



SHAPING YOUR STANFORD

Final Report

Communication 138: Applying Deliberative Polling
Stanford University
June 2020

By first name, Audrey Senior, Caroline Ghisolfi, Chaze Vinci, Cricket Bidleman, JJ Sutton, Jasmine Nguyen, Joel Swann, Julia Skwarczyński, Kate Yeager, Kevin Edwards, Megha Parwani, Syd Westley, Willoughby J. Winograd

Corresponding authors:

Alice Siu, Center for Deliberative Democracy (asiu@stanford.edu)

Luke Terra, Haas Center for Public Service (lterra@stanford.edu)

Shaping Your Stanford Team



From left, Dr. Alice Siu, Audrey Senior '22, Dr. Luke Terra, Syd Westley '21, Joel Swann '20, Julia Skwarczyński '21, Megha Parwani '21, Kate Yeager '21, Kevin Edwards '21, Caroline Ghisolfi '21, Willoughby J. Winograd '22, Jasmine Nguyen '23, JJ Sutton '22, Cricket Bidleman '21 (not pictured)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Shaping Your Stanford Team	3
Executive Summary	4
Quantitative Analysis: Stanford Issues	8
Lowering the Cost of Tuition	8
The Neighborhood System	9
Gender-Neutral Housing	10
Abolishing Greek Life	11
Quantitative Analysis: National Issues	15
“Medicare for All”	15
Financing COVID-19 Treatment	15
Mandatory Vaccination	18
Contact Tracing	18
Punishment for Violating Stay-at-Home Orders	20
Emergency Money for the People Act	22
Qualitative Analysis: Stanford Issues	24
Lowering the Cost of Tuition	24
The Creation of a Neighborhood System	25
Abolishing Greek Life	26
Qualitative analysis: National issues	28
Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccines	28
Punishment for Violating Stay-at-home Orders	31
Emergency Money for the People Act	32
Knowledge Gains	35
Political Efficacy and Disagreement	35
Event Evaluations	36
Representativeness	37

Appendix I: Transcripts of Deliberation	40
Unedited Transcript for Group 1 Deliberating Mandatory Vaccination	40
Unedited Transcript for Group 2 Deliberating Mandatory Vaccines	41
Unedited Transcript for Group Deliberating Punishment for Violating Stay-at-Home Orders	43
Unedited Transcripts for Group Deliberating Emergency Money for the People Act	44
Appendix II: Statistical Analysis	48

Executive Summary

Shaping Your Stanford was a Deliberative Poll conducted by students and researchers in a practicum course, Communication 138: Applying Deliberative Polling. It sought to give undergraduates at Stanford a means to discuss and engage with issues affecting both the Stanford community and the country at-large through fact-based, well-moderated deliberation. In partnership with the Haas Center for Public Service, Associated Students of Stanford University, and the Office of the President of Stanford University, the course engaged the participating students in a two day deliberation, surveying the stratified random sample of undergraduates both before and after deliberation to determine how opinions changed.

On May 16th and May 17th, the selected students convened, along with panels of experts, through the Stanford Online Deliberation Platform, a web-based platform that facilitates constructive discussion with the use of an automated moderator. Prior to the deliberations, the participants were given fact-based, balanced discussion materials—vetted by a balanced group of academic experts—that outlined prominent arguments for and against proposals to address issues affecting the Stanford community and country.

In general, the students became more knowledgeable about the issues, more confident of the ability to understand political issues, less critical of those with whom they disagree, and their views on the proposals changed significantly. Overall, students viewed the event overwhelmingly favorably.

What is a Deliberative Poll?

Ordinary polls provide a snapshot of the public's impressions of sound bites and headlines. Most citizens most of the time are not well informed about complex public issues. Deliberative Polling addresses the question: what would a scientific sample of the public think about policy issues if it could be engaged in good conditions for thinking about them? Those good conditions include balanced briefing materials, small-group discussions with trained moderators, questions composed in small-groups to panels of competing experts in plenary sessions and an opportunity to register one's opinions in confidential questionnaires both before and after this process of deliberation. As this report will detail, there were substantial changes in opinion after deliberation in this project. Deliberative Polls have been conducted more than 100 times and in 28 countries under the direction of the team at the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University.

Agenda

At the event, participants deliberated specific policy proposals in small, moderated groups. The participants could choose to focus their discussions on the policies they found the most relevant, with an automated moderator overseeing the conversations to encourage civility, and participation. After deliberating with their peers, students posed questions to, and heard from, experts on the issues, including Mona Hicks, the Senior Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students at Stanford; Nate Boswell, Associate Dean of Residential Education at Stanford; Cindy Chavez, the President of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors; Dave Cortese, also on the Board of Supervisors representing the 3rd District; and Merrill Matthews, residential scholar at the Institute for Policy Innovation and former president of the Health Economics Roundtable for the National Association for Business Economics.

Stanford Issues

After their deliberations, students became more favorable towards reducing tuition for online classes, even at the cost of reducing financial aid; more favorable towards proposals to make roommate assignments gender-neutral, unless otherwise requested; less approving of the University's planned undergraduate residential neighborhood system; and viewed Greek life organizations on campus more favorably, although they remained concerned that Greek organizations were biased to the privileged in their selection process for new members. Notably, a majority of the 188 students surveyed opposed abolishing Greek life on campus.

