

Online Appendix A Table 1: Immigration Index

Questions	T1	T3	T3-T1	Sig.
Q9_1: Illegal immigrants should be eligible for national health care	.649	.711	.062	.001
Q9_2: The children of illegal immigrants should be eligible to attend public school	.782	.794	.012	.469
Q9_3: Decisions about what immigrants to admit should take no account of what country they are from	.667	.723	.056	.010
Q11_1: Reinforcing border controls	.287	.347	.060	.000
Q11_2: Imposing penalties on employers who hire illegal immigrants	.229	.134	-.096	.000
Q10_4: Being Christian	.778	.835	.057	.000
Q10_5: Being White	.889	.915	.025	.025
Q10_7: Commitment to [nationality] way of life	.320	.407	.086	.000
Q10_8: Coming from a similar culture	.642	.700	.058	.001

For this table, paired tests were used to examine the attitude change between time 1 and time 3.

All questions in the table have been rescaled onto a 0 to 1 scale. In order to have a consistent index, some questions have been recoded so that higher numbers represent more openness to immigration, lower numbers represent less openness to immigration and 0.5 remains the midpoint. Question 7 asking participants how serious a problem immigration is was originally on a 0 to 10 scale, with higher numbers indicating immigration is the most serious problem we face. After rescaling and recoding, the results show that before deliberation participants were close to the midpoint at .465, after deliberation participants' attitude decreased to .345, indicating immigration is a serious problem.

Question 9_1, 9_2, and 9_3 were on a 1 to 5 scale, from agree strongly to disagree strongly. The questions were rescaled and recoded, where higher numbers meant participants agreed that illegal immigrants should be eligible for national health care (9_1), that the children of illegal immigrants should be eligible to attend public school (9_2) and that decisions about what immigrants to admit should take no account of what country they are from. For 9_1, participants increased from .649 to .711, for 9_2, participants increased from .782 to .794. and for 9_3, participants increased from .667 to .723.

The questions 11_1 and 11_2 were on a 1 to 5 scale from favor strongly to oppose strongly. The questions were rescaled onto 0 to 1 scale. Participants moved from .287 to .347 showing increased opposition to reinforcing border controls (11_1) and participants' opinion decreased from .229 to .134, indicating their favor toward imposing penalties on employers who hire illegal immigrants.

Questions 10_4, 10_5, 10_7 and 10_8 were on a 0 to 10 scale and were rescaled and recoded. Participants felt that being Christian, White or coming from a similar culture were unimportant in deciding what immigrants from non-EU countries should be admitted to participants' own country, the means increased from, .778 to .835 (10_4), .889 to .915 (10_5), and .642 to .700 (10_8). Finally, participants felt that commitment to participants' own country's way of life was somewhat important, but not as important after deliberation, the means increased from .320 to .407.

Online appendix A Table 2: Climate Change Index

Questions	T1	T3	T3-T1	Sig.
Q20: On a scale from 0 to 10, where '0' is "no problem at all", '10' is "the most serious problem we face", and '5' is "exactly in the middle", how serious a problem or not would you say global climate change is? (rescaled onto 0 to 1 scale)	.753	.831	.077	.000
Q21: On a scale from 0 to 10, where '0' means that	.587	.671	.084	.000

we should do everything possible to combat climate change, even if that hurts the economy, '10' means that we should do everything possible to maximize economic growth, even if that hurts efforts to combat climate change and 5 is exactly in the middle, where would you position yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about that? (rescaled onto 0 to 1 scale)				
--	--	--	--	--

For this table, paired ttests were used to examine the attitude change between time 1 and time 3.

Online appendix B: Matching

Table 6: Explaining the Green Vote T1 and T3 (Matching)

		BEFORE DELIBERATION (T1)			AFTER DELIBERATION (T3)		
Parties		b	S. E.	Sig.	b	S. E.	Sig.
GREENS	Immigration	5.526	1.660	.001	3.662	1.600	.022
	Climate Change	4.547	1.353	.001	3.231	1.162	.005
	Left - Right	-0.291	1.069	.785	-1.470	0.692	.034
	Intercept	-9.764	1.872	.000	-5.830	1.565	.000
	N	330			330		
	χ^2	17.30			26.00		
	Pseudo R ²	.188			.140		

NOTE: Reference Category are participants that selected other parties or did not offer a selection.

