified as holding a migration background if at least one grandparent or parent, or they themselves were born outside of Germany.
[10] In these calculations, the threshold for a Q-sort to load onto a factor is based on the automatic criteria designated by the qmethod package.

4.5. Result 2: Four distinct perspectives on citizenship

Table 7 displays the four resulting factors. The table shows the average ranking of each Q-statement within the quasi-normal distribution displayed in Table 6, with a ranking of 3 indicating the most preferred and -3 the least preferred statement within the factor.

In the subsequent text, the factors are referred to by a name summarizing their position: critical ethno-culturalist (Factor 1), active democrats (Factor 2), liberal democrats (Factor 3), and cosmopolitans (Factor 4). In the following, each of the four perspectives expressed, through the four factors displayed in Table 7, is briefly summarized. The summary draws on the average ranking of each Q-statement within each perspective, which is indicated throughout the text in brackets.

Factor 1: Critical ethno-culturalists' citizenship conception rests strongly on cultural factors. They are the only group to believe that 'German culture' needs to be protected (2), and they strongly demand assimilation from immigrants (3). They are worried about competition for social rights through immigration (2), they do not afford the same degree of belonging to non-citizens living in Germany as to German citizens (-2), and they are the group to most strongly oppose minority rights (-3). In line with this, they oppose further EU integration (-2) and the conception of universal rights generally (-1). The idea that Germany holds special responsibility for safeguarding human rights is rejected (-2). They do not feel connected to people in other countries (-1) and believe that gaining orientation in the world rests on knowing one's roots (1).

This group includes duties in their conceptualization of citizenship (2) and thinks it problematic if not everyone participates politically (-1). At the same time, their point of emphasis for duties does not seem to rest primarily on political or civic participation: The group does not wish for more political or social engagement (0) and does not allocate higher importance to political than to other forms of voluntary engagement (1). This might be connected to the critical distance this group maintains towards the German state: They think of the state as freedom-limiting (1) and believe citizens should be critical towards the state (1). Despite their closeness to German culture, they are not necessarily proud of German democracy (0).

Ethno-culturalists think of every individual as responsible for their economic situation (1). In their conception of citizenship, they seem to include people who share culture, work, and everyday life – albeit with distance towards the state, immigrants, and multilateral institutions.

Table 7: Average ranking of the Q-statements of the four emerging factors f1, f2, f3 and f4

	f1	f2	f3	f4
Some rights are so generally applicable that they should be implemented all over the world and for every individual.	-1	3	1	2
For some societal groups (e.g. people with different ethnicities or religions) special rights are necessary so that their standpoint is not overlooked by the majority.	-3	-1	-2	-1
It would be good if more decisions were made on the European level.	-2	0	0	-1
Germany has a special historical responsibility for human rights.	-2	2	-2	-1
Every person is responsible for their own economic situation.	1	-1	2	-3
I am worried that German citizens have to compete with immigrants for social welfare (e.g. employment benefits or pensions).	2	-2	-1	-2
The concept of national citizenship is fundamentally unjust.	0	-2	-2	0
The state too often limits my personal freedom.	1	-3	-3	0
The individual, not the community should be the first priority of our state.	0	-2	-1	0
Citizens always have to be observant and critical towards the state.	1	0	-1	2
If we know our roots, we have a better orientation in the world.	1	0	-1	-2
For me, being a citizen does not only mean having rights but also having obligations toward the state and society.	2	2	3	1
People learn a lot from political participation, for example about themselves, their skills, and society.	0	1	0	0
It is no problem at all if only some people want to participate politically in our state.	-1	-1	0	-1
I would like for more people in Germany to become active in politics or society.	0	1	0	1
Civic engagement for a good cause (e.g. voluntary engagement in a football club) is just as important as political participation (e.g. protesting or voting.)	1	1	1	0
German culture must be protected.	2	-1	0	-1
Culture and religion are private matters and should not be part of political discussions or decisions.	0	-1	2	2
Citizens do not have to have anything in common aside from accepting common rights and democracy.	-1	0	0	1
A person belongs in Germany if they live here, even if they do not have German citizenship.	-2	1	-1	1
If people want to live in Germany they should adapt to German customs and traditions.	3	0	2	0
I am proud of the German democracy.	0	2	1	-2
There is just as much that connects me with people from other countries as with people from my own country.	-1	0	1	1
We have to understand ourselves as citizens of the world first and foremost.	-1	1	1	3

Note: For each of the four factors (f1, f2, f3, f4), the table indicates the average ranking for each statement. That ranking is obtained by calculating z-scores, which are the weighted average of the scores given to a statement by participants who subscribe to each factor. The z-scores are then rounded towards the discrete values part of the Q-sort grid (see Zabala, 2014). In this Q-sort grid, participants could rank statements by endorsing them (i.e. ranking them in position 3, 2, or 1, with 3 indicating the greatest level of endorsement), rejecting them (i.e. ranking them in position -1, -2, or -3, with -3 indicating the greatest level of rejection), or not selecting them as relevant to their definition of citizenship (i.e. ranking them in position 0). Overall, 85 Q-sorts (i.e. participants) load significantly onto Factor 1; 62 on Factor 2; 25 on Factor 3; and 19 on Factor 4. The full list of factor loadings can be found in Appendix 2.

Factor 2: Active democrats are fond of many aspects of German democracy: Universal rights are very important to them (3) and they support Germany's responsibility for safeguarding human rights (2). They strongly reject the idea that the state limits individual freedom (-3) and are proud of German democracy (2). This pride also manifests in the emphasis this group places on political participation: They are the only group to think of political participation as a learning experience (1). Active democrats want citizens to be more engaged (1) and value both political and broader civic engagement (1). This group strongly prioritizes common interests above individual ones (-2).

Active democrats are relatively open: To them, someone belongs as soon as they live in Germany (1), do not think 'German culture' needs protection (-1), and do not feel that the social welfare system is threatened through immigration (-2). They are the only group that wishes to resolve conflicts based on culture and religion within politics (-1).

Cultural definitions of citizenship mean little to this group. Rather, they think of themselves as world citizens (1). The group also understands economic inequalities as a structural rather than an individual issue (-1). However, they do not consider the concept of national citizenship to be unfair (-2). Again, this may be connected to the fact that they value the German nation-state and its opportunities for political participation.

Factor 3: Liberal democrats most strongly favor a citizenship conception that emphasizes duties (3). However, these duties do not seem to manifest in political participation: The group has no position on whether citizens should be more actively engaged (0) or on the extent of political participation (0). Broad civic participation is just as meaningful to them as political participation (1).

The group seems to place more emphasis on individual private obligation: They favor the idea that each individual is responsible for their economic situation (2) and demand assimilation from immigrants (2). Consequently, simply living in Germany is insufficient for genuine belonging (-1). The group also rejects special minority rights (-2). Beyond this obligation to care for oneself and adapt to society, cultural factors do not play a significant role for this group. They feel just as connected to individuals from other countries as to German citizens (1) and do see themselves as world citizens (1). All the while, they reject the idea that Germany holds special responsibility for human rights (-2) and do not think that national citizenship is unfair (-2). Generally speaking, the group does seem to be open to international cooperation and connectedness, but within the structure of the nation-state.

This may be connected with this group's positive view of the German state. They strongly reject the idea that the state limits their freedom (-3) and are proud of German democracy (1). They do not think citizens should be critical of the state (-1). It seems that this group connects citizenship with individual-level responsibility and activity, and with a (possibly passive) acceptance of the nation-state's authority. They accept both migration and international cooperation, as long as the order of and within the nation-state is maintained.

Factor 4: Cosmopolitans see themselves as citizens of the world first (3). They favor thin commonalities attached to citizenship (1), accept geographical belonging (1), and feel just as connected to people in other countries as to German citizens (1). This group is most strongly opposed to the idea of people needing their roots to find fulfillment (-2). They reject pride in German democracy (-2) and are opposed to protecting 'German culture' (-1).

Cosmopolitans take an open and accepting approach towards others. They are concerned about structural economic inequality (-3). The group is not worried about immigration leading to competition over social rights (-2). However, they do not necessarily favor institutionalizing minority rights (-1), and consider issues around culture and religion to be private (2). This might be due to their distance from the state: The group associates good citizenship with taking a critical stance towards the state (2). They are against further EU integration (-1) and are opposed to Germany taking special responsibility for human rights (-1) – however, they strongly believe in universal rights (2).

Although the individuals in this group think it is a problem if not everyone participates politically (-1), they have no position on other statements on increasing participation. They seem to endorse a liberal cosmopolitanism that connects humanist acceptance with mobility and openness without an institutionalized structure.

4.6. Result 3: Qualification of the citizenship perspectives

The four identified factors provide four coherent and encompassing citizenship conceptualizations from below. To better understand the factors' potential implications for political attitudes and behaviors, this section builds socio-demographic and political profiles for each factor. It also explores in how far the factors interrelate with conceptions of national identity. The idea is to explore whether Q-methodology is in line with traditional measurements, and to assess what it can add to their results.

In order to build socio-demographic and political profiles for each factor, I explore descriptive data collected in the run of the survey per factor (see Table 8). There are no large differences between factors in terms of participants' age. In terms of gender, education, migration background, and German federal state, there is some variation between factors. However, the only statistically significant difference (based on t-tests) is on migration background between critical ethnoculturalists and liberal democrats (factors 1 and 3). The proportion of participants with a migration background is lowest for critical ethnoculturalists (13.8%) and highest for liberal democrats (38.1%).

For political indicators, differences are statistically significant on political ideology and on trust in government. In terms of political ideology, there are statistically significant differences both

between factors 1 and 2, and between factors 1 and 3: Critical ethnoculturalists (factor 1) are right-leaning more often than participants of other factors (21.1% of factor participants fall between 7 and 10, so on the right-side end of the political ideology scale); active democrats (factor 2) are clearly more left-leaning (rated between 0 and 3, i.e. on the left end of the political ideology scale, by 30.6% of the factor participants). Meanwhile, liberal democrats (factor 3) are very centrist; none subscribe to the right end of the political ideology scale, and a very large proportion of 81.0% fall in the middle (ratings between 4 and 6 on that scale).

Table 8: Socio-demographic and political data per factor

	F1	F2	F3	F4	Total sample
gender					
female	52.5	61.3	60.9	57.1	54.4
male	47.5	38.7	39.1	42.9	45.2
Education level					
tertiary education	22.5	32.3	39.1	7.1	26.1
Migration background					
with	13.8	21.0	38.1	28.6	20.9
without	86.3	79.0	61.9	71.4	79.1
East and West Germany					
east	30.0	13.1	26.1	21.4	77.1
west	70.0	85.2	73.9	78.6	22.1
Political interest					
not at all/low (1-2)	51.3	64.5	34.7	35.7	50.7
medium (3)	35.9	25.8	56.5	50.0	38.2
quite/high (4-5)	13.8	9.7	8.7	14.3	11.0
Political ideology					
Left (0-3)	17.1	30.6	19.0	35.7	25.6
Middle (4-6)	61.8	66.1	81.0	57.1	66.0
Right (7-10)	21.1	3.2	0	7.1	8.4
Age					
18-29	8.8	19.4	13.0	7.1	13.2
30-44	27.5	27.4	30.4	35.7	27.2
45-59	38.8	22.6	39.1	42.9	33.8
60-74	23.8	30.6	13.0	14.3	24.3
75 and older	1.3	0	4.3	0	1.5
Trust in government					
no trust (no/ rather no)	60.1	6.4	17.3	71.4	33.9
trust (trust/ rather trust)	36.3	92.0	78.3	28.5	61.3

Note: N=272. The total sample includes both participants who loaded onto a factor and who did not.

Scores on trust in government are statistically significant between nearly all factors: Government trust is low for critical ethnoculturalists 1 (60.1% do not trust). By comparison, nearly all active democrats trust the government (92.0% do trust), while liberal democrats have relatively high trust (78.3% do trust). Note that no statistically significant differences could be discerned between any of these factors and cosmopolitans (factor 4), which might be due to the low number of participants who subscribed to factor 4, meaning that calculations of statistical significance will be less impactful (Button et al. 2013).

In summary, the following socio-demographic profiles emerge: Participants who load onto factor 1 (critical ethnoculturalists) are socio-demographically less diverse; those who load onto factor 3 (liberal democrats) are most diverse (in terms of lowest proportion of participants who are female and have a migration background and female). Liberal democrats are also the most highly educated. Differences can also be discerned on political indicators. Critical ethnoculturalists (factor 1) are less politically interested and more right-leaning. Active democrats also have low political interest but tend to be left-leaning. Liberal democrats (factor 3) are politically interested and centrist, while cosmopolitans (factor 4) are politically interested and left-leaning.

Next, I explore whether the factors map onto distinct conceptions of national identity. As previously mentioned, national identity is often measured using the so-called ethnic civic measure. The instrument asks participants to rate nine indicators in terms of their importance for someone being considered as genuinely German (or whichever national identity is under investigation). Responses are given on a four-point scale (ranging from 'not at all important' to 'very important'). I included the instrument in this survey to be able to compare results from the innovative Q-methodological citizenship conceptualizations with a more established measure of national identity.

To analyze the ethnic civic instrument all nine indicators are subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (Reeskens and Hooghe 2010). Comparing overlaps between the ethnic civic indicator and the Q-methodological conceptualizations demonstrates that critical ethnocultural citizens (factor 1) load strongly onto both ethnic and civic conceptions of national identity, while few participants load onto either category among liberal and cosmopolitan citizens (factors 3 and 4, see Annex 3)[11]. This indicates that the two instruments do not measure similar concepts. Rather, it seems that ethnocultural citizens generally feel strongly about having criteria for perceiving someone as German, while liberal and cosmopolitan citizens have lower demands.

This is further confirmed by an analysis of the individual items of the ethnic civic indicator. Ethnocultural citizens (factor 1) allocate an above-average importance (compared to the overall sample) to being born in Germany, maintaining German traditions, having German ancestors and speaking German well; on all of these items the difference between ethnocultural citizens'

---

[11] Note that this finding is limited by only about one third of participants loading onto both a Q-methodological factor and an ethnic-civic dimensions.

rankings and those of most other factors are statistically significant[12]. They also give high ratings to being Christian and maintaining civic obligation (though active citizens (factor 2) rank these criteria even higher on average). This is especially interesting when compared to cosmopolitan citizens (factor 4): Participants rate nearly all items of the ethnic civic dimension as relatively unimportant. Given these contrasts, it seems that ethnocultural citizens simply have overall thick criteria for what it means to be German, while cosmopolitan citizens have thin criteria. This is also in line with the conceptualizations exhibited in the Q-methodological study: Critical ethno-culturalists (factor 1) want to have much in common with their fellow citizens not just politically, but also in terms of culture and tradition. Cosmopolitans (factor 4) embrace flexible notions of belonging in their Q-methodology responses.

The analysis yields more mixed results for active and liberal citizens (factors 2 and 3). Active citizens allocate an above average importance to equality and democracy; this difference is statistically significant (with all other factors). All liberal citizens think maintaining equality is important to being German (though the difference with other factors is not statistically significant). This indicates that active and liberal citizens do have criteria for what it means to be German, but these criteria are defined in terms of democratic norms and/ or constitutional principles.

Table 9: Percentage of participants who rated each civic-ethnic component as very important/ important (by factor)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Total sample
having DE ancestors	67.1	42.0	36.4	53.9	52.4
birth in DE	79.5	50.0	56.5	61.6	62.2
spending majority of life in DE	73.4	69.4	78.2	42.9	67.8
being Christian	32.5	28.3	14.3	23.1	26.0
following DE tradition	87.2	63.4	65.2	42.9	67.2
knowledge of DE language	60.1	37.1	40.9	42.9	46.8
treating all with equality	76.7	96.7	100	76.9	86.7
endorsing democracy	88.2	98.3	86.4	92.3	91.0
following civic obligation	92.0	93.5	86.3	53.9	89.1

Note: those who did not load onto a factor are not displayed, so the percentages of each factor need not align with the percentage of the total sample.

---

[12] There is a statistically significant difference between factor 1 and factors 2 and 3 respectively on having German ancestors, being born in Germany, speaking German; this applies to German traditions though the difference between factors 1 and 4 is also statistically significant here.

4.7. Discussion: Connectivity in ethnic, active, liberal and cosmopolitan variants

Q-methodological surveys typically allow the identification of distinguishing statements (that significantly differentiate factors from one another) and consensus statements, positions that the sorts within all factors agree on. The analysis presented here yields no consensus statements, which demonstrates that citizenship definitions are highly contested not just in theory but also in practice.

Nonetheless, some common tendencies can be identified in the Q-sorts: There is relatively large agreement on obligation and participation. Particularly, all four groups understand citizenship as more than a status: Citizenship comprises not only rights but also obligations. The form of obligations differs between perspectives: Obligation means safeguarding culture and way of life for ethnocultural citizens, political participation for active citizens, adherence to laws and the maintenance of institutions for liberal citizens, and a humanist duty towards others for cosmopolitan citizens. Across citizenship perspectives, citizenship is connected with participation and civic engagement, and three of the four groups agree that it is unacceptable if not all citizens participate politically.

There are also some common tendencies on justice and culture: All of the factors indicate a negative reaction towards implementing minority rights for religious or cultural groups. Additionally, two factors (ethnocultural and liberal citizens) favor assimilation by immigrants, with the two other factors that entail a more open and inclusive conception of citizenship (active and cosmopolitan citizens) not necessarily opposing assimilation. This implies the importance of shared guidelines for citizenship. These could be in the form of cultural aspects, but it also seems that the validity of universal rights plays a relatively prominent role in German citizens' perspectives.

Additionally, while ethnocultural citizens reject humanist connections across borders, the three remaining groups do also see themselves as citizens of the world. There seems to be a general notion of feeling responsible for or belonging to a space beyond the nation-state. However, this is not necessarily connected with an endorsement of global institutions: Further EU integration is rejected by cosmopolitan citizens, and not endorsed by active or by liberal citizens. Cosmopolitan citizens may view the German nation-state and the EU as incapable of delivering the interconnected world they envision. Humanist connectedness does not seem to be limited to Europe – and there does seem to be a preference for informal rather than institutionalized cooperation.

The Q-methodological survey proved to be an effective method to make relatively distinct yet complex perspectives on citizenship visible. Its results resonate with empirical results found elsewhere: The first emerging factor (ethnocultural citizens) aligns with the concept of ethnic citizenship that puts culture, common tradition, and ancestry at the forefront of its definition. Meanwhile, all of the other factors bear some qualities connected with a civic conception of

citizenship – all three embrace universal rights, for example. But they do so in very different constellations, and with different points of emphasis on participation, on following laws, and on global connection.

The analysis of participant profiles per factors demonstrates that there are especially stark differences between critical ethnoculturalists (factor 1) and the other factors. The ethnocultural perspective has the highest number of factor loadings which is also a potential indicator of it being an especially distinct perspective where participants, if they subscribe to it, subscribe strongly and exclusively. This echoes the previous finding that civic conceptions of citizenship are multifaceted (Wright, Citrin, and Wand 2012). It also mirrors some of the divides of the so-called transnational cleavage. The transnational cleavage separates those who benefit from and are open to globalization from those who do not benefit and are skeptical (see also Chapter 2).

Additionally, an analysis of national identity shows that the emerging factors differ in terms of holding thick or thin conceptions of national identity, which can be sorted into ethnic or civic categories only to a limited extent. A similar notion is pointed out by previous research. Bonikowski and DiMaggio find that only half of all Americans load onto either ethnic or civic dimensions, and that in particular young and highly educated Americans do not subscribe to notions of national identity at all (Bonikowski and DiMaggio 2016). The analysis in this chapter showed that critical ethnocultural citizens find all criteria defined by the ethnic civic indicator important to perceive someone as genuinely German, while cosmopolitan citizens found none really relevant. To some extent, the analysis by factor demonstrated that, across citizenship conceptions, civic factors are seen as important to national identity. Ethnic criteria however are controversial, a finding corroborated by previous research in the US (Wright, Citrin, and Wand 2012). These results confirm that the relevance of ancestry or birth to citizenship is a controversial aspect of German citizenship conceptions (see also Moffitt, Juang, and Syed 2018).

In this sense, the results from the Q-methodological study are a relatively good expression of established empirical cleavages, and its findings add nuance and depth to their results. Together, the findings provide an encompassing overview of bottom-up ideas on the role of the state, the responsibilities of the citizen towards the state, as well as on how social stratification is relevant to perspectives on citizenship and democracy.

4.8. Chapter summary: subjective perspectives on citizenship

The results presented in this chapter contribute to the understanding of citizenship policies and the everyday practice of citizenship in Germany. They explain the relevance of discussions around commonality (e.g. in the form of the debates around a lead culture), or around obligation (e.g. in the form of the proposal for a compulsory year of service). There is a relatively broad understanding that citizens want connectivity from citizenship. These results tap into a long-

standing conflict between commonality and pluralism in modern citizenship (see also Duchesne 2003), as well as into deeply anchored cleavages found in other investigations.

The concourse construction showed a large overlap between conflicts between citizenship theories and conflicts in citizenship discourse. This shows that theoretical approaches can structure and systematize real-world discussion. While one might assume that discourse on social media is not of high quality, the Twitter analysis conducted in this study yielded diverse arguments on core political issues. Some arguments also resonate with key themes from the academic debate on citizenship, indicating a fairly high level of sophistication of social media discussions.

These results differentiate and specify existing research on individual understandings of citizenship. In particular, they demonstrate that it is useful to study contested concepts like citizenship from a broad starting point, granting participants the room to make meaning of their perspectives. Q-methodology and other subjective methods not only offer an expansion of the methodological toolkit on measuring citizenship. By developing a concourse, for example, aspects can emerge that traditional tools capture insufficiently. The comparison with national identity dimensions shows that results from the Q-methodological survey re-iterate some findings from previous research, but also adds to and differentiates them. This methodological approach has shown that a concourse can add to the scope of sub-aspects of citizenship that we consider relevant. It also clarified that citizenship is understood to be more than a legal status: Something shared between citizens is attached to all perspectives, be it through thick conceptions of shared ancestry, active participation, thin conceptions of shared institutions, or humanist connection.

In sum, this study demonstrates that to more fully understand individuals' perspectives on citizenship, a multitude of methods is required. More recently, there have been more bottom-up investigations on citizenship. To deepen their results, we also need to collect more subjective and discursive data to understand how people talk about, practice, and live citizenship. The investigation of subjective perspectives on Twitter demonstrated that already in everyday conversation, people re-iterate notions from political theory when talking about citizenship. This indicates that it is indeed realistic to conceptualize citizenship with all its complexities with or by citizens.

In applying these results in policy and practice, it will be necessary to think about ways for citizens to feel connected to a common project in a civic frame. This analysis has shown that citizens themselves have different ideas on this, ranging from thick political participation to a thinner but tangible dedication to institutions. It seems useful to bring these perspectives into conversation with each other to seek out commonalities, compromises, and conflicts. Developing ideas for public spaces or common practices could be a useful starting point for making a unifying experience of citizenship possible in pluralistic societies.

5.　Opinion transformation and reasoning on the boundary problem

How citizens conceptualize citizenship has important implications for democratic preferences on the rules that govern common life. Simultaneously, ideas on what citizenship means also reflects in policy preferences. Some of the most pressing challenges of democracies are associated with issues connected to citizenship, such as how to balance commonality and pluralism between citizens, and what demands to place on political participation. The previous chapter established distinguishing conflicts between citizenship perspectives, and discussed how citizenship can be a driver of social connectivity. A remaining problem then would be how to establish connectivity in societies in which non-citizen residents make up a large share of the population.

In this chapter, I turn to a concrete policy example that re-iterates this problem and further activates conflicts on citizenship: foreigner voting rights. The introduction of foreigner voting rights is a central policy proposal in the framework of democratic theory's boundary problem. To fulfil the democratic premise that all those subjected to power should hold control over that same power, theoretical approaches described in Chapter 2 suggest two main pathways: The first is to maintain the connection between political rights and citizenship, and focus instead on naturalization as a solution to the boundary problem. Note that even theorists who advocate this path admit that most current naturalization regimes are too restrictive to sufficiently satisfy the requirement of democratic control. The second proposal is to separate political rights from citizenship, which would introduce foreigner voting rights.

This chapter investigates the second and third research questions of the thesis. The third question asks whether participants' positions on foreigner voting rights change after they deliberate about them. I investigate this research question using a survey experiment with a pre-post analysis. The question's results contribute to the procedural challenge of the thesis which investigates deliberative outcomes. Citizenship-related policies generally and foreigner voting rights specifically are a particularly suitable example for exploring whether there is a communitarian version of deliberation which orients participants towards the status quo. The suitability of this example is demonstrated in previous empirical results that do not find progressive opinion transformations after deliberative or direct democratic designs on foreigner voting rights (see e.g. Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014; Bochsler and Hug 2015). In investigating what drives opinion change, I analyze participants' patterns of reasoning. These results also contribute to the theoretical challenge of the thesis which aims to understand how citizens reckon with the boundary problem.

5.1. Context for the analysis: Foreigner voting rights and citizenship

The policy proposal of granting voting rights to non-citizen residents is suitable to explore citizenship conceptions in more depth and to better understand their applicability in the context of political opinions and behaviors.

Access to political rights mobilizes conflicts on citizenship in several ways. To demonstrate this, I return to the concourse on citizenship which displays distinguishing conflict lines (the conflict lines are rights and justice, social and financial justice, individual and social freedom, obligation and participation, culture and identity; see Chapter 4, Table 4). The fact that these conflict lines are all relevant to the boundary problem shows that it is a useful example for deepening participants' thinking on citizenship. The following considerations might be made within each conflict line when reckoning with the boundary problem:

In terms of justice, introducing foreigner voting rights opens a discussion on the sovereignty of the nation state (Carens 1989), and the remaining importance of national citizenship more generally – scholars assume that disconnecting voting rights from citizenship will reduce the importance, or value, of national citizenship (Song 2009). Additionally, some consider non-citizen voting rights to threaten the premise of equal legal status of all members of the demos (Celikates 2012).

In terms of equality, a discussion on foreigner voting rights might question why different citizenships lead to different access to political rights in Germany (for example, EU nationals hold some political rights that non-EU-nationals do not). Questions could be raised about the inequality that underlies the global system of national citizenships generally, given the extent to which national citizenships determine access to mobility and opportunity (Mau 2021). In addition, the concourse identified financial obligations as an important component of citizenship discussions in Germany (Buck and Geissel 2009). Here, the discussion could focus around the fact that many non-citizen residents work and pay taxes in Germany without being able to determine their spending. On the other hand, public debate often frames migration as a threat to welfare systems (Soysal 2012).

Concepts of freedom play an important role in determining the boundary problem, as it rests on the idea that individuals should be able to control the political power to which they are subjected (Dahl 1989). Different ideas of freedom in citizenship theory come into play here: Some argue that democratic decisions are automatically limited by minority rights (Saunders 2012). Others argue that it is not sufficiently democratic to have to rely on others to safeguard one's own freedom. Additionally, the individual choice to vote where one feels most at home might be debated (Pedroza 2019) vis-à-vis assumptions that political rights come with solidarity and social trust, which only full citizenship can guarantee (Carens 2005).