The deliberation on the first proposal—to reduce tuition for online classes—was particularly engaging for the participants, as students were beginning to come to terms with the transition to an exclusively online learning environment due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the potential drawback of decreasing financial aid for students, the mean rating for the proposal to reduce tuition increased significantly ($P < .01$) from 5.785 to 6.448 (on a scale from 0 to 10), with a majority (70%) of students in favor. In the small-group deliberations, students emphasized how tuition reduction would affect the first-generation low-income experience, with many concerned about the effects of tuition reduction on the broader Stanford community. Notably, however, support for reducing tuition increased significantly ($P < .05$) after deliberation among students with 75-100% of their tuition covered by financial aid, with 65% of those students in favor (up from 45% before deliberation). This level of support was almost as high as among students not receiving any financial aid, with 69% in favor after deliberation.

On the issue of undergraduate housing, results showed that students were largely against the implementation of Stanford's planned undergraduate residential neighborhood system. This plan, if implemented, would divide student housing into neighborhoods in order to create stronger community ties across Stanford's vast campus; however, the

mean rating for the proposal decreased significantly ($P<.05$) from 4.766 to 4.328. The highest opposition was among freshmen. On the issue of gender and housing, the vast majority of students supported increasing the number of residences that offer gender-neutral housing. By contrast students were divided as to whether gender-neutral room assignments should be the standard, with about half (48% down from 68%) of students in opposition after deliberation.

Lastly, students deliberated on the issue of Greek life—its value to the community and what its future should be. Students generally increased their support for Greek life. The proposal to abolish Greek life proved to be relatively unfavorable, with a majority of students (61%) in opposition after deliberation. Moreover, student agreement that Greek life offers valuable social experiences increased significantly ($P<.01$) from a mean of 6.034 to 6.452; however, students were largely divided before and after as to whether housing was an essential part of the Greek life experience.

National Issues

After their deliberations, students overwhelmingly supported proposals for the federal government to cover treatment causes for COVID-19, but support decreased for making vaccination mandatory once vaccines for COVID-19 are made available. Students also became less favorable towards imposing stay-at-home orders with the threat of criminal punishment, a fine, or jail time, but became more supportive of proposals for nonprofits and private corporations to work with the government to make opt-in contract tracing programs. While almost all students surveyed believed that the one-time cash grant provided by the CARES Act was insufficient, support for a proposal to give Americans monthly cash grants decreased.

On the proposal that “The federal government should implement a “Medicare for All” system,” the mean rating decreased significantly ($P<.001$) after deliberation from 7.706 to 7.141; but the vast majority of students (77% down from 87%) remained in favor. Likewise, support for the federal government to pay for domestic treatment of COVID-19 decreased significantly, despite remaining, overall, quite popular. After deliberation, 93% of students agreed that the federal government should cover treatment for the uninsured, while 64% (down from 72%) believed that all treatment for COVID-19 should be covered.

On the proposal to make COVID-19 vaccines mandatory, when they are made available, support decreased significantly ($P<.001$) from a mean of 8.353 to 6.810, with 75% of students in favor. Similarly, students demonstrated strong opposition against repercussions for violating social distancing measures. The proposal for local, state, and federal governments to impose stay-at-home orders with the threat of criminal punishment lost majority favor (39% down from 67%). Students were also less likely to agree that fining someone for violating stay-at-home orders would ensure their community was kept safe, with the mean rating declining significantly ($P<.01$) from 5.209

to 4.670. Moreover, students were strongly against putting someone in jail for violating stay-at-home orders. After deliberation, only 5% of students favored such a proposal.

Regarding contact-tracing, students indicated a concern for privacy rights, but support for nonprofit organizations and private corporations working with the government to implement opt-in-only contact tracing platforms increased significantly with the vast majority of students in favor. Students tended to trust nonprofit organizations more than private corporations with their data, although both had net favorability. The proposals also highlighted citizen relationships with private corporations and potential privacy violations. One concern was that private corporations will take advantage of citizens' data, but agreement with this view decreased significantly ($P < .05$) from a mean rating of 6.618 to 6.271.

On federal support for middle and working class families, the vast majority (89%) of students agreed that the one-time cash grant provided to eligible adults in response to the COVID-19-induced economic downturn was insufficient; however, support for the proposal for the federal government to give every American age 16 and older who earns less \$130,000 per year \$2,000 every month until employment reaches pre-COVID-19 levels decreased significantly ($P < .001$) from a mean rating of 6.047 to 5.333.

Concluding Thoughts

This online Deliberative Poll was held in mid-May, which was only a couple months after Stanford students were asked to vacate campus due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For many students, after engaging in only online courses and void of normal day-to-day conversations, this event provided students with a valuable and rare opportunity to meet and talk with their fellow classmates about substantive and important public policy issues. A participant from Group S, shared that he:

"...learned a lot from all of you because you'll have very different stories and experiences and points of view..."

Events such as events are more important than ever as students are no longer able to engage freely and easily as they previously could. Our team is incredibly grateful for all participants that devoted their time for these deliberations, and we hope that their informed and thoughtful opinions will come to shape university policy for the future and for the better.

Quantitative Analysis: Stanford Issues

Lowering the Cost of Tuition

As Spring Quarter transitioned online in order to slow the spread of COVID-19, many students objected to Stanford's decision to charge full tuition. Feeling that their online class experience did not match the quality of education promised when agreeing to pay tuition fees, many students called for reduced tuition while classes remained online.