Table 8: Explaining the Green Vote, T1 and T4 (Matching)

PARTICIPANTS							
		BEFORE DELIBERATION (T1)			AFTER DELIBERATION (T4)		
Parties		b	S. E.	Sig.	b	S. E.	Sig.
GREENS	Immigration	5.141	1.667	.002	3.473	1.826	.057
	Climate Change	4.561	1.346	.001	4.648	1.280	.000
	Left - Right	-0.266	1.055	.801	-2.393	0.867	.006
	Intercept	-9.648	1.868	.000	-7.397	1.973	.000
	N		315			315	
	χ^2		17.16			33.51	
	Pseudo R ²		.187			.199	
CONTROL GROUP							

		BEFORE DELIBERATION (T1)			AFTER DELIBERATION (T4)		
Parties		b	S. E.	Sig.	b	S. E.	Sig.
GREENS	Immigration	0.236	1.409	.867	2.183	1.179	.064
	Climate Change	1.680	0.943	.075	0.765	0.808	.343
	Left - Right	-2.294	0.668	.001	-1.933	0.660	.003
	Intercept	-3.791	1.365	.005	-4.234	1.171	.000
	N		663			663	
	χ^2		14.35			21.15	
	Pseudo R ²		.056			.051	

NOTE: Reference Category are participants that selected other parties or did not offer a selection.

Table 9: Voting and the Major Parties (Matching)

		BEFORE DELIBERATION (T1)			AFTER DELIBERATION (T3)		
Parties		b	S. E.	Sig.	b	S. E.	Sig.
PES	Immigration	1.671	1.260	.184	-0.013	1.419	.992
	Climate Change	-0.882	0.919	.337	-0.828	1.059	.434
	Left - Right	-2.825	0.963	.003	-2.429	0.822	.003
	Intercept	-0.971	1.177	.408	1.821	1.273	.153
EPP	Immigration	0.575	0.897	.522	-1.401	1.327	.291
	Climate Change	-0.785	0.722	.277	-0.603	0.928	.516
	Left - Right	3.227	0.829	.000	3.196	0.794	.000
	Intercept	-2.663	1.019	.009	-0.034	1.113	.975
GREENS	Immigration	5.903	1.734	.001	3.128	1.856	.092

	Climate Change	4.186	1.404	.003	2.284	1.351	.091
	Left - Right	-0.063	1.243	.959	-1.403	0.890	.115
	Intercept	-9.45	1.918	.000	-3.267	1.776	.066
ALDE	Immigration	1.101	1.978	.578	-0.918	1.858	.621
	Climate Change	0.111	0.970	.909	-2.176	1.111	.050
	Left - Right	1.761	1.167	.132	-0.256	1.306	.844
	Intercept	-3.987	1.677	.017	1.428	1.630	.381
Other Party	Immigration	3.654	1.808	.043	-1.168	2.021	.563
	Climate Change	-2.282	1.287	.076	-3.045	1.208	.012
	Left - Right	0.174	1.279	.892	0.115	1.073	.914
	Intercept	-3.267	1.499	.029	2.265	1.550	.144
	N		330			330	
	χ^2		61.67			63.76	
	Pseudo R ²		.100			.106	

NOTE: Reference Category is participants who did not choose a party.

A propensity matching score was constructed to determine if there were differences between the pre-treatment test group and the control group. The authors selected demographic variables and used coarsened exact matching (cem) to match the test and control groups to determine whether these groups differed significantly. The cem algorithm used for this analysis determined the data was able to reach minimal multivariate imbalance while maintaining close to 100 percent of the cases available. When applying the cem algorithm on this paper's regressions, the results show minimal differences between the results with and without the cem algorithm. These tables are all two-tailed tests.