**APPENDIX**

**A1. Regression of Deliberation Experience on Individual Characteristics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy |
| Female | 0.37\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.074) | (0.032) | (0.030) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Female | 0.07 | -0.07 | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.252) | (0.094) | (0.094) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young |  |  |  | 0.24\*\* | -0.01 | -0.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.096) | (0.037) | (0.041) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Young |  |  |  | -0.46 | -0.13 | -0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.290) | (0.129) | (0.115) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.35\*\*\* | -0.01 | 0.20\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.107) | (0.037) | (0.049) |  |  |  |
| Proportion Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.09 | 0.00 | -0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.288) | (0.130) | (0.132) |  |  |  |
| No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.28\*\* | -0.16\*\*\* | -0.03 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.115) | (0.052) | (0.054) |
| Proportion No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.385) | (0.167) | (0.152) |
| Group Size | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* |
|  | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Constant | 8.76\*\*\* | 3.32\*\*\* | 3.06\*\*\* | 9.03\*\*\* | 3.37\*\*\* | 3.10\*\*\* | 8.93\*\*\* | 3.34\*\*\* | 3.02\*\*\* | 8.92\*\*\* | 3.33\*\*\* | 3.06\*\*\* |
|  | (0.377) | (0.116) | (0.118) | (0.377) | (0.104) | (0.109) | (0.356) | (0.098) | (0.099) | (0.361) | (0.099) | (0.105) |
| Observations | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 |
| R-squared | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Dummies for sites are always included.

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**A2. Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Obs** | **Mean** | **Std. Dev.** | **Min** | **Max** | **Nat’l Population** |
| Dependent Variables |  |
| Small Group Experience | 2215 | 8.40 | 1.88 | 1 | 10 |  |
| Feeling Respected | 2222 | 3.35 | 0.70 | 1 | 4 |  |
| Feeling Efficacious | 2016 | 2.74 | 0.72 | 1 | 4 |  |
|  |  |
| Independent Variables |  |
| Female | 2257 | 0.54 | 0.72 | 0 | 1 | .51 |
| Young | 2257 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0 | 1 | .26 |
| Non-white | 2257 | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0 | 1 | .36 |
| No College Education | 2257 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0 | 1 | .71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compositions of Discussant Partners |  |
| Proportion Female | 2257 | 0.54 | 0.18 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Proportion Young People | 2257 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Proportion Non-white | 2257 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0 | 0.80 |  |
| Proportion of No College Education | 2257 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0 | 0.67 |  |

Notes:

1. Data for national population on gender, race, and education was obtained from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html> on September 26, 2015
	1. Non-white percentage for the national population was calculated by subtracting the percentage of “White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010” from 1
	2. The percentage of participants with no college education was calculated by subtracting the percentage of “Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013” from 1
2. Data for national population on age was obtained from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-03.pdf> on September 26, 2015 and calculated relative to everyone older than 19 years old

**A3. Balance Checks**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Proportion Female | Proportion Young | Proportion Non-whites | Proportion No College |
| Female | -0.01\* | -0.01 | -0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.007) | (0.006) | (0.005) | (0.005) |
| Young | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.00 | -0.00 |
|  | (0.009) | (0.007) | (0.007) | (0.005) |
| Non-white | -0.01 | 0.00 | -0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.010) | (0.008) | (0.007) | (0.006) |
| No College | 0.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.011) | (0.009) | (0.008) | (0.007) |
| Constant | 0.56\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.21\*\*\* | 0.16\*\*\* |
|  | (0.022) | (0.017) | (0.017) | (0.014) |
| Observations | 2,257 | 2,257 | 2,257 | 2,257 |
| R-squared | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.20 |

 Dummy variables for sites are always included.

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

 Randomization in an experiment theoretically ensures that the assignment of participants into treatment is independent of participants' characteristics (covariates). In our study, the treatment is group composition and the covariate is the corresponding individual characteristic (female, young, nonwhite, no college degree). Randomization occurred in sites and therefore the independence between covariate and treatment happened within and not between sites, so site dummies must be included in the balance check. It is also important to remember that a person’s own descriptive characteristics are not randomly assigned. For this reason, we exclude the subject from the calculation of group composition. Since a person’s own characteristics cannot be counted in the calculation of the group’s proportions and is effectively removed from the pool, this necessarily means there can be a small negative correlation between a person’s descriptive attributes and the group’s composition with regards to those attributes.

