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This online appendix contains further information on the codebook, coding instructions, examples and procedures as well as supplementary analyses. It has four main parts:

A.1 Codebook Framing Climate Policy Ambitions in the European Parliament (pp. 2-12)
A.2 Climate Policy Ambitions: Targets and Implementation (p. 13)
A.3 Representative Claims and Justification Frames of Climate Policy Ambitions (pp. 14-15)
A.4 Justification Frames by EPG and Representative Claims Western Europe and CEE (pp. 16-17)
A.5 Reliability Test Results (p. 18)
A.1 Codebook Framing Climate Policy Ambitions in the European Parliament

1. Aim and research question

This codebook provides guidelines for a manual content analysis of climate policy ambitions in parliamentary debates. It conceptualizes and operationalizes climate policy ambitions by combining insights from research on policy change and output (e.g., Schaffrin et al. 2015) with a coding of representative claims and justification frames (e.g., de Wilde 2013; Wendler 2016). We apply the codebook to key climate policy debates in the 9th European Parliament (EP) to investigate how its members (MEPs) debate climate policy ambitions. The codebook also contains additional information on how the debates were retrieved and prepared for analysis using DeepL and MAXQDA.

2. Defining climate policy ambitions (in parliamentary debates)

Based on IPCC definitions (2018), we distinguish between climate mitigation ambitions and adaptation ambitions:

Mitigation: A human intervention to reduce emissions or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases” (p. 554).

Adaptation: In human systems, the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects, in order to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In natural systems, the process of adjustment to actual climate and its effects; human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects” (p. 542).

Mitigation measures: “In climate policy, mitigation measures are technologies, processes or practices that contribute to mitigation, for example, renewable energy (RE) technologies, waste minimization processes and public transport commuting practices.” (p. 554).

Adaptation options: “The array of strategies and measures that are available and appropriate for addressing adaptation. They include a wide range of actions that can be categorized as structural, institutional, ecological or behavioural” (p. 542).

We then define five core elements of climate policy ambitions: targets, scope, implementation, monitoring, and stakeholder involvement (Duwe & Evans 2020; Garvey & Buzogány 2021; Schaffrin et al. 2015).

Targets: Climate policy goals and objectives that actors aim to achieve. These can be quantifiable or non-quantifiable, economy-wide or sector-specific and have different time horizons (short to long-term) (see Nachmany & Mangan 2018).

Scope: This refers to the target group of the policy ambition (demand vs. supply side) as well as the targeted energy sources (fossil energy, renewable energy, nuclear). It captures how encompassing actors are in their climate policy ambitions (Schaffrin et al. 2015).

Implementation: Measures, tools and instruments used to reach the climate policy targets. This includes some sub-categories (see Schaffrin et al. 2015), namely in how far actors discuss

- **Budget / set expenditure**: Do actors earmark a certain amount of money, talk about budgetary implications, the need for investment, costs of climate policy ambitions etc.?  
- **Implementation procedures**: Do actors specifically name implementation procedures and actors / institutions responsible for the implementation process?  
- **Sanctioning mechanisms**: Do actors commit to any form of sanctioning in case of non-compliance with set targets or implementation mechanisms?  
- **Mainstreaming requirements**: Do actors discuss mainstreaming climate change ambitions into other policy areas such as trade policy for example? This means evaluating legislation and policies against the background of implications for climate change in all policy areas.  
- **Policy integration**: Do actors discuss climate policy measures as part of a larger framework, in relation to other (climate) policy measures?

1 Please also consult the main article for the conceptual discussion.
**Monitoring:** Do actors talk about monitoring requirements? These include reporting requirements, evaluation requirements and updating requirements. This also captures in how far an independent scientific advisory board is discussed as part of the progress monitoring (Duwe & Evans 2020).

**Stakeholder Involvement:** This captures the participatory dimension, namely in how far actors discuss the involvement of citizens, civil society and interest groups as well as scientists in the climate policy process.

Since these elements come from research on policy outputs, activities and change, they are largely geared towards the analysis of policy instruments, legal texts or legislative amendments and do not yet capture elements of political debate.

To capture these elements, we additionally code

**Actor Position** towards climate policy ambition (both target and implementation separately)

**Representative Claim:** Whom does the actor claim to represent / speak for and about when discussing a certain climate policy ambition (see de Wilde 2013; Kinski 2021).

**Justification Frame:** How does the actor frame the climate policy ambition when it comes to why a policy ambition should (not) be done? (see Wendler 2016).