Aspects around obligation and participation are central to the discussion around the boundary problem. While some maintain that non-citizen residents already fulfill many civic obligations,

others contend that political rights must come with the full scope of obligations (De Schutter and Ypi 2015). Additional arguments revolve around political participation as learning (Pedroza 2014).

Cultural components can also be discussed within foreigner voting rights. Definitions differ in the type of commonality they see necessary for making democratic decisions together, such as territorial belonging, social embeddedness, or indeed sharing common values and culture (see e.g. Parekh 2000; Walzer 2007). These explanations show that foreigner voting rights can be discussed along many of the conflict lines from the concourse on citizenship. Thereby, the issue is suitable for deepening this exploration on how citizens perceive citizenship.

The issue of foreigner voting rights is not only relevant to political theory – it also plays a growing role in political debate. This also applies to the country case of this study, Germany: The last 30 years have seen several political discussions on the increasing number of long-term German residents who are disenfranchised based on their citizenship status. Most recently, in the run-up to the 2020 national election, broad media coverage problematized foreigner disenfranchisement: A wide range of publications explored the issue or interviewed non-citizen residents on their difficulties to naturalize. This debate may additionally gain traction in the German context because the coalition agreement of the 2020 government foresees the lowering of the voting age to 16, which may trigger a broader debate on enfranchisement, and draw out questions on who should be included in the demos. These aspects make it clear that it is worth investigating how German citizens think about the boundary problem.

Currently, foreigner voting rights in Germany are granted within the Maastricht Treaty's EU-wide stipulation on residence-based voting: EU citizens can vote wherever they reside within the EU in local, communal, and European Parliament elections. Thus, non-EU citizens have no voting rights in Germany, and no foreigner voting rights exist for federal state or national elections (Bundesministerium des Innern und für Heimat 2021).

Several political attempts have been made to extend these entitlements. Before the EU regulation came into effect, both the federal states of Bremen and Hamburg attempted to introduce residency-based voting rights based for federal-state-level elections. The proposal was struck down by the German Constitutional Court with the main argument that democratic sovereignty lies with the German people (Staatsvolk), i.e. with the citizens. The Court did acknowledge that long-term disenfranchisement is a democratic challenge in Germany, but argued that a solution should instead focus on facilitating naturalization (Deutscher Bundestag 2016).

In 2017, political parties in the federal state of North-Rhine-Westphalia attempted to extend local voting rights to residents who are not EU citizens, a proposal that was too controversial to move forward to a parliamentary vote (Zeit Online 2017). In consequence, while non-citizen voting rights are and have been controversial, and advancements have largely failed in the German context, they are a recurring issue with relevance in both politics and public discourse.

5.2. Sample, design and operationalization

In total, 286 German citizens completed the survey experiment on foreigner voting rights. To evaluate whether this sample is large enough, I conduct a power analysis using the pwr package in R[13]; this confirms that the sample size is sufficient to detect meaningful opinion changes should they occur. The survey company recruited about 450 participants; after eliminating incomplete and non-coherent responses[14], 286 responses could be used for the analysis. The dropout rate is indicative of the relatively high demands that even a fairly minimal deliberative research design places on survey participants (see also Bächtiger and Wyss 2013).

Table 10: Comparison of Samples

	Discussion	Information	Control	Total sample	Allbus2018
gender					
female	51.1	57.3	50.0	52.8	48.9
male	48.9	42.7	49.0	46.9	51.1
Education level					
tertiary education	34.8	21.9	22.4	26.2	19.5
East and West Germany					
east	29.3	26.0	20.6	25.3	19.2
west	69.6	74.0	78.4	74.0	80.8
Political interest					
not at all/low (1-2)	11.2	10.5	14.2	12.0	15.6
medium (3)	37.8	32.6	43.5	37.9	45.6
quite/high (4-5)	51.0	56.8	42.2	50.1	43.1
Political ideology					
Left (0-3)	30.0	31.1	23.7	28.1	21.2
Middle (4-6)	63.3	58.9	67.0	63.2	62.0
Right (7-10)	6.7	10.0	9.3	8.7	16.8
Age					
18-29	15.2	12.5	17.3	15.0	14.6
30-44	31.5	27.1	19.4	25.9	21.8
45-59	31.5	33.3	34.7	33.2	29.3
60-74	21.7	26.0	25.5	24.5	23.3
75-89	0	1.0	3.1	1.4	10.5
89 and older	0	0	0	0	0.5

Note: Own calculations. Cell entries are percentages. Comparison is with the ALLBUS 2018 population sample.

---

[13] A power analysis revealed that a sample size of N = 300 leads to a power level of 0.9, alpha = .05 and a medium effect size using Cohen's (1988) criteria for F-Tests. This corresponds to effect sizes identified in research using online deliberation on attitude formation and change.

[14] A quality control question in which participants were asked to select the letter "D" among the responses ensured that participants read the survey questions.

The socio-demographic composition of the sample matches large-scale population samples in Germany on most relevant accounts such as age, gender, migration background, and political identity. However, there are slight imbalances, with participants of the survey experiment having slightly more interest in politics, being better educated and coming more frequently from East Germany. Table 10 shows a comparison of the sample with representative ALLBUS population data for Germany.

Those willing to participate were assigned randomly to three groups, an information-deliberation group, an information-only group and a true control group. Overall, randomization into the three groups worked well; the comparison of the three treatment groups is displayed in Table 11.

Table 11: Randomization of Treatment Groups

Factor	N	mean	s.d.	min	max	control	inform.	discus.	p (info<> contr)	p (disc<> contr)
age	286	47.2	15.08	18	76	48.10	47.90	45.52	0.93	0.24
female	286	0.53	0.50	0	1	0.50	0.57	0.51	0.31	0.88
migration background	284	0.21	0.41	0	1	0.23	0.16	0.24	0.18	0.91
east Germany	286	0.25	0.43	0	1	0.20	0.26	0.29	0.36	0.16
university degree	286	0.26	0.44	0	1	0.22	0.22	0.35	0.92	0.06
political interest	285	2.47	0.99	1	5	2.48	2.33	2.60	0.28	0.39
political identity	277	46.3	19.13	0	100	48.11	45.70	45.0	0.40	0.25
post-materialism	286	0.21	0.41	0	1	0.14	0.30	0.18	0.01	0.44

Experimental set-up

In the first stage of the experiment, the information-deliberation and the information-only group read three arguments in favor of and three arguments against introducing foreigner voting rights. The arguments are based on statements from the concourse, which were modified to look like arguments from other participants. This meant rephrasing statements into colloquial language or including examples. Such a design ensured that the arguments within the deliberative treatment reflect diverse and salient views. The exercise also led participants to re-evaluate notions they already knew from the concourse.

Meanwhile, the pure control group read a text on voting rights in Germany. The text explains how regional, national and EU parliaments work (in terms of who is elected and the powers these institutions have) and defines who is entitled to vote for each of these elections.

Table 12: Full list of forum arguments on foreigner voting rights presented to the information-only and deliberation groups (in randomized order)

Pro arguments	
Democracy as equal rights	There cannot be a second-class set of rights for people who live and work in Germany, have family here and have a residency permit. This also holds for voting rights! *(Original German: Für Menschen, die in Deutschland wohnen und arbeiten, hier Familie und Aufenthaltserlaubnis haben, aber nicht die deutsche Staatsbürgerschaft besitzen, darf es kein Recht zweiter Klasse geben - auch nicht beim Wahlrecht!)*
EU unification	In my eyes making it possible that people vote wherever they live in a unified Europe is a sign that we are growing closer together as Europeans. For me that is the future! *(Original German: Wenn wir es in einem vereinten Europa möglich machen, dass Menschen dort wählen wo sie leben und arbeiten, ist das für mich eher ein Zeichen, dass wir als Europäer zusammenwachsen. Für mich ist das die Zukunft!)*
Geographic belonging	I've been part of German society for 15 years. But I don't want to give up my heritage and family in Turkey. I am not allowed to have dual citizenship. My future is in Germany and I want to participate here. *(Original German: Ich bin seit 15 Jahren fester Bestandteil der deutschen Bevölkerung. Aber ich will meine Herkunft und Familie in der Türkei nicht aufgeben. Ich darf keine doppelte Staatsbürgerschaft aufnehmen. Meine Zukunft ist in Deutschland und ich will hier mitbestimmen.)*
Contra arguments	
Protection of democracy	We have seen that many people who live in Germany with a Turkish passport vote for an autocrat like Erdogan. Granting voting rights could lead to people being given the vote who don't really support our democracy. *(Original German: Wir sehen ja, dass viele Personen in Deutschland mit türkischem Pass mit Erdogan einen Autokraten wählen. So ein Wahlrecht kann dazu führen, dass lauter Leute mitwählen, die unsere Demokratie gar nicht unterstützen.)*
Common values	I would only accept this under certain conditions. I don't want people to vote who think completely differently and have different values than us to be able to decide on our future. *(Original German: Ich würde das nur unter bestimmten Bedingungen akzeptieren. Ich möchte nicht, dass Personen die komplett anders denken und andere Werte haben als wir mit wählen und mit über unsere Zukunft entscheiden.)*
Election as a responsibility	I think voting is an important right but also a great privilege. German democracy and the constitution say that citizens are allowed to vote. I think elections should be taken very seriously and this democratic principle safeguarded. *(Original German: Ich finde Wahlen ein wichtiges Recht aber auch großes Privileg. Die deutsche Demokratie und die Verfassung machen die Vorgabe, dass Staatsbürgerinnen und Staatsbürger wählen dürfen. Ich finde man sollte Wahlen sehr ernst nehmen und entsprechend auch diesen demokratischen Grundsatz wahren.)*

Arguments in favor reflect three aspects of the debate: (1) democratic societies require equal rights for all based on residence; (2) long-term residents are already part of societies regardless of their citizenship status; and (3) European integration will be facilitated by access to national voting rights based on residence. Arguments against foreigner political rights also reflect three aspects: (1) those participating in national elections should share common values and culture; (2) voting should be attached to a full range of (informal) civic responsibilities; and (3) citizens entitled to vote do not jeopardize democratic norms. Participants were asked to read all arguments and can react to them directly using thumbs up and down. For the information-only group, the treatment ended after viewing these arguments. Table 12 displays all arguments (that were read by deliberation and information groups).

Participants in the information-deliberation group then proceeded into a virtual "deliberation space" and were asked to engage with two further arguments, one in favor and the other against foreigner voting rights. Arguments in favor and against were randomized and presented as if they were made by other participants. This takes the treatment a step further: Participants not only passively read, but actively reflect, take a position, and vocalize it. All arguments only re-iterate notions that have already been covered in the six original arguments, though they are reformulated. Thereby, the information-deliberation group did not receive more factual information than the information-only group. Throughout the exercise, all participants remained fully anonymous and were allocated a random username. Figure 1 shows how the deliberative treatment looked to survey participants.

Figure 1: Extract from the deliberative treatment

Another participating person reacted to this argument with the comment below.
First, read their exchange:

user_138 I've been part of German society for 15 years. But I don't want to give up my heritage and family in Turkey. I am not allowed to have dual citizenship. My future is in Germany and I want to participate here.

user_465 I wonder how we can make sure that people who vote also want to protect democracy. I do think that believing in the rule of law and democracy is important to participate in an election in Germany. This might be difficult for someone who has grown up in country that is not a democracy.

What do you think of the counter-argument?
Please respond to the participant in at least two sentences:

Operationalization of the variables

The analysis of the survey experiment focuses on opinion change and argumentative quality. Opinion change is measured as the difference in positions on foreigner voting rights before and after the treatment. These positions are measured on a 0-100 scale, where 0 indicates strong rejection and 100 indicates strong approval of granting voting rights to non-citizen residents of at least five years.

Table 13: Operationalization of control variables for the covariate models

Variable	Operationalization
Deliberative Treatment	Allocation to the deliberative treatment group=1
	Allocation to another group =0
Information Treatment	Allocation to the information-only treatment group=1
	Allocation to another group =0
Gender (female)	Female =1
(Reference categories: male, other)	Male or other =0
Age	Age in numbers
University degree	Holding a university degree =1
	Holding another educational degree (high school, secondary school, apprenticeship or other) =0
Migration background	Migration background (the participant, min. one of their parents or min. one of their grandparents was not born in Germany) =1
	No migration background =0
Ethnic-civic indicators	
(Responses to the question: What do you think: When is someone really German? Some people say these aspects are important to being German, others think they are not. How important are these aspects for you to consider someone as genuinely German? A total of 9 aspects were part of the survey. 1= not at all important, 2= not very important, 3= rather important 4= very important)	
Geographical belonging	Having lived the majority of one's life in Germany
Civic obligations	Taking on civic obligations
Citizenship indicators	
(Response to the question: Please rate the following statements. A total of 24 statements were part of the survey. 1= do not at all agree, 4= neither agree nor disagree, 7= strongly agree)	
Pride in German democracy	I am proud of German democracy.
Individualism	The individual and not the community should come first in our society.
Cosmopolitanism	Just as much connects me to people in other countries as to people in my country.

Argumentative quality is measured using two indicators: argument repertoire and integrative complexity. Argument repertoire captures the range of arguments people hold both in favour and against their own viewpoint, and is frequently seen as a measure of opinion quality (Capella, Price, and Nir 2002). It is measured based on a question asking participants to list arguments in favour of and against foreigner voting rights separately. It then simply counts how many arguments each participant made. Integrative complexity, in turn, is a psychological

concept and captures "differentiation" of viewpoints (the extent to which participants take a multitude of perspectives into account) and "integration" of viewpoints (i.e. the degree to which participants account for complexities in their reasoning). Integrative complexity is measured on the basis of an automated LIWC (Linguistic Inquiry & Word Count) dictionary-based approach (Brundidge et al. 2014; Wyss, Beste, and Bächtiger 2015). Both opinion change and argument quality are subjected to causal analysis in order to determine whether they were systematically affected by the deliberative and/ or information treatments.

A number of control variables are included in the models investigating opinion change – gender, age, university degree and migration background – to address potential systematic differences between the viewpoints of socio-demographic groups. The previously mentioned question on ethnic and civic national identity as well as some responses from individual statements of the Q-methodological survey are also included in the causal analysis. This is to investigate the effect of broader citizenship conceptions on positions on foreigner voting rights. All operationalizations can be found in Table 13.

5.3. Result 1: Opinion transformation on foreigner voting rights

The research design allows an investigation of whether and why opinions on foreigner voting rights change after participants reflect and deliberate on them. The third research question on deliberative opinion change is the focus of this sub-section. It analyzes pre-deliberative opinion and deliberative opinion change on the individual and aggregate levels.

Before the experiment, participants report a mean response of 41.2 points (out of 100 points) on the outcome variable, which is indicative of a skeptical position towards political rights of foreigners. Over 40% of participants tend towards an extreme position with 31.8% strongly rejecting the proposal (i.e. giving a rating of 10 points or lower) and 12.2% strongly supporting it (i.e. giving a rating of 90 points or higher). After the treatment, the position of the overall sample moves to a slightly more positive position on average (with a mean increase of 1.1 points).

An exploration of individual-level opinion change shows a moderating tendency in the overall sample: On average, participants moved towards the middle. This moderating change applies especially to those who initially held negative positions; they experienced a net increase in position of 1.9 (after subtracting the expected regression to the mean[15]).

---

[15] The regression to the mean is the observation that participants always tend towards more moderate positions when asked on a position the second time. The RMT is calculated using the formula RMT = 100*(1-cor(pre-position, post-position)); the RMT indicates a percentage for the expected mean change.

Table 14: Observed differences in means and expected differences in means for those with initially (un)favorable positions on foreigner voting rights, per treatment group

	Initial position positive (>50)				Initial position negative (<50)			
	Mean (before)	Mean (after)	Difference in means	Expected RMT	Mean (before)	Mean (after)	Difference in means	Expected RMT
Overall sample	76.1	73.9	-2.2	-7.3	15.3	18.7	+3.4	+1.5
Discussion group	73.6	71.4	-2.2	-5.1	17.8	18.3	+0.5	+1.2
Information group	78.7	77.6	-1.1	-3.7	15.5	17.8	+2.3	+0.7
Control group	76.5	73.5	-3.0	-12.3	1.7	20.1	+7.8	+2.0

An analysis of the regression to the mean by treatment groups gives a first indication of systematic differences: In all three treatment groups, the position changes of those who were initially favorable to foreigner voting rights (i.e. rated them as above 50 on a scale of 0 to 100) remain smaller than expected based on the regression to the mean and therefore seem negligeable. While the control group experiences a noticeable increase in favorable positions (of 5.8 points after subtracting the expected regression to the mean), this does not apply to the information and discussion groups. Particularly participants in the deliberation group who were unfavorable at the outset experienced nearly no change in position. Based on this, there is some indicator for polarization in the discussion and in the information groups, in the form of participants who already had an unfavorable position holding onto it or even moving towards a more extreme position. A variance test is run to further explore this finding: The variances on the pre- and post-position of control and information group are virtually the same, but I do indeed find quite an increase in variance for the post-position of the discussion group. However, none of these differences are statistically significant (see Appendix 4).

Causal analysis of opinion change

Next, I explore whether the differences between treatment groups are systematic and significant. To do so, I employ OLS regression analysis to estimate the treatment effect. To avoid "ceiling effects", post-treatment opinions are regressed on pre-treatment opinions (Gerber et al. 2014). One model also includes pre-treatment control variables to control for slight imbalances across the three treatment groups as well as to reduce noise and increase power in experiments (Broockman et al. 2017). These control variables are: gender, age, university degree, migration background, opinions on ethnic and civic national identity as well as on citizenship (all of which are deeply interlinked with preferences on foreigner voting rights).

Table 15: Opinion change

Dependent Variable: Position T2 on foreigner voting rights

	Basic Model	Model with pre-treatment controls	Interaction Model
Treatment Effect (Reference category: Control Group)			
Deliberative Treatment	-3.02	-4.83 **	-7.51 **
	(2.15)	(2.30)	(3.43)
Information Treatment	-1.85	-3.35	-5.73 *
	(2.12)	(2.30)	(3.22)
Individual-level variables			
Gender (female) (Reference categories: male, other)		0.05	
		(1.90)	
Age		-0.11 *	
		(0.07)	
University degree		1.74	
		(2.15)	
Migration background		5.07 **	
		(2.31)	
Ethnic-civic indicators			
Geographical belonging		-2.21 **	
		(1.11)	
Civic obligations		-1.29	
		(1.46)	
Citizenship indicators			
Pride in German democracy		0.42	
		(0.63)	
Individualism		0.87	
		(0.25)	
Cosmopolitanism		1.51 **	
		(0.01)	
Interaction Terms			
Position T1 * deliberative treatment			0.11 *
			(0.06)
Position T1 * information treatment			0.10
			(0.06)
Position T1 F	0.91 ****	0.83 ****	0.85 ****
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Intercept	6.40 ****	3.16	9.05 ****
Multiple R2	0.82	0.83	0.82
Adjusted R^2	0.82	0.82	0.82

Note: N=286 for all models; Standard Errors in parentheses; where *p< 0.1; p**< 0.05; p***< 0.00

I run several models: First, a first-difference model[16] without pre-treatment controls yields no statistically significant effects across the three groups. Second, in a model with control variables, I find that the deliberation group is less positive toward voting rights for foreigners after the treatment compared to the control group, even though the substantive effect is small (about 5 points on a 100-point-scale). Third, more substantive differences emerge when I interact the initial positions on foreigner voting rights with the three groups. The deliberation group now scores more than 7 points lower than the control group on the approval of foreigner voting rights. There is also a statistically significant difference between the information-only and the control group (with the former scoring lower after the treatment than the latter). The interaction term between initial position on foreigners voting rights and the deliberation group indicates that the deliberation treatment is contingent on the position of participants at the outset: While I observe a slightly positive (and marginally significant) trend for those who had positive positions initially (in comparison to the control group), I find a negative trend for those who were skeptical of foreigner voting rights pre-deliberation. This indicates a clarification of opinions: Rather than leading to agreement or moderation, deliberation clarified and stabilized existing views.

In sum, opinion changes on political rights are model-dependent. However, I find no indication that deliberating participants more strongly support political rights of foreigners in the aggregate, as predicted by the progressive variant of deliberation. This difference even holds if I run the models only with those participants in the sample who have migration background, (and thus have potentially greater personal affectedness regarding foreigner political rights). The results of all models for participants with a migration background specifically is displayed in Table 16. The correspondingly smaller sample size should be seen as a limitation, but given the large effect sizes I can assume that the effect at least does not disappear for participants with a migration background[17].

---

[16] Based on Liker, Augustyniak & Duncan (1985), a first difference model can be run if we can assume that the only factor that changes between a pre- and post-measurement is the experience of the treatment, meaning that other observable or unobservable factors can be dropped from the equation.

[17] Based on the same power analysis conducted for the general model, with N=60, power levels of 0.9 and a statistical significance of 0.05, this small sample is just enough to predict large effects. The models in this calculation do yield much larger effects than the models with the whole population.

Table 16: Opinion change among participants with migration background

Dependent Variable: Position T2 on foreigner voting rights

	Basic Model	Model with pre-treatment controls	Interaction Model
Treatment Effect **(Reference category: Control Group)**			
Deliberative Treatment	-8.32 *	-8.67	-20.31 **
	(4.86)	(5.42)	(8.76)
Information Treatment	-9.64 *	-14.43	-27.08 ***
	(5.35)	(6.23)	(9.63)
Individual-level variables			
Gender (female)		-1.34	
(Reference categories: male, other)		(4.79)	
Age		-0.16	
		(0.15)	
University degree		-4.32	
		(5.97)	
Ethnic-civic indicators			
Geographical belonging		-5.62 **	
		(2.42)	
Civic obligations		4.62	
		(3.25)	
Citizenship indicators			
Pride in German democracy		0.93	
		(1.57)	
Individualism		0.46	
		(1.73)	
Cosmopolitanism		2.51	
		(1.52)	
Interaction Terms			
Position T1 * deliberative treatment			0.25
			(0.16)
Position T1 * information treatment			0.34 **
			(0.16)
Position T1 F	0.82 ****	0.71 ****	0.66 ****
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.10)
Intercept	18.44 ****	15.38	27.12 ****
Multiple R^2	0.74	0.80	0.76
Adjusted R^2	0.73	0.75	0.74

Note: N=60 for all models; Standard Errors in parentheses; where *$p < 0.1$; p**< 0.05; p***< 0.00

As a further robustness check, I used matching techniques to ensure that effects are not driven by systematic differences in the random treatment allocations. The matching procedure was based on the variables on which the treatment groups slightly differed (education, regional background (east vs west Germany) and positions on foreigner voting rights at the outset). The deliberation treatment effect in the matched data is significant in the model using the interaction variable (see Appendix 5 for the full models with matched data).

Upon closer inspection, I find that the clarification effect holds especially for those situated at the extremes. There is a slight positive trend for those with very positive initial positions (i.e. who rated acceptance of foreigner voting rights with at least 90 points); in turn, there is a negative trend of those with initially skeptical positions. This negative trend can be observed for nearly all of those who rated foreigner voting rights negatively at the outset (i.e. 50 points or lower) but again is the strongest for those at the extremes (i.e. who have accepted foreigner voting rights with 10 points and less)). This is indicative of a clarification effect of deliberation and its communitarian variant, where participants find out where they really stand through deliberation. The clarification effect is further supported through an analysis of individual-level changes, especially for those participants with already negative views (i.e. a position ≤ 50). Among participants with already negative views, the proportion of those with opinion polarization is highest for the deliberation group (36.7% of those with negative views polarized their view, compared to only 24.1% in the pure control group). Overall, only 10.8% of participants switched sides (i.e. move from <50 to >50 on the scale).

5.4. Result 2: Quality of opinion

The research design uses a minimal definition of deliberation, which begs the question of whether deliberation was actually effective in this limited format. To investigate the effectiveness of the deliberation treatment, this sub-section analyses argument quality. If deliberation worked, the deliberating group should show higher levels of argument quality.
To analyze argument quality, I focus on argument repertoire and integrative complexity. Since the variable argument repertoire is highly skewed, I employ a poisson regression[18], again with and without pre-treatment covariates. To measure argument repertoire, I count the arguments participants make in an exercise that asks them to list all arguments in favor of and against foreigner voting rights respectively.

---

[18] Results of a negative binomial regression yielded a very large Theta value, while the poisson regression yields an excellent model fit.

Table 17: Treatments and argument repertoire

	Basic Model	Model with pre-treatment controls
Treatment Effect **(Reference category: Control Group)**		
Deliberation Treatment	0.42 **** (0.12)	0.40 *** (0.12)
Information Treatment	0.18 (0.12)	0.18 (0.13)
Individual-level variables		
Gender (female) (Reference categories: male, other)		0.15 (0.10)
Age		-0.01 ** (0.00)
University degree		0.03 (0.11)
Migration background		0.10 (0.12)
Ethnic-civic indicators		
Geographical belonging		0.06 (0.06)
Civic obligations		0.01 (0.07)
Citizenship indicators		
Pride in German democracy		0.02 (0.03)
Individualism		0.00 (0.04)
Cosmopolitanism		0.03 (0.03)
Pre-position		0.00 (0.00)
Intercept	0.64 **** (0.09)	0.43 (0.41)
Null deviance	159.3	140.5
Residual null deviance	145.6	105.5
AIC	666.76	608.59

Note: N=286 for all models; Standard Errors in parentheses; where *p< 0.1; p**< 0.05; p***< 0.00

The deliberation group in particular has a higher argument repertoire compared to the information-only and especially the control group (see Table 2). Being part of the deliberation group increases argument repertoire by about half an argument (on average). A glance at the raw figures indicates that participants of the control group produced between one and six arguments (about 36% producing only one argument), whereas participants in the information-

only and the deliberation groups produce between one and eight arguments. In the deliberation group, almost 25% produced two arguments while 22% produced four arguments or more.

Table 18: Treatments and integrative complexity

	Basic Model	Model with pre-treatment controls
Treatment effect (Reference category: control group)		
Deliberative Treatment	1.53 * (0.85)	1.80 ** (0.89)
Information Treatment	1.56 (0.85) *	2.49 *** (0.91)
Individual-level variables		
Gender (female) (Reference categories: male, other)		1.02 (0.73)
Age		-0.02 (0.06)
University degree		1.05 (0.82)
Migration background		0.07 (0.93)
Ethnic-civic indicators		
Geographical belonging		0.31 (0.46)
Civic obligations		0.68 (0.55)
Citizenship indicators		
Pride in German democracy		0.29 (0.24)
Individualism		0.03 (0.28)
Cosmopolitanism		-0.19 (0.24)
Pre-position		0.03 ** (0.01)
Intercept	-1.11 * (0.61)	-6.32 ** (2.93)
Multiple R^2	0.02	0.10
Adjusted R^2	0.01	0.05

Note: N=286 for all models; Standard Errors in parentheses; where *p< 0.1; p**< 0.05; p***< 0.00

This already indicates that opinion stability (or partial opinion polarization) in the deliberation group is based on more reasons than in the information and control group. I now check whether those reasons are also more sophisticated. I do so by focusing on integrative complexity, which is analyzed for both pro and con arguments. An OLS regression shows that both the deliberation and information treatment have higher levels of integrative complexity compared to the control group (the slight differences in integrative complexity between the deliberation and information-only group are not statistically significant[19]). The results on argument repertoire and integrative complexity underline that the virtual deliberative space produced deliberative value by enhancing participants' breadth and depth of argumentation. This also confirms that despite its minimal design, the deliberative treatment did have a deliberative effect: Participants are better able to provide nuanced and reflected reasoning on foreigner voting rights.