 The following simplified example illustrates the logic. Consider six participants to be randomly assigned to two groups of three. The two female subjects, , would have a 50% chance of having one other woman in the group and a 50% chance of not having the other woman in the group. In contrast, the four men would face a 10% chance of an all-male group, a 60% chance of a group with one women, and a 30% of a group with gender parity. This means that women in this example are less likely to have female discussants because they have been removed from the pool of possible discussants. Thus, the descriptive group membership and the proportion of the deliberative group sharing that characteristic will be negatively correlated. The balance tests displayed above generally meet those expectations, but the relationship is exceedingly weak.

**A4. Evaluations of Moderators**

**Participate**: My small group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate (1-5)

**Influence**: My small group moderator sometimes tried to influence the group (1-5)

**Agree**: My small group moderator sometimes tried to get us to agree on the issues (1-5)

Responses are coded so that higher scores reflect better moderator (encouraging participation, not trying to influence, and not trying to get agreement)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Participate | Influence | Agree | Participate | Influence | Agree | Participate | Influence | Agree | Participate | Influence | Agree |
| Female | 0.01 | 0.09\*\* | 0.21\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.022) | (0.036) | (0.043) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Female | 0.04 | 0.20\* | -0.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.087) | (0.110) | (0.117) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young |  |  |  | 0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.024) | (0.045) | (0.056) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Young |  |  |  | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.100) | (0.146) | (0.154) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 | -0.18\*\*\* | -0.27\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.030) | (0.053) | (0.070) |  |  |  |
| Proportion Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | -0.09 | -0.22 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.087) | (0.152) | (0.165) |  |  |  |
| No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05\* | -0.24\*\*\* | -0.17\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.030) | (0.068) | (0.071) |
| Proportion No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | -0.36\*\* | -0.31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.112) | (0.176) | (0.202) |
| Group Size | -0.02\*\* | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.02\* | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.02\*\* | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.02\*\* | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.009) | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.009) | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.008) | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.008) | (0.011) | (0.011) |
| Constant | 5.04\*\*\* | 4.43\*\*\* | 4.27\*\*\* | 5.04\*\*\* | 4.55\*\*\* | 4.32\*\*\* | 5.06\*\*\* | 4.61\*\*\* | 4.45\*\*\* | 5.05\*\*\* | 4.66\*\*\* | 4.44\*\*\* |
|  | (0.128) | (0.200) | (0.214) | (0.140) | (0.200) | (0.217) | (0.135) | (0.209) | (0.227) | (0.135) | (0.214) | (0.223) |
| Observations | 2,225 | 2,222 | 2,222 | 2,225 | 2,222 | 2,222 | 2,225 | 2,222 | 2,222 | 2,225 | 2,222 | 2,222 |
| R-squared | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses. Site dummies are always included. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10 |