In a Faculty Senate Meeting, Provost Persis Drell stated that the lowering of tuition would affect students receiving financial aid from the University, as their aid would also have to be reduced.¹ This would impact low-income students especially, possibly creating a barrier to their attendance.

In light of the costs and benefits of changing tuition, participants were asked to rate their agreement with the proposal: "Tuition should be reduced for online classes even if that means reducing financial aid." Support for this proposal increased significantly after deliberation, with the mean support increasing from a rating of 5.785 to 6.448. This change is surprising given the fact that in response to the statement, "Having online only classes is not the Stanford college experience, that's why tuition should be reduced," support decreased from a mean of 7.457 to 7.429. A possible explanation for this shift might lie in skepticism over administrators' the administration's answers during the plenary session, as many students, in their reflections, wondered if financial aid *actually* had to be reduced if tuition was reduced. Regardless of their reasoning, more students at the end of the deliberation were in favor of reducing tuition, despite other costs.

The Neighborhood System

As part of the University's Long-Range Plan, the ResX Task Force proposed that campus housing be divided into 10 to 14 residential neighborhoods largely based on existing communities. The neighborhood model borrows from those at Harvard and Yale, aiming to "foster continuity" in relationships across four years of undergraduate education. According to the proposal, each neighborhood would have about 700 undergraduate student "citizens."² Student citizens would remain in one neighborhood throughout their time at Stanford, although they would still have the opportunity to join themed houses in

¹ Erin Woo, "Despite pushback, Stanford holds firm on maintaining spring quarter tuition," Stanford Daily, March 27, 2020

<https://www.stanforddaily.com/2020/03/27/despite-pushback-stanford-holds-firm-on-maintaining-spring-quarter-tuition/>

² Alex Kekaouha, "ResX Task Force releases final recommendations," Stanford News, April 16, 2019 <https://news.stanford.edu/2019/04/16/resx-task-force-releases-final-recommendations/>

other neighborhoods or to live in their sorority or fraternity houses, of which there will be ten.³ In addition to theme houses, each neighborhood will include co-ops, upper-class dorms, and Row-style houses, which will offer an independent housing option for upperclassmen.

The participants were asked to rate their approval of the neighborhood proposal University's Long-Range Plan. After the deliberation, the mean rating decreased from 4.766 to 4.328.

Gender-Neutral Housing

Stanford undergraduates are required, at least during their first year, to share a roommate with a student or students of a specific gender identity. There is no gender-neutral roommate option until sophomore year. After the first year, students seeking gender-neutral housing must complete an additional housing application (the Gender-Inclusive Housing Request),⁴ which allows them to draw into one of a handful of student residences that offer gender neutral housing. Roth is the only single-gender, non-Greek student residence on campus—an all-female dorm that describes itself as “an inclusive space for womxn.”

As many groups, such as Stanford's Weiland Initiative, have begun to push for easier ways for students to access gender-inclusive housing, participants were asked to rate their support of the proposal: “Stanford should increase the number of residences that offer gender-neutral housing.” Support for this proposal was high with 80% of students in favor, and the mean rating did not change significantly after deliberation. Support did increase significantly for the second proposal: “All roommate assignments should be made gender-neutral unless otherwise requested” from a mean rating of 3.617 to 4.856, although about half of students (48%) still opposed it.

Abolishing Greek Life

About 25% of Stanford's student body is part of a Greek organization on campus.⁵ Greek organizations have inspired significant praise and criticism among students and around the country. In light of this, participants were asked to rate and discuss the proposal that

³ Holden Foreman, “University to maintain 10 Greek houses, seek ‘fair’ expectations of Greek life,” Stanford Daily, February 26, 2019
<https://www.stanforddaily.com/2019/02/26/university-to-maintain-10-greek-houses-look-fair-expectations-of-greek-life/>

⁴ “Gender Inclusive Undergraduate Housing” Stanford Residential & Dining Enterprises
<https://rde.stanford.edu/studenthousing/gender-neutral-housing-0>

⁵ “Greek Houses” Stanford Residential & Dining Enterprises
<https://rde.stanford.edu/studenthousing/greek-houses>

“Stanford should abolish Greek life.” After deliberation, a majority of students (61%) opposed this proposal.

Participants were also asked to rate their agreement with the view that “Greek organizations provide valuable social experiences for those who are participating,” and “Greek organizations are biased towards privileging students in their selection process for new members.” These two questions give further insight into student thinking on Stanford Greek life. Presumably because so many students shared their positive experiences with Greek life, support for Greek life as a “valuable social experience” increased from a mean rating of 6.034 to 6.452. Nevertheless, agreement that “Greek organizations are biased towards privileging students in their selection process for new members” remained astoundingly high with 84% agreeing.

The issue of Greek housing has also inspired debate due to frequent changes in the occupancy of Greek houses for procedural or punishment reasons.⁶ Susie Brubaker-Cole, Vice Provost for Student Affairs, has said 10 Greek houses will be maintained on campus in the neighborhood system. On this subject, participants were first asked to rate their support for the proposal, “Housing for Greek organizations is an essential part of the Greek life.” Support decreased from a mean of 5.477 to 4.981. Similarly, participants were asked to rate their support for the proposal, “Greek organizations should not be given their own houses.” In response to this proposal, support increased from a mean of 4.943 to 5.222.