5.5. Result 3: Substantive reasons

This sub-section explores how participants reckon with the boundary problem, thereby responding to the second research question of the thesis. The research question also allows unravelling why participants in the deliberation group – who have a higher argumentative repertoire and higher integrative complexity, especially in comparison with the pure control group – tend not to endorse political rights of foreigners. It thereby attempts to explain the argumentative mechanism behind deliberative opinion change.

I present two results in this sub-section: First, I conduct a relatively rough analysis of arguments made during the online deliberative exercise. This gives a first overview of reasons given by the deliberating treatment group. However, the number of arguments made is relatively low and participants responded directly to other arguments, which potentially led to a framing effect on certain issues. Second, arguments made by all participants during the pro and contra exercise (which was also the basis for analyzing argument repertoire and complexity) is subjected to in-depth qualitative analysis. This allows a broader analysis of arguments important to participants, as well as a comparison of arguments made between treatment groups.

First, I explore the content of arguments made in the deliberative exercise. In the framework of the deliberation exercise, each deliberating participant interacted with two randomly assigned argumentation threads. The participants' responses were subjected to qualitative content analysis. Arguments were allocated into six categories: Common values and ideas, obligation, rule of law and democracy, financial contribution and social connectedness.

The largest number of arguments falls into the category of rule of law and democracy. Participants emphasize that democratic norms should be shared, democratic processes respected and the rule of law maintained. Those who wish to participate in German democracy

---

[19] The coefficient on the information treatment is not significant in any models that use deliberation as a baseline category (only the control group treatment is).

should follow its laws and procedures, and should even be willing to protect or fight for democracy.

Within the arguments surrounding common values and ideas as a requirement for access to political rights, participants distinguish between common values (which are often explicitly defined in broad terms, such as values enshrined in the constitution) and common ways of thinking (which are more concretely defined in terms of holding specific political views). A large number of arguments tend towards common values being important for joint citizenship. They are seen as relevant to maintaining democracy, keeping the order, and accepting a 'German way of life'. On the other hand, all arguments against common values entail the idea that these are helpful in principle, but that it is morally difficult to demand that people adopt values they do not embrace. Meanwhile all but one argument reject commonality in terms of common ways of thinking for the following reasons: The demos already includes people with different opinions, political viewpoints cannot (and should not) be controlled, and different (and even potentially extreme) views enrich democracy. Arguments on obligation demand that rights should not be granted without asking for some degree of responsibility, be it in the form of contributing to society or proclaiming a dedication to the society or state.

While a few arguments suggest that paying taxes or making financial contributions to the state could entitle someone to gain access to political rights, this criterion is more often rejected. Participants state that employment or financial means should not determine political participation, that working in Germany does not yet make one a good citizen or provide common ground, and that a similar criterion does not (and also should not) apply to those who already hold German citizenship.

Many arguments target social connectedness. Most often, these suggest a minimum residence requirement. Residence is seen as allowing people to learn about the country, its political system, and its history. Often, familial relationships, employment, and an active role within the community are connected with seeing someone as belonging in Germany. Aspects like having a common experience with Germans and sharing the same interest in the country's future are also invoked.

All in all, this initial systematization of arguments paints a relatively clear picture at least on some points. Respecting laws and endorsing democratic processes seems a broadly shared criterion, sometimes with allusions to constitutional patriotism. Requesting a common way of thinking among citizens is relatively clearly rejected, while common values, their content, and in how far they should be related to culture are a contested criterion for belonging. Most often, purely financial criteria are rejected and employment is rather invoked in connection with points on social connectedness – there is broad agreement that residence, relationships, and lived experience as well as knowledge of the political system and the language matter to belonging.

Second, I analyze arguments from the pro and contra exercise. This allows the analysis of a larger number of arguments made in a broader context, and by all participants. For the qualitative analysis, all arguments are collected and categorized in several rounds of in-depth reviewing. This entails reading each individual statement (i.e. argument) in the first round,

exploring the context (i.e. all arguments given by one person together) in the second round, and finally making sense of arguments in a broader context (i.e. the discussion around foreigners' political rights (Gerbaudo 2016; Saldaña 2015)). The arguments are coded in each round, and codes revised after each round. In the end, I summarize the coded arguments under seven broad themes: geographical factors and common life, economic factors, democracy, obligation, commonality, legal concerns and conditionality. For each of these categories, I define sub-aspects to make the coding more specific (see Appendix 6). In the coding process, each argument is counted as belonging to one specific code; this was nearly always unambiguous because arguments were nearly always formulated as bullet points or in a very straightforward way.

The categories reveal the main themes that matter to participants on foreigner voting rights. Arguments produced in favor of foreigner voting rights mainly fall in the democracy category and revolve around three themes: First, many arguments acknowledge that it is not fair or democratic for people who live in a place to not hold a vote there. Second, arguments understand voting rights as a path to citizenship. They see partaking in an election as an opportunity for non-citizens to learn about the political system and important developments in the country. Third, arguments see voting rights as a logical consequence of an interconnected world. As people become mobile, we cannot expect them to be tied to one place in the long term and should be more flexible about our ideas of belonging.

Arguments produced against foreigner voting rights frequently propose that non-citizens should naturalize instead. Overall, many participants demonstrate in their reasoning that they are willing to accept foreigner voting rights under conditions that are similar to the conditions tied to naturalization, such as length of residence, knowledge about the political system and history, language skills, and acceptance of the basic premises of the constitution. These arguments acknowledge that many foreigner residents already fulfil these obligations (participants do say that foreigners should be given the vote so long as they fulfil these criteria).

Furthermore, many arguments against foreigner voting rights target obligation more specifically, albeit in different ways. Some arguments use the terminology of obligation to ask for commitment to Germany, responsibilities tied to voting, or loyalty to the German constitution and democracy. Arguments made on obligations connected to democratic participation do not want people to vote without considering their choice, or without being informed about the past and present of the country. Other arguments cast obligation as mainly economic and propose that those allowed to vote should have a workplace, pay taxes, or be financially independent. Many arguments emphasize geographical belonging: If foreigners obtain voting rights, then they must be committed to stay in the long-term. This commitment should go beyond simple residence; foreigners should also be committed to the country, to share basic democratic principles, or to contribute to the economy and society. As a minimum, foreigners should see their lives rotate primarily around the place of residence. Finally, some arguments for rejecting foreigner voting rights stress the importance of common culture or common values. Those who partake in democratic decisions must share a common conviction to certain values or norms – ranging from a commitment to liberal democracy to a shared way

of life, tradition, or religion. Some arguments also view democracy as a way to safeguard a 'German way of life'.

Table 19 displays how often each theme was invoked by participants from the deliberative, the information and the pure control group respectively. As can be gleaned from Table 4, the majority of arguments fall in the categories of obligation, commonality, geography, economy and law which tend to imply restrictive versions of granting voting rights to foreigners; by contrast, the democracy category which implies progressive ideas about enfranchising foreigners, is only mentioned in about 10-20% of the arguments. Moreover, we see that there are *differences across the groups*. The democracy arguments are least mentioned in the deliberation group and most mentioned in the control group. Except for economic factors (which the control group hardly refers to), the other themes are invoked in relatively equal parts by each group. These results show that the deliberation group invoked arguments connected to commonality and obligation[20] more frequently, and they invoked arguments connected to democracy less frequently. This indicates that slight conservative trend we found in the deliberation group seems to be driven by a different weighting of substantive arguments.

Table 19: Treatments and Substantive Arguments

	Deliberative Group	Information-only Group	Pure Control Group
Democracy (Equal rights, plurality of opinion, democracy as learning)	10.0% (17)	13.8% (19)	19.8% (24)
Geography (Residence, center of life, knowledge of country)	20.0% (34)	21.0% (29)	19.8% (24)
Economy (Workplace, taxes, welfare independence)	14.7% (25)	11.6% (16)	1.7% (2)
Obligation (Commitment and loyalty, responsibility)	14.7% (25)	10.1% (14)	14.9% (18)
Commonality (Democratic norms, values, socialization, culture, religion, language, integration)	29.4% (50)	26.8% (37)	22.3% (27)
Law (Citizenship requirement, avoiding multiple citizenships)	11.2 (19)	16.7% (23)	21.5% (26)

Note: Relative (and absolute) number of themes invoked in pro and con arguments on foreigner voting rights

---

[20] While a similar proportion of arguments is made on obligation in relative terms, the deliberating group focuses on obligation much more often in absolute terms.

Overall, the analysis of substantive rationales reveals that participants echo many of the arguments put forward by de Schutter and Ypi (2016) in their proposal for "mandatory citizenship". Skeptics of foreigner voting rights usually do not oppose the idea of non-citizens voting in principle but they do not agree with granting an important citizenship right without imposing the corresponding obligations. That foreigners should be a part of a common life is strongly mirrored in participants' arguments demanding long-term attachment to geographical place, a concrete commitment to economy or society, or a feeling of connectedness and primary loyalty. De Schutter and Ypi also dub these "informal obligations", i.e. civic obligations that are not predetermined by law but defined by practices and expectations. An example is that citizens are expected to be knowledgeable about the political system in which they are entitled to vote. While some participants argue that political rights should be granted to immigrants who *already* fulfil these obligations, others feel that citizenship adds a layer of obligation and commitment that long-term residency fails to deliver. In short, long-term residents must be more than "permanent guests" (De Schutter & Ypi 2015, p.241) if they are granted voting rights. Notice that De Schutter and Ypi argue that "mandatory citizenship simultaneously implies that the state is obliged to grant citizenship to foreigners automatically and facilitate full belonging for new citizens (De Schutter & Ypi 2015). It is questionable, however, whether such automatic naturalization would find support among those demanding assimilation in exchange for citizenship. In sum, while "informal obligations" strongly matter for the participants of the experiment, their exact shape and implications remain contested.

5.6. Chapter discussion: Communitarian deliberative mechanisms and reasoning

This chapter analyzes survey participants' opinions, opinion transformations and reasoning on the contested issue of foreigner voting rights. Although deliberation is often said to conduce to progressive outcomes (and also does so in many deliberative events), this deliberative experiment on foreigner voting rights tells a different story. Participants of the deliberating group did not move towards a more progressive standpoint of granting non-citizen residents the right to vote. Rather, the analyses point to a clarification effect, whereby especially those with already negative views at the outset increased their skepticism (compared to the control group). Surely, the deliberative treatment was fairly minimal (targeted at engagement with and reflection on counterarguments), but a similar result was obtained in an in-person two-hour deliberation on foreigner voting rights in Switzerland (Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014). This suggests that the results are not a product of the minimal deliberative treatment, but rather they can be seen as a general effect of considered opinions on this topic. Notice further that the Swiss experiment was applied to university students – a demographic that tends to be more progressive and leftist than the average population – but no student deliberation group 'warmed up' with foreigner voting rights (with some groups even showing a marked negative trend) (Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014).

These results may seem puzzling for some deliberative enthusiasts, but opening the "black box" behind opinion change in the experiment shows that participants in the deliberation group had a higher argumentative repertoire and higher levels of integrative complexity in their reasoning, especially in comparison with the control group. Though rare, similar patterns of opinion polarization and decreasing enthusiasm for more inclusive politics have been found in previous deliberative experiments, for example on same-sex marriage in Poland (Wojcieszak and Price 2010). An in-depth look at the substantive rationales displays that the participants strongly emphasized arguments revolving around obligations and commitment to the nation and society. It seems that issues deeply rooted in individual values or strongly established in or framed through public discourse are difficult to change in a deliberative process (see also Dryzek and Niemeyer 2008; Mendelberg 2002). Previous examples from research and politics have indicated similar results, which leads to the assumption that this deliberative mechanism may be issue-specific. A panel study on direct democracy has found that issues around minorities most often have conservative outcomes – a similar pattern may be at play in deliberative processes (for contrary findings see Lindell et al. 2017).

A focus on the 2015 referendum on introducing foreigner voting rights in Luxemburg bolster such a conclusion. The introduction of foreigner voting rights failed with a strong opposition of 78% (Government of Luxembourg 2015). Ahead of the referendum, public opinion polls actually showed a 60% support for introducing foreigner voting rights (Finck 2015), a tendency that seems to have reversed during the campaign. This is indicative of the fact that engagement with and reflection on foreigner voting rights might increase skepticism and conservatism, not progressivism. It is also interesting to note that the "No" campaign placed a strong focus on agreeing with the aims of the proposal in principle but proposed the naturalization of foreigners instead (de Jonge and Petry 2021). This is similar to the argument advances by the German Constitutional Court that disenfranchisement should be solved via naturalization. Thus, the argument in favor of full membership (and thereby maintaining the connection between citizenship and political rights) seems to resonate not only with the participants in our experiment but also in the context of real-world politics and law.

Moreover, the findings underline the challenge of law-making in the context of minority rights, and immigrant rights in particular. Both the Luxembourg referendum as well as empirical analyses from Switzerland show that promoting the rights of immigrants via participatory practices – such as direct democratic voting – is often unsuccessful (Arrighi 2021; Veri 2019), a result supported by cross-country investigations (Bochsler and Hug 2015). Citizenship policies are highly politicized and often mobilized by political parties for vote gains (Vink and Bauböck 2013). This analysis shows that deliberation does not necessarily fare better in this regard. Even though many progressive reformers have a soft spot for participatory tools, they need to re-think the pathways how to realize their goals. Veri, for example, makes the provocative recommendation that in order to succeed, the expansion of citizen rights "must be hidden from public scrutiny and embedded in a general constitutional reform." (Veri 2019 p.419)

At the same time, measures of opinion quality and the qualitative analysis of substantive reasons demonstrate that participants skepticism of foreigner voting rights is not prejudiced or

unconsidered. Rather, participants invoke reasons that are reflective of the debate in political theory, thereby indicating a rather high degree of sophistication. Participants in the deliberative treatment also displayed higher levels of argument repertoire and integrative complexity (especially in comparison with the control group), underling that the process of opinion formation was not 'irrational'. A qualitative analysis of participants' substantive reasons unravels traces of what De Schutter and Ypi (2015) dub "mandatory citizenship", implying that political rights must be attached to obligations, commitment and belonging to the community. There does seem to be genuine concern about the meaning of non-citizen voting rights for social cohesion, solidarity, and democracy. Even though participants acknowledge that many denizens already fulfil obligations, they are not willing to grant rights without any conditionality.

5.7. Chapter summary: Opinions on the boundary problem

The findings presented in this chapter deepen insights from the findings on citizenship (Chapter 4) in several ways: In the discussion on foreigner voting rights, participants re-iterate the importance they allocate to the status of citizenship. It demonstrates a joint commitment to democracy, entails rules of fairness and equal status between all involved, and grants some degree of connectivity. Most participants defined commonality as going beyond a joint commitment to democracy, such as through shared values or shared connectedness to a place.

These reasons explain why participants are skeptical of non-citizen voting rights – in particular, those in the deliberating group who had additional space to reflect their views, and exhibit high ability to reason with the proposal. In sum it seems that while participants understand the dilemma of the boundary problem, they do not wish to resolve it through foreigner voting rights. To some extent, this also confirms that to participants, national citizenship has a unique value that they expect those entitled to vote to share in.

In this experiment, deliberation had a clarification effect and re-iterated the status quo. At the same time, I observe relatively high-quality deliberation (especially given that the deliberative treatment was minimal). This is insightful to the study of deliberation and grants insight into deliberative mechanisms on challenging issues that tap into identity and belonging.

6. Discussion: What makes a citizen?

Contemporary societies struggle with strengthening or revitalizing democracies. Observers worry about dropping participation rates and waning political trust in Western democracies. Deliberative democrats have proposed to strengthen democracy by improving on public discourse on all democratic levels – from participatory processes, over parliaments, to democratic systems as a whole. Often, they also call for more participatory democratic institutions. These allow citizens themselves to reflect on or play a part in political decision-making.

In forming these proposals, deliberative democrats assume citizens to be competent and interested in discussing and making democratic decisions. Because of this, citizens themselves hold the creative potential for effective democratic innovation. This study provides further support for this assumption in the framework of particularly contested issues, namely citizenship and political membership. It shows that when citizens exchange and weigh reasons, they form well-reflected and thoughtful proposals on solving democratic dilemmas.

In discussions around both deliberative and participatory democratic solutions, one core challenge is achieving genuine inclusion, in the sense of making sure that all relevant voices are recognized as relevant, heard, and taken into account. This refers back to another challenge inherent to democratic crises, namely the balance between commonality and pluralism. In a pluralistic democracy, it is contested who belongs and who should be accounted for politically. This thesis used the concept of citizenship to mobilize such questions, for example by investigating how citizens themselves define the commonality required between those who vote together, the relevance of civic obligations, or the rights afforded to others. In combining the field of deliberative democracy and citizenship, the thesis was able to generate surprising and insightful results via three research questions, the responses to which are briefly summarized in this chapter. In a synthesis of all findings, I further specify participants' proposals on democratic membership in the 21st century, and discuss how these proposals were formed and transformed via a set of discursive research instruments. With these overviews in mind, I then respond to each of the three challenges of the field defined at the outset and discuss in how far this study contributed to their exploration.

6.1. Summary of the results

The first research question built on a critique of traditional survey instruments to measure citizenship conceptions, by asking:

RQ 1. How do German citizens conceptualize citizenship?

Though useful in some contexts, many survey instruments are insufficient to capture citizenship as a contested concept. This is especially because they discount ambiguity and social embeddedness. I used Q-methodology to measure how German citizens conceptualize citizenship, and argued for the usefulness of its subjective approach that allows a behavioral response from participants. At the same time, Q-methodology yields a systematic result by delivering distinct but encompassing citizenship perspectives. This allowed a relatively straightforward identification of commonalities and differences in citizenship conceptualizations. The results presented bottom-up citizenship conceptualizations in broad and holistic terms. They revealed that a Q-methodological survey measures different facets of citizenship perspectives than traditional survey instruments (such as the ethnic civic instrument). This makes it a helpful method to identify further contentions and nuances in citizens' perceptions. The investigation showed that a wide range of different research instruments is needed to capture a concept as complex and dynamic as citizenship.

The investigation effectively showed that citizenship conceptualizations are indeed diverse and contested. There are deep differences for example in terms of how participants relate to the state, how they believe equality should be achieved, and the importance they assign to culture. At the same time, the investigation did identify commonalities, the most striking one being that some degree of connectivity with others is important to how citizenship is understood.

Q-statements that drew broad agreement across the four perspectives embrace obligation and what can be summarized as "a common way of life". All participants' citizenship conceptions entail both rights and obligations, and nearly all agree that it is unacceptable if not everyone participates politically (except for liberal democrats who did not use the statement in their sorts). There was broad agreement on the legal basis of politics: participants tend strongly towards universal rights. At the same time, some participants disagree with ideas that can be viewed as multiculturalist: Minority rights are rejected across perspectives, and both ethnocultural and liberal citizens are in favor of assimilation.

The identified commonalities show that there is no easy or straightforward solution to a complex problem. While there is a shared idea of connectivity between citizens, the form of that connectivity varies starkly between conceptualizations: Participants define connectivity through thick conceptions of shared ancestry, active participation, thin conceptions of shared institutions, or humanist connection. While there is a common point of departure, the paths towards defining joint conceptions of belonging have fundamental conflicts. This points towards potential challenges for implementing such connectivity in political systems in

practice. Resolving such challenges will be relevant to developing ideas of how to balance commonality and pluralism.

In practice, discussions on complex issues often entail the fundamental question of what should be talked about. It is difficult to pinpoint which conflicts deserve attention in the sense that their discussion will move the conversation forward. The discursive methodological design of this thesis was effective at getting to the heart of a conflict. It clearly defined commonalities and differences between views. The fact that there is some degree of common ground is promising to theories and practitioners interested in democracy. Common ground is a starting point for building bridges even on conflictual issues. Future conversations between citizens, and future research that focuses on how to resolve remaining controversies holds the potential for generating shared understandings of citizenship in contemporary democracies.

Table 20: Strongest commonalities between citizenship perspectives

	Ethnocultural citizens (85 participants)	Active citizens (62 participants)	Liberal citizens (25 participants)	Cosmopolitan citizens (19 participants)
For me, being a citizen does not only mean having rights, but also having obligations toward state and society.	2	2	3	1
It is no problem at all if only some people want to participate politically in our state.	-1	-1	0	-1
For some societal groups (e.g. people with different ethnicities or religions) special rights are necessary so that their standpoint is not overlooked by the majority.	-3	-1	-2	-1
If people want to live in Germany they should adapt to German customs and traditions.	3	0	2	0

Meanwhile, other aspects of citizenship conceptualizations pointed primarily towards deep conflict. For the Q-statements with the strongest disagreement between sorts, it is not immediately clear how to determine common ground. For these aspects, it seems more relevant to dig deeper and gain a better understanding of *why* people disagree on these points, and what they expect in turn. In the citizenship conceptualizations identified in this study, the most controversial points are on the welfare state, immigration, the relationship to German democracy and world citizenship. Disagreement is broad on economic responsibility where perspectives are split between individuals holding responsibility for their financial situations on the one hand, and structural inequalities as a main driver of individuals' economic situation. In addition, while ethnocultural citizens see immigration as a threat to the welfare state, all other perspectives actively reject this. Again, ethnocultural citizens take a unique position by not identifying as citizens of the world, unlike all other perspectives. Lastly, there is a split between perspectives' view of German democracy: While some are actively proud of it, others reject

pride. All of these aspects point towards difficult conflict points. Deliberative democrats have made attempts at designing solutions to resolve deep division (see O'Flynn 2006).

Table 21: Strongest differences between citizenship perspectives

	Ethnocultural citizens (85 participants)	Active citizens (62 participants)	Liberal citizens (25 participants)	Cosmopolitan citizens (19 participants)
Every person is responsible for their own economic situation.	1	-1	2	-3
I am worried that German citizens have to compete with immigrants for social welfare (e.g. employment benefits or pensions).	2	-2	-1	-2
If people want to live in Germany they should adapt to German customs and traditions.	3	0	2	0
We have to understand ourselves as citizens of the world first and foremost.	-1	1	1	3
I am proud of the German democracy.	0	2	1	-2

The second component of the discursive research design combined citizenship studies with the study of deliberation. Simultaneously, this step combined the abstract questions around the concept of citizenship with concrete policy debates. Its goal was to deepen questions around citizenship, but also to make them more tangible and applicable to concrete policy decisions. To achieve this, the research design implemented a deliberative exercise on the question of foreigner voting rights, a concrete proposal emerging from the much-discussed boundary problem in political theory. In response to the boundary problem, some argue that citizenship and voting rights belong together, and maintaining their connection is relevant to social cohesion, strong democracy, and civic obligation. Others argue that voting rights should be tied to residence to maintain the all-subjected principle, and to reflect the stakes and obligations people already hold for their place of residence. The research design investigated how citizens themselves weigh these options. This is the subject of research question 2 which asks:

RQ 2. What arguments in favor of and against foreigner voting rights are relevant to German citizens, and how do these differ for those who have deliberated?

The results to this question were drawn from an argumentation exercise in which survey participants list pro and contra arguments on foreigner voting rights (after having been subjected to a deliberative survey experiment). Qualitative analysis confirmed and deepened the results from the first research question: Here, too, the dominant reason for rejecting foreigner voting rights is shared obligation between citizens. Sharing these obligations is seen as necessarily combined with gaining access to the right to vote.

Participants' reasoning added nuance to previous results: Some arguments refer to shared tradition, or a need to protect German culture. These definitions of commonality are arguably irreconcilable with pluralism to some extent. They define citizenship criteria which immigrants who were not born in the country or do not have corresponding ancestry simply cannot achieve. However, a much larger proportion of arguments does not define essentialist criteria for political rights.

Instead, participants' arguments draw on the following aspects: geographically shared life, economic contributions, taking a responsibility for and being committed to country and society, and common practice and knowledge about life in a country. A few arguments focusing on commonality also attempt a re-framing of the terminology of lead culture. Political theorists have largely rejected the term of lead culture as it was used in the German debate, and see it as transporting a racialized and exclusionary conception of belonging (Wasmer and Koch 2000). In the substantive reasoning exercise, participants suggest a European or a multicultural lead culture – an attempt at defining commonality in ways that is compatible with pluralism.

In the last research question, the more established method of a survey experiments investigated how deliberation transforms opinions on foreigner voting rights. While the previous questions where focused on mapping citizens' viewpoints, and exploring them more deeply, this question had a slightly different outlook: It investigated how opinions change or do not change through information gains and deliberation. Thereby it gave insight into a different level of understanding on citizenship conceptions, namely on how positions on citizenship develop and in how far they are alterable (and why). In addition, the research question analyzed political outcomes of deliberative processes. To explore this question, I displayed the contrast between progressive and communitarian deliberation, with the aim of exploring which of the two is activated on a deliberation about foreigner vote rights. This is reflected in the third research question which asks:

RQ 3. How does deliberation affect opinion change on foreigner voting rights?

The results showed that while all participants were relatively skeptical of introducing foreigner voting rights at the outset, deliberation led to a further increase of those skeptical positions. The increase in skeptical positions was driven by a clarification effect, whereby participants strengthened their pre-deliberative position. This holds especially for participants with extremely negative initial views. This is what communitarian deliberation would predict: Those notions already established pre-deliberation are further accentuated further post-deliberation. The design shows a significant, albeit small, effect of deliberation moving participants to a more skeptical position, a result that seems especially driven by those with already negative views. Although deliberation did not yield progressive outcomes, measures of argument quality show it was clearly reflexivity-inducing.

Citizenship-related policies generally and foreigner voting rights specifically are particularly suitable examples for exploring communitarian versions of deliberation. Previous empirical

results do not find progressive opinion transformations after deliberative or direct democratic designs on foreigner voting rights (see e.g. Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014; Bochsler and Hug 2015). The responses to the two previous research questions, which found connectivity to play an important part in citizenship conceptualizations indicate a potential explanation. It seems important to citizens that they share common ground, or know what to expect from those that they make political decisions with. Participants draw on existing bounds and connections to formulate their conceptions of belonging.