**A5. Evaluations of Unmoderated Sessions and Interactions**

**Whole**: Evaluation of the deliberation experience as a whole (1-10)

**Large group**: Evaluation of the large group session with experts and policy advocates (1-10)

**Off-session**: Evaluation of off-session interactions with other participants (1-10)

Responses are coded so that higher scores mean more positive experience.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Whole | Large Group | Off-Session | Whole | Large Group | Off-Session | Whole | Large Group | Off-Session | Whole | Large Group | Off-Session |
| Female | 0.64\*\*\* | 0.74\*\*\* | 0.24\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.080) | (0.126) | (0.083) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Female | 0.36 | 0.55 | -0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.288) | (0.419) | (0.352) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young |  |  |  | 0.16 | -0.10 | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.123) | (0.136) | (0.152) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Young |  |  |  | -0.67\* | -0.53 | -0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.348) | (0.620) | (0.377) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.56\*\*\* | 0.87\*\*\* | 0.74\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.154) | (0.201) | (0.122) |  |  |  |
| Proportion Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.40 | -0.07 | 0.16 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.393) | (0.604) | (0.387) |  |  |  |
| No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.27\* | 0.55\*\*\* | 0.56\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.144) | (0.197) | (0.171) |
| Proportion No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.472) | (0.544) | (0.566) |
| Group Size | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.04\* | -0.00 | -0.02 | -0.04 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.04\* | -0.00 | -0.02 | -0.04 |
|  | (0.029) | (0.040) | (0.023) | (0.027) | (0.039) | (0.023) | (0.028) | (0.041) | (0.024) | (0.028) | (0.040) | (0.023) |
| Constant | 7.83\*\*\* | 7.50\*\*\* | 7.98\*\*\* | 8.44\*\*\* | 8.29\*\*\* | 7.99\*\*\* | 8.15\*\*\* | 7.98\*\*\* | 7.86\*\*\* | 8.22\*\*\* | 8.02\*\*\* | 7.93\*\*\* |
|  | (0.314) | (0.376) | (0.283) | (0.230) | (0.337) | (0.225) | (0.290) | (0.360) | (0.208) | (0.249) | (0.348) | (0.202) |
| Observations | 2,222 | 2,201 | 2,155 | 2,222 | 2,201 | 2,155 | 2,222 | 2,201 | 2,155 | 2,222 | 2,201 | 2,155 |
| R-squared | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.03 |
| Robust standard errors clustered within sites in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10. |