Overall, this coding scheme codes how actors answer the questions of WHAT, HOW, HOW WELL, BY & WITH WHOM (Duwe & Evans 2020), FOR WHOM and WHY (not) in their political debates

---

3. Two-step coding process: unitizing and coding unit

We apply a two-step coding process that first identifies climate policy ambitions and then codes their respective elements (target, implementation etc.) in a second step. The individual **climate policy ambition** is the **coding unit** and may range from a (part of) a sentence to an entire paragraph depending on how many core (target, scope, implementation, monitoring, stakeholder involvement) and additional elements (position, representation, justification) it contains.

**Example 1** (mitigation ambition only containing a target): “Today, we will enshrine into law that the EU, which started as a coal and steel union more than 70 years ago, will become the first carbon—neutral continent by 2050 at the latest.” Jytte Guteland, Climate Law Debate 24.06.2021

**Examples 2** (several mitigation ambitions incl. target and implementation):

“The Liberals want to see a 65% reduction in emissions by 2030, but we also want to focus on how we get there; climate targets mean nothing without economically efficient sustainable solutions” (target and unspecific implementation_1).

“That is why we say yes to a common carbon tax (implementation ambition 1), yes to scrapping subsidies for fossil fuels (implementation ambition 2), yes to investing heavily in research and new technology (implementation ambition 3) and we say yes to nuclear power (4) and carbon storage (5) as part of the solution.” Karin Karlsbro, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020

**Example 3** (containing urgency and leadership frames)

“Madam President, climate change and environmental degradation pose a serious threat to Europe and the world. That is why it is important to be ambitious and make Europe the world's first climate-neutral continent.” Edina Tóth, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020

**Example 4** (target, implementation, justification, representation)

The need to reduce emissions (target) is indisputable. As is, for example, the move away from coal to RES (Renewable Energy Sources) (implementation_1). The “New Green Deal” must propose a new fund for a just transition (implementation_2) - one that will not affect thousands of miners in Poland (representation_1 miners), and that will allow post-mining regions (implementation_2 regions) to fairly maintain their cultural identity (justifications_1_2: fairness, cultural identity).” Robert Biedroń, Green Deal Debate 11.12.2019
4. Coding scheme and instructions

Speaker variables

Coded in a separate Excel sheet formatted to correspond to MEP names and document (debate titles) in MAXQDA to allow for automatic identification of ‘focus group speakers’ and the merger of these speaker variables to the coded material.

Data was mainly retrieved from individual MEP websites on EP website:


**MEP name** (automatically from debate transcript)

**EPG affiliation** at the time of speech, enter abbreviation:

- Left Group (GUE/NGL)
- Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats (S&D)
- Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance (Greens/EFA)
- Renew Europe Group (Renew)
- Group of the European People’s Party (EPP)
- European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR)
- Identity and Democracy Group (ID)
- Not affiliated (NI)

**Nationality**: country abbreviation, e.g. AT, SW, HU etc.

Binary variable: CEE 1 (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia), rest 0

In total, 134 MEPs gave 152 speeches in two plenary debates, 48 speeches were from CEE MEPs, 104 from Western European MEPs. Speeches GUE/NGL 9; S&D 35; Greens/EFA 17; Renew 23; EPP 33; ECR 15; ID 13; NI 7
Content variables (measuring climate policy ambitions)

Only the subcodes were added in MAXQDA (frequencies automatically added to parent code)

0_type of ambition

0_ambition\0_type\0_mitigation: human action to fight climate change

0_ambition\0_type\0_adaptation: human action to live with / become resilient to climate change and its effects

Added inductively in the coding process:

0_ambition\0_type\0_general ambition: generic calls to actions / calls to be ambitious (often unclear whether mitigation and / or adaptation)

0_ambition\0_type\0_environment ambition: human action related to protecting nature, biodiversity, stop pollution and resource depletion

Note that MEPs can also simultaneously talk about different ambitions that is for example link adaptation and mitigation or mitigation and environmental ambitions.

Examples

Mitigation and environmental ambition:

“The European Parliament has, alongside several countries, local authorities and scientists, declared that our planet is facing a climate and environment emergency. To avoid accelerated and irreversible climate change and a massive decline in biodiversity, global greenhouse gas emissions need to be rapidly reduced” Rovana Plumb, Climate Law Debate, 06.10.2020.

“Agriculture, the environment and the climate are mutually dependent, not mutually opposed. That is why we must have concrete solutions on the table” Asger Christensen, Climate Law Debate, 06.10.2020.