6.2.   A synthesis

Each research question of this thesis responded to a specific challenge, and the response to each challenge yielded additional insight on people's thinking about citizenship when they deliberate. The elements of this research design provided a mixed method approach which allows studying opinions on citizenship from different perspectives. I now attempt to synthesize the results by displaying them in combination with each other to provide a further summary and overview of the results. The overview draws on Q-statements, participants' arguments from the deliberative treatment and arguments from the argumentation exercise.

Synthesizing citizenship conceptions and arguments on non-citizen voting rights

In collating results from the Q-methodological survey, the points made by deliberative arguments, and the content of the argumentation exercise it becomes apparent that similar themes play a role in the results of all three: democracy and law, commonality and obligation, and geography and social connectedness. Within these themes, there are slightly different points of emphasis depending on the exercise. Table 22 displays arguments made under these themes in all three elements of the design. The synthesis crystallizes four main findings of the thesis across elements: First, the relevance allocated to financial contributions as a criterion for good citizenship in elite investigations is not mirrored in citizens' perspectives. While some citizens consider taxation as an alternative system for allocating voting rights, an economic conditionality for citizenship is largely rejected. Second, across perspectives and arguments, participants emphasize that citizenship must entail both rights and obligations. Some define obligations via commonality, but the content of commonality and the demands that can be legitimately made for becoming a citizen, or a member of the demos, are highly contested. Third, participants view citizenship as a practice. They are connected to other citizens by virtue of a shared place of residence, common life, and shared routines. Fourth, the synthesis underscores just how heavily participants of this study draw on core ideas of political theory to make their arguments.

Table 22: Synthesis of results on citizenship and voting rights

	Best rated Q-statements	Points made during deliberation	Points made in argumentation
Democracy and law	Some rights are so generally applicable that they should be implemented all over the world and for every individual. I would like for more people in Germany to become active in politics or society. Civic engagement for a good cause (e.g. voluntary engagement in a football club) is just as important as political participation (e.g. protesting or voting.) People learn a lot from political participation, for example about themselves, their skills, and society. I am proud of the German democracy.	Constitution, human rights democratic procedure and rule of law must be accepted and complied with. There is a responsibility to actively defended constitution and democracy.	Equal rights require non-citizen voting rights Plurality of opinion and their representation is important. Participating democratically is a learning experiences and contributes to belonging.
Commonality and obligation	For me, being a citizen does not only mean having rights but also having obligations toward the state and society. If people want to live in Germany they should adapt to German customs and traditions. German culture must be protected. Citizens always have to be observant and critical towards the state.	Common values must be shared (political, societal and sometimes cultural), but no common thinking is required. Obligation is important, e.g. using vote responsibly, contributing to society, and protecting and acting in the interest of the future of the country.	Democratic norms, values, and sometimes culture should be shared. Commitment and loyalty to the country and its future are required. Political rights come with responsibilities. Language and socialization benefit understanding of the country.
Geography and social connectedness	(A person belongs in Germany if they live here, even if they do not have German citizenship.)	Residence is required. Social relationships, family, knowledge and care for place are important.	Residence is important. Having the center of one's life in a country entitles to voting there. Sufficient knowledge about the country and its politics are required.

Note: See Appendix 7 for the mean ratings of each displayed Q-statement, and the number of times each displayed argument was mentioned during deliberation and argumentation respectively.

Rejection of economic conditionality

While economic factors emerged as an aspect of the concourse, they gained relatively little traction in participants' reasoning[21]. Financial independence was a well-supported Q-statement and some points emerged on paying taxes as a criterion for voting rights, but most arguments in this category defined having a job in Germany as an indicator for social connectedness rather than as a requirement to make a financial contribution. The Q-statements also confirmed that all in all, there is not much worry about immigration endangering the stability of the German welfare system.

It should be noted however that the relative unimportance of economic factors is in itself an important finding: Many researchers find that financial self-sufficiency and economic productivity is an increasingly prevalent theme in elite framings of citizenship (Newman and Tonkens 2011) and in citizenship education (Buck and Geissel 2009). Meanwhile, this does not seem to reflect in citizens' perceptions: political and social factors are greater points of emphasis.

Obligation as central to citizenship

Across exercises, the most heavily invoked notion was that people who vote together should feel a joint sense of obligation and have a basic set of commonalities. Commitment and connectivity were emphasized. These can be translated into the vertical and horizontal dimensions inherent to citizenship: In terms of the relationship between citizens and polity, participants emphasized a sense of commitment to the state, the institutions of democracy, the constitution, or the future of the country. In terms of the horizontal relationship between citizens, participants found connectivity between citizens important (be it in the form of shared language, knowledge, or life).

That citizenship includes obligations next to rights was the most heavily endorsed Q-statement, and the largest number of points made during the deliberative and the argumentation exercises were on commonality and obligation. Across instruments, there was a relatively straightforward conception of obligation: Obligations are important and consist of an active contribution to society, a commitment to the country and its future, and a responsibility for protecting democracy (for example by voting responsibly or critically observing actions of one's own government).

While some notion of commonality seems important to participants, its contents are contested: At the outset, the Q-methodological survey showed high popularity for statements that endorse the protection of German culture and cultural assimilation. Some nuance was added through the deliberative exercise: Common values, such as democratic and basic societal norms are required for voting together but commonality should not be defined in too narrow terms. Common ways of thinking were strongly rejected by deliberating participants and they

---

[21] In order to concentrate on aspects that were more important to participants, economic factors are not included in Table 22.

emphasized the value of plural political views. In the argumentation exercise, too, participants focused mainly on sharing democratic norms and values, with only few references to cultural commonality.

Citizenship as a practice

In terms of geography and social connectedness, the main points of emphasis are social interaction and shared knowledge. Residence is connected with having relationships and knowing how things work. Interesting patterns emerged on the points surrounding geography and social connectedness: The Q-statement on geographical definitions of belonging did not perform particularly well – especially in comparison to the statements in the other categories. However, participants often returned to geography in their reasoning: During deliberation, participants accepted that residence leads to deep connectedness. Often, they stated that especially when residence is combined with having social or familial relationships, a place of work, or deep knowledge of the country, this entitles people to vote. In the argumentative exercise, these points appeared again, and were supplemented with the idea of someone voting in the place where they have their "center of life" (German: "Lebensmittelpunkt"). This implies that different aspects of one's life are organized around this particular place.

Re-iterations of ideas from political theory

The results in the category on democracy and law showed that participants reprise ideas from both liberal and republican citizenship theory. Liberal ideas played an important role when participants specified what commonalities should be shared. Democratic norms were the most heavily invoked example. Deliberating participants drew heavily on ideas such as constitutional patriotism and actively defending democracy. Across arguments further basic tenets of liberal democracy were emphasized, such as an appreciation for universal rights and for the plurality of opinions in politics. The Q-statements showed that there is high appreciation for universal rights, and participants state their appreciation for and need to preserve democratic institutions and the rule of law. In the argumentation exercise, arguments around democracy were most often used to support non-citizen voting rights by emphasizing the relevance of equal rights. Meanwhile, a dedication to preserving constitutional principles was also used to endorse the status quo which ties voting rights to citizenship.

Some arguments in the democracy and law category echo ideas on the substantive value of participation closer to republican thought. In these arguments, political participation is important to democratic citizenship both for citizens to learn about politics, and to uphold democracy as a whole. Participants emphasized that they value activity both to politics and to societal life together. They also underscored that good democracy requires the full representation of plural perspectives.

An evaluation of the research instruments

This synthesis shows that the most important points can be discerned across the research instruments of this study: Participants found aspects important in their citizenship conceptualizations, and returned to them when discussing the concrete question of non-citizen voting rights. This speaks for the authentic and well-thought through conceptions. Results are clearly not casually or superficially issued preferences. At the same time, combining insights from all elements of this study contributed to a more nuanced understanding. Most importantly, the synthesis demonstrates that even when participants hold similar positions, they might do so for very different underlying reasons. The comparison of positions on non-citizen voting rights and citizenship conceptualizations underscored this: Similar citizenship conceptualizations do not automatically mean similar policy preferences – active democrats may endorse non-citizen voting rights because they value learning through participation, or reject non-citizen voting rights because they find civic responsibilities important. At the same time, those who reject foreigner voting rights hold different citizenship conceptualizations, and will reject non-citizen voting rights for very different reasons.

The collation of all results also shows that the positions measured via approval of individual Q-statements become much more nuanced when looking at qualitative arguments. For example, while geographical belonging was not one of the most popular Q-statements, arguments based on geographical belonging played an important role in the argumentation exercise. Similarly, while Q-statements on protecting German culture and assimilation received very high approval, these demands were differentiated – and sometimes placed in a more civic frame – in the qualitative arguments. On the whole, qualitative arguments made for a more balanced position that is conducive to inclusivity: Participants were able to explain that they have criteria for someone to vote, and that they find aspects of democratic participation to be specific to Germany – but they often found ways to formulate these criteria in ways that are accessible to those not born in Germany. This is a particularly interesting insight because as mentioned earlier, previous research has pointed to citizens supporting equality in general terms more often than supporting it in the context of concrete practical policy questions (Coskun and Foroutan 2016 see also Chapter 2). This investigation revealed that more concrete questions can actually yield more inclusive proposals – if participants are given the chance to openly express ambiguities and their reasoning. It is possible that once reservations about more inclusive policies can be openly stated, it is easier for participants to also make concessions towards more inclusive ways of sharing power.

In consequence, the research design demonstrates that asking an abstract question in combination with a concrete policy question can help gain stronger results. By using different instruments, the research design is able to conclude relatively reliably that citizens want connectivity from citizenship – they indicate this in the quantitative and the qualitative analyses of this investigation. At the same time, the addition of a concrete question, and the space for reasoning, deepens insight into why citizen think the way that they do, what is genuinely important to them, what motivates them, and what they think of first and foremost when solving political problems.

6.3. Response to the challenges of the field

Three challenges of the field determined the research agenda of this thesis. The combination of citizenship and deliberation made use of two synergies: (1) Using deliberative democratic insights allows developing a research methodology that meets the challenges of dynamic identities and complexity, and (2) Citizenship and deliberative democracy studies tackle similar core questions of political science through different lenses, the combination of which is an enrichment to both fields. Additionally, by combining approaches and using a discursive methodology, the thesis contributed to a discursive investigation of core concepts of democratic theory. In the following, I discuss in how far these goals were achieved in the context of the methodological, the theoretical and the procedural challenge.

Methodological challenge

The citizenship definition by Isin and Saward which emphasizes citizenship as practice (Isin and Saward 2011) proved to be heavily reflected in participants' sense-making on citizenship: Participants conceptualize citizenship as obligation, connectivity and common life. Most obligations participants referred to are informal. They concern a commitment to the country and its future, a sharing in democratic values and a life centered around the place of residence. Participants' criteria for access to political rights re-enforce two aspects that often play only a small part in contemporary liberal definitions of citizenship: practice and obligation.

These findings underline the role of joint meaning-making in citizenship conceptualizations: As outlined in Chapter 2, researchers understand citizenship as socially constructed and defined by social context and practice (Olsen 2008). This is also reflected in the way that citizens themselves perceive of citizenship: They see it as a social practice. In this perspective, informal political and social activity can also lead to connectivity between citizens.

A motivation for the research design of this thesis was addressing the problem that participants of political science investigations express views that are prejudicial, malleable or generally not well developed (see e.g. Stoker, Hay, and Barr 2016). Analyses of argument quality and content analysis of provided arguments both confirmed that this was successful. Participants have well reflected views which are based on a careful weighing of arguments on non-citizen voting rights.

The thesis confirmed previous criticism that the ethnic civic indicator of national identity measures conceptions of national identity that are not relevant for everyone. The investigation was not able to contribute a concrete solution to this, as the Q-methodological survey proved to have not only a different measurement pattern but also yielded results of different aspects which overlap with the ethnic civic dimension to limited extents. However, the Q-methodological survey proved effective for contextualizing conflict lines between civic citizenship conceptions. For example, they lie in different conceptions of political participation, financial equality and social redistribution, as well as the transnationalization of citizenship.

Part of the agenda of the methodological challenge was to experiment with methods which better predict political behavior. The synthesis made clear that additional insight but also potential inconsistencies became clear by investigating abstract questions (on citizenship generally) and concrete issues (on the boundary problem, in this case) in combination with each other. Results underscore citizenship's ever-evolving and contingent nature.

Previous research has found participants to judge issues slightly differently in the abstract than in the concrete. This investigation concludes that measuring abstract conceptualizations that will at the same time translate into political behaviors is particularly difficult. This implies two conclusions for measuring abstract and contested concepts: First, measurements of abstract conceptions will always have limitations when it comes to their implications for political behavior. Which aspects of such conceptualizations become most salient or relevant seems dependent on context. This, in turn, means they can always only be an approximation of issue-related opinions. Second, investigating questions with a combination between abstract and concrete is a tool that helps make potential discrepancies apparent, and explain what drives them.

Theoretical Challenge

In reckoning with the boundary problem, participants demonstrated that Bauböck's "quasi-citizenship" (Bauböck 2010) is a reality to them: They invoke some arguments on non-citizen residents belonging, contributing and being recognized as members in their state as well as other arguments that limit full belonging on the long-term.

Many of the arguments provided by participants in favor of and against introducing non-citizen voting rights reflected the overview of the debate in political theory outlined in Chapter 2. However, some theoretical arguments were more relevant to participants than others: When participants explain that someone should have their center of life in a place to be allowed to vote, they invoke what Rubio-Marín calls "deep affectedness" in her argumentation in favor of residence-based voting (Rubio-Marín 2000). In both conceptions, the idea is that a multitude of relationships, attachments and practices come together, and generate a deep connection to a place, which in turn entitles to claim-making. An argument also echoed by participants is Pedroza's point on political participation being a way to facilitate learning about politics and a country (Pedroza 2014). Participants do not mention the principle of non-coercion directly, but they do talk about equal rights with a similar idea in mind: All those who live together should also determine their future together.

Among the political theoretical arguments against foreigner voting rights, the most important was the idea of obligation connected to citizenship, which plays a central role to de Schutter and Ypi's concept of mandatory citizenship (De Schutter and Ypi 2015). All instruments revealed that participants are not satisfied with purely rights-based definitions of citizenship. Participants echoed the idea of citizenship having a "sticky quality" (Bauböck 2009 p.20) by asking that those who participate in elections bear the consequences of that election in the future.

In Song's conception, tying voting rights to citizenship is a way to express that "citizenship is an ideal and institution worth preserving" (Song 2009 p.611). On the whole, with the analyses of arguments in mind, participants do see citizenship in this way and want some of its structures (like the combination of rights and obligations) to remain intact. However, there participants demonstrated openness to defining access to citizenship in less culturalist terms.

The theoretical challenge also used a concrete policy example to more closely inspect abstract citizenship conceptualizations. Interestingly, the Q-methodological perspectives on citizenship led to surprisingly little variance on foreigner voting rights positions. There were small differences (within maximum 13 points on average on the 100-point-scale) between perspectives that are in line with the openness of the corresponding perspective: ethnocultural and liberal citizens are more critical of non-citizen voting rights than active and cosmopolitan citizens (for a full comparison see Appendix 7). However, the small scale of differences between perspectives might indicate that participants oppose foreigner voting rights for a multifaceted range of reasons. The patterns of reasoning invoked could be systematically linked to the core concerns within participants' citizenship conceptualization. For example, ethnoculturalists tend to focus culture, while liberal democrats are more concerned with maintaining the established legal order. Future research could more closely inspect the interconnections between abstract perspectives, policy positions and patterns of reasoning. Such an exploration would be especially promising in a design with a more large-scale deliberation that yields a greater number of reasons to analyze. An investigation of these interconnections holds potential for the more sophisticated engagement substantive reasons within deliberative democracy studies.

Procedural Challenge

The research design of this thesis was inspired by Ahlhaus' solution to the boundary problem, a boundary assembly (Ahlhaus 2020). Within a minimal deliberative design, participants reckoned with granting non-citizens the right to vote. The results of this thesis contribute two important insights on this proposal: First, a boundary assembly seems feasible in terms of participants' willingness and capacity to engage with the multifaceted question of the boundaries of the demos. Participants contributed nuanced points that refer to a large number and variety of arguments even within this limited design. With this in mind, a more expansive deliberative process on non-citizen voting rights seems realistic and potentially insightful. Second, in this instance, deliberating participants became more skeptical of introducing non-citizen voting rights. This implies that we cannot be sure of the outcome of a boundary assembly, and whether it would amend the status quo. This is relevant given that a status quo outcome would not necessarily resolve the membership dilemma.

The result is rather unusual, as many previous deliberative experiments observe opinion change in progressive directions (see e.g. Farrar et al. 2010; Farrell et al. 2020; Sanders 2012). This might lead to the conclusion that in this experiment, deliberation did not work as intended.

Argument repertoire and integrative complexity measure deliberative quality; both showed that the deliberative treatment significantly improved deliberative quality.

In connection with this, I find that clarification rather than consensus is the outcome of this deliberative experiment. While deliberation was traditionally conceptualized as generating consensus between differing perspectives, several deliberative democrats view clarification of opinions as an equally important outcome (Bächtiger et al. 2018; Knight and Johnson 1994). Empirical research indicates that deliberative mechanism can lead to both, a moderation of opinions in terms of participants moving closer together as well as a polarization of views where participants move further apart after deliberation because they realize the extent of their conflict, or hold their initial positions more deeply (Lindell et al. 2017). The contribution of deliberation in this case is manifold. It can structure disagreement, and thereby point towards where perspectives differ (Moore and O'Doherty 2014), or it can lead to increased reflexivity when participants deeply explore the sources of the disagreement (Knight and Johnson 1994). Especially given the contested and complex nature of citizenship and the boundary problem, structuring and better understanding disagreement is a valuable result which informs further research as well as policy alternatives on non-citizen voting rights.

This finding ties into the agenda of the procedural challenge: Deliberation does not necessarily lead to more progressive opinions. Deliberative theory makes some normative requirements that define the content of democracy beyond procedures. The question is whether deliberative democrats would accept deliberative outcomes as long as these rest on well-considered and justified responses, or if there are specific demands to be made of the inclusivity or critical stance that solutions must take towards the status quo. Deliberative democrats have begun to discuss what instituting deliberative procedures means for political outcomes both in theory (e.g. Cohen 1997; Gutmann and Thompson 2000) and empirically (e.g. Baccaro, Bächtiger, and Deville 2014; Lindell et al. 2017). The results from this study provide further support for the assumption that deliberative outcomes are not necessarily progressive (Gastil, Bacci, and Dollinger 2010) or left-leaning (Kuran 1998).

Within the minimal deliberative and argumentation exercises of this research design, participants spent a relatively short period of time thinking about citizenship conceptualizations. Despite its minimal implementation, this deliberative experiment already contributed to Dalton's ideal of citizenship being defined as "a shared set of expectations about the citizen's role in politics" (Dalton 2008 p.78). This is a promising result for those who advocate deliberative, participatory and co-creative solutions to democratic problems.

Additionally, I have argued that non-citizen voting rights are gaining traction in the German public debate. Though this is true, it remains a discussion that is in its relative beginnings. Policy proposals or parliamentary debates on the matter remain rare, and those that do exist are not recent. This means that the idea of voting without citizenship will still have been relatively new to participants and required them to think critically about the status quo.

7. Conclusion

This thesis set out to explore citizenship conceptualizations under the premise that citizenship is never finished. By using deliberation as a method, the research design made use of and captured citizenship's complex and contested formations in the perspectives of German citizens. The introduction to this thesis pointed out that citizenship, as a core concept of democracy is difficult: its contents and applications are under constant re-negotiation. The investigation rests on the premise of citizens being competent to engage with that re-negotiation and conceptualize citizenship and its dilemmas. The results of this research project have shown that a discursive methodology allowed participants to express nuanced and differentiated views on citizenship in abstract terms, and on criteria they would apply for membership in the demos.

While this study has yielded insightful and applicable results, it has not answered all open questions. In this conclusion, I first summarize the most important results briefly. Thereafter, I discuss some limitations of the research design and its findings, and point towards how future applications might remedy them. To conclude, I detail avenues for future research and outline some of the questions that this research project asked (rather than answered).

7.1. Most relevant contributions of the study

This research project yielded a number of unique results and insights. In terms of contributions to citizenship studies, national citizenship proved to be a meaningful concept for participants. They treasure aspects of citizenship, though the shape of those aspects varied widely. These variations indicated different definitions of criteria for who belongs. Several questions arise from these findings: First, connectivity is important to citizens but they acknowledge that they live in a pluralistic society. This leads to the question of how commonality and pluralism can be balanced. Second, citizens make reference to obligations, both formal and informal. In this, they emphasize an understanding of citizenship as a practice, a perspective also taken in citizenship studies (Isin and Saward 2011). Better understanding how citizenship as a practice looks and what it means for future citizenship concepts is another emerging question. Thirdly, there are some indications that participants see citizenship as ranging beyond an obligation or connection to the nation state, but these are rarely connected with European or global institutions. Here, too, citizenship seems rather to be a practice that connects people in different countries, or behind different causes. In their work on global citizenship, Isin and Nyers emphasize that especially in times of contested borders, such practice-based understandings of citizenship are not only useful for analysis, but also for developing new ways of thinking about rights and social justice (Isin and Nyers 2014). This proposal resonates with citizens and thereby also deserves further exploration.

Citizenship conceptualizations are contested between citizens, but they all define citizenship as connectivity. This notion is echoed when citizens reckon with the boundary problem. They do not fundamentally oppose granting non-citizens voting rights, but want rights to be connected to obligations. Citizens re-iterate notions defined by de Schutter and Ypi in their concept of 'mandatory citizenship' – citizenship is seen as a privilege and right, but also as an obligation and commitment (De Schutter and Ypi 2015). In part, this connection can explain why deliberating on foreigner voting rights leads to more negative views on it.

Using Q-methodology to study citizenship conceptualizations from below proved to be insightful. The study is one of the few to conduct Q-methodology with a large number of participants (for an exception see Pelletier et al. 1999), and proved that this can also be done effectively. While a shortcoming is that a correspondingly high number of participants might not significantly load onto any factor, this study showed that emerging factors still yield distinct and profound commonalities and differences between perspectives. Citizenship is contested and dynamic, meaning it is extremely difficult to capture. Identifying where prominent commonalities and conflicts lie within a set of complex aspects of citizenship already grants nuanced insights into what matters to citizens, what they expect from each other and their state, and how they view democracy as a whole. This research design showed that an online Q-methodological survey with a large number of participants can be a useful strategy to identify conflict lines. Thus, using a discursive method could also be used to regularly re-assess where relevant conflicts actually lie, so that they can be addressed in public discourse. This is especially relevant because the dynamic and embedded nature of complex concepts means that their meanings change over time, and thus require regular re-assessment.

Results are further enriched and expanded when Q-methodological results are combined with further methods that qualify and deepen their findings. Previous research has often used Q-methodological results as a starting point for survey research (see e.g. Theiss-Morse 1993). The design presented here showcases other informative combinations of Q-methodology with survey experiments, qualitative research, or discursive tools like deliberation.

In particular, the study makes a strong argument for using deliberation as a method of political science. It allowed investigating how people think about issues in a socially embedded context, drew on subjectivity, and made for a useful design to study how opinions emerge and transform (and why). Observing deliberation effectively allows insight not just into participants preferences but also into their underlying values, experiences and root causes of ambiguity. The process of opinion formation becomes observable and, to some extent, measurable. It entails participants voicing preliminary views, rating and engaging with different arguments, voicing their own points and in the process revising, specifying or changing their perspective. Thereby, deliberation as a tool of political science can be used to study both opinion formation of an issue (by investigating deliberative opinion change) as well as providing insight into meaning-making (by investigating arguments qualitatively).

Such insights are not only useful for scholars of opinion formation, but also for policymakers and political practitioners. Deliberation entails an intersubjective and relational component:

Participants not only weigh reasons, they are also put in a position to justify themselves towards others, and to understand others' viewpoints. Identifying potential areas of agreement or connection is meaningful in an era where many lament polarization and deep conflicts within societies. The identified commonalities are points of departure for bridge-building proposals. In grappling with how to live together well in a polity, such intersubjective and relational components are particularly pertinent.

At the same time, this study provides further evidence for deliberation having different formations and activating different mechanisms. The deliberative outcome in this study points towards a form of communitarian deliberation, whereby citizenship identities became salient and maintaining the status quo emerged as most convincing. The results provide food for thought for both advocates and critics of deliberative democracy. For critics, the design provides counter-evidence for the worry that deliberation is merely a tool to achieve a specific set of politically left policies. For advocates, the results point out that further work remains to be done both in theorizing and empirically researching deliberative outcomes and their substantive arguments. Such differentiated deliberative mechanisms also indicate that advocating deliberative solutions to real-world policy problems requires careful consideration of what outcomes should be achieved.

The thesis set out to exploit two synergies: First, the thoughtful opinions gathered through a discursive method inspired by deliberative democracy was implemented to alleviate existing shortcomings in the empirical research on citizenship. This combination was indeed productive. Participants voiced nuanced criteria for how they define belonging. Participants' argumentation reflected viewpoints on concepts deeply entangled with citizenship which were outlined in the beginning of the thesis. Examples are immigration, naturalization and solidarity. The results implicate how we might re-think immigration, integration and naturalization policies, and point towards what is important for social cohesion and solidarity in pluralistic societies in the German context.

Second, the study argued that deliberative democracy and citizenship studies work on similar core issues of democracy, and that combining them could enrich both fields. In bringing these fields together, the study's framework drew on arguments and concepts from both theoretical and empirical research. In discussing the boundary problem, citizens re-iterated several prominent arguments from political theory, thereby demonstrating their potential for implementation in electoral law. Considerations of how to make decisions together and on what basis are insightful to both scholars of citizenship and deliberative democracy, as they point towards criteria for legitimate decision-making. Using topics around citizenship brought to the fore new insights on which deliberative mechanisms lead to a specific set of deliberative outcomes: these might be issue-specific or related to identity. In this interpretation, communitarian deliberation could become activated in a deliberation on the boundary problem because discussing citizenship makes citizenship identities and notions of belonging salient.

In summary, the further research indicated by the thesis is twofold: First, the discursive methods employed here could be applied in other country contexts, or for the exploration of other

concepts of political science. Second, its findings can be developed in future studies on citizenship. They imply that it is relevant to further interrogate different definitions and meanings of obligations and to investigate the different variants of civic citizenship.

7.2. Limitations of the study

The results and their discussion yield interesting insights and point towards promising research and policy questions for the future, but they have also demonstrated some limitations.

First, the experiment was in the form of an online exercise. I have already outlined that this holds both advantages and disadvantages to deliberative norms (see Chapter 5). While anonymous online deliberation has many advantages, the lack of a durable identity (for example a username under which one returns to the online space) and of personal connectedness can pose challenges to communicative accountability (Moore 2018). This could indicate lower empathy levels in this online design where participants interacted with other participants in one limited instance, and without personal markers. Possibly, exchanging views in a more stable or personalized deliberative space would have made arguments in favor of foreigner voting rights more convincing to participants. However, previous results from an in-person deliberative experiment and from a referendum on non-citizen voting rights (outlined in Chapter 5) yield results similar to those presented here, indicating at least that an in-person setting can come to the same response as the online setting. Nonetheless, effects from an in-person deliberation might differ in terms of effect sizes, argument quality or content of arguments.