**A6. Original Analysis Controlling for Evaluations of Moderators**

**Females:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Small Group | Small Group | Respect | Respect | Respect | Efficacy | Efficacy | Efficacy |
| Female | 0.35\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* | 0.34\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.08\*\* | -0.14\*\*\* | -0.14\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.072) | (0.074) | (0.074) | (0.033) | (0.032) | (0.033) | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.031) |
| Prop female | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.08 | -0.06 | -0.07 | -0.05 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.16\* |
|  | (0.227) | (0.251) | (0.252) | (0.092) | (0.096) | (0.095) | (0.092) | (0.093) | (0.095) |
| Moderator (Participate) | 0.97\*\*\* |  |  | 0.15\*\*\* |  |  | 0.06\* |  |  |
|  | (0.129) |  |  | (0.031) |  |  | (0.033) |  |  |
| Moderator (Influence) |  | 0.23\*\*\* |  |  | 0.13\*\*\* |  |  | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | (0.067) |  |  | (0.021) |  |  | (0.021) |  |
| Moderator (Agree) |  |  | 0.11\*\* |  |  | 0.10\*\*\* |  |  | -0.01 |
|  |  |  | (0.051) |  |  | (0.017) |  |  | (0.017) |
| Group Size | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* | -0.02\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.019) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.007) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Constant | 3.87\*\*\* | 7.77\*\*\* | 8.34\*\*\* | 2.59\*\*\* | 2.72\*\*\* | 2.88\*\*\* | 2.76\*\*\* | 3.02\*\*\* | 3.12\*\*\* |
|  | (0.704) | (0.503) | (0.439) | (0.194) | (0.145) | (0.136) | (0.208) | (0.147) | (0.133) |
| Observations | 2,200 | 2,197 | 2,196 | 2,208 | 2,205 | 2,205 | 2,003 | 2,001 | 2,000 |
| R-squared | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Site dummies are always included. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**Young People:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Small Group | Small Group | Respect | Respect | Respect | Efficacy | Efficacy | Efficacy |
| Young | 0.24\*\*\* | 0.25\*\*\* | 0.25\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.04 | -0.04 | -0.04 |
|  | (0.090) | (0.094) | (0.095) | (0.037) | (0.036) | (0.036) | (0.040) | (0.041) | (0.041) |
| Prop young | -0.56\*\* | -0.49\* | -0.49\* | -0.14 | -0.14 | -0.15 | -0.08 | -0.08 | -0.09 |
|  | (0.262) | (0.282) | (0.286) | (0.125) | (0.129) | (0.127) | (0.114) | (0.115) | (0.115) |
| Moderator (Participate) | 0.98\*\*\* |  |  | 0.15\*\*\* |  |  | 0.06\* |  |  |
|  | (0.129) |  |  | (0.031) |  |  | (0.032) |  |  |
| Moderator (Influence) |  | 0.24\*\*\* |  |  | 0.14\*\*\* |  |  | 0.00 |  |
|  |  | (0.067) |  |  | (0.021) |  |  | (0.021) |  |
| Moderator (Agree) |  |  | 0.13\*\* |  |  | 0.11\*\*\* |  |  | -0.02 |
|  |  |  | (0.051) |  |  | (0.017) |  |  | (0.016) |
| Group Size | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.019) | (0.021) | (0.022) | (0.007) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Constant | 4.11\*\*\* | 7.95\*\*\* | 8.51\*\*\* | 2.63\*\*\* | 2.75\*\*\* | 2.91\*\*\* | 2.79\*\*\* | 3.07\*\*\* | 3.19\*\*\* |
|  | (0.713) | (0.501) | (0.434) | (0.185) | (0.136) | (0.126) | (0.200) | (0.137) | (0.129) |
| Observations | 2,200 | 2,197 | 2,196 | 2,208 | 2,205 | 2,205 | 2,003 | 2,001 | 2,000 |
| R-squared | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Site dummies are always included. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**Non-Whites:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Small Group | Small Group | Respect | Respect | Respect | Efficacy | Efficacy | Efficacy |
| Non-white | 0.34\*\*\* | 0.39\*\*\* | 0.39\*\*\* | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.19\*\*\* | 0.19\*\*\* | 0.19\*\*\* |
|  | (0.110) | (0.110) | (0.111) | (0.038) | (0.037) | (0.037) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.049) |
| Prop non-white | -0.15 | -0.09 | -0.08 | -0.00 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.265) | (0.285) | (0.285) | (0.127) | (0.125) | (0.127) | (0.131) | (0.132) | (0.133) |
| Moderator (Participate) | 0.98\*\*\* |  |  | 0.15\*\*\* |  |  | 0.06\* |  |  |
|  | (0.127) |  |  | (0.031) |  |  | (0.032) |  |  |
| Moderator (Influence) |  | 0.25\*\*\* |  |  | 0.14\*\*\* |  |  | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | (0.067) |  |  | (0.021) |  |  | (0.021) |  |
| Moderator (Agree) |  |  | 0.14\*\*\* |  |  | 0.11\*\*\* |  |  | -0.01 |
|  |  |  | (0.051) |  |  | (0.017) |  |  | (0.016) |
| Group Size | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.019) | (0.021) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Constant | 4.01\*\*\* | 7.80\*\*\* | 8.36\*\*\* | 2.60\*\*\* | 2.71\*\*\* | 2.86\*\*\* | 2.73\*\*\* | 2.97\*\*\* | 3.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.699) | (0.488) | (0.421) | (0.180) | (0.129) | (0.120) | (0.194) | (0.129) | (0.119) |
| Observations | 2,200 | 2,197 | 2,196 | 2,208 | 2,205 | 2,205 | 2,003 | 2,001 | 2,000 |
| R-squared | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Site dummies are always included. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**No College Degree:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Small Group | Small Group | Respect | Respect | Respect | Efficacy | Efficacy | Efficacy |
| No-college | 0.25\*\* | 0.36\*\*\* | 0.32\*\*\* | -0.16\*\*\* | -0.12\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* | -0.04 | -0.03 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.111) | (0.117) | (0.118) | (0.052) | (0.050) | (0.051) | (0.053) | (0.054) | (0.054) |
| Prop no-college | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.20 | 0.19 | 0.26 | 0.24 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.08 |
|  | (0.353) | (0.377) | (0.379) | (0.160) | (0.167) | (0.167) | (0.150) | (0.152) | (0.152) |
| Moderator (Participate) | 0.97\*\*\* |  |  | 0.15\*\*\* |  |  | 0.06\* |  |  |
|  | (0.128) |  |  | (0.031) |  |  | (0.033) |  |  |
| Moderator (Influence) |  | 0.25\*\*\* |  |  | 0.13\*\*\* |  |  | 0.00 |  |
|  |  | (0.068) |  |  | (0.021) |  |  | (0.021) |  |
| Moderator (Agree) |  |  | 0.13\*\* |  |  | 0.11\*\*\* |  |  | -0.02 |
|  |  |  | (0.051) |  |  | (0.017) |  |  | (0.016) |
| Group Size | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* | -0.02\*\* | -0.02\*\* |
|  | (0.019) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Constant | 4.02\*\*\* | 7.75\*\*\* | 8.36\*\*\* | 2.58\*\*\* | 2.70\*\*\* | 2.86\*\*\* | 2.76\*\*\* | 3.03\*\*\* | 3.16\*\*\* |
|  | (0.709) | (0.490) | (0.425) | (0.185) | (0.132) | (0.123) | (0.199) | (0.138) | (0.127) |
| Observations | 2,200 | 2,197 | 2,196 | 2,208 | 2,205 | 2,205 | 2,003 | 2,001 | 2,000 |
| R-squared | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Site dummies are always included. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**A7. Regression of Deliberation Experience on Individual Characteristics**