⁶ Fan Liu, “Game of Homes,” Stanford Daily, September 24, 2019
<https://www.stanforddaily.com/2019/09/24/game-of-homes/>

Quantitative Analysis: National Issues

“Medicare for All”

Given that nation debates on healthcare reform often include discussion of the viability of single-payer healthcare, participants were asked to rate their agreement with the proposal: “The federal government should implement a “Medicare for All” system.” Support for this proposal decreased after deliberation from a mean of 7.706 to 7.141, although support remained high overall, with 77% of students in favor.

Financing COVID-19 Treatment

In addition to deliberation on a single-payer healthcare model, students deliberated the possibility of the federal government covering the treatment costs of COVID-19. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with the proposal: “The federal government should pay for all domestic treatment of COVID-19 for the uninsured.” Support decreased after deliberation from a mean rating of 8.461 to 8.180, although three-quarters of students remained in favor. The next question asked participants to rate their agreement with the proposal: “The federal government should pay for all domestic treatment of COVID-19.” Support for this proposal also decreased after deliberation from a mean rating of 6.920 to 6.349. The decrease in support appears not to be due to concerns about the potential unpredictability of treatment costs. Agreement with the view that “treatment costs for COVID-19 are unpredictable, therefore the government should not be footing the bill for everyone’s treatment” did not change significantly. Only 18% of students shared this view.

Mandatory Vaccination

On the proposal that “COVID-19 vaccines should be mandatory when they are made available,” support decreased after deliberation from a mean rating of 8.353 to 6.810. Unlike many of the proposals where participants initially stated they had no opinion or were in the middle, nearly all participants entered the deliberation with clear views in support of or in opposition of this proposal, making the decline of support even more striking. This follows a general trend of students favoring opt-in responses to COVID-19, rather than government mandates.

Contact Tracing

The following proposals dealt with non-governmental entities aiding the government in implementing opt-in-only contact tracing platforms. Both on the proposal that “Nonprofit organizations should work with the government to implement opt-in-only contact tracing

platforms to monitor the spread of COVID-19” and on the proposal that “Private corporations should work with the government to implement opt-in-only contact tracing platforms to monitor the spread of COVID-19,” support did not change significantly. In both cases, a majority of students were in favor; however, in the case of nonprofits, favor was distinctively higher (83% in favor compared to 64% in the case of private corporations).

Although students broadly supported opt-in contract tracing programs, the students did express concerns about the trustworthiness of private corporations in their development. 70% of students agreed with the view that “Private corporations will take advantage of citizens’ data if they work with the government to implement contact tracing platforms.” Students were not, however, only 29% of students believed that “Government-coordinated contact tracing platforms violate essential privacy rights,” indicating that students are not concerned about all contract tracing platforms in general.

Punishment for Violating Stay-at-Home Orders

Participants were also asked to consider their agreement with police enforcement of stay-at-home orders, through a fine or imprisonment, during the COVID-19 pandemic. On the proposal that “Local, state, and federal governments should be able to impose stay-at-home orders with the threat of criminal punishment,” support decreased after deliberation from a mean rating of 6.066 to 4.153. While a majority of students favored the proposal before deliberation, a majority opposed it after deliberation. One possible explanation for this large shift in opinion was increased concern that such a policy would not be effective. Agreement with the view that “Fining someone for violating stay-at-home orders will ensure our community is kept safe” decreased significantly after deliberation. Likewise, agreement that “Putting someone in jail for violating stay-at-home orders will ensure our community is kept safe” also decreased. In sum, this demonstrates that after the deliberation, support for enforcement of stay-at-home orders, both through financial penalties and through arrest, declined substantially.

Emergency Money for the People Act

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and ensuring economic crisis, participants were asked whether “A one-time cash grant provided to eligible adults in response to the COVID-19-induced economic downturn was sufficient.” While the vast majority (89%) of students disagreed, support for the proposal that “The federal government should give every American age 16 and older who earns less \$130,000 per year \$2,000 every month until employment reaches pre-COVID-19 levels,” essentially the “Emergency Money for the People Act” previously proposed in Congress, decreased after deliberation from a mean rating of 6.066 to 4.153.

Qualitative Analysis: Stanford Issues

This section aims to shed light on the reasoning people used when deliberating the Stanford proposals. The three proposals discussed are those pertaining to (1) lowering the cost of tuition in light of online learning, (2) the creation of a neighborhood system and (3) abolishing Greek life. The statistical change in opinion is cited alongside excerpts of transcripts from 8 out of the 19 groups analyzed that may bring further clarity to the deliberations.

Please note: Transcript excerpts have been edited to remove the filler word “like” to increase clarity of expression. Unedited transcripts can be found in the Appendix. All names are pseudonyms. Ellipses (“...”) indicate pauses and they do not indicate that a statement has been condensed.

Lowering the Cost of Tuition

Throughout the deliberation, groups concentrated on the needs of first generation, low income students, with many students introducing themselves not only with their names and class years, but with their first-generation, low income (FLI) identities. In groups with more of these students, it appeared that people began to grow in favor of either not decreasing tuition or posing alternative solutions to decreasing tuition. This stemmed from the fear of FLI students possibly getting a reduction in financial aid and being unable to provide for themselves and their families.