Additionally, an issue might lie in the quality and content of arguments provided within the research design. Theoretically speaking, if the contra arguments had been of much better quality by some measure (for example by being easier to understand, more accessible, more convincing, more logical) than the pro arguments, this would prime participants towards taking a more skeptical position[23]. Note that the pure control group did not read any of the arguments and thereby would forego this priming effect. Even though the cited examples from previous research and policy-practice have similar results, the structural marginalization of minority perspectives might lead to important aspects having been overlooked in these contexts as well. Exploring whether this might have been the case, and which perspectives are often overheard on the issue deserves further attention. In contexts of difference or on identity- and value-related issues, research has indicated the need for a special emphasis on reframing power imbalances between participants (Healy 2011; Lupia and Norton 2007). Young's premise is that in situations of power imbalance, formal inclusion in deliberation is not enough to achieve equality (Young 2001). Recent deliberative research has refocused on dealing with power in deliberative settings (Curato, Hammond, and Min 2019), and it would be especially interesting to expand this in the context of citizenship and the boundary problem. For example, future

---

[23] Participants could rate each argument in the information treatment. On average, the contra arguments received more positive ratings than the pro arguments – this would however be the case in both scenarios: if contra arguments are of better quality, and if participants genuinely endorse contra arguments more.

applications might place greater emphasis on giving space to the reasons why non-citizens have difficulties to naturalize, and on the practical disadvantages of not having access to political rights. It would be interesting to further deepen the rich discussions on belonging, obligation and equality in a context that more actively counteracts structural inequality.

A plausible explanation for the activation of communitarian deliberation in this deliberative experiment is issue-specificity: An issue like foreigner voting rights, which taps into citizenship conceptualizations and thereby on issues closely tied to individual and group identity and belonging, might be particularly conducive to communitarian positions. A possible explanation for communitarian deliberation is that the experiment itself increased the salience of citizenship identity. For example, Brewer finds that "[w]hen social identity is salient, the individual assimilates his or her self-concept to that of the "typical" in-group member" (Brewer 1993 p.153). Although the survey never actively acknowledged this, all survey participants held German citizenship. They partook in developing citizenship conceptualizations just before engaging in the deliberative exercise. Within the mock deliberative space, participants practiced the intersubjective component of citizenship, and could thus think about potential preconditions for collective decision-making in a more action-oriented way. This would also be in line with the previously indicated findings by van Zomeren and colleagues on collective identities becoming more salient when they are acted upon (van Zomeren, Leach, and Spears 2010) – being asked to position oneself on German citizenship can be seen as a context in which one acts as a citizen. This setting may have made participants' German identity salient, and prompted them to foreground it in their argumentation on foreigner voting rights. It could also have led to them to distancing themselves from outgroup members, in this case non-citizens, which Brewer also finds as an effect of group identities becoming salient (Brewer 1993).

Note however that the experimental setting took precautions to alleviate this effect somewhat, based on the literature cited at the outset: Treatment arguments were formulated as arguments coming from non-citizens, thereby ensuring that the deliberation was not set between group members only (see Pilialoha and Brewer 2006). Research has also found recognition of an identity to be important for its salience (Andreouli and Howarth 2012) – in the run of all instruments, participants were presented with different conceptions of citizenship identity. Thus, they were also challenged to consider that they might share just as much with resident non-citizens (or even citizens of other countries altogether), or that what connects them is common residence rather than common citizenship status. Within further research, it would be useful to explore the identities that underlie thinking about citizenship more deeply. In this context, it would be interesting to draw on research that points out how mere participation in a research project changes participants' self-identities: Eliasoph for example cites examples on how citizens who were interviewed about politics began to see themselves as citizens more actively (Eliasoph 1998).

Further, many issues with the research design have been explored in the run of the presented analyses. Results remained unchanged after matching data from the respective treatment groups. Note also that the diversity of viewpoints among *participants* was not the generator of diversity of arguments in this deliberative design: Participants did not engage with arguments

by other participants but with arguments provided by the design. This meant that the diversity of viewpoints is steered by the design, not the sample.

All the while, measurement issues in the research design could be driven by specific contextual factors. Generally, the thesis used many subjective methods which are always contingent on context. The survey was administered in autumn 2020, which was several months after the outbreak of the Coronavirus pandemic. The experience of such a global health threat, and public measures restricting freedoms to protect others may have influenced the ways that participants engaged with this survey. In particular, the finding on participants embracing obligations could be connected with the broad public appeals to limit oneself to protect others, or to take individual responsibility for the wellbeing of the health system. With these limitations in mind, it would be insightful to conduct a similar experiment again at another point in time, and in another country context.

As mentioned, citizenship conceptions and citizenship-related positions are context-dependent; in line with this, findings are limited to the German country context. In discussing the results, I have drawn on some literature from other country contexts, though always taking care that these countries have similarly restrictive citizenship regimes, most notably Switzerland and Luxembourg. In particular, it would be of interest to compare results with an investigation in a country context with a traditionally more liberal naturalization and citizenship regime. This is of particular importance because previous research has found history and cultural differences in nation state development to make a large impact on prevalent citizenship regimes and perceptions (see e.g. Brubaker 1992).

7.3. The potential of exploring democratic preferences discursively: Wider implications and future research

This research project has a number of relevant wider implications. I discuss these below. Implications for academia and the politics of citizenship and of deliberation are discussed. Thereafter I draw conclusions on research design, and on how the study of contested concepts might advance dialogue in conflictual societies. I finish with an outlook on what future research on this could achieve.

On Citizenship and deliberative democracy

Citizenship researchers have long discussed whether supranational politics, global interconnectedness and culture would lead to the decreasing relevance of national citizenship (see e.g. Koopmans 2012; Soysal 2010). The results from this analysis indicate that national citizenship remains a relevant category to German citizens. Participants ascribed meaning to it,

and that meaning goes well beyond holding a passport or receiving protection for one's fundamental rights. Rather, citizenship is understood as an organizing mechanism of societies, and holds significance for how participants define their relationship with the state and their relationship with each other as fellow citizens. Participants' reasoning on non-citizen voting rights provides further evidence: Definitions of belonging may be up for discussion, but across conceptions they do *exist*.

Additionally, some of these points can be seen in line with Song's argument on non-citizen voting rights being an interim solution that allows participation while naturalization processes are ongoing (Song 2009). A few participants in this study also see non-citizen voting rights as second best. They argued that naturalization procedures are difficult or that they know too little about naturalization processes to judge how easy they are. It would be relevant for policymakers to focus on facilitating paths to citizenship, and for scholars to work on recommending how these might be better implemented.

The relevance of national citizenship is also an important finding for scholars who study globalization and its impacts: When thinking about the prospects of supranational or global politics, citizens believe that the nation state should remain a relevant entity. This is challenging, also because recent research on globalization has focused on citizenship being a driver of inequality. This study demonstrated that there is relatively low salience of the injustices that underlie the global system of national citizenships: Participants in the Q-methodological survey largely disagreed with the corresponding statement. However, in the run of the deliberative exercise, some arguments on this topic did gain traction, such as the differences between immigrant and emigrant voting rights. It seems that the inequalities of citizenship are not yet well established in participants' perspectives. In consequence, it seems more promising for those interested in more inclusive access to political rights to place their focus on improving access to citizenship and on increasing public discourse around inequalities in global citizenship and migration regimes.

Both academic and public debate has considered how belonging can be conceptualized in pluralistic societies. The findings from this study provide relevant insights and potential starting points for solutions. That citizenship should entail not only rights but also obligations was the most endorsed aspect among the Q-statements, and participants' reasoning emphasized the necessity of taking responsibility or making a commitment to the country. Many of the participants, though they want commonality, are aware that this must be done in a way that accommodates Germany's de facto post-migration society.

This finding is relevant to those academic discussions that consider whether and in how far an emphasis on obligation is appropriate in liberal democracies, which traditionally rest on thin duty (Joppke 2019; for an opposing view see Ferrera 2019). Given that practicing responsibility and obligations is important to participants, it seems all the more necessary to explore how civic obligation can be realized in the 21st century. Joppke uses the example of the Brexit referendum to argue that citizens now live in such different realities and have increasingly contrasting perceptions of the world that it is nearly impossible to re-generate solidarity between them. In

his view "'Citizenship' has become an obsolete clip to tie them together," (Joppke 2019 p.202). In contrast, this study emphasized not only the importance that citizens allocate to citizenship as such, it also showed that they in fact see the potential of citizenship to generate solidarity, belonging or connectivity.

Deliberative theory places special emphasis on mutual obligations, and so could serve as potential inspiration for solutions. Investigating how to conceptualize civic obligation via deliberation could lead to useful synergies. Chambers for example claims that in a democracy where people hold different worldviews, it is a civic obligation to "give account to each other" (Chambers 2010 p.897). As Curato puts it, deliberation „foregrounds the obligations citizens owe to one another" (Curato 2013 p. 103) In these conceptions, giving reasons is important because it gives others the opportunity to respond (be it by changing behaviors or simply by being aware that different perspectives exist and are legitimate). Participants are asked to recognize and engage with difference (Dryzek 2005), with the aim of gaining access to a broad array of perspectives (Curato et al. 2017). Some deliberative democrats argue that public reasoning is especially important in pluralistic societies because it allows mutual recognition of different groups or interests, and contributes to an individual more completely understanding the society in which they live (Kanra 2009; Pirsoul 2019). Because it makes clear where commonalities and conflicts lie, deliberation has often been described as a method to deal with questions of collective will (see e.g. Fishkin 2003; Kanra 2005; Mercier and Landemore 2012). Generating mutual understanding and ensuring that the positions of all societal groups are subject to public justification is also an important argument in favor of de Schutter and Ypi's mandatory citizenship (De Schutter and Ypi 2015). Future research could exploit these common questions by exploring the reconceptualization of obligation with deliberative methods, or by drawing on deliberative theory to formulate obligations for citizenship (and vice-versa on citizenship to refine deliberative notions of obligation).

Additionally, participants emphasized the importance of commonalities to citizenship but disagreed on the shape and form of those commonalities. Researchers like Foroutan have suggested that a post-migration Germany requires new pluralistic definitions of civic commonality and of German national identity as historically heterogenous (Foroutan 2015). A potential challenge for this solution is that there are few concrete ideas on the form such civic obligations might take. The most prominent existing mechanism to ensure minimum levels of commonality, civic integration tests, are controversially debated (Blake 2019; Sharp 2022). A further problem is that public debate on commonality often revolves around cultural cues especially when there is far-right influence (Castelli Gattinara 2017).

Participants in this study used creative terms to describe plural conceptions of commonality both on Twitter and in the argumentative exercise: for example, they want a multicultural or European lead culture. Some suggestions from political theory connect commonality and pluralism, for example in Laborde's combination of republicanism with cosmopolitanism. This concept combines collective global responsibility with critical political engagement in the nation state (Erez and Laborde 2020). Further ideas might derive from concepts that debate the balance between individual freedom and societal participation. The question is how to allow

people to freely follow their own will while at the same time obliging them towards the democratic societies in which they live. Both Habermas and Walzer suggest solutions, Habermas in his co-originality thesis which assumes that individual freedom cannot be maintained without rule of law and democratic process and vice-versa (Habermas 2001), and Walzer in his rule of double accommodation of difference which recognizes both individual and community-based differences as legitimate claims in politics (Walzer 2007). This study showed that ideas exist both in practice and in theory for how to balance commonality and pluralism. It also underscored the urgency of such questions for defining how to live together well. This indicates that questions around commonality and pluralism require a place on policy agendas.

Another emerging result is that while citizens prefer bounded citizenship and a demos defined by citizenship, they often invoked definitions of belonging based on practice or social connection. Some ideas on how such practice-based conceptions could respond to the boundary problem are presented in Chapter 2: These include granting voting rights based on participation in "the cooperative scheme of public provision" (Abizadeh 2016 p.120), based on participation in the "fair play" that underlines societal mechanisms (Song 2016), or joint political practice (Wilcox 2004).

Existing research also makes connections between social activity and political participation. There is relatively good evidence that social connectedness is a useful indicator for how politically active and how interested in naturalizing residents will be. Political theorists suggest that maintaining a geographical component of citizenship is important to politicization (Kallio 2018; Somers 2006). Empirical research from Switzerland finds that non-citizen voting rights increases overall participation rates (Kayran and Nadler 2022), which implies that access to political rights mobilizes political participation. This is also confirmed by research which finds that the political interest of German citizens with a migration background is largely driven by their degree of social integration (Goerres et al. 2021). In addition, naturalization intentions are highest for those who feel a strong connection to a place and the social relationships therein (Donnaloja and McAvay 2022). This bears particular relevance in the context of Germany which has a tradition of demanding assimilation from immigrants (Ersanilli and Koopmans 2010). This well explored relationship posits that in re-defining civic obligation and connectivity, social connectedness and political participation may be useful starting points. Future research should exploit this potential.

The arguments from political theory and the Constitutional Court's judgement on foreigner voting rights underscore that the long-term disenfranchisement of non-citizen residents is a problem for German democracy. Interestingly, empirical investigations find that resident voting rights tend to be made available in countries with less permissive immigration schemes (Kayran and Erdilmen 2021). It seems that states will always apply criteria for accessing the demos, albeit via different mechanisms. This demonstrates that political decisions on immigration, citizenship and the boundaries of the demos are interconnected. In considering democratic enfranchisement, both research and policymakers should consider the mechanisms of all three fields together.

In summary, this study provided for wide-ranging implications on citizenship research and practice. Its findings can be put into the context of existing empirical and theoretical academic work. Placing the findings into the context of existing research demonstrates the ways in which citizenship can be reformulated from below to become a driver of great inclusion and solidarity.

The results of this investigation add to a rich existing body of research on the variation of deliberative mechanisms and outcomes. They suggest support for previous analyses which contend that deliberative results are dependent on many factors, among them the specificities of the issue under deliberation (Gerber et al. 2014; Jackman and Sniderman 2006; Mercier and Landemore 2012; Steenbergen and Brewer 2019). Indeed, many deliberative democrats have pushed for a deeper look into the multifaceted nature of deliberation; this includes a more nuanced perspective on when and how deliberation can be used to make political decisions, and when deliberation might be more suitably used to prepare a decision, assess a situation or better understand public opinion on an issue (see also Lafont 2020).

In the past years, deliberative theory has made advances towards more multifaceted and multifunctional understandings of deliberation. The systematic turn in deliberative democracy calls attention to context-specific and situational moments of practicing democracy, social inclusion, or citizens' impact on policy outcomes. The literature has aptly demonstrated that deliberation is not a silver bullet – it can be incredibly effective in some circumstances, while other democratic mechanisms might be more suitable elsewhere (see e.g. Bächtiger and Parkinson 2019). In order to make convincing and well-reflected recommendations for when (and how) deliberation is best implemented, studies of deliberative outcomes deserve further attention. Connecting deliberative outcomes with substantive reasons can help to better explain opinion change, to study democratic preferences, or to investigate in how far deliberative arguments re-iterate or counteract dominant discourses. It should also be noted here that deliberative researchers have compiled a great variety of deliberative processes in order to make such comparative investigations possible at a smaller scale (see e.g. OECD 2020; Participedia.net)

On the methodological approach and research design

Beyond using deliberation as a method, some further innovative components of this research design proved to be useful in order to study a contested concept. In particular, elements balanced capturing concepts in their full complexity on the one hand, and allowing a systematization that provides clarity on the other hand. Three approaches in this thesis are potentially useful for the investigation of other complex concepts or questions: These are the combination of theory and empirics, of abstract and concrete questions, and of multiple democratic challenges.

First, combining theory and empirics was useful in the context of this thesis. Interestingly, democratic theory and empirical democracy research have often worked on questions far removed from each other (Saward 2021)[24]. This investigation has shown that political theory concepts are relevant and resonate "on the ground" given that many participants invoked concepts from theory. Combining democratic theory and empirical research has a double effect. On the one hand, it democratizes democratic theory because it allows citizens to play a more prominent role in defining core concepts of democracy. This makes theoretical elaborations more relevant to real-world challenges, and has the potential to inspire democratic innovation. On the other hand, real-world challenges can gain from democratic theory. They can ensure that empirical design and analysis reflect democratic norms. This too can inspire innovative, more just, or more consequential real-world political solutions.

Secondly, combining abstract and concrete questions yielded interesting results. It allowed exploring the concept of citizenship holistically and concretely. Generally, combining abstract and concrete questions is helpful simply because it allows measuring attitudes with a combination of different instruments, where each might capture different nuances. It also allowed exploring whether people feel similarly about citizenship when they think about it in abstract terms and when they think about a concrete policy issue – an alignment that is not self-evident. Combining abstract with concrete questions also helps to understand which aspects of meaning-making translate into political action. For example, the reactions to a specific policy example can demonstrate what parts of abstract definitions are translated or activated when asked about a concrete application. The positions of citizenship perspectives on non-citizen voting rights revealed that within abstract concepts lie different patterns of reasoning, which in turn lead to differentiated positions on policy questions. This research project entailed only a superficial analysis for the connection between citizenship concept on the one hand, and deliberative preference and reasoning for the other. Future research should more deeply explore this connection for example by using existing tools (see e.g. Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007) within different issue contexts. It would also be insightful for research to systematically investigate how and why values and attitudes translate into political behavior.

Third, this research design benefited from combining multiple democratic challenges. The combination of key questions around citizenship and deliberative democracy shed a new light on sub-aspects of both fields: Viewing citizenship from a deliberative viewpoint made clear its discursive and intersubjective nature, and investigating the boundary problem using a deliberative set-up pointed towards solutions that define the demos through practice-based or even deliberative procedures. In turn, using deliberation in the context of citizenship underlined the structural issue of deliberative inclusion, and made apparent the difficulty of valuing both common ground and pluralism in a deliberative process. Combining both helped gaining innovative perspectives, and supports the idea that citizens themselves are capable and willing to come up with inspired and constructive solutions for core challenges of our democracies.

---

[24] Exceptions exist but they tend to investigate fields that already have close relationships. An example is Song's 2009 analysis that combines citizenship and migration studies for an enhanced normative analysis (Song 2009).

The findings on citizenship, deliberation, and the new combination of approaches have wide-ranging implications not only for research but also for politics. In our conflictual societies, it is increasingly important to identify points of conflicts correctly, in relevant terms, and without an often-added layer of symbolism or rhetoric. So many political debates seem to lack clarity on what *actually* bothers people – this is demonstrated well by other research fields, for example investigations into populism which have shown what motivates citizens to embrace populist ideas beyond the rhetoric (see e.g. Abou-Chadi and Hix 2021; Weisskircher 2020). Research into the welfare state has also done excellent work in picking apart when people support redistribution and under what conditions (see e.g. Bloemraad et al. 2019). Politicized issues will always require that political scientists conduct the daunting challenge of picking issues apart, and digging deeper to find motivations. To understand what drives democratic decline, we need a better understanding of what people expect from democracy. A variety of different methodological set-ups and questions can be helpful to achieve this. This research design has demonstrated that indeed deliberation can be used as a method to map conflict lines.

Additionally, it is not just important to understand where conflicts run deep, but also to identify areas of potential commonality. Finding common ground in conditions of pluralism may be challenging – but broadly speaking, it is already useful to identify common problem definitions (Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007). This study found connectivity to be a common component of citizenship, and thereby indicated that it is an area of future development. Granted, how to achieve connectivity remains a substantial point of conflict, but the common idea of feeling connected is already a useful ideal to strive towards, and for which different proposals can then be weighed against each other. Compromise might be much more easily achieved when there is the sense of still walking in the same direction. Future research could connect this finding with proposals on strengthening public spaces.

Finally, though this research design has led to productive results, much more is possible. The discursive design in this investigation was relatively small-scale and implemented deliberation minimally defined. I would argue that it worked well and is a useful, straightforward, and clean method for investigating deliberation. The design benefited hugely from its use of different instruments, and its being able to ask similar questions via different types of measurements. However, there are many ways in which the design could have been expanded to achieve more.

In order to generate a more powerful deliberative treatment, the treatment could have been expanded in terms of interactivity, space, and length. First, participants in this design only deeply interacted with two arguments. This could have been expanded to more arguments, or placed into a longer thread of argumentation. The format could be expanded to an asynchronous format that allows a back-and-forth of arguments. This would have benefited the study in two particular ways: It would have made for a more convincing case that genuine deliberation took place (of which I am convinced but recognize some deliberative democrats might not be willing to), and it would have increased the scope of content for the analysis of substantive arguments and thereby improved qualitative interpretation. Second, participants in this design were very closely led along a certain flow of arguments to consume and to respond to – this is useful because it controls many factors, but it does of course limit the ideas that participants potentially

bring to the table. More open space formats might have been useful. These would have to be carefully designed to encourage participants to genuinely engage. In all questions that asked for an open response in this survey, especially when instructions where relatively open-ended, the responses were few and short in length. Third, and in connection with both previous points, participants' engagement was limited to one sitting. Again, this allowed implementing the design with relatively limited resources and without much attrition – any formats that ask for multiple or longer engagements would require much greater efforts, but they would also allow for an extended time period for deliberation.

Finally, the experiment would have benefitted from a more diverse set of perspectives by increasing participant numbers, and especially by including non-citizens. This was not possible because of practical reasons, but of course it means that some questions remain unanswered. The most relevant is perhaps whether those without citizenship would have displayed different patterns of argumentation. An open question is whether connectivity and commonality are demands placed by those who are already citizens towards others. Those who are not citizens might prefer citizenship to be an enabler for full participation. They might also be aware of the difficulties of participating as a perceived outsider, and thereby prefer citizenship conceptions with thin obligations. Similar points might be made about the arguments provided in the forum. Though one was phrased to come from a non-citizen resident, the arguments could have drawn on diverse perspectives more strongly, especially if the experiment had included more than six arguments.

There are many more imaginable ways in which discursive designs could be implemented or expanded on in the future. Such studies would be suitable for other contested concepts that define the shape of our democracies, such as equality, justice, or freedom.

7.4. The future potentials of citizenship

"Developing understanding of citizenship by identifying the experiences and knowledges of citizens themselves as a central concern, points to the need to use methodologies which enable people to articulate their realities and propose strategies for change." (Jones and Gaventa 2002 p.28)

This study allowed citizens to make sense of citizenship themselves. Though asked to discuss their citizen conceptions generally, and their reasoning on non-citizen voting rights specifically, many participants developed scenarios for how citizenship might change in the future. The summary presented in this chapter has pointed out that the future of citizenship might reconceptualize civic obligation, ideas of belonging and modes of generating connectivity.

This research design provided a minimal deliberative set-up that was doable with limited resources and with mixed methods. Given the minimal set-up, the insights yielded are

remarkable and useful. This chapter has pointed out how more expansive designs, but also research focused on more specific questions that arose from the results might expand these insights.

This thesis was motivated by better understanding citizens' views on citizenship as a basis for better understanding their ideas on democracy. Many contemporary researchers have pointed out that to understand how democracy might look in the 21st century, we need more innovative approaches that involve citizens in their design processes (Saward 2021). A 2019 study on democratic satisfaction in Germany found that Germans generally hold high approval of democracy but are not content with how it works in practice; at the same time, participants lacked ideas on how possible reforms to make democracy work might look (Weisskircher and Hutter 2019). It seems that much creative work remains to be done on designing democracies for the future. This study has used citizenship to point out some aspects that future co-creative deliberative formats might focus on especially: connectivity, participation and obligation.

All of these factors are based on the idea of making a society that will work in the future and for future generations to come. This is also reflected in the poem by Amanda Gorman I cited in the introduction: It continues with a focus on active democracy and the future, and a hopeful message that possibilities for improvement can always be found.

"We will not be turned around
or interrupted by intimidation,
because we know our inaction and inertia
will be the inheritance of the next generation.
Our blunders become their burdens.
But one thing is certain,
If we merge mercy with might,
and might with right,
then love becomes our legacy,
and change our children's birthright.
So let us leave behind a country
better than the one we were left with."
(From "The Hill we Climb", (Gorman 2021))

Bibliography

Abadi, David, Leen D'Haenens, Keith Roe, and Joyce Koeman. 2016. "Leitkultur and Discourse Hegemonies: German Mainstream Media Coverage on the Integration Debate between 2009 and 2014." *International Communication Gazette* 78(6): 557–84.

Abizadeh, Arash. 2012. "On the Demos and Its Kin: Nationalism, Democracy, and the Boundary Problem." *American Political Science Review* 106(4): 867–82.

———. 2016. "The Special-Obligations Challenge to More Open Borders." In *Migration in Political Theory. The Ethics of Movement and Membership*, eds. Sarah Fine and Lea Ypi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abou-Chadi, Tarik, and Simon Hix. 2021. "Brahmin Left versus Merchant Right? Education, class, multiparty competition, and redistribution in Western Europe." *The British Journal of Sociology* 72(1): 79–92.

Adams, Brian E. 2014. "Reason-Giving In Deliberative Forums." *Journal of Deliberative Democracy* 10(2): 1–27.

Ahlhaus, Svenja. 2020. *Die Grenzen Des Demos. Mitgliedschaftspolitik Aus Postsouveräner Perspektive*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Anderson, Christopher et al. 1997. "Divergent Perspectives on Citizenship Education: A Q-Method Study and Survey of Social Studies Teachers. 1997.Pdf." *American Educational Research Journal* 34(2): 333–64.

Andreouli, Eleni, and Caroline Howarth. 2012. "National Identity, Citizenship and Immigration: Putting Identity in Context." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 43(3): 361–82.

Arendt, Hannah. 1951. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harvest/ HBJ.

———. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arrighi, Jean-Thomas. 2021. "Immigrants, Emigrants and the Right to Vote: A Story of Double Standards." In *Handbook of Citizenship and Migration*, eds. Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso. London: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Asenbaum, Hans. 2018. "Anonymity and Democracy: Absence as Presence in the Public Sphere." *American Political Science Review* 112(3): 459–72.

Baccaro, Lucio, André Bächtiger, and Marion Deville. 2014. "Small Differences That Matter: The Impact of Discussion Modalities on Deliberative Outcomes." *British Journal of Political Science* 46(3): 551–66.

Bächtiger, André, John S. Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark E. Warren. 2018. "Deliberative Democracy: An Introduction." In *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*, eds. André Bächtiger, John S. Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark E. Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bächtiger, André, and John Parkinson. 2019. Mapping and Measuring Deliberation *Mapping and Measuring Deliberation*. Oxford.

Bächtiger, André, and Dominik Wyss. 2013. "Empirische Deliberationsforschung – Eine Systematische Übersicht." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft* 7(2): 155–81.

