

Online Appendix
Table 1: Knowledge Gains

Knowledge

Item	Before Deliberation	After Deliberation	Change
Which political party holds the majority in the California State Senate? (Democratic)	75.8%	85.1%	+9.3%*
How about the California State Assembly? (Democratic)	69.5%	80.1%	+10.6%
How large a majority of the State Legislature is needed to approve a proposed constitutional amendment? (two-thirds of both houses)	61.9%	81.3%	+19.4%**
How large a majority of the State Legislature is needed to increase taxes? (two-thirds of both houses)	60.7%	86.8%	+26.1%**
Ballot measures can be signed by...(anyone who is registered to vote in California)	63.1%	70.0%	+6.9%
Which state has the most residents per member of the state legislature? (California) †	62.1%	79.1%	+17.-%
On average, which state has the highest total tax burden? (New York) †	30.7%	49.4%	+18.7%***
In Governor Brown's most recent budget proposal, the largest single share of spending goes to which of the following? (K-12 education)	36.0%	73.6%	+37.6%***

NOTE: Entries are percentages answering correctly. The correct answers are given in parentheses.

†Before = arrival rather than initial interview.

*significant at the .05 level; **significant at the .01 level, ***significant at the .001 level.

Table 2: Attitude Change for Policy Proposals

Item	Initial Phone Survey	Before Deliberation	After Deliberation	Change over Weekend
On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely undesirable", 10 is "extremely desirable," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how desirable or undesirable would you say each of the following is?				
a. Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input		0.609	0.692	0.084**
b. Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law		0.442	0.449	0.012
c. Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative		0.423	0.389	-0.035*
d. Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents		0.467	0.421	-0.049*
e. Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment		0.346	0.283	-0.065**
f. Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot	0.562	0.556	0.613	0.059**
g. Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for		0.843	0.806	-0.034**
h. Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for		0.826	0.857	0.031*
i. Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future		0.677	0.697	0.018
j. Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet		0.815	0.885	0.072**
k. Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120		0.622	0.653	0.031+
l. electing more than one representative from each assembly and senate district with the winners receiving seats proportional to votes		0.528	0.537	0.007
m. Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members		0.439	0.469	0.030
n. Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries		0.505	0.353	-0.154**
o. Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts		0.620	0.538	-0.083**
p. Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election		0.614	0.583	-0.031+
q. Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6	0.417	0.501	0.774	0.277**
r. Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation		0.824	0.837	0.012

before passage				
s. Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years		0.806	0.847	0.040**
t. Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets		0.617	0.717	0.100**
u. Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year		0.736	0.777	0.042**
v. Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them		0.635	0.697	0.066**
w. Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance		0.542	0.621	0.080**
x. Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities		0.659	0.667	0.010
y. Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations		0.718	0.721	0.003
z. Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them		0.811	0.841	0.028**
aa. Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	0.795	0.850	0.851	-0.001
ab. Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for		0.800	0.812	0.009
ac. Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for		0.800	0.830	0.029*
ad. Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund		0.777	0.803	0.020+
ae. Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget		0.692	0.710	0.014
af. Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate		0.447	0.497	0.049*
ag. Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate		0.332	0.312	-0.022
ah. Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year		0.494	0.507	0.012
ai. Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now		0.558	0.697	0.139**
aj. Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 <i>and</i> allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward		0.433	0.404	-0.030
ak. Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap		0.345	0.352	0.007

al. Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes		0.486	0.483	-0.001
am. Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%		0.385	0.489	0.106**

Attitude Change Results (** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .10$)

All the proposals were rated on the same 0 to 10 scale with 0 as “extremely undesirable” and 10 “extremely desirable” and 5 “exactly in the middle.”

More details on all the results, before and after deliberation, the analyses of representativeness including matching with the comparison group, as well as further details about the design of the event and additional regressions and transcript excerpts offered to explain the opinion changes can be found in the report available online from the CDD at:

<http://cdd.stanford.edu/polls/california/2011/final/nextca-a-results.pdf>