Here is the beginning of one group’s discussion on this proposal, in which a FLI student voiced her concerns and the concerns for other FLI students and their wellbeing:

Amy: *And I think students who even are staying on campus still need financial aid because personally I use financial aid to pay for bills for my house. Well, I've been back home because like, you know with COVID like a lot of people got laid off including my mom. So, a lot of other students are using their financial aid for similar reasons, or maybe they had to pay for rent somewhere because they couldn't return home. So, a lot of students have used the financial aid, even if they aren't on campus...*

Mark: *Yeah, so I really liked what you said Amy because that's true and also Alan like that's a really important point that financial aid isn't just for covering university related costs. Like that is money that goes towards very real and legitimate directions.*

The Creation of a Neighborhood System

A common question posed on the topic was regarding ethnic themed dorms and how students would be able to choose to move from one ethnic themed dorm to another, along with accessibility questions in general. Some students felt that though The Draw

was a troubling process, they simply did not understand the logistics of the residential plan and were wary of choosing to adapt it.

One group mentioned feeling that a neighborhood dynamic already existed, and voiced concerns about victims of sexual assault being forced to live in the same communities as their abusers:

Richard: *I was a little confused when they first proposed neighborhoods because I feel like we kind of already have neighborhoods in a sense like Wilbur's one, Casper's one and the row— they're already kind of their own neighborhood. And I also had a question about survivors of assault and violence. Like if you're in a neighborhood and you have to go through this kind of long and arduous process to leave the neighborhood and your abusers in your same neighborhood is you...*

Amy: *Yeah Richard, that's a great point.*

Mark: *I feel a little bit like a broken record, but I just feel like I can't emphasize enough how difficult I think it like the neighborhood system could make it be like just introducing more barriers to moving between different kinds of spaces on campus. I totally hear people like Alex who are saying that like the draw process is stressful because it is and it doesn't reduce unnecessary drama it does but at the same time and you know, you could end up with like really bad luck or four years.*

This group specifically voiced their concerns regarding ethnic dorms along with their concern that a neighborhood system may hinder their ability to meet new people across campus:

Sally: *One so far. What I've read is that like a themed house would be in a neighborhood and so like unless you transferred neighborhoods, my understanding is like only the people in that neighborhood could go to that one themed house.*

Harry: *Well to me, that sounds undesirable. So yeah, I mean, I don't like that aspect of it.*

Don: *Yeah, and also a little unsure about how this whole neighborhood system creates community because it makes sense. Like there's some natural community that's formed if you just live around people in your dorm for a long time, but that doesn't necessarily transfer to other dorms.*

Chris: *Yeah, I personally think that like this neighborhood idea. It isn't that great of an idea because I feel like one of the main goals is to foster community like among undergraduates. I feel like it's a little too early to do that. Everyone kind of settles down into their own bubbles and I feel like at least for me, part of the undergraduate experience is just branching out and meeting all different types of people throughout my four years and I feel like that this neighborhood system might hinder that.*

Abolishing Greek Life

It appears that this was one of the most controversial topics deliberated, in which students did not appear to take much middle ground. Rather, many of the participants either sided to abolish it entirely or to keep Greek life on campus. Common points brought up in favor of Greek life were the importance of multicultural Greek life and the safe spaces they provide for people of color, the sisterhood of a sorority, and the importance of Greek life as the center of campus party culture. Common points against it included the lack of people of color in Greek life, classism in Greek life, and heteronormativity and rape culture in Greek life.

This group had some in favor of abolishing Greek life and some against it. Similarly, to many groups in the deliberation, it appeared little consensus was reached.

Ron: *I'll just say my perspective. I'm a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority Incorporated, which is the first historically black sorority that was ever founded. And so I, in terms of all of the black sororities and fraternities on campus out of our entire body contributes to 22 people max.*

Al: *So I agree with what Ron says 100% it's one of the big reasons why I do not agree Greek life should be abolished. I want to clarify that I believe that what a lot of Greek has done has been very very damaging. I want to acknowledge that there has been a lot of discrimination against women, against other races. I think that's a huge problem. That's something that Stanford needs to address right away. But I still think that it's the center of party life at stake.*

Jackie: *Yeah, I agree with that. I think I just don't agree that it would be so dramatic to get rid of the non-minority centered frats and sororities. I mean so many East Coast Schools have done it, small liberal arts colleges have done it, and I feel like it's been really successful and I also super agree that there are huge problems in Stanford's culture as a whole.*

Al: *So obviously I'm in the minority on this one, which is totally fine. And I told you it was just totally and completely fine. But I again before I just want to re-emphasize again because I know we're going to move on to the next topic, but just to close off this topic if we're going to say we have to abolish Greek life we need to understand the impact of such a decision. Number one on people who are in Greek life right now.*

This group discussed heteronormativity in Greek life and toxic masculinity. It is interesting to note that one of the students, Chris, notes his positionality as a straight white male before speaking on the issue:

Sally: *Don't hate me. I'm anti Greek life. Sorry*

Harry: *I am very anti Greek life.*

Walter: *I agree.*

Austin: *I was in one and it was the worst. I hate Greek life. It was the worst part of my Stanford experience and there are so many reasons and should be abolished. I mean for one is it's incredibly dangerous for women and sexist. It's dangerous for honestly everyone, and sexist. It's also based on the gender binary. It is extremely heteronormative. I even as a queer person in an organization with other queer people could never escape the heteronormative structure of it. Yes. Sorry.*