**(Only Groups with Mixed Composition on the Respective Characteristic)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy |
| Female | 0.38\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.074) | (0.032) | (0.030) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Female | 0.14 | -0.08 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.259) | (0.097) | (0.098) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young |  |  |  | 0.30\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.100) | (0.040) | (0.044) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Young |  |  |  | -0.53 | -0.16 | -0.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.324) | (0.151) | (0.149) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.36\*\*\* | 0.01 | 0.20\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.121) | (0.044) | (0.055) |  |  |  |
| Proportion Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.398) | (0.185) | (0.204) |  |  |  |
| No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.24\* | -0.16\*\*\* | -0.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.141) | (0.061) | (0.065) |
| Proportion No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.20 | 0.18 | 0.29 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.546) | (0.287) | (0.233) |
| Group Size | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.04 | -0.01 | -0.03\*\*\* | -0.07\*\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.03\*\*\* | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.024) | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.024) | (0.009) | (0.011) | (0.028) | (0.009) | (0.011) |
| Constant | 8.69\*\*\* | 3.35\*\*\* | 3.09\*\*\* | 9.31\*\*\* | 3.43\*\*\* | 3.15\*\*\* | 9.40\*\*\* | 3.54\*\*\* | 3.05\*\*\* | 9.11\*\*\* | 3.38\*\*\* | 2.98\*\*\* |
|  | (0.382) | (0.118) | (0.120) | (0.325) | (0.118) | (0.130) | (0.351) | (0.112) | (0.152) | (0.387) | (0.132) | (0.155) |
| Observations | 2,202 | 2,209 | 2,004 | 1,956 | 1,962 | 1,781 | 1,523 | 1,530 | 1,369 | 1,444 | 1,454 | 1,313 |
| R-squared | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Dummies for sites are always included.

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**A8. Regression of Deliberation Experience with Interactions**