“Madam President, climate change and environmental degradation pose a serious threat to Europe and the world. That is why it is important to be ambitious and make Europe the world’s first climate-neutral continent” Edina Tóth, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020.

Adaptation ambition:

“One last word: adaptation to climate change is fundamental, all European territories are concerned, farmers who live with droughts, people who live with floods, rising waters on the coasts, this European law is still too weak on adaptation, that is why we have tabled an amendment, to stop spending European money if we do not test the capacity of the major projects we finance to adapt, to be resilient to climate change. I hope that all of us in this Chamber will be able to support this amendment tomorrow, which is absolutely fundamental, both for the climate, for the territories and for the proper use of public money” Pascal Canfin, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020.

Adaptation and mitigation in farming:

“Farmers are the first to feel the impact of climate change. Yet bear in mind the pressure on their shoulders by the rigorous standards of the future CAP, the budget cuts, the unfair competition triggered by the Mercosur trade agreement and the international trade disputes countermeasures. It is, thus, fundamental to design policies that accompany our farmers towards this transition, instead of putting even more pressure on them.” Carmen Avram, Green Deal Debate, 11.12.2019.

Mitigation and environmental ambition in forestry:

“Forestry also plays a crucial role in addressing climate change. It has significant potential to reduce emissions, sequester carbon and boost economies in a sustainable manner. With over 40% of the EU’s land area covered by forests, it is clear that the European Green Deal must include an updated post-2020 EU Forest Strategy, to put the legislation in line with renewed climate and biodiversity ambitions. However, as the Commission knows, each Member States has its specificities. During the last plenary debate on the protection of forests, Romanian illegal logging was discussed. I call on the Commission to explain all the concrete initiatives which might be taken in order to protect Romanian forests and its biodiversity” Carmen Avram, Green Deal Debate, 11.12.2019.
1_target

1_target\1_position
   1_target\1_position\1_neutral, none
   1_target\1_position\1_pro, positive
   1_target\1_position\1_con, negative
   1_target\1_position\1_ambivalent

1_target\1_time
   1_target\1_time\1_long_term
   1_target\1_time\1_short_term
   1_target\1_time\1_no_term

1_target\1_quantifiable
   1_target\1_quantifiable\1_non-quantifiable
   1_target\1_quantifiable\1_quantifiable

1_target\1_sector
   1_target\1_sector\1_secondary sector
      1_target\1_sector\1_secondary sector\1_consumer goods
      1_target\1_sector\1_secondary sector\1_construction
      1_target\1_sector\1_secondary sector\1_transportation
      1_target\1_sector\1_secondary sector\1_manufacturing
   1_target\1_sector\1_primary sector
      1_target\1_sector\1_primary sector\1_primary energy sources
      1_target\1_sector\1_primary sector\1_fishing
      1_target\1_sector\1_primary sector\1_forestry
      1_target\1_sector\1_primary sector\1_farming & livestock
      1_target\1_sector\1_primary sector\1_mining

1_target\1_non-sector
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_negative emissions
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_stop_resource depletion
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_stop nature pollution
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_protect biodiversity
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_circular economy
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_green growth
   1_target\1_non-sector\1_limit_global_warming_at_1.5
1. 
2. 
3. 

1. **Target**
   - **Non-sector**
     - **2050 Climate / Carbon Neutrality**
     - **GhG Emissions Reduction**
     - **2040 Interim Target**
     - **2030 Target**
       - **40%**
       - **60%**
       - **Not Specified**
       - **55%**
       - **70%**
       - **50%**

1. **End fossil economy**

2. **Scope**
   - **2. Target Groups**
     - **Supply Side (Business, Companies)**
     - **Demand Side (Consumers, Citizens)**
   - **2. Energy Sources**
     - **Nuclear**
     - **Fossil Energy (Coal, Oil, Gas)**
     - **Renewables (Wind, Solar, Hydro, Biomass, Heat & Power)**

3. **Implementation**
   - **3. Position**
     - **Neutral, None**
     - **Pro, Positive**
     - **Con, Negative**
     - **Ambivalent**
   - **3. Implementation Type**
     - **Policy Fields**
       - **Industrial Policy**
       - **Common Fisheries Policy**
       - **Common Agricultural Policy**
       - **Trade Policy**
       - **Energy Policy / Energy Union**
       - **Environmental Policy**
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_policy fields\3_EU foreign policy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_policy fields\3_financial policy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_policy fields\3_cohesion policy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_policy fields\3_infrastructure & transportation policy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_policy fields\3_technology & innovation policy