Chris: *At least for me I agree with everything you guys said about toxic masculinity and just like all of the bad things that are associated with the Greek life, but I'm not entirely convinced that abolishing it would be the best solution. I feel like it's also like I feel like it would be very very unproductive. I think to address all of those issues that are sort of systemic to Greek life instead of abolishing the entire thing. I feel like that doesn't solve the problem. I feel like we need to foster those environments more.*

Chris: *Yeah, I really don't know because I don't know a whole lot about the issue and I mean just look at me like I'm the token of a Greek person. You know, I'm a white heterosexual man, but like um, so I feel like I'm not like the best person to ask but like I don't know I think that like the idea of abolishing Greek life is a good idea.*

Qualitative Analysis: National issues

This section aims to shed light on the reasoning people used when deliberating the proposals on national issues. The three proposals discussed are those pertaining to (1) mandatory COVID-19 vaccines, (2) punishment for violating stay-at-home orders and (3) passing the Emergency Money for the People Act (\$2000 government assistance cheques for those above 16 years of age earning less than \$130,000 yearly). An overview of the arguments used for and against proposals is given followed by particularly illuminating excerpts from group deliberations.

On the whole, the tone of these discussions was respectful, with the interruption feature being used only once, by accident, across 8 of the 17 groups analyzed. Participants asked many questions about technicalities of each proposal—such as medical, economic, or international perspectives—and were eager to be educated by their co-participants. To students analyzing the transcripts, the discussion resembled that which might happen in a classroom or discussion section, just without an instructor.

Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccines

The proposal “*Coronavirus vaccines should be mandatory*” saw a statistically significant decrease in support after deliberation, with mean support falling from 6.051 to 5.288 after deliberation. There was a 10% increase in those who opposed this proposal (i.e. rated it between 0-4). There was also a decline in support for the related belief, “*Fining someone for violating stay-at-home orders will ensure our community is kept safe,*” with mean support falling from 5.217 to 4.629 and a 9% increase in opposition to this belief. Why might this be the case?

In the qualitative analysis of transcripts, many groups found making the vaccine mandatory a desirable but unrealistic outcome due to anti-vaccination sentiment in the US and a belief that courts would likely find mandatory vaccination unconstitutional at the federal or state level. Some such groups thought it would be more realistic for schools, workplaces, or international travel requirements to make the vaccine mandatory, rather than having the federal government do so. It is possible but not clear whether such doubt about the feasibility of making vaccines mandatory drove opinions shifts.

That said, the increase in opposition could have also been influenced by participants who articulated concerns about mandatory vaccination schemes violating civil liberties and setting a dangerous precedent by mandating certain medical treatments, even if someone has personal convictions opposed to it.

Here is the beginning of one group’s discussion on this proposal:

Alice: *Yes. Yes, they should be [mandatory]! I mean herd immunity is not really working right now because a bunch of moms are just refusing to vaccinate their children because, while there is educational programming, a lot of people are listening to mom forums instead and not vaccinating their children. Yes, they should be mandatory.*

Kiley: *I don't think that it's realistic for the US to make any sort of medical treatment in a way mandatory. I just don't think that's how this country works at all. But I do think that it's really possible at a lot of schools like Stanford, for example. Like a lot of schools make it mandatory to have certain students have to have certain vaccinations to come to school. Or if you're in a workplace, you have the right to say to your employees "you have to have a certain vaccination to come to school." It could be a push where certain spaces are requiring it [the vaccine] rather than the government is requiring it of every individual citizen.*

Olivia: *Yeah, I agree that it would be difficult to get the government to do it as a whole but I do think that, just listening to the question, like it should be mandatory. Looking at some of the cons—that we could just have educational programs to get people to get the vaccine—we don't have that much time and I feel like this is too urgent. Once a vaccine comes out, which is going to be months, then we don't want to wait months for the educational programs.*

Adam: *I mean, I think from a moral perspective, I think that this is one of the few areas where I think we need to sort of take a utilitarian framework when thinking about civil liberties. I think with every sort of thing where you're only affecting yourself you absolutely have the right to do what you want with your body, even if it's, you know, it's ill-informed. But when it comes to things that hurt other people, I think that you don't have that right. And in this case, the primary benefit of vaccines is actually herd immunity which comes from the entire population or like nearly the entire population having it [the vaccine]. So I think that people, as a moral matter, don't really have the right not to get it.*

Matthew: *I think that I don't like the word like mandatory. I don't really think that it goes with this country. Like people do have their own reasons. It's not just always that mom that reads that thread online—maybe people had their own religious reason. There's just different reasons. And I mean herd immunity—I think I've read some research that the rate of herd immunity for a coronavirus is going to be somewhere around 65 to 70% and I don't think that 30 percent of the population is not going to get vaccinated once the vaccine does come out. So I don't know if this requires that the vaccine should be mandatory.*

Another deliberated about whether mandating a vaccine violates civil liberties and the fact that, in some countries, herd immunity to measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) was achieved through education, rather than mandatory vaccination, which was highlighted in our briefing materials for the Poll. One participant also raised concerns about the safety of a vaccine developed as quickly as the coronavirus vaccine might be developed.

Gemma: *Also, I do think there's something to be said with the fact that like a hundred percent of the population doesn't need to be immunized to cancel out the herd immunity*

thing. So I think that like, I don't know I think people also have some sort of right and freedom to not get the vaccine, especially if it seems like other countries are able to achieve those really high percentages [of immunization] without making it mandatory. I don't know. No, yeah, I don't know if people have insight into what happened with the other countries with mumps and measles and things. But I'd be curious to hear about that.