**(Only Groups with Mixed Composition on the Respective Characteristic)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy | Small Group | Respect | Efficacy |
| Female X Prop Female | -0.60 | -0.00 | -0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.448) | (0.179) | (0.184) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.70\*\*\* | 0.10 | -0.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.246) | (0.102) | (0.103) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Female | 0.46 | -0.08 | 0.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.355) | (0.125) | (0.136) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young X Prop Young |  |  |  | 0.47 | 0.15 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.732) | (0.328) | (0.362) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young |  |  |  | 0.17 | -0.06 | -0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.210) | (0.087) | (0.099) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Young |  |  |  | -0.63\* | -0.19 | -0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.376) | (0.167) | (0.156) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-white X Prop Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.75\* | -0.69\*\* | -0.48 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.967) | (0.301) | (0.429) |  |  |  |
| Nonwhite |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.80\*\*\* | 0.18\*\* | 0.32\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.258) | (0.085) | (0.128) |  |  |  |
| Proportion Non-white |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.44 | 0.14 | 0.10 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.449) | (0.188) | (0.217) |  |  |  |
| No College X Prop No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.37 | 0.48 | 0.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1.631) | (0.655) | (0.663) |
| No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.31 | -0.25\* | -0.17 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.342) | (0.132) | (0.142) |
| Proportion No College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.15 | 0.12 | 0.21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.619) | (0.317) | (0.263) |
| Group Size | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.03\*\*\* | -0.07\*\*\* | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.03\*\*\* | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.024) | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.024) | (0.009) | (0.010) | (0.028) | (0.009) | (0.011) |
| Constant | 8.50\*\*\* | 3.35\*\*\* | 3.03\*\*\* | 9.35\*\*\* | 3.44\*\*\* | 3.16\*\*\* | 9.35\*\*\* | 3.52\*\*\* | 3.04\*\*\* | 9.10\*\*\* | 3.40\*\*\* | 3.01\*\*\* |
|  | (0.389) | (0.125) | (0.134) | (0.334) | (0.120) | (0.131) | (0.358) | (0.109) | (0.154) | (0.395) | (0.137) | (0.161) |
| Observations | 2,202 | 2,209 | 2,004 | 1,956 | 1,962 | 1,781 | 1,523 | 1,530 | 1,369 | 1,444 | 1,454 | 1,313 |
| R-squared | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Dummies for sites are always included.

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10

**A9. Descriptive Statistics of Intersectionality**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | N | Mean | Stdev | Group Max % |
| Nonwhite Female | 2257 | 0.09 | 0.286 | 0.80 |
| No College Female | 2257 | 0.06 | 0.243 | 0.33 |
| No College Nonwhite | 2257 | 0.03 | 0.163 | 0.33 |
| Young Female | 2257 | 0.12 | 0.321 | 0.80 |
| Young No College | 2257 | 0.03 | 0.176 | 0.29 |
| Young Nonwhite | 2257 | 0.04 | 0.202 | 0.60 |

**A10. Intersectionality of Deliberative Experience**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| VARIABLES | Small Group | Respected | Efficacy |
|   |   |   |   |
| Female | 0.43\*\*\* | 0.09\*\* | -0.17\*\*\* |
|  | (0.087) | (0.036) | (0.033) |
| Young | 0.22\* | -0.04 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.113) | (0.043) | (0.046) |
| Non-white | 0.42\*\* | -0.07 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.189) | (0.064) | (0.077) |
| No college | 0.35\* | -0.20\*\* | 0.02 |
|  | (0.197) | (0.083) | (0.077) |
| Non-white female | -0.09 | 0.07 | 0.30\*\*\* |
|  | (0.241) | (0.077) | (0.100) |
| No College Female | -0.26 | 0.03 | -0.12 |
|  | (0.222) | (0.103) | (0.111) |
| No College Non-White | -0.16 | 0.04 | 0.13 |
|  | (0.328) | (0.125) | (0.148) |
| Young No College | 0.30 | 0.08 | -0.14 |
|  | (0.220) | (0.122) | (0.124) |
| Young Non-White | -0.07 | 0.12 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.228) | (0.093) | (0.101) |
| Constant | 8.62\*\*\* | 3.33\*\*\* | 3.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.356) | (0.102) | (0.099) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 |
| R-squared | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.06 |
| Also includes controls for site, group size, and wave. |  |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |  |  |  |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10 |  |  |  |