3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_directives_strategies
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_Methane Strategy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_Biodiversity Strategy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU Mobility Strategy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_Renewable Energy Directive
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU rules on air quality
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_circular economy action plan
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_50 steps to 2050 / 2050 long-term strategy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_reducing administrative burden
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU digital strategy / digitalization
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU chemicals strategy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU farm to fork strategy / food safety
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU industrial strategy
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_strategies\3_EU forest strategy / deforestation

3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_carbon compensation / offsetting
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_carbon tariff, quota
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_Horizon Europe
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_preventing carbon leakage
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_deregulation
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_Emissions Trading System, ETS
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_ghg emissions budget
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_subsidies
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_bans (e.g., plastic straws)
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_taxes (plastic, carbon)
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_carbon capture, storage, sinks
3_implementation\3_implementation type\3_mechanisms\3_border adjustment mechanism
3implementation\3implementation type\3mechanisms\3Just Transition Fund
3implementation\3implementation type\3mechanisms\3Com_impact assessment
3implementation\3implementation type\3mechanisms\3technological neutrality

3implementation\3implementation type\3other
3implementation\3implementation type\3other\3measures to reach UN 2030 Agenda / SDGs
3implementation\3implementation type\3other\3SGP
3implementation\3implementation type\3other\3MFF, EU budget
3implementation\3implementation type\3other\3European Semester

3implementation\3sanctioning

3implementation\3procedure

3implementation\3policy integration

3implementation\3budget, investment

3implementation\3mainstreaming

4monitoring
4monitoring\4scientific body w/ own resources
4monitoring\4updating
4monitoring\4evaluating
4monitoring\4reporting

5stakeholder Involvement
5stakeholder Involvement\5citizens
5stakeholder Involvement\5civil society & interest groups
5stakeholder Involvement\5scientists
6_representation

Code references to sectoral, functional, territorial, social groups/interests (speaking for / about benefits and costs of ambition for them, their needs, problems, burdens, interests)

6_representation\protesters
6_representation\next generation, youth, children
6_representation\citizens
6_representation\business, companies, industry
6_representation\vulnerable, marginalized, poor
6_representation\farmers, foresters, fishers
6_representation\member states
6_representation\workers
6_representation\families
6_representation\miners
6_representation\regions
6_representation\consumers
6_representation\small producers, SMEs

7_justification

Justification of (not) doing / supporting a policy ambition. Actors can use the same frame to argue for or against an ambition. For example, an actor justifying a measure as socially just or criticizing it precisely because it is not socially just. Similarly, an actor can argue for EU leadership on climate policy ambitions, but also against it because other regions of the world are not contributing as much. In both cases social justice / leadership is the frame to be coded. The position is captured in 1_target and / or 3_implementation.

7_justification\health

Policy ambition (PA) framed with reference to consequences of climate change on health of citizens and health systems (e.g., air and plastic pollution)

7_justification\consistency & coherence

PA framed with reference to being consistent with existing laws and coherent in terms of fitting into existing policies, including continuity and predictability of policy instrument (e.g., often used by those critical to argue against too rapid change / for planning certainty)

7_justification\urgency

PA framed as (not) necessary because of emergency (not) requiring swift action (often used by proponents of swift actions, e.g., the planet is on fire, we have to act now and we have to be ambitious)

7_justification\adequacy

PA framed as (not) adequate to fight / live with climate change, proportionality (often used by proponents of ambitious action calling for action adequate to the severe challenge)

7_justification\inclusiveness & accessibility

PA framed as (not) taking everyone on board in the entire climate change transition process (specific stakeholders, but also general calls to leave no one behind)
intergenerational justice
PA framed as (not) moral obligation towards future generations, youth, children; also reconciling interests of future and current generations

fairness
PA framed as (not) fair with regard to distribution of costs and contributions (everyone has to contribute their fair share, we need a fair transition that takes into account where everyone started from)

solidarity
PA framed as (not) shared interest and objectives creating a sense of unity and support, willingness to help (can be with social groups, but also among member states)

social justice
PA framed as (not) just in terms of distribution of wealth, opportunities and privileges in a society; protection of most vulnerable groups in society; social equality / equity

competitiveness
PA framed referring to (lack of) economic competitiveness mostly compared to non-EU countries, also maintaining exports

prosperity
PA framed referring to country’s / EU’s wealth, economic growth, stable employment

leadership
EU as a leader in climate policy ambitions, pioneer, example to follow (in terms of climate targets, but also with regard to technological innovation in response to climate change)

credibility
PA framed with reference to (not) being trusted as both an international partner, but also vis-à-vis domestic stakeholders; credible commitment to policy ambitions

responsibility
PA framed with reference to (lack of) obligation for someone or something, e.g. responsible for fighting climate change; often also in connection to being responsible with regard to international partners and commitments (can be linked to credibility, code two codes)

feasibility
PA framed with reference to degree to which ambitions are possible. May include economic, institutional, social or technological feasibility constraints.