Steve: Yeah, well just to, just to have them...I think Gemma has a point, right? I think that..I think there are sort of rights we have as a free society, right? You just have to be cognizant to certain concerns related to one's ability to consent or not consent regarding the vaccine. I certainly think that people just naturally will choose the vaccine. They did a survey where, if all stay-home orders were lifted, 80% percent of people would still abide by them and I think allowing people to voluntarily choose to opt into the vaccine is, I think, a good solution just in that part.

[...]

Justin: Yeah, this isn't like gospel or anything. I just quickly Googled this and found a poll that said 84% of Americans would accept a coronavirus vaccine if it were given and then like another six said they would wait like six months and then there's five percent of people who said they would only get it if Trump got it. But yeah those just like aren't super encouraging numbers and I think on like the measles-mumps issue. I think those [cases] are easier because the [measles-mumps] vaccine is effective for things 95 plus percent. Whereas if this is anything like the flu vaccine— the flu vaccine is 50% effective—so this is only 50% effective. That means a good number of people could be like walking around having gotten the vaccine and still transmitting the disease which seems like why herd immunity is so difficult.

Gemma: Yeah, I think that's all like super valid. I just think there's something that still feels odd to me to make something mandatory that causes risks to someone's own body because I mean, I don't know much about the vaccine obviously still being developed but to but to like tell people they have to get it, like I don't know...I just think that sets like a weird precedent. Obviously I think that it should be required for this specific issue, but I can just think of what that means for the law and precedent with the law down the line and looking at... I don't know just where that could go and people using this instance to validate other concerns.

Justin: Yeah, kind of agreeing with Gemma just a little bit. I think it's important to recognize also that if there were to be a vaccine for this, even in the next year, it would be like the quickest developed vaccine in human history. And so saying like everyone should get a measles vaccine when we know that that measles vaccine is actually like a 100% safe is, I think, a lot different than saying that everyone should get this vaccine. Because it's not even like anti-vaxxers think this vaccine would not be safe—like very legitimate scientists say if you develop a vaccine in like 12 months, there's a decent chance that it's not completely safe, especially because it bypasses so many of the FDA steps because it's in

emergency testing. So I think once you get to a certain point of guaranteed safety, then I think it should be mandatory, but I think in the interim there's a little leeway.

Punishment for Violating Stay-at-home Orders

Preliminary qualitative analysis suggests discussions on this topic followed a similar trajectory across groups. Transcripts suggest initial support for this proposal was largely driven by support for fines, but not imprisonment. Arguments against imprisonment raised concerns about a disproportionate impact of incarceration on racial and socioeconomic minorities and the risk of creating/exposing individuals to outbreaks in prisons. And while some participants saw a need for punishing those who violate stay-at-home orders, others raised concerns about punitively restricting the movements of people in economically desperate circumstances.

Here is how one small-group went about deliberation on this proposal:

Diego: *Yeah me personally. I'm not a hundred percent sure where I stand on parts of the matter. I think I'm leaning towards fines being okay. But I think imprisonment is definitely not okay. Like you look at people who smoke marijuana, for instance, in prison [and] they definitely do not belong with people who've done actual harmful things like other people and I think that like this case [violating stay-at-home orders] isn't very much. I think there's a lot better ways to impose some sort of like punishment system or keep people in check then imprisonment, which is really extreme.*

James: *This is actually already being done and police are using it to disproportionately fine or imprison people of color. So I think as with really any...I feel like this is one of those examples of a law that gives the just police the freedom to really... do like... kind of incarcerate or fine whoever they want. And I think that's a pretty dangerous right to bestow upon police.*

Eric: *I agree with you James like more incarceration is absolutely not the answer and it's kind of ironic to me that the third Pro says that it's about protecting lives. But one of the most vulnerable populations are people who are incarcerated because it's not possible to do social distancing. So if you want to save lives, you shouldn't put more people in jail or in prison.*

Harrish: *I think even in places like San Francisco where there are fines in place, but not imprisonment, you're already seeing huge disparities. Like I was walking by Dolores Park yesterday and it was just like packed with people and I was very disturbed and you didn't have anyone enforcing but then you walk by the BART station at 24th and Mission, which is like usually a hangout spot for people of color, and it's all fenced off no one can stand there and it's just a very stark the difference.*

Alex: *Out of curiosity. I also agree that jail is like the wrong way to approach this epidemic. How do you think we can incentivize people to stay at home and follow social distancing*

guidelines without threatening without threatening...[without] like the possibility of fines or jail time. I'm just curious to hear people's ideas [and] thoughts.

Ethan: *I feel like making a distinction between people who are genuinely...genuinely need to... who genuinely feel economic pressure to open up and not comply and others who are actively just protesting the government use of power during the pandemic. I'm personally totally fine with fines for individuals who are like the Michigan protesters, who are actively serving up civil unrest but I think that there are greater systems that need to be fixed for the majority of people who are complying.*

Emergency Money for the People Act

A preliminary qualitative analysis revealed that, while many participants valued government assistance to those in need during the pandemic, they were not sure monthly \$2000 cheques were the best way to provide assistance. Some participants raised concerns about the economic consequences of passing the Act, such as inflation in the long term, while others questioned whether the money would go to those who need it most in a timely manner. Many groups suggested alternative forms of government intervention, such as moratoriums on rent, expanding testing efforts and taxing corporations.