**A11. Randomly assigned small group composition and intersectionality**



**Figure A1: Evaluation of Small Group Experience by Proportion Female in Small Group**

****

**Figure A2: Sense of Efficacious Participation by Proportion Female in Small Group**

****

**Figure A3: Feeling Respected by Proportion Female in Small Group**



**A12. Assessing the Effects of the Presence of at least One Other Group Member**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| VARIABLES | small\_group | respect | efficacy | small\_group | respect | efficacy | small\_group | respect | efficacy | small\_group | respect | efficacy |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| femaleXalone\_female | -0.60 | 0.57\*\*\* | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.434) | (0.211) | (0.236) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 0.37\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.074) | (0.032) | (0.030) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| alone\_female | 0.91\*\*\* | -0.44\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.257) | (0.101) | (0.067) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| youngXalone\_young |  |  |  | -0.49 | 0.02 | -0.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.317) | (0.114) | (0.115) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| young |  |  |  | 0.31\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.100) | (0.040) | (0.043) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| alone\_young |  |  |  | 0.28\* | 0.03 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.168) | (0.064) | (0.065) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nonwhiteXalone\_nonwhite |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | -0.12 | -0.01 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.271) | (0.104) | (0.114) |  |  |  |
| nonwhite |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.34\*\*\* | 0.01 | 0.20\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.118) | (0.042) | (0.055) |  |  |  |
| alone\_nonwhite |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.107) | (0.043) | (0.042) |  |  |  |
| nocollegeXalone\_nocollege |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.12 | -0.01 | 0.09 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.244) | (0.119) | (0.119) |
| nocollege |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.24\* | -0.16\*\*\* | -0.06 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.142) | (0.062) | (0.065) |
| alone\_nocollege |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.09 | -0.04 | -0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.107) | (0.043) | (0.039) |
| grp\_size | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.00 | -0.02\*\* | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.02\*\* |
|  | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.022) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Constant | 8.76\*\*\* | 3.30\*\*\* | 3.15\*\*\* | 8.87\*\*\* | 3.33\*\*\* | 3.06\*\*\* | 8.87\*\*\* | 3.33\*\*\* | 3.01\*\*\* | 8.97\*\*\* | 3.38\*\*\* | 3.07\*\*\* |
|  | (0.367) | (0.100) | (0.104) | (0.361) | (0.100) | (0.106) | (0.350) | (0.100) | (0.101) | (0.348) | (0.098) | (0.105) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 | 2,215 | 2,222 | 2,016 |
| R-squared | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses. Dummies for sites are always included. |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**A13. Balance Test: Whether Group Composition is Independent of Group Membership (Stratified by Site).**
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**Reporting Standards**

1. Hypotheses
2. Members of less powerful subgroups (i.e., women, ethnic minorities, youth, and people without a college degree) will have a more positive evaluation of the deliberative experience than other subgroups (e.g., older, white men).
3. Members of subgroups will have a more positive evaluation of the evaluative experience when a fellow member of the subgroup also participates in the same small group deliberation. That is, when another woman, ethnic minority, young person, or non-college graduate is a member of a small group discussion, any other member of the same sub-group will evaluate the small group deliberation more highly.
4. Subjects and Context

The data collection process is described extensively in Farrar et al. (2009)[[1]](#footnote-1), from whom the authors obtained the original dataset. The data collection was sponsored by MacNeil/Lehrer Productions’ By the People project. For the two data collections (January 24, 2004 and October 16, 2004), the process began with a short random sample telephone presurvey by the UC Berkeley Survey Research Center. Participants were then offered $75 to attend a local deliberation.

1. Allocation Method

Participants who agreed to participate in the deliberation session were then randomly assigned to discussion groups in each site. In the case that a discussion group had only few participants due to absenteeism, that discussion group was merged with other small groups.

1. Treatments

Treatment of interest in our study is proportion of other small group members who shared participants’ memberships in some relatively disadvantaged social groups (women, young people, non-white people, and people with no college degree)

1. Results
2. The measures of our dependent variable are listed at the top of Table A4. The measures for age, gender, ethnicity, and education level were all self-identified during the initial invitation survey. All of the hypotheses tested in the main text were initially proposed, which is probably why we received “null” results for each of the group-level hypotheses. The analysis controlling for moderators (A4, A5, and A6) was conducted in response to a reviewer. The analysis examining only mixed groups (A7) was conducted at the request of a reviewer. The intersectionality analysis (Tables A9 – A11) was conducted at the behest of a reviewer. The analysis of having at least one member of a subgroup deliberate with you was the second operationalization we planned for the manuscript and proposed before analysis began. Since it only served to confirm the null findings, we buried it in the appendix.
3. CONSORT Flow chart



1. Analysis
	1. Table A2 reports the descriptive statistics.
	2. Table A1 presents the results of the regression analysis.
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