Bächtiger, André, Maija Setälä, and Kimmo Grönlund. 2014. "Towards a New Era of Deliberative Mini-Publics." In *Deliberative Mini-Publics. Involving Citizens in the Democratic Process*, eds. Kimmo Grönlund, André Bächtiger, and Maija Setälä. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Barabas, Jason. 2004. "How deliberation affects policy opinions." *American Political Science Association* 98(4): 687-701.

Bassel, Leah, Pierre Monforte, David Bartram, and Kamran Khan. 2020. "Naturalization Policies, Citizenship Regimes, and the Regulation of Belonging in Anxious Societies." *Ethnicities* (0(0)): 1–12.

Bauböck, Rainer. 2009. "Comparing Citizenship Regimes." In *Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, ed. Shachar, Ayelet, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Vink. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010. "Studying Citizenship Constellations." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(5): 847–59.

Beck, Ulrich, and Natan Sznaider. 2010. "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda." *British Journal of Sociology* 61(SUPPL. 1): 381–403.

Beckman, Ludvig. 2009. *The Frontiers of Democracy: The Right to Vote and Its Limits*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Bender, Felix. 2021. "Enfranchising the Disenfranchised: Should Refugees Receive Political Rights in Liberal

Democracies?" *Citizenship Studies* 25(1): 56–71.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Benton, Meghan. 2010. "The Tyranny of the Enfranchised Majority? The Accountability of States to Their Non-Citizen Population." *Res Publica* 16: 397–413.

Berg, Sebastian, Tim König, and Ann-Kathrin Koster. 2020. "Political Opinion Formation as Epistemic Practice: The Hashtag Assemblage of #metwo." *Media and Communication* 8(4): 84–95.

Biesta, Gert. 2007. "Education and the Democratic Person: Towards a Political Conception of Democratic Education." *Teachers College Record* 109(3): 740–69.

Black, Laura W. 2008. "Deliberation, Storytelling, and Dialogic Moments." *Communication Theory* 18: 93–116.

Blake, Michael. 2019. "Are Citizenship Tests Necessarily Illiberal?" *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 22(2): 313–329.

Bloemraad, Irene, Will Kymlicka, Michèle Lamont, and Leanne S. Son Hing. 2019. "Membership without Social Citizenship? Deservingness & Redistribution as Grounds for Equality." *Daedalus* 148(3): 73–104.

Bochsler, Daniel, and Simon Hug. 2015. "How Minorities Fare under Referendums: A Cross-National Study." *Electoral Studies* 38: 206–16.

Bohman, James. 1998. "The Globalization Public Sphere. Cosmopolitan Publicity and the Problem of Cultural Pluralism." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 24(2/3): 199–216.

Bonikowski, Bart, and Paul DiMaggio. 2016. "Varieties of American Popular Nationalism." *American Sociological Review* 81(5): 949–80.

Bornschier, Simon, Silja Häusermann, Delia Zollinger, and Céline Colombo. 2021. "How 'Us' and 'Them' Relates to Voting Behavior—Social Structure, Social Identities, and Electoral Choice." *Comparative Political Studies* 54(12): 2087–2122.

boyd, danah. 2010. "Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications." In *Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*, ed. Zizi Papacharissi. London: Routledge.

Braw, Elisabeth. 2020. "Ask What You Can Do for Your Country." *Foreign Policy*. Available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/04/national-service-germany-usa-ask-what-you-can-do-for-your-country/

Brewer, Marilynn B. 1993. "Social Identity, Distinctiveness, and in-Group Homoegeneity." *Social Cognition* 11(1): 150–64.

———. 2009. "Social Identity and Citizenship in a Pluralistic Society." In *The Political Psychology of Democratic Citizenship*, eds. Eugene Borgida, Christopher M Federico, and John L Sullivan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broockman, David E., Joshua L. Kalla, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2017. "The Design of Field Experiments With Survey Outcomes: A Framework for Selecting More Efficient, Robust, and Ethical Designs." *Policy Analysis* 25: 435–464.

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1998. "Myths and Misconceptions in the Study of Nationalism." In *The State of the Nation*, ed. John A. Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 272–306.

———. 2001. "The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and Its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(4): 531–48.

Brundidge, Jennifer, Scott A. Reid, Sujin Choi, and Ashley Muddiman. 2014. "The 'Deliberative Digital Divide:' Opinion Leadership and Integrative Complexity in the U.S. Political Blogosphere." *Political Psychology* 35(6): 741–55.

Bruter, Michael. 2003. "Winning Hearts and Minds for Europe: The Impact of News and Symbols on Civic and Cultural European Identity." *Comparative Political Studies* 36(10): 1148–79.

Buck, Alexy, and Brigitte Geissel. 2009. "The Education Ideal of the Democratic Citizen in Germany: Challenges and Changing Trends." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 4(3): 225–43.

Bundesministerium des Innern und für Heimat. 2021. *Ausländerwahlrecht*. Available at https://www.bmi.bund.de/DE/themen/verfassung/wahlrecht/auslaenderwahlrecht/auslaenderwahlrecht-

node.html, last accessed in November 2021

Button, Katherine S. et al. 2013. "Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 14: 365-376.

Burkhalter, Stephanie, John Gastil, and Todd Kelshaw. 2002. "A Conceptual Definition and Theoretical Model of Public Deliberation in Small Face-to- Face Groups." *Communication Theory* 12(4): 398–422.

Calhoun, Craig. 2003a. "'Belonging' in the Cosmopolitan Imaginary." *Ethnicities* 3(4): 531–53.

———. 2003b. "The Elusive Cosmopolitan Ideal." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 47: 3–26.

Capella, Joseph N., Vincent Price, and Lilach Nir. 2002. "Argument Repertoire as a Reliable and Valid Measure of Opinion Quality: Electronic Dialogue During Campaign 2000." *Political Communication* 19: 73–93.

Carens, Joseph H. 1989. "Membership and Morality: Admission to Citizenship in Liberal Democratic States." In *Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*, ed. Rogers Brubaker. Lanham: University Press of America.

———. 2005. "The Integration of Immigrants." *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 2(1): 29–46.

———. 2016. "In Defense of Birthright Citizenship." In *Migration and Political Theory. The Ethics of Movement and Membership*, eds. Sarah Fine and Lea Ypi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carlin, Ryan E. 2018. "Sorting Out Support for Democracy: A Q-Method Study." *Political Psychology* 39(2): 399–422.

Carter, April. 2006. *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship*. New York: Routlege.

Castelli Gattinara, Pietro. 2017. "Framing Exclusion in the Public Sphere: Far-Right Mobilisation and the Debate on Charlie Hebdo in Italy." *South European Society and Politics* 22(3): 345-364.

Celikates, Robin. 2012. "Demokratische Inklusion: Wahlrecht Oder Bürgerschaft?" In *Migration Und Ethik*, eds. Andreas Cassee and Anna Goppel. Münster: mentis.

Chambers, Simone. 2003. "Deliberative Democratic Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 6: 307–26.

———. 2010. "Theories of Political Justification." *Philosophy Compass* 5(11): 893–903.

Clarke, John, Kathleen Coll, Evelina Dagnino, and Catherine Neveu. 2014. *Disputing Citizenship*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Cohen, Elizabeth F., and Cyril Ghosh. 2019. *Citizenship*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cohen, Joshua. 1989. "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." In *The Good Polity. Normative Analysis of the State*, eds. Alan Hamlin and Philip Pettit. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1997. "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." In *Deliberative Democracy and Essays on Reason and Politics*, eds. James Bohman and William Rehg. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Condor, Susan. 2011. "Towards a Social Psychology of Citizenship? Introduction to the Special Issue." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 21: 193–201.

Condor, Susan, and Stephen Gibson. 2007. "'Everybody's Entitled to Their Own Opinion': Ideological Dilemmas of Liberal Individualism and Active Citizenship." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 17: 115–40.

Cooke, Maeve. 2000. "Five Arguments for Deliberative Democracy." *Political Studies* 48(5): 947–69.

Coskun, Canan, and Naika Foroutan. 2016. "The Paradox of Equal Belonging of Muslims." *Islamophobia Studies Journal* 3(2): 160–76.

Cowling, David. 2016. "Why Were the Polls Wrong Again in 2016?" *BBC*. Available at https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-38402133, last accessed in May 2022.

Craig, Stephen C., Michael D. Martinez, James G. Kane, and Jason Gainous. 2005. "Core Values, Value Conflict, and Citizens' Ambivalence about Gay Rights." *Political Research Quarterly* 58(1): 5–17.

Crouch, Colin. 2004. *Post-Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Crossley, Nick. 1996. *Intersubjectivity. The Fabric of Social Becoming*. London: Sage.

———. 2001. "Citizenship, Intersubjectivity and the Lifeworld." In *Culture and Citizenship*, ed. Nick Stevenson. London: Sage Publications.

Curato, Nicole. 2013. "Deliberative capacity as an indicator of democratic quality: The case of the Philippines." *International Political Science Review* 36(1): 99-116.

Curato, Nicole et al. 2017. "Twelve Key Findings in Deliberative Democracy Research." *Daedalus* 146(3): 28–38.

Curato, Nicole, Marit Hammond, and John B. Min. 2019. *Power in Deliberative Democracy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Curato, Nicole, and Simon Niemeyer. 2013. "Reaching out to Overcome Political Apathy: Building Participatory Capacity through Deliberative Engagement." *Politics and Policy* 41(3): 355–83.

Czymara, Christian S., and Alexander W. Schmidt-Catran. 2016. "Wer Ist in Deutschland Willkommen?: Eine Vignettenanalyse Zur Akzeptanz von Einwanderern." *Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. 68(2):193-227

Dahl, Robert A. 1970. "What Is Politics?" In *Politics: Canada*, ed. P. Fox. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

———. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Deutscher Bundestag. 2016. *Teilnahme von Ausländern an Volksabstimmungen*. Wissenschaftlicher Dienst Ausarbeitung. Available at https://www.bundestag.de/resource/blob/420490/b860b35378b9b59f2ddf9e0809b54e72/wd-3-258-14-pdf-data.pdf

Dagger, Richard. 2002. "Republican Citizenship." In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, eds. Engin F Isin and Bryan S. Turner. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dahlberg, Lincoln. 2007. "The Internet, Deliberative Democracy, and Power: Radicalizing the Public Sphere." *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics* 3(1): 47–64.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. 2003. *Die Krisen Der Demokratie*. München: C.H. Beck.

Dalton, Russell J. 2008. *Citizen Politics. Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Washington DC: CQ Press.

Davidov, Eldad et al. 2018. "Explaining Measurement Nonequivalence Using Multilevel Structural Equation Modeling: The Case of Attitudes Toward Citizenship Rights." *Sociological Methods and Research* 47(4): 729–60.

Davis, Charles, and Carolyn Michelle. 2011. "Q Methodology in Audience Research: Bridging the Qualitative/Quantitative 'Divide.'" *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies* 8(2): 559–93.

Dean, Rikki, Jean-Paul Gagnon, and Hans Asenbaum. 2019. "What Is Democratic Theory?" *Democratic Theory* 6(2): v–xx.

Delli Carpini, Michael X., Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 315–44.

Dempster, Helen, and Karen Hargrave. 2017. "Understanding Public Attitudes towards Refugees and Migrants." *ODI and Chatham House Working Paper 512* (June).

Donnaloja, Victoria, and Haley McAvay. 2022. "The Multidimensionality of National Belonging: Patterns and Implications for Immigrants' Naturalisation Intentions." *Social Science Research* (March): 102708.

Dorr Goold, Susan et al. 2012. "What Is Good Public Deliberation?" *Hastings Center Report* 42(2): 24–26.

Druckman, James N. 2004. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)Relevance of Framing Effects." *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 671–86.

Dryzek, John S. 1990. *Discursive Democracy. Politics, Policy, and Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2000. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond. Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2005. "Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia." *Political Theory* 33(2): 218–42.

———. 2019. "The Crisis of Democracy and the Science of Deliberation." *Science* 6432: 1144–46.

Dryzek, John S, and Jeffrey Berejikian. 1993. "Reconstructive Democratic Theory." *American Political Science Review* 87(1): 48–60.

Dryzek, John S., and Simon Niemeyer. 2006. "Reconciling Pluralism and Consensus as Political Ideals." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3): 634–49.

———. 2008. "Discursive Representation." *American Political Science Review* 102(4): 481–93.

Dryzek, John S, and Jonathan Pickering. 2017. "Deliberation as a Catalyst For Reflexive Environmental Governance." *Ecological Economics* 131: 353–60.

Dryzek, John S et al. 2019. "The crisis of democracy and the science of deliberation." *Science* 363(6432): 1144–1146.

Duchesne, Sophie. 2003. "French Representations of Citizenship and Immigrants: The Political Dimension of the Civic Link." *Immigrants and Minorities* 22(2–3): 262–79.

Duchesne, Sophie, and André-Paul Frognier. 2008. "National and European Identifications: A Dual Relationship." *Comparative European Politics* 6(2): 143–68.

Dumbrava, Costica. 2012. *Nationality, Citizenship and Ethno-Cultural Membership. Preferential Admission Policies of EU Countries*. ed. Dissertation. Florence: Department of Political and Social Sciences, European University Institute.

———. 2014. *Nationality, Citizenship and Ethno-Cultural Belonging*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ecker-Ehrhardt, Matthias. 2012. "Cosmopolitan Politicization: How Perceptions of Interdependence Foster Citizens' Expectations in International Institutions." *European Journal of International Relations* 18(3): 481–508.

Eden, Sally, Andrew Donaldson, and Gordon Walker. 2005. "Structuring Subjectivities? Using Q Methodology in Human Geography." *Area* 37(4): 413–22.

Eliasoph, Nina. 1998. *Avoiding Politics. How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erez, Lior. 2017. "Anti-Cosmopolitanism and the Motivational Preconditions for Social Justice." *Social Theory and Practice* 43(2): 249–82.

Erez, Lior, and Cécile Laborde. 2020. "Cosmopolitan Patriotism as a Civic Ideal." *American Journal of Political Science* 64(1): 191–203.

Ersanilli, Evelyn, and Ruud Koopmans. 2010. "Rewarding Integration? Citizenship Regulations and the Socio-Cultural Integration of Immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(5): 773–91.

Eschweiler, Jennifer. 2013. *Towards a Voice in the Public Sphere? Deliberation with Muslim Civil Society in Berlin*. eds. Rupert Graf Strachwitz and Christian Schreier. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius Verlagsgesellschaft mbH.

Escobar, Oliver, and Stephen Elstub. 2017. "Forms of Mini-Publics: An Introduction to Deliberative Innovations in Democratic Practice." *newDemocracy*: 1–9. https://www.newdemocracy.com.au/2017/05/08/forms-of-mini-publics/.

Esterling, Kevin M. 2011. "'Deliberative Disagreement' in U.S. Health Policy Committee Hearings." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 36(2): 169–98.

———. 2018. "Deliberation and Experimental Design." In *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*, eds. André Bächtiger, John S Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Etzioni, Amitai. 2014. "Communitarianism revisited." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 19(3): 241-260.

Exel, Job Van, and Gjalt de Graaf. 2005. *Q Methodology : A Sneak Preview*. http://qmethod.org/articles/vanExel.pdf.

Farrar, Cynthia et al. 2010. "Disaggregating Deliberation's Effects: An Experiment within a Deliberative Poll." *British Journal of Political Science* 40(2): 333–47.

Farrell, David M. 2022. "We May Have Overdone It on Citizens' Assemblies." *The Irish Times*. Available at https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/we-may-have-overdone-it-on-citizens-assemblies-1.4803375, last accessed in May 2022

Farrell, David M, Jane Suiter, Kevin Cunningham, and Clodagh Harris. 2020. "When Mini-Publics and Maxi-Publics Coincide: Ireland's National Debate on Abortion." *Representation*: 1–19.

Felicetti, Andrea, Simon Niemeyer, and Nicole Curato. 2015. "Improving Deliberative Participation: Connecting Mini-Publics to Deliberative Systems." *European Political Science Review*. 8(3): 427-448

Ferrera, Maurizio. 2019. "EU Citizenship Needs a Stronger Social Dimension and Soft Duties." In *Debating European Citizenship*, ed. Rainer Bauböck. Cham: Springer Open.

Finck, Michèle. 2015. "Towards an Ever Closer Union Between Residents and Citizens? On the Possible Extension of Voting Rights to Foreign Residents in Luxembourg." *European Constitutional Law Review* 11: 78–98.

Fine, Robert, and Will Smith. 2003. "Jurgen Habermas's Theory of Cosmopolitanism." *Constellations* 10(4): 469–87.

Fishkin, James S. 2003. "Consulting the Public through Deliberative Polling." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 22(1): 128–33.

Fishkin, James S, and Robert C Luskin. 2005. "Experimenting with a Democratic Ideal: Deliberative Polling and Public Opinion." *Acta Politica* 40(3): 284–98.

Fontein-Kuipers, Yvonne. 2016. "Development of a Concourse for a Q-Method Study about Midwives' Perspectives of Woman-Centered Care." *Health Education and Care* 1(2): 31–36.

Foroutan, Naika. 2015. "Die Einheit Der Verschiedenen: Integration in Der Postmigrantischen Gesellschaft." *focus Migration Kurzdossier* 28.

Foroutan, Naika et al. 2014. *Deutschland Postmigrantisch I. Gesellschaft, Religion, Identität*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. papers3://publication/uuid/8D5D8226-BFB7-48C7-8F91-7378BE55D8FF.

Forsa/ SAS. 2013. "Open Government: Wünschen Bürger Mehr Beteiligung?" *Open Data Open Government Monitor*. Available at https://www.sas.com/content/dam/SAS/bp_de/doc/studie/ba-st-open-government-wuenschen-buerger-mehr-beteiligung-2253838.pdf

Forst, Rainer. 1996. *Kontexte Der Gerechtigkeit - Politische Philosophie Jenseits von Liberalismus Und Kommunitarismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

———. 2001. "The Rule of Reasons. Three Models of Deliberative Democracy." *Ratio Juris* 14(4): 345–78.

Franchino, Fabio, and Francesco Zuchhini. 2015. "Voting in a Multi-Dimensional Space: A Conjoint Analysis Employing Valence and Ideology Attributes of Candidates." *Political Science Research Methods* 3(2): 221–41.

Fraser, Nancy. 1998. "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, Participation." *WZB Discussion Paper* No. FS I 9.

Galston, William A. 2002. *Liberal Pluralism: The Implications of Value Pluralism for Political Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gastil, John, Chiara Bacci, and Michael Dollinger. 2010. "Is Deliberation Neutral? Patterns of Attitude Change during 'the Deliberative Polls™.'" *Journal of Public Deliberation* 6(2): 1-33.

Gastil, John, and James P Dillard. 1999. "Increasing Political Sophistication Through Public Deliberation." *Political Communication* 16: 3–23.

Gastil, John, Laura Black, and Kara Moscovitz. 2008. "Ideology, Attitude Change, and Deliberation in Small Face-to-Face Groups." *Political Communication* 25(1): 23–46.

Gerard, Harold B., and Ruben Orive. 1987. "The Dynamics of Opinion Formation." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. Leonard Berkowitz. Orlando: FL Academic Press.

Gerbaudo, Paolo. 2016. "From Data Analytics to Data Hermeneutics. Online Political Discussions, Digital Methods and the Continuing Relevance of Interpretive Approaches." *Digital Culture & Society* 2(2): 95–112.

Gerber, Marlène et al. 2014. "Deliberative and Non-Deliberative Persuasion: Mechanisms of Opinion Formation in EuroPolis." *European Union Politics* 15(3): 410–29.

Gerhards, Jürgen, Silke Hans, and Jürgen Schupp. 2016. "German Public Opinion on Admitting Refugees." *DIW Economic Bulletin* 21: 243–250.

Gibson, Stephen. 2011. "Dilemmas of Citizenship: Young People's Conceptions of Un/Employment Rights and Responsibilities." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 50(3): 450–68.

Gibson, Stephen, and Lorna Hamilton. 2011. "The Rhetorical Construction of Polity Membership: Identity, Culture and Citizenship in Young People's Discussions of Immigration in Northern England." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 21: 228–42.

Goel, Urmila. 2006. "Ausgrenzung Und Zugehörigkeit. Zur Rolle von Staatsbürgerschaft Und Einbürgerung." In *Masala.de Menschen Aus Südasien in Deutschland*, eds. Christiane Brosius and Urmila Goel. Heidelberg: Draupadi Verlag.

Goerres, Achim, Jonas Elis, Sabrina Mayer, and Dennis Spies. 2021. "Integration and Transnational Political

Interest among Immigrant-Origin Voters: An Analysis of Germans from Turkey and Their Children in the Immigrant German Election Study 2017." *SSRN Electronic Journal* (January): 1–20.

Goldberg, Saskia, Dominik Wyss, and André Bächtiger. 2020. "Deliberating or Thinking (Twice) About Democratic Preferences: What German Citizens Want From Democracy." *Political Studies* 68(2): 311–31.

Goodin, Robert E. 2007. "Enfranchising All Affected Interests, and Its Alternatives." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 35(1): 40–68.

Goodman, Sara Wallace. 2009. *Civic Integration Requirements and the Transformation of Citizenship*. ed. Dissertation. Washington DC: Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Georgetown University.

Gorman, Amanda. 2021. *The Hill We Climb. An Inaugural Poem for the Country*. New York: Viking Books.

Government of Luxembourg. 2015. *Mémorial B N° 66 de 2015, B66 : Arrêté Ministériel Du 12 Juin 2015 Arrêtant Le Résultat Du Référendum Du 7 Juin 2015 Sur Différentes Questions En Relation Avec l'élaboration d'une Nouvelle Constitution*.

Grégoire, Jean-François. 2014. "Beyond the Liberal Route to Federalism: Republican Freedom." *Theoria* 61(138): 18–36.

de Groot, Isolde. 2017. "Narrative Learning for Democratic Citizenship Identity: A Theoretical Framework." *Educational Review* (4): 1–18.

Guibert, Géraud. 2021. "La Transition Écologique Est-Elle Soluble Dans La Démocratie Citoyenne?" *Futuribles* 445: 33–43.

Gutmann, Amy, and Dennis Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 2000. "Why Deliberative Democracy Is Different." *Social Philosophy and Policy* 17(1): 161–80.

———. 2004. *Why Deliberative Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1995. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, Band 2: Zur Kritik der funktionalistischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

———. 2001. "Constitutional Democracy: A Paradoxical Union of Contradictory Principles?" *Political Theory* 29(6): 766–81.

Hampshire, James. 2011. "Liberalism and Citizenship Acquisition: How Easy Should Naturalisation Be?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37(6): 953–71.

Hannerz, Ulf. 2005. "Two Faces of Cosmopolitanism: Culture and Politics." *Stratsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* 107(3): 199–213.

Hansen, Holley E., and Bicki L. Hesli. 2009. "National Identity: Civic, Ethnic, Hybrid and Atomised Individuals." *Europe-Asia Studies* 61(1): 1–28.

Hanson, Kristin, and Emma O'Dwyer. 2019. "Patriotism and Nationalism, Left and Right: A Q-Methodology Study of American National Identity." *Political Psychology* 40(4): 777–95.

Häusermann, Silja, and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2015. "What Do Voters Want? Dimensions and Configurations in Individual-Level Preferences and Party Choice." In *The Politics of Advanced Capitalism*, eds. Pablo Beramendi, Silja Häusermann, Herbert Kitschelt, and Hanspeter Kriesi. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Healy, Paul. 2011. "Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 37(3): 295–311.

Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy. Americans' Beliefs about How Government Should Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobson, Kersty, and Simon Niemeyer. 2013. "'What Sceptics Believe': The Effects of Information and Deliberation on Climate Change Scepticism." *Public Understanding of Science* 22(4): 396–412.

Hoffmann, Holger. 2004. "The Reform of the Law on Citizenship in Germany: Political Aims, Legal Concepts and Provisional Results." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 6(3): 195–203.

Honohan, Iseult. 2003. *Civic Republicanism*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks. 2018. "Cleavage Theory Meets Europe's Crises: Lipset, Rokkan, and the Transnational Cleavage." *Journal of European Public Policy* 25(1): 109–35.

Howard, Marc Morjé. 2009. *The Politics of Citizenship in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huckfeldt, Robert, and John Sprague. 1995. *Citizens, Politics, and Social Communication. Information and*

Influence in an Election Campaign. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, Thomas. 2020. "Naturalisation in context: how nationality laws and procedures shape immigrants' interest and ability to acquire nationality in six European countries." *Comparative Migration Studies* 8:18.

Huddleston, Thomas, and Maarten Vink. 2013. "Membership and/ or Rights? Analysing the Link between Naturalisation and Integration Policies for Immigrants in Europe." *Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies Policy Papers* 15.

Hylton, Patrick, Ben Kisby, and Paul Goddard. 2018. "Young People's Citizen Identities: A Q-Methodological Analysis of English Youth Perceptions of Citizenship in Britain." *Societies* 8(4): 1-21.

Inglehart, Ronald, and Pippa Norris. 2016. "Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash." *HKS Working Paper* RWP16-026: 1–52.

Isakhan, Benjamin. 2012. *Democracy in Iraq. History, Politics, Discource*. London: Routledge.

Isin, Engin F., and Peter Nyers. 2014. "Introduction. Globalizing Citizenship Studies." In *Routledge Handbook of Global Citizenship Studies*, eds. Engin F. Isin and Peter Nyers. Oxon: Routledge.

Isin, Engin F., and Michael Saward. 2011. *Enacting European Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackman, Simon, and Paul Sniderman. 2006. "The Limits of Deliberative Discussion: A Model of Everyday Political Arguments." *The Journal of Politics* 68(2): 272–83.

Jayasuriya, Kanishka. 2005. "Economic Constitutionalism, Liberalism and the New Welfare Governance." *Asia Research Centre Working Paper* (121).

Jones, Emma, and John Gaventa. 2002. "Concepts of Citizenship: A Review." *IDS Development Bibliography* 19: 1–72.

de Jonge, Léonie, and Ralph Petry. 2021. "Luxembourg: The 2015 Referendum on Voting Rights for Foreign Residents." In *The Palgrave Handbook of European Referendums*, ed. Juli Smith. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Joppke, Christian. 1995. "Toward a New Sociology of the State: On Roger Brubaker's 'Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany.'" *European Journal of Sociology* 36(1): 168–78.

———. 2018. "War of Words: Interculturalism v. Multiculturalism." *Comparative Migration Studies* 6(11): 1–10.

———. 2019. "Liberal Citizenship Is Duty-Free." In *Debating European Citizenship*, ed. Rainer Bauböck. Cham: Springer Open.

Juhász, Zoltán, and Roland Abold. 2007. "Das ' Wir ' Entscheidet - Nationale Identität in Zeiten Der Globalisierung." *BACES Discussion Paper* 13.

Kallio, Kirsi Pauliina. 2018. "Citizen-Subject Formation as Geosocialization: A Methodological Approach on 'Learning to Be Citizens.'" *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography* 100(2): 81–96.

Kalu, Kalu N. 2003. "Of Citizenship, Virtue, and the Administrative Imperative: Deconstructing Aristotelian Civic Republicanism." *Public Administration Review* 63(4): 418–27.