transparency
PA framed with reference to a (lack of) publicly open process (policy process and implementation process)

accountability
PA framed with reference to (lack of) answerability to various principals.

sovereignty
PA framed with reference to member state sovereignty (e.g., EU encroaching upon that sovereignty)

cultural identity
PA framed with reference to harming or helping cultural identity of a particular group, country

negotiation tactics
PA framed with reference to ambition being part of bargaining strategy, inter-institutional power play and negotiation tactics
5. European Parliament debates on climate policy ambitions

The following debates were coded by two coders (also check main article for justification of this sample):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Debates were accessed in HTML format via the EP debate search engine using information on the date, title and type of debate: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu](https://www.europarl.europa.eu)


As a result of the debate on 11 December 2019, the EP adopted a *resolution*[^2] on 15 January 2020 that, among other things, called for climate neutrality by 2050 (legally binding, EU-wide, national targets), a 2030 target of 55% on ghg emission reduction (and an interim target for 2040), Commission impact assessment prior to climate law (also for the following, see Erbach 2021).

The EP *negotiation position*[^3] adopted on 6 October 2020 contained a 60% EU-wide 2030 target, 2050 climate neutrality (EU-wide and MS-level), negative emissions after 2050, and a call for a 2040 target.

The *agreement* between Council and EP of 21 April 2021 included a 55% ghg reduction target by 2030 (EU-wide), 2050 climate neutrality (EU-wide), creation of a European Climate Change Council (ECCC). Parliament approved this on 24 June 2021.

A.2 Climate Policy Ambitions: Most frequent targets and Implementation measures

1_target
1_non-sector\1_2050_climate / carbon neutrality: 93
1_non-sector\1_2030 target (40, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70%, % not specified): 87
1_non-sector\1_ghg emissions reduction: 45
1_sector\1_primary sector\1_primary energy sources: 36
1_non-sector\1_end fossil economy: 29

3_implementation
3_policy fields\3_energy policy / Energy Union: 44
3_policy fields\3_technology & innovation policy: 43
3_mechanisms\3_Just Transition Fund: 21
3_policy fields\3_infrastructure & transportation policy: 20
3_policy fields\3_trade policy: 20
3_mechanisms\3_taxes (plastic, carbon): 20
A.3 Representative Claims and Justification Frames of Climate Policy Ambitions

Absolute and relative frequencies behind code cloud in *Figure 2*, main article.

*Representative Claims*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>citizens</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member states</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business, companies, industry</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next generation, youth, children</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulnerable, marginalized, poor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmers, foresters, fishers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protesters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small producers, SMEs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Justification Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urgency</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitiveness</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequacy</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feasibility</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosperity</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solidarity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credibility</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusiveness &amp; accessibility</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intergenerational justice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency &amp; coherence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sovereignty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural identity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiation tactics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Norm-based, resource-based, cultural justifications (similar Wendler 2016)
### Table A.4.1 Justifications by EPG (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>GUE/NGL</th>
<th>S&amp;D</th>
<th>Greens/EFA</th>
<th>Renew</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>ECR</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urgency</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequacy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feasibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solidarity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credibility</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusiveness &amp; accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intergenerational justice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency &amp; coherence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sovereignty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiation tactics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                  | 100     | 100  | 100        | 100   | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100 |

**N frames** | 46     | 183  | 87         | 79    | 168  | 65   | 55   | 40  |

**Notes:** Norm-based, resource-based, cultural justifications (similar Wendler 2016)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEE</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>citizens</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member states</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business, companies, industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next generation, youth, children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulnerable, marginalized, poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmers, foresters, fishers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protesters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small producers, SMEs</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N claims (speeches)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.5 Reliability Test Results

Unitising Reliability (statement identification)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Deviant</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEP1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coding Reliability (for manually coded variables used in the article)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Holst</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>KALPHA</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition_type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target_position</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target_quant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target_time</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target_sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target_non_sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement_pos</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement_type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep_1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep_2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justi_1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justi_2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results exceed accepted standards (Krippendorff, 2013; Lombard 2002).