Kanra, Bora. 2005. "Democracy, Islam and Dialogue: The Case of Turkey." *Government and Opposition* 40(4): 515–39.

———. 2009. *Islam, Democracy and Dialogue in Turkey. Deliberating in Divided Societies*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Kayran, Elif Naz, and Merve Erdilmen. 2021. "When Do States Give Voting Rights to Non-Citizens? The Role of Population, Policy, and Politics on the Timing of Enfranchisement Reforms in Liberal Democracies." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 47(13): 2855–76.

Kayran, Elif Naz, and Anna Lena Nadler. 2022. "Non-Citizen Voting Rights and Political Participation of Citizens: Evidence from Switzerland." *European Political Science Review*: 1–20.

Kim, Joohan, and Eun Joo Kim. 2008. "Theorizing Dialogic Deliberation: Everyday Political Talk as Communicative Action and Dialogue." *Communication Theory* 18(1): 51–70.

Kiwan, Dina. 2012. "Human Rights and Citizenship Education: Re-Positioning the Debate." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 42(1): 1–7.

Klaver, Odé. 2009. *Civic Integration and Modern Citizenship*. Groningen: European Law Publishing.

Knight, Jack, and James Johnson. 1994. "Aggregation and Deliberation: On the Possibility of Democratic

Legitimacy." *Political Theory* 22(2): 277–96.

Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias. 2011. "Is Global Democracy Possible?" *European Journal of International Relations* 17(3): 519–42.

Koopmans, Ruud. 2012. "The Post-Nationalization of Immigrant Rights: A Theory in Search of Evidence." *British Journal of Sociology* 63(1): 22–30.

Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis and London: University of Chicago Press.

Kühler, Michael, and Nadja Jelinek. 2010. "Autonomy and the Self." *Preprints of the Centre for Advanced Study in Bioethics*. Available at https://www.uni-muenster.de/imperia/md/content/kfg-normenbegruendung/intern/publikationen/kuehler/10_k__hler_-_autonomy_and_the_self.pdf

Kuran, Timur. 1998. "Insincere Deliberation and Democratic Failure." *Critical Review1* 12(4): 529–44.

Kuyper, Jonathan W. 2018. "The Instrumental Value of Deliberative Democracy – Or, Do We Have Good Reasons to Be Deliberative Democrats?" *Journal of Public Deliberation* 14(1): 1–32.

Kwon, K. Hazel, C. Chris Bang, Michael Egnoto, and H. Raghav Rao. 2016. "Social Media Rumors as Improvised Public Opinion: Semantic Network Analyses of Twitter Discourses during Korean Saber Rattling 2013." *Asian Journal of Communication* 26(3): 201–22.

Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lafont, Cristina. 2017. "Can Democracy Be Deliberative & Participatory? The Democratic Case for Political Uses of Mini-Publics." *Daedalus* 146(3): 85–105.

———. 2020. *Democracy without Shortcuts: A Participatory Conception of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lavine, Howard. 2001. "The Electoral Consequences of Ambivalence toward Presidential Candidates." *American Journal of Political Science* 45(4): 915–29.

Levitsky, Steven, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2018. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Broadway Books.

Liker, J. K., Augustyniak, S., and Duncan, G. J. 1985. "Panel data and models of change: A comparison of first difference and conventional two-wave models. " *Social Science Research* 14(1): 80–101.

Lindell, Marina et al. 2017. "What Drives the Polarisation and Moderation of Opinions? Evidence from a Finnish Citizen Deliberation Experiment on Immigration." *European Journal of Political Research* 56(1): 23–45.

Lindstam, Emmy, Matthias Mader, and Harald Schoen. 2019. "Conceptions of National Identity and Ambivalence towards Immigration." *British Journal of Political Science*: 1–22.

Lister, Michael. 2005. "'Marshall-Ing' Social and Political Citizenship: Towards a Unified Conception of Citizenship." *Government and Opposition* 40(4): 471–91.

Lister, Ruth. 1997. "Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis." *Feminist Review* 57: 28–48.

López-Guerra, Claudio. 2005. "Should Expatriates Vote?" *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13(2): 216–34.

Lovett, Frank. 2010. "Republican Global Distributive Justice." *DiaCrítica. Série Filosofia e Cultura* 24(2).

Lupia, Arthur, and Anne Norton. 2007. "Inequality Is Always in the Room: Language & Power in Deliberative Democracy." *Daedalus* 146(3): 64–76.

Luskin, Robert C, James S Fishkin, and Roger Jowell. 2002. "Considered Opinions: Deliberative Polling in Britain." *British Journal of Political Science* 32(3): 455–87.

Maier, Franziska. 2021. "Citizenship from below: exploring subjective perspectives on German citizenship." *Political Research Exchange* 3(2): 1-23.

Mader, Matthias. 2016. "Stabilität Und Wandel Der Nationalen Identität in Der Deutschen Bevölkerung." *Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 68(3): 435–56.

Mäs, Michael, Kurt Mühler, and Karl-Dieter Opp. 2005. "Wann Ist Man Deutsch? Empirische Ergebnisse Eines Faktoriellen Surveys." *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 57(1): 112–34.

Maireder, Axel, and Julian Ausserhofer. 2014. "Political Discourses on Twitter: Networking Topics, Objects and People." In *Twitter and Society*, eds. Katrin Weller et al. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Manin, Bernard, Elly Stein, and Jane Mansbridge. 1987. "On Legitimacy and Political Deliberation." *Political Theory* 15(3): 338–68.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2015. "A Minimalist Definition of Deliberation." In *Deliberation and Development. Rethinking the Role of Voice and Collective Action in Unequal Societies*, eds. Patrick Heller and Vijayendra Rao. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Mansbridge, Jane et al. 2010. "The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 18(1): 64–100.

Marshall, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Martí, José Luis. 2017. "Pluralism and Consensus in Deliberative Democracy." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 20(5): 556-579.

Mau, Steffen. 2021. *Sortiermaschinen. Die Neuerfindung Der Grenze Im 21. Jahrhundert*. München: C.H. Beck.

McCann, James A. 1997. "Electoral Choices and Core Value Change: The 1992 Presidential Campaign." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(2): 564–83.

Mendelberg, Tali. 2002. "The Deliberative Citizen: Theory and Evidence." In *Research in Micropolitics, Volume 6: Political Decision Making, Deliberation and Participation*, eds. Michael Delli Carpini, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Y. Shapiro. Cambridge: Elsevier Press.

Mercier, Hugo, and Hélène Landemore. 2012. "Reasoning Is for Arguing: Understanding the Successes and Failures of Deliberation." *Political Psychology* 33(2): 243–58.

Merkel, Wolfgang, and Sascha Kneip. 2018. *Democracy and Crisis. Challenges in Turbulent Times*. Cham: Springer VS.

Merkel, Wolfgang, and Michael Zürn. 2019. "Kosmopolitismus, Kommunitarismus Und Die Demokratie." In *Internationale Gerechtigkeit Und Institutionelle Verantwortung*, eds. Julian Nida-Rümelin, Detlef von Daniels, and Nicole Wloka. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Merten, Moritz. 2013. "Die Positionierungen Deutsch-Türkischer Jugendlicher Zwischen Ethnisierenden Zuschreibungen Und Alltagserfahrungen. Eine Kritik Am Dominanten Diskurs Über Zugehörigkeit." In *Migrationsforschung Als Kritik?*, eds. Paul Mecheril et al. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.

Mey, Eva. 2016. "Junge Menschen Sprechen Über Die Einbürgerung: Gesellschaftliche Positionierung Und Formale Staatsbürgerschaft Im Übergang Ins Erwachsenenalter." *Swiss Journal of Sociology* 42(2): 333–53.

Miley, Thomas Jeffrey. 2007. "Against the Thesis of the 'Civic Nation': The Case of Catalonia in Contemporary Spain." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 13(1): 1–37.

Miller-Idriss, Cynthia. 2006. "Everyday Understandings of Citizenship in Germany." *Citizenship Studies* 10(5): 541–70.

Miller-Idriss, Cynthia, and Bess Rothenberg. 2012. "Ambivalence, Pride and Shame: Conceptualisations of German Nationhood." *Nations and Nationalism* 18(1): 132–35.

Miller, David. 2008. "Immigrants, Nations, and Citizenship." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 16(4): 371–90.

Moffitt, Ursula, Linda P. Juang, and Moin Syed. 2018. "Being Both German and Other: Narratives of Contested National Identity among White and Turkish German Young Adults." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 57(4): 878–96.

Moore, Alfred. 2018. "Anonymity, pseudonymity, and deliberation: Why not everything should be connected." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 26(2): 169-192.

Moore, Alfred, and Kieran O'Doherty. 2014. "Deliberative Voting: Clarifying Consent in a Consensus Process." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 22(3): 302–19.

Mouffe, C. 1991. "Democratic Citizenship and the Political Community." In *Community at Loose Ends*, ed. Miami Theory Collective. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Muradova, Lala. 2021. "Seeing the Other Side? Perspective-Taking and Reflective Political Judgements in Interpersonal Deliberation." *Political Studies* 69(3): 644–64.

Neblo, Michael. 2007. "Change for the Better? Linking the Mechanisms of Deliberative Opinion Change to Normative Theory." *Available at polisci.osu.edu/faculty/mneblo/papers/ChangeC4.pdf*.

———. 2009. "Three-Fifths a Racist: A Typology for Analyzing Public Opinion about Race." *Political Behavior* 31(1): 31–51.

Neblo, Michael A. et al. 2010. "Who Wants to Deliberate - and Why?" *American Political Science Review* 104(3): 566–83.

Newman, Janet, and Evelien Tonkens. 2011. "Active Citizenship. Responsibility, Choice and Participation." In *Participation, Responsibility and Choice: Summoning the Active Citizen in Western European Welfare States*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Niemeyer, Simon. 2011. "The Emancipatory Effect of Deliberation: Empirical Lessons from Mini-Publics." *Politics & Society* 39(1): 103–40.

———. 2020. "Deliberation and Ecological Democracy: From Citizen to Global System." *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 22(1): 16–29.

Niemeyer, Simon, and John S. Dryzek. 2007. "The Ends of Deliberation: Meta-Consensus and Inter-Subjective Rationality as Ideal Outcomes." *Swiss Political Science Review* 13(4): 497–526.

Niemeyer, Simon, and Julia Jennstal. 2018. "Scaling Up Deliberative Effects—Applying Lessons of Mini-Publics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*, eds. André Bächtiger, John S Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikraftar, Tayebeh, and Reza Shokri. 2014. "Dominant Concourse about Important Barriers to Promoting Coordination in Iranian Government Machinery." *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy* 8(3): 357–73.

OECD. 2020. *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions Catching the Deliberative Wave*. Available at https://www.oecd.org/gov/open-government/innovative-citizen-participation-new-democratic-institutions-catching-the-deliberative-wave-highlights.pdf

van Oers, Ricky. 2020. "Deserving Citizenship in Germany and The Netherlands. Citizenship Tests in Liberal Democracies." *Ethnicities* 0(0)(1–18).

O'Flynn, Ian. 2006. *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

———. 2021. *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Oldfield, Adrian. 1990. "Citizenship: An Unnatural Practice?" *Political Quarterly* 61(2): 177–87.

Olsen, Espen D.H. 2008. "The Origins of European Citizenship in the First Two Decades of European Integration." *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(1): 40–57.

Ouahes, Idir. 2017. "Situating the Syrian State: Nation and Education 1914-2014." In *Citizenship, Belonging, and Nation-States in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Stokes-DuPass, Nicole and Ramona Fruja. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Owen, David. 2012. "Constituting the Polity, Constituting the Demos: On the Place of the All Affected Interests Principle in Democratic Theory and in Resolving the Democratic Boundary Problem." *Ethics & Global Politics* 5(3): 129–52.

———. 2018. "Populus, Demos and Self-Rule." In *Democratic Inclusion*, ed. Rainer Bauböck. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Owen, David, and Graham Smith. 2015. "Survey Article: Deliberation, Democracy, and the Systemic Turn." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23(2): 213–34.

Participedia.net. "Participedia." https://participedia.net/ (last accessed May 2, 2022).

Parekh, Bhikhu. 2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. London: Macmillan.

———. 2016. *A New Politics of Identity*. New York: Red Globe Press.

Partheymüller, Julia, and Thorsten Faas. 2015. "The Impact of Online versus Offline Campaign Information on Citizens' Knowledge, Attitudes and Political Behaviour Comparing the German Federal Elections of 2005 and 2009." *German Politics* 24(4): 507–24.

Pautz, Hartwig. 2005. "The Politics of Identity in Germany: The Leitkultur Debate." *Race & Class* 46(4).

Pedroza, Luicy. 2014. "The Democratic Potential of Enfranchising Resident Migrants." *International Migration* 53(3): 22–35.

———. 2019. *Citizenship Beyond Nationality*. *Immigrants' Right to Vote Across the World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pelletier, David et al. 1999. "The Shaping of Collective Values through Deliberative Democracy: An Empirical Study from New York's North Country." *Policy Sciences* 32(2): 103–31.

Pettit, Philip. 2013. "Two Republican Traditions." In *Republican Democracy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Pilialoha, Brian R.U., and Marilynn B. Brewer. 2006. "Motivated Entitativity: Applying Balance Theory to Group Perception." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 9(2): 235–47.

Pirsoul, Nicolas. 2019. "Recognition and Deliberation: A Deliberative Corrective to Liberal Multicultural Policies." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 15(1).

Pitts, Margaret Jane, Kate Kenski, Stephanie A. Smith, and Corey A. Pavlich. 2017. "Focus Group Discussions as Sites for Public Deliberation and Sensemaking Following Shared Political Documentary Viewing." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 13(2): 1-24.

Pogonyi, Szabolcs. 2019. "The Passport as Means of Identity Management: Making and Unmaking Ethnic Boundaries through Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 975–93.

Podhoretz, John. 2020. "The Pollsters Were Wrong Again — Why Do We Listen to Them?" *New York Post*. Available at https://nypost.com/2020/11/03/the-pollsters-were-wrong-again-why-do-we-listen-to-them/, last accessed May 2022

Pontusson, Jonas, and David Rueda. 2010. "The Politics of Inequality: Voter Mobilization and Left Parties in Advanced Industrial States." *Comparative Political Studies* 43(6): 675–705.

Posner, Richard. 2004. "Smooth Sailing." *Legal Affairs*. Available at https://www.legalaffairs.org/issues/January-February-2004/feature_posner_janfeb04.msp

Potter, Jonathan, and Sally Wiggins. 2008. "Discursive Psychology." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*, eds. Carla Willig and Wendy Stainton-Rogers. London: Sage.

Price, Vincent. 2009. "Citizens Deliberating Online: Theory and Some Evidence." In *Online Deliberation: Design, Research, and Practice*, eds. Todd Davies and Seeta Pena Gangadharan. CSLI Publications.

Reeskens, Tim, and Marc Hooghe. 2010. "Beyond the Civic-Ethnic Dichotomy: Investigating the Structure of Citizenship Concepts across Thirty-Three Countries." *Nations and Nationalism* 16(4): 579–97.

Reiner, Toby. 2011. "The Sources of Communitarianism on the American Left: Pluralism, Republicanism, and Participatory Democracy." *History of European Ideas* 37(3): 293–303.

Rodrik, Dani. 2016. "The False Economic Promise of Global Governance." *Project Syndicate*. Available at https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/global-governance-false-economic-promise-by-dani-rodrik-2016-08

Rosenberg, Shawn. 2005. "The Empirical Study of Deliberative Democracy: Setting a Research Agenda." *Acta Politica* 40: 212–23.

Rothwell, Erin, Rebecca Anderson, and Jeffrey R. Botkin. 2015. "Deliberative Discussion Focus Groups." *Qualitative Health Research* 26(6): 1–7.

Rubio-Marín, Ruth. 2000. *Immigration as a Democratic Challenge. Citizenship and Inclusion in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruedin, Didier. 2015. "Increasing Validity by Recombining Existing Indices: MIPEX as a Measure of Citizenship Models." *Social Science Quarterly* 96(2): 629–38.

Ryfe, David M. 2005. "Does Deliberative Democracy Work?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 49–71.

Saldaña, John. 2015. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Sage.

Sandel, Michael J. 1999. "Liberalism and Republicanism: Friends or Foes? A Reply to Richard Dagger." *Review of Politics* 61(2): 209–14.

Sanders, David. 2012. "The Effects of Deliberative Polling in an EU-Wide Experiment: Five Mechanisms in Search of an Explanation." *British Journal of Political Science* 42(3): 617–40.

Saunders, Ben. 2012. "Defining the Demos." *Politics, Philosophy and Economics* 11(3): 280–301.

Saward, Michael. 2003. "Enacting Democracy." *Political Studies* 51(1): 161-179.

———. 2021. *Democratic Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schlenker, Andrea, and Joachim Blatter. 2014. "Conceptualizing and Evaluating (New) Forms of Citizenship between Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism." *Democratization* 21(6): 1091–1116.

Schmidtke, Oliver. 2021. "Policy Formation and Citizenship Practices: Germany's Regions as Laboratories for Immigrant Integration." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 22(4): 1349–68.

Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, and Oana Lup. 2013. "Seeking the Soul of Democracy: A Review of Recent Research into Citizens' Political Talk Culture." *Swiss Political Science Review* 19(4): 513–38.

De Schutter, Helder, and Lea Ypi. 2015. "The British Academy Brian Barry Prize Essay: Mandatory Citizenship

for Immigrants." *British Journal of Political Science* 45(2): 235–51.

Selznick, Philip. 1995. "Thinking about Community: Ten Theses." *Society* 32(5): 33–37.

Setälä, Maija and Kaisa Herne. 2014. "Normative Theory and Experimental Research in the Study of Deliberative Mini-Publics." In *Deliberative Mini-Publics. Involving Citizens in the Democratic Process.* eds. Kimmo Grönlund, André Bächtiger, and Maija Setälä.

Sharp, Daniel. 2022. "Why Citizenship Tests Are Necessarily Illiberal: A Reply to Blake." *Ethics and Global Politics* 15(1): 1–7.

Shklar, Judith N. 1991. *American Citizenship: The Quest for Inclusion.* New Haven: Harvard University Press.

Shotter, John. 1994. "Psychology and Citizenship: Identity and Belonging." In *Citizenship and Social Theory*, ed. Bryan S. Turner. London: Sage.

Silva, Ricardo. 2012. "Republicanism and Liberalism in the Current Theoretical Debate." In *22º World Congress of Political Science - IPSA Visions of Liberty*, 1–20.

Sindic, Denis. 2011. "Psychological Citizenship and National Identity." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 21(3): 202–14.

Sjöberg, Ola. 2010. "Ambivalent Attitudes, Contradictory Institutions: Ambivalence in Gender-Role Attitudes in Comparative Perspective." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 51(1–2): 33–57.

Smith, Rogers M. 2008. "The Principle of Constituted Identities and the Obligation to Include." *Ethics & Global Politics* 1(3): 139–53.

Sneegas, Gretchen. 2020. "Making the Case for Critical Q Methodology." *Professional Geographer* 72(1): 78–87.

Somers, Margaret R. 2006. "Citizenship and the Place of the Public Sphere: Law, Community, and Political Culture in the Transition to Democracy." *American Sociological Review* 58(5): 587.

Song, Sarah. 2009. "Democracy and Noncitizen Voting Rights." *Citizenship Studies* 13(6): 607–20.

———. 2016. "The Significance of Territorial Presence and the Rights of Immigrants." In *Migration and Political Theory. The Ethics of Movement and Membership*, eds. Sarah Fine and Lea Ypi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soysal, Yasemin. 2010. "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism: An Insider-Outsider's Reading." *British Journal of Sociology* 61(SUPPL. 1): 405–11.

———. 2012. "Citizenship, Immigration, and the European Social Project: Rights and Obligations of Individuality." *British Journal of Sociology* 63(1): 1–21.

Steenbergen, Marco R, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, and Jürg Steiner. 2003. "Measuring Political Deliberation: A Discourse Quality Index." *Comparative European Politics* 1(1): 21–48.

Steenbergen, Marco R., and Paul R. Brewer. 2019. "The Not-So-Ambivalent Public: Policy Attitudes in the Political Culture of Ambivalence." In *Studies in Public Opinion*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stephenson, William. 1986. "The Concourse Theory of Communication." *Operant Subjectivity* 9(2): 37–58.

Stevenson, Nick. 1997. "Globalization, National Cultures and Cultural Citizenship." *Sociological Quarterly* 38(1): 41–66.

———. 2003. Media *Cultural Citizenship. Cosmopolitan Questions*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Stilz, Anna. 2011. "Collective Responsibility and the State." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 19(2): 190–208.

Stoker, Gerry, Colin Hay, and Matthew Barr. 2016. "Fast Thinking: Implications for Democratic Politics." *European Journal of Political Research* 55(1): 3–21.

Stryker, Sheldon, and Peter J. Burke. 2000. "The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(4): 284–97.

Sullivan, John L et al. 2015. "Patriotism, Politics, and the Presidential Election of 1988." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(1): 200–234.

Tanasoca, Anna. 2020. *Deliberation Naturalized. Improving Real Existing Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Charles. 1994. *Multiculturalism. Examining the Politics of Recognition*. ed. Amy Gutman. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Teney, Céline, Onawa Promise Lacewell, and Pieter De Wilde. 2013. "Winners and Losers of Globalization in

Europe: Attitudes and Ideologies." *European Political Science Review* 6(4): 575–95.

Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. 1993. "Conceptualizations of Good Citizenship and Political Participation." *Political Behavior* 15(4): 355–80.

Theuns, Tom. 2021. "Pluralist Democracy and Non-Ideal Democratic Legitimacy. Against Functional and Global Solutions to the Boundary Problem in Democratic Theory." *Democratic Theory* 8(1): 23–49.

Thompson, Michael J. 2017. "Autonomy and Common Good: Interpreting Rousseau's General Will." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 25(2): 266–85.

Tinsley, Meghan. 2019. "Decolonizing the Civic/Ethnic Binary." *Current Sociology* 67(3): 347–64.

Tully, James. 2000. "Struggles over Recognition and Distribution." *Constellations* 7(4): 469–82.

———. 2014. *On Global Citizenship*. London: Bloomsbury.

Turner, Bryan S. 1993. "Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship." In *Citizenship and Social Theory*, ed. Bryan S. Turner. London: Sage.

Veri, Francesco. 2019. "Explaining Foreigners ' Political Rights in the Context of Direct Democracy: A Fuzzy-Set QCA of Swiss Cantonal Popular Votes." *Politics and Governance* 7(2): 410–26.

Vink, Maarten Peter, and Rainer Bauböck. 2013. "Citizenship Configurations: Analysing the Multiple Purposes of Citizenship Regimes in Europe." *Comparative European Politics* 11(5): 621–48.

Voorheis, John, Nolan McCarty, and Boris Shor. 2015. "Unequal Incomes, Ideology and Gridlock: How Rising Inequality Increases Political Polarization." *SSRN* 2015: 1–52.

Wallace, Robert M. 1999. "How Hegel Reconciles Private Freedom with Citizenship." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 7(4): 419.

Wallaschek, Stefan. 2020. "The Discursive Construction of Solidarity: Analysing Public Claims in Europe's Migration Crisis." *Political Studies* 68(1): 74–92.

Walzer, Michael. 1983. *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books.

———. 2007. "The Politics of Difference: Statehood and Toleration in a Multicultural World." In *Thinking Politically*. *Essays in Political Theory*, eds. Michael Walzer and David Miller. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Warren, Mark. 1992. "Democratic Theory and Self-Transformation." *The American Political Science Review* 86(1): 8–23.

Watts, Simon, and Paul Stenner. 2014. *Doing Q Methodological Research: Theory, Method and Interpretation*. London: Sage

Wasmer, Martina, and Achim Koch. 2000. "Ausländer Als Bürger 2. Klasse? Einstellungen Zur Rechtlichen Gleichstellung von Ausländern." In *Deutsche Und Ausländer: Freunde, Fremde Oder Feinde?*, eds. Richard Goldstein, Peter Schmidt, and Martina Wasmer. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Weisskircher, Manès. 2020. "The Strength of Far-Right AfD in Eastern Germany: The East-West Divide and the Multiple Causes behind 'Populism'." *The Political Quarterly* 91(3): 614–622.

Weisskircher, Manès, and Swen Hutter. 2019. "Idle Democrats?" In *When Citizens Talk About Politics*, eds. Bert Klandermans and Clare Saunders. London: Routledge.

Wilcox, Shelley. 2004. "Culture, National Identity, and Admission to Citizenship." *Social Theory and Practice* 30(4): 559–82.

Wilke, Helmut. 2010. *Governance in a Disentchanted World*. *The End of Moral Society*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Wojcieszak, Magdalena, and Vincent Price. 2010. "Bridging the Divide or Intensifying the Conflict? How Disagreement Affects Strong Predilections about Sexual Minorities." *Political Psychology* 31(3): 315–39.

Wotherspoon, Terry. 2018. "Migration, Boundaries and Differentiated Citizenship: Contested Frameworks for Inclusion and Exclusion." *Social Inclusion* 6(3): 153–61.

Wright, Matthew, and Irene Bloemraad. 2012. "Is There a Trade-off between Multiculturalism and Socio-Political Integration? Policy Regimes and Immigrant Incorporation in Comparative Perspective." *Perspectives on Politics* 10(1): 77–95.

Wright, Matthew, Jack Citrin, and Jonathan Wand. 2012. "Alternative Measures of American National Identity: Implications for the Civic-Ethnic Distinction." *Political Psychology* 33(4): 469–82.

Wyss, Dominik, Simon Beste, and André Bächtiger. 2015. "A Decline in the Quality of Debate? The Evolution

of Cognitive Complexity in Swiss Parliamentary Debates on Immigration (1968–2014)." *Swiss Political Science Review* 21(4): 636–53.

Yoshizawa, Go et al. 2016. "Q Workshop: An Application of Q Methodology for Visualizing, Deliberating and Learning Contrasting Perspectives." *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education* 11(13): 6277–6302.

Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2001. "Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy." *Political Theory* 29(5): 670–90.

Zabala, Aiora. 2014. "Qmethod: A Package to Explore Human Perspectives Using Q Methodology." *R Journal* 6(2): 163–73.

Zabala, Aiora, Chris Sandbrook, and Nibedita Mukherjee. 2018. "When and How to Use Q Methodology to Understand Perspectives in Conservation Research." *Conservation Biology* 32(5): 1185–94.

Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 579–616.

Zeit Online. 2017. "CDU Warnt Vor AKP-Vertretern in Deutschen Stadträten." Available at https://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2017-03/auslaenderwahlrecht-cdu-nordrhein-westfalen, last accessed in May 2022

Zemborain, Martin R., and Gita Venkataramani Johar. 2007. "Attitudinal Ambivalence and Openness to Persuasion: A Framework for Interpersonal Influence." *Journal of Consumer Research* 33(4): 506–14.

Zhang, Weiyu, Xiaoxia Cao, and Tran Minh Ngoc. 2013. "The Structural Features and the Deliberative Quality of Online Discussions." *Telematics & Informatics* 30(2): 74–86.

Zimmermann, Katharina, Jan Ocko Heuer, and Steffen Mau. 2018. "Changing Preferences towards Redistribution: How Deliberation Shapes Welfare Attitudes." *Social Policy and Administration* 52(5): 969–82.

Zimmermann, Klaus F., Amelie F. Constant, and Liliya Gataullina. 2009. "Naturalization Proclivities, Ethnicity and Integration." *International Journal of Manpower* 30: 70–82.

van Zomeren, Martijn, Colin Wayne Leach, and Russell Spears. 2010. "Does Group Efficacy Increase Group Identification? Resolving Their Paradoxical Relationship." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46(6): 1055–60.

Zubrzycki, Geneviève. 2002. "The Classical Opposition Between Civic and Ethnic Models of Nationhood: Ideology , Empirical Reality and Social Scientific Analysis." *Polish Sociological Review* 139: 275–95.

Zuckert, Michael P. 2007. "On Constitutional Welfare Liberalism: An Old-Liberal Perspective." *Social Philosophy and Policy* 24(1): 266–88.

Zürn, Michael, and Pieter De Wilde. 2016. "Debating Globalization: Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism as Political Ideologies." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 21(3): 280–301.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Extended summary of the results from the discourse analysis on Twitter

Justice Concepts	Citizenship as a purely legal status	33
	Universal and unconditional rights/ historical German responsibility for human rights	30
	Unfair nature of national citizenship, references to racism and global inequalities	23
	Calls for reform or openness of citizenship: In favor of dual citizenship and multiple identities	22
	European solidarity or increased common regulations on issues of migration within the EU	9
	Enforcement of human rights is not unconditional/ should not lie with Germany (alone)	8
	Law is not moral but neutral	3
	Law or legal system must reflect (national) culture	2
Equality	immigration motivated by social welfare	38
	Immigration conditionality based on qualifications and job prospects	26
	Immigration is driven by neoliberalism/ corporate interests to reduce wages	21
	citizenship should be tied to taxation	17
	Citizenship as taking responsibility for oneself	18
	Competition for welfare between nationals and immigrants	12
Liberal citizenship	Civic obligation to be vigilant towards government, call it to order	61
	Citizenship as a purely legal status defined only by law, not connected to ethnicity or behaviors	33
	Civic obligation to be informed	20
	Minimal duties: going to school, paying taxes, working, voting is more of a right than a duty	15
	Citizens should not follow orders; obligation lies with state rather than citizens	10
	Civic duty for tolerance and diversity of religion	10
	Only needed commonality between citizens is acceptance of the constitution	9
	Strong civic obligation limits individual freedom	9
	Against obligatory year	6
	Rights and citizenship are unconditional	5
	Civic obligation to think for oneself	4
	Civic obligation to protect basic freedoms	3
	Citizens should not follow orders	2
Obligation and participation	Broad social engagement and civic practice	45
	Civic obligation to follow orders and stay calm	37
	Voting as duty	31
	Common practice: Lead culture as a practice, normative expectations implemented in civil society rather than the state, common behaviors oriented on the common law (as an orientation)	26
	Illegal immigration as a criminal act (that sometimes justifies preventing access to further rights),	23
	In favor of obligatory social year to strengthen social cohesion and develop useful skills	17
	Civic duty to denunciate others (sometimes ironically placed)	16
	Opening voting rights for non-citizens to strengthen democracy	9
	Political participation as a duty	8
	Lead culture as blindly following authority	8
	citizenship should be withdrawn for terrorists; no dual citizenship should be granted to those with a criminal record	7
	Social peace requires limiting immigration	6

	Rights should not outweigh responsibilities	6
	Unequal obligations: obligations towards weaker in society, greater obligation for non-citizens	6
	Popular vote on migration to control own borders	3
Cultural conditionality	(lead) culture is ridiculous/ jokes about lead culture/ jokes about patriotism	50
	(lead) culture is in need of protection/ is necessary/ is needed for integration/ is national	45
	Citizenship should be tied to ethnicity (for most citizens)/ nationality and citizenship are different	25
	Dual citizenship prevents integration	22
	Assimilation and integration	14
	citizenship requires loyalty	13
	Assimilation/ integration is necessary for citizenship/ German culture and traditions need to be protected from migration	11
	Segregation	11
	Being religious does not go with German citizenship / German culture is Christian or non-Islamic	11
	German culture is Christian	10
	Patriotism without nationalism	2
Global and multicultural citizenship	Geographic idea of common life and citizenship, Germany as an immigration country requires expansion of belonging	33
	Against lead culture and in favor of multiculturalism	31
	in favor of an open, European, multicultural lead culture	17
	Preference for EU or global citizenship	17

Appendix 2: Factor loadings of the Q-methodological analysis

(Loadings of all observations for all factors. Statistically significant loadings are indicated using a *)

	factor 1	factor 2	factor 3	factor 4
1	-0.09	0.20	0.02	0.02
2	-0.08	0.26	0.37	-0.26
3	0.45	0.20	0.24	0.41
4	0.48	0.17	* 0.55	0.03
5	* 0.58	-0.25	0.26	0.04
6	* -0.46	0.24	-0.07	0.24
7	* 0.68	-0.37	0.10	0.22
9	* 0.74	0.01	0.08	-0.20
10	* 0.76	-0.11	-0.06	-0.34
11	* -0.41	0.33	-0.07	0.21
12	0.31	0.07	0.22	-0.24
13	0.08	0.31	0.23	-0.05
14	-0.17	* 0.62	0.04	0.11
15	-0.43	* 0.54	-0.24	-0.08
16	-0.42	-0.15	0.26	0.40
17	-0.44	0.49	0.31	0.09
18	0.27	0.32	-0.02	0.03
19	* 0.53	0.21	-0.21	-0.16
20	0.26	0.34	0.20	0.12
21	0.19	0.00	0.35	0.22
22	-0.12	-0.01	0.29	0.06
23	-0.27	* 0.64	-0.12	0.16
24	0.10	* 0.84	-0.05	0.27
25	-0.07	* 0.66	0.08	0.19
26	-0.34	0.41	0.42	0.49
27	* 0.85	0.24	-0.03	-0.26
28	0.25	0.07	* 0.71	0.02
29	-0.24	0.01	0.20	* -0.60
31	0.15	0.17	* 0.57	0.13
32	0.38	0.01	0.26	-0.13
33	0.04	* 0.84	0.22	0.06
34	* 0.79	0.07	0.09	-0.10
35	* 0.79	0.12	-0.09	0.13
36	* 0.53	0.27	0.19	0.24
37	* 0.87	-0.21	0.12	-0.14
38	0.14	* 0.66	0.29	-0.02
39	-0.16	0.53	0.49	0.28
40	* 0.66	0.06	0.06	0.47
41	0.43	0.01	-0.19	* 0.59
42	0.30	0.37	0.01	0.36
43	* 0.42	-0.17	-0.15	0.19
44	0.08	* 0.58	0.30	0.20
45	* 0.69	-0.25	0.15	-0.13
46	-0.56	0.37	-0.15	0.57
47	-0.04	* 0.52	-0.02	0.22
49	* 0.78	0.03	0.16	-0.33
50	0.31	0.43	0.33	0.02
51	0.09	0.10	0.34	0.33
52	-0.34	0.44	0.33	0.04
53	* 0.67	0.34	0.07	-0.29
54	0.16	0.48	0.38	0.30
55	-0.17	0.36	0.06	* 0.70
56	0.44	0.50	0.27	-0.19
57	* 0.78	0.11	0.45	0.00
58	0.39	* 0.60	0.02	-0.08
59	* 0.62	-0.12	0.40	0.05
60	0.23	* 0.53	0.33	-0.02
61	0.13	* 0.41	-0.24	-0.21
62	* -0.64	0.39	-0.03	0.38
63	-0.41	0.45	0.33	0.24
64	* 0.80	-0.26	0.05	0.19
65	0.13	* 0.46	0.27	0.06
66	-0.02	0.30	-0.06	-0.19
67	0.14	0.26	-0.05	0.21
68	0.46	-0.13	-0.05	* 0.54
69	* 0.62	0.08	0.30	0.14
70	-0.15	0.10	* 0.56	0.21
71	-0.11	0.11	0.03	-0.04
72	0.08	0.01	-0.23	0.13
73	0.27	* 0.47	-0.25	0.01
74	-0.07	* 0.53	0.20	-0.16
75	* 0.77	0.06	0.24	-0.11
76	-0.29	0.26	0.27	* 0.66
77	-0.19	* 0.51	0.10	-0.09
78	-0.24	0.09	-0.06	* 0.60

	factor 1	factor 2	factor 3	factor 4
169	* 0.75	0.19	-0.26	0.13
171	0.56	0.51	0.11	-0.37
173	0.19	0.34	* 0.68	0.16
174	-0.52	0.31	0.19	0.63
175	-0.50	0.30	0.44	0.14
177	-0.19	* 0.59	0.25	-0.04
178	* 0.87	-0.04	-0.01	0.09
179	-0.15	* 0.84	0.07	0.18
180	* 0.62	0.06	0.01	-0.08
181	0.38	0.11	0.08	0.35
182	0.20	0.18	* 0.54	-0.06
183	0.50	0.34	0.60	-0.01
184	0.33	0.22	* 0.47	-0.06
185	-0.40	0.48	0.21	0.43
186	* 0.80	-0.03	-0.12	0.12
187	0.04	* 0.44	-0.02	-0.13
188	* -0.54	0.40	0.18	0.15
189	* 0.57	0.22	0.48	-0.05
190	-0.16	* 0.52	0.25	0.17
191	* 0.59	0.07	0.08	0.10
192	* 0.84	-0.17	0.21	0.11
193	-0.22	0.17	-0.03	0.05
194	-0.05	-0.08	-0.36	* 0.48
195	0.46	0.61	0.47	-0.12
196	* 0.43	0.08	0.11	-0.19
197	-0.41	* 0.70	0.08	0.20
198	-0.16	* 0.73	0.18	-0.01
199	-0.39	0.36	-0.10	0.49
200	* 0.86	0.12	0.03	-0.24
201	0.50	-0.11	0.41	0.55
202	-0.16	* 0.67	0.29	-0.02
203	0.38	0.01	* 0.41	0.14
204	0.37	-0.23	0.36	0.38
205	* 0.40	0.28	0.04	0.11
207	* 0.82	0.00	0.07	0.10
208	-0.08	* 0.73	0.15	0.28
209	-0.04	* 0.67	0.31	0.25
210	-0.34	* 0.71	-0.09	0.20
211	* -0.57	0.18	-0.22	0.42
213	-0.22	0.19	0.23	* -0.52
214	0.02	-0.05	0.23	-0.27
216	0.04	* 0.57	0.26	0.10
217	-0.15	-0.09	0.32	0.03
218	* 0.76	0.02	0.04	0.01
219	* 0.51	0.23	0.22	0.23
220	* -0.71	0.51	-0.20	0.17
221	-0.09	0.23	-0.07	-0.16
222	-0.09	0.23	-0.07	-0.16
223	* 0.67	0.18	-0.18	-0.07
224	0.23	0.36	* 0.60	0.07
225	0.38	* 0.53	-0.16	0.11
226	-0.15	0.44	-0.23	0.50
227	-0.02	* 0.55	0.13	0.26
228	* 0.63	0.09	0.08	0.46
229	0.18	-0.01	-0.13	-0.03
230	0.14	-0.02	0.03	0.15
231	0.17	0.21	* 0.61	0.03
232	* -0.67	0.10	0.14	0.54
233	-0.19	0.44	0.15	0.46
235	0.49	-0.17	0.52	0.35
236	0.05	0.09	0.34	-0.22
237	* 0.69	-0.40	0.15	0.09
238	0.47	0.47	0.11	0.08
239	-0.42	0.30	0.27	0.46
240	-0.02	* 0.77	0.16	-0.26
241	-0.20	-0.24	-0.03	-0.13
242	0.15	* 0.55	0.29	0.33
243	0.22	* 0.59	0.34	-0.23
244	0.41	0.34	0.35	0.13
245	* 0.79	-0.20	-0.03	-0.04
246	0.09	* 0.68	-0.03	0.21
247	* 0.61	0.21	-0.03	0.45
248	* 0.67	0.35	-0.02	0.15
249	-0.07	* 0.76	0.03	0.11
250	0.01	* 0.64	0.41	0.17

79	0.14	0.16	* 0.41	-0.01
81	-0.03	0.01	0.01	0.08
82	* 0.47	0.06	0.02	-0.30
83	* 0.47	0.06	0.02	-0.30
84	0.05	0.11	-0.37	-0.01
85	0.05	0.11	-0.37	-0.01
86	0.34	* 0.79	-0.01	0.02
87	-0.05	0.07	* 0.74	0.28
88	0.56	0.53	0.11	-0.26
89	-0.41	0.23	-0.34	0.55
90	0.33	0.31	0.07	-0.08
91	-0.12	0.16	0.24	* 0.74
92	-0.52	0.47	0.23	0.25
93	0.28	0.45	0.36	0.12
94	-0.26	-0.24	-0.03	-0.18
95	0.09	0.37	0.46	-0.32
96	-0.28	-0.20	* 0.43	0.13
97	-0.55	0.38	0.02	0.44
98	* 0.51	0.27	-0.14	0.06
99	-0.01	0.19	-0.24	0.28
100	-0.07	0.29	0.41	0.48
101	0.25	* 0.66	0.38	0.01
102	0.11	0.26	0.21	0.34
103	0.22	0.19	* 0.54	0.05
104	-0.18	0.11	0.25	-0.06
105	* 0.56	0.16	0.46	0.10
107	* 0.77	-0.11	0.37	-0.02
109	* -0.61	-0.09	0.44	0.16
110	-0.04	0.32	* 0.74	0.05
111	-0.05	0.13	0.20	* -0.40
112	0.02	* -0.52	0.14	-0.04
113	0.31	* 0.65	0.40	-0.12
114	0.24	* 0.47	0.13	0.09
117	0.21	0.39	0.47	0.37
118	0.27	0.31	0.28	-0.01
119	* 0.79	-0.20	0.09	0.01
120	-0.11	* 0.68	0.14	0.41
121	0.08	0.37	* 0.56	0.13
122	-0.25	0.39	0.27	0.54
123	* 0.71	-0.14	-0.06	-0.21
124	* -0.67	0.18	-0.04	0.34
125	* 0.80	0.02	0.25	0.14
126	-0.48	0.15	0.23	0.52
127	* 0.54	-0.15	0.23	0.20
128	-0.02	* 0.60	0.50	-0.21
129	* 0.76	-0.04	0.27	-0.14
130	0.16	0.22	0.53	0.51
131	* 0.53	0.26	0.08	0.23
132	0.43	* 0.59	0.09	0.25
134	0.36	0.35	0.30	0.22
135	-0.28	0.46	0.11	0.50
136	* 0.60	0.12	0.13	-0.05
137	-0.19	0.34	* 0.62	0.03
138	0.07	0.29	-0.06	-0.32
140	-0.26	* 0.70	-0.14	-0.10
141	-0.12	0.26	0.10	-0.32
142	0.24	* 0.52	0.32	0.09
143	-0.18	* 0.59	0.21	0.42
145	0.14	* 0.56	-0.23	0.28
146	0.46	0.40	0.46	-0.38
147	0.23	-0.03	0.35	-0.12
148	0.46	0.52	0.02	0.30
149	* -0.64	0.26	-0.13	0.31
150	* -0.62	0.36	0.10	0.28
151	-0.06	* 0.50	0.14	-0.17
152	-0.31	0.31	0.35	-0.15
153	-0.25	0.10	0.17	* 0.50
154	* 0.69	0.21	-0.15	0.13
155	-0.39	* 0.60	-0.10	0.35
156	0.38	-0.17	0.06	* -0.53
158	-0.03	0.39	-0.10	0.24
159	* 0.68	-0.18	0.16	0.03
160	-0.08	0.16	-0.23	-0.04
161	* 0.46	-0.34	0.12	-0.03
162	0.00	0.27	* 0.81	-0.13
163	0.18	* 0.49	0.19	0.05
164	-0.30	0.11	0.14	0.14
165	0.14	0.41	0.24	* 0.58

166	0.47	-0.07	0.07	* -0.48
167	* 0.50	0.17	0.39	0.03
251	* 0.58	-0.29	0.49	0.07
252	-0.43	0.54	0.35	0.04
253	-0.03	0.01	* 0.58	0.10
254	* 0.81	0.06	0.00	-0.31
256	0.15	0.32	0.43	-0.26
257	-0.14	0.15	-0.34	0.08
259	-0.21	* 0.62	0.04	0.30
260	0.25	* 0.65	-0.02	0.19
262	0.44	0.47	-0.14	-0.47
263	0.15	0.28	* 0.50	0.16
264	-0.33	* 0.63	-0.05	0.24
265	0.11	0.34	0.14	0.04
266	-0.09	* 0.55	0.21	0.49
267	* 0.78	-0.17	0.06	-0.16
268	0.12	-0.40	-0.10	0.13
269	-0.23	* 0.76	-0.14	0.30
270	* 0.66	-0.18	0.20	-0.04
271	-0.11	0.21	0.20	* 0.67
272	0.06	* 0.65	0.39	-0.18
273	-0.17	-0.02	0.17	0.38
274	-0.40	* 0.58	-0.08	0.21
275	-0.38	-0.41	-0.08	0.45
277	-0.04	* 0.75	0.15	0.19
278	0.34	0.08	-0.46	0.39
279	0.11	-0.07	-0.30	-0.15
281	* 0.71	-0.29	-0.05	0.16
282	-0.38	0.34	-0.30	0.56
283	0.26	-0.12	-0.04	0.32
284	0.36	-0.01	-0.11	0.09
285	0.07	0.04	-0.03	-0.05
286	* 0.45	-0.02	-0.22	-0.05
287	-0.27	* 0.79	0.09	0.09
288	0.21	0.11	0.11	* 0.50
289	* 0.83	-0.06	0.00	-0.13
290	0.28	* 0.59	0.25	-0.21
291	* -0.74	0.09	-0.08	0.41
293	0.36	0.28	* 0.69	0.11
295	* 0.85	-0.04	0.16	0.15
296	0.36	0.22	* 0.64	0.06
297	0.29	0.26	0.10	* 0.56
299	* 0.70	-0.44	0.12	0.11
300	* 0.75	-0.23	0.09	0.01
302	0.15	0.35	0.02	0.29
303	-0.24	-0.12	-0.05	-0.16
304	* 0.73	0.20	0.22	-0.12
305	-0.36	* 0.72	-0.09	-0.11
306	* 0.45	0.29	0.07	0.30
307	0.14	0.41	* 0.72	0.11
308	* 0.58	0.22	-0.04	0.02
309	* 0.45	-0.09	-0.06	-0.05
310	* 0.60	0.04	0.22	-0.03
311	0.24	0.11	* -0.63	0.30
312	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.11
313	-0.53	-0.02	-0.22	* 0.62
314	0.41	0.44	-0.26	0.12
315	0.26	0.22	* 0.59	-0.25
316	-0.35	0.46	0.27	0.52
317	-0.13	-0.03	0.02	-0.04
318	-0.20	* 0.70	0.22	0.28
319	-0.14	0.48	0.06	* 0.53
320	-0.10	0.00	-0.32	0.25
321	* 0.54	0.28	0.08	-0.43
322	* 0.44	0.30	-0.16	0.28
323	* 0.68	-0.09	0.05	-0.10

(103 observation without a significant loading onto any factor)

Appendix 3: Distribution of Q factors on ethnic-civic dimension

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	99
Ethnic national identity	19.62% (21)	31.78% (34)	6.54% (7)	5.61% (6)	36.64% (39)
Civic national identity	41.94% (39)	10.75% (10)	7.53% (7)	7.53% (7)	32.26% (30)

Appendix 4: Variance distribution of the pre- and post-treatment variables (including statistical significance of difference in variances)

	Variance pre-position	Variance post-position	Variance (post-pre)	p (pre<>post)
Deliberation Group	1090.25	1142.64	52.39	0.82
Information Group	1210.04	1184.76	-25.3	0.92
Control Group	1255.54	1276.94	21.4	0.93
Overall Sample	1182.42	1197.43	15.01	0.92

Appendix 5: Regression models with matched data (deliberation and control group)

Dependent Variable: Position T2 on foreigner voting rights

	Basic Model	Model with pre-treatment controls	Interaction Model
Treatment Effect **(Reference category: Control Group)**			
Deliberative Treatment	-3.42	-6.04 **	-9.00 **
	(2.47)	(2.61)	(4.02)
Individual-level variables			
Gender (female) (Reference categories: male, other)		-0.98 (2.60)	
Age		-0.24 ** (0.09)	
University degree		1.83 (2.87)	
Migration background		8.05 *** (3.04)	
Ethnic-civic indicators			
Geographical belonging		-2.52 (1.54)	
Civic obligations		-3.20 (2.06)	
Citizenship indicators			
Pride in German democracy		1.02 (0.90)	
Individualism		1.31 (1.13)	
Cosmopolitanism		1.43 (0.87)	
Interaction Terms			
Position T1 * deliberative treatment			0.13 * (0.07)
Position T1 F	0.89 **** (0.04)	0.79 **** (0.05)	0.83 **** (0.05)
Intercept	7.87 ***	10.93	10.51 ****
Multiple R2	0.77	0.79	0.77
Adjusted R^2	0.76	0.77	0.77

Note: N=184 for all models; Standard Errors in parentheses; where $*p< 0.1$; $p**< 0.05$; $p***< 0.00$. The matching is based on nearest neighbor matching with a propensity score. Matching is based on pre-position, east Germany, and university degree because there were slight imbalances on these variables between the groups, and they led to a good fit.

Appendix 6: Coding of pro and contra of arguments

	Deliberative Group	Information-only Group	Pure Control Group
Democracy	10.0% (17)	13.8% (19)	19.8% (24)
Democracy/ democratic participation can and should be a learning experience	2	3	3
Democracy means equal rights (including for non-citizens)	12	14	19
Democracy means diversity of opinion/ democracy must be able to handle diversity	3	2	2
Geography	20.0% (34)	21.0% (29)	19.8% (24)
Voting requires that the center of one's life is in Germany (e.g. family, work, everyday life, long-termism)	17	19	13
A minimum of 5 years before being granted the right to vote is approved/ is too little	6	10	2
Living in Germany for a few years does not imply enough knowledge to be given a vote	9	0	8
Living in Germany for a few years implies enough knowledge to be given a vote	2	0	1
Economy	14.7% (25)	11.6% (16)	1.7% (2)
A condition for the right to vote should be having a steady job/ paying taxes	21	13	2
Migration leads to increased competition over social rights/ voting rights will further drive social competition	4	3	0
Obligation	14.7% (25)	10.1% (14)	14.9% (18)
Naturalization signals (long-term, exclusive) loyalty to Germany and is necessary for voting rights	19	10	16
(Voting) rights require transmitting corresponding obligations	2	1	1
Voting comes with obligations/ is a big responsibility (which non-citizens can/ cannot assume in the same way)	4	3	1
Commonality	29.4% (50)	26.8% (37)	22.3% (27)
People who vote must share in democratic norms and principles like equal human dignity	8	11	3
People who vote should share German culture/ have been socialized or educated in Germany to genuinely understand the country	10	10	4
People must share German/ Western values	7	5	1
People who vote must respect secularity of the state/ reject religious extremism	4	0	1

People who vote must be fully integrated, assimilated	20	10	15
People who vote must share a conviction for the rule of law/ cannot be convicted	1	1	3
Law	11.2 (19)	16.7% (23)	21.5% (26)
Citizenship is a condition for voting and this principle should not be disregarded	16	19	24
Granting voting rights to residents is unfair because they would be allowed to vote in multiple countries	3	3	2
If we do not grant voting rights we should grant dual citizenship		1	

Note: Relative (and absolute) number of themes invoked in pro and con arguments on foreigner voting rights

Appendix 7: Quantitative background of the synthesis

	Best rated Q-statements	Mean rating (N=294)
Democracy and law	Some rights are so generally applicable that they should be implemented all over the world and for every individual.	5,7
	I would like for more people in Germany to become active in politics or society.	5,6
	Civic engagement for a good cause (e.g. voluntary engagement in a football club) is just as important as political participation (e.g. protesting or voting.)	5,4
	People learn a lot from political participation, for example about themselves, their skills, and society.	5,3
	I am proud of the German democracy.	5,3
Commonality and obligation	For me, being a citizen does not only mean having rights but also having obligations toward the state and society.	6,0
	If people want to live in Germany they should adapt to German customs and traditions.	5,7
	German culture must be protected.	5,4
	Citizens always have to be observant and critical towards the state.	5,4
Geography and social connectedness	(A person belongs in Germany if they live here, even if they do not have German citizenship.)	4,5

	Points made during deliberation	Number of arguments (N=92)
Democracy and law	Constitution, human rights democratic procedure and rule of law must be accepted and complied with.	20
	There is a responsibility to actively defended constitution and democracy.	
Commonality and obligation	Common values must be shared (political, societal and sometimes cultural), but no common thinking is required.	36
	Obligation is important, e.g. using vote responsibly, contributing to society, and protecting and acting in the interest of the future of the country.	
Geography and social connectedness	Residence is required.	35
	Social relationships, family, knowledge and care for place are important.	

	Points made in argumentation	Number of arguments (N=272)
Democracy and law	Equal rights require non-citizen voting rights	128
	Plurality of opinion and their representation is important.	
	Participating democratically is a learning experiences and contributes to belonging.	
Commonality and obligation	Democratic norms, values, and sometimes culture should be shared.	171
	Commitment and loyalty to the country and its future are required.	
	Political rights come with responsibilities.	
	Language and socialization benefit understanding of the country.	
Geography and social connectedness	Residence is important.	87
	Having the center of one's life in a country entitles to voting there.	
	Sufficient knowledge about the country and its politics are required.	

Appendix 8: Positions on non-citizen voting rights (measured on a 100-point-scale) by Q-factor

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	99
Strong rejection (0)	21.92 (16)	7.55% (4)	10.00% (2)	20.00% (3)	11.36% (10)
Rejection (1-33)	28.77% (21)	28.30% (15)	60.00% (12)	40.00% (6)	31.82% (28)
Middle ground (34-65)	28.77% (21)	32.08% (17)	10.00% (2)	6.70% (1)	26.14% (23)
Endorsement (66-99)	12.33% (9)	26.42% (14)	15.00% (3)	26.70% (4)	21.60% (19)
Strong endorsement (100)	8.22% (6)	5.66% (3)	5.00% (1)	6.70% (1)	9.10% (8)

Note: Just like in the overall sample, within each factor the average post-position is slightly more positive than the average pre-position. The largest increase between pre- and post-position can be observed among liberal democrats by three points on the 100-point-scale (of agreement on foreigner voting rights) and among critical ethnoculturalists by two and a half points.