Here is how one group went about deliberating this topic, touching on many points above and showing shifts in opinion:

Meera: *With regards to the cons, like I really want to hear some stronger cons than the ones that are given here [in the briefing materials] that are just concerned about the national debt. I feel like nobody's concerned about national debt when the country wants to go to war for no real reason. Nobody's concerned about national debt when we're, you know, when the federal government wants to give big payouts to like huge corporations and whatnot. I mean whether you're for or against like a government that's super involved in your life, at the end of the day the government should be for the public...it should be serving the people so I mean, what is the money for if not for the people?*

Katie: *I think for me the biggest con is like how do we pay for this? Because like what the government does is like they just print the money and that's like kind of how you get inflation. So I do agree that something should be done but like paying this much for this long seems a bit excessive but I don't know what a viable alternative is and I do think that something should be done to, especially now, to help the people who are excluded from the original CARES Act.*

Gaurav: *Hasn't a much larger payment been made towards corporations already? And that was passed very quickly. I think, like Meera argues, the government is for the people not just for the corporations and if we're not going to let them [the corporations] suffer like what about people who you know don't have you know large corporations, large employers backing them?*

Jodie: *I totally agree. I think that the most important thing is...the question is ‘where is this money going to come from?’ I feel like so much money has already gone to supporting these big corporations. And I mean Amazon is doing great right now. Like I feel like they [big corporations/Amazon] could just get really taxed. I mean, I know that that's not...I think that's probably going to happen because Americans are afraid of taxing big corporations because all of our politicians are under their thumbs, but I feel like that would be a good solution in an Ideal World.*

Kisha: *My question is more...where's the money going to go? I know it can go for rent and water and electricity and all of those things to help people live. It could also go to healthcare if anybody gets sick. But then I feel like an alternative is that certain counties put a moratorium [on rent]—like, you don't have to pay rent for this month— instead. And then I wonder, if people don't have to pay rent and if you don't have to pay rent or utilities, where are people going to spend money? The money is going to keep going to Amazon. So yeah, that's if anyone has opinions. I'd like to hear that.*

Kathy: *Yeah, I guess, I think Kisha made a good like a really good point about “Where is this money going to go?” And then I also really agree with Jodie that, in an Ideal World, we would tax these like larger corporations, but it's not like we can just be like “Oh like we're going to tax you right now.” Taxes are a thing that have to be implemented and happen during tax season and everything. It doesn't seem like a practical solution right now and I just I still think that this [\$2000 per person] is a lot of money and there's a better way we could be using the money whether it's providing healthcare...for making sure that everyone gets treatment and tested.*

Meera: *I think you guys actually made really good points. I think my support for this is now kind of like changing. I like what Katie was really specifically getting at— like we have to have it [government assistance] set up so that this can be viable and actually helpful rather than harmful for inflation, which I did not think about. And I think Kisha talking about rent really has me thinking about removing rent and putting pressure on landlords to not pressure their tenants.*

Knowledge Gains

Knowledge gains were significant in all but one area. The largest change was on the question, “Which of the following is true about Stanford’s “Residential Neighborhoods” Long Range Plan?” Initially only 9.0% of participants were aware that the correct answer was “Students will be allowed to change neighborhoods.” After deliberation, that number increased significantly to 73.4%. The smallest change was on the question, “Approximately what percentage of Stanford students receive need-based aid in 2019?” Initially 31.4% of participants were aware that the correct answer was “40-50%.” After deliberation, that number actually decreased to 30.9%, though this was an insignificant change.

Given that knowledge increased significantly on all other questions, it is not surprising that views that “Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on” and “Most Stanford University issues are so complicated that students like me can’t really understand what’s going on” decreased significantly from 3.979 to 3.478 and from 2.817 to 2.457, respectively.

Political Efficacy and Disagreement

Participants were asked a series of questions about general political efficacy and also Stanford specific questions. Regarding overall efficacy, there was a substantial decrease in disagreement on the statement “public officials care a lot about what people like me think.” Before deliberations, 72 percent of participants disagreed with this statement and after deliberations, 56 percent disagreed. The mean for this question increased from 3.464 to 4.293. On whether “most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on,” participants’ disagreement increased from 58 to 67 percent. This mean decreased from 3.973 to 3.478. After deliberations, participants felt they had “opinions about politics that are worth listening to” - agreement with this statement increased from 68 to 85 percent. However, the statement ‘people like me don’t have any say about what the government does remained unchanged at roughly 50 in agreement with this statement.

The participants offered their opinions on these same statements but with respect to Stanford University administrators. On whether the administrators ‘care a lot about what the students like me think’, the results remained the same 52 percent before and 50 percent after. The results for ‘People like me don’t have any say about what the Stanford University administration does’ also had similar results. And, over 80 percent of participants before and after deliberations with ‘Most Stanford University issues are so complicated that students like me can’t really understand what’s going on’. Lastly, on ‘I have opinions about Stanford issues that are worth listening to’, the increase in agreement with this statement increased from 83 to 93 percent.

Now, moving on to questions regarding participants' views about those that disagreed with themselves. A battery of questions were asked in relation to how participants felt about people that disagreed with them and why they may think so. The results that remained unchanged after deliberations were 'they just don't know enough', 'they believe somethings that aren't true', and 'they are not thinking clearly'. Roughly half of the participants before and after deliberations felt that those that disagreed with them just did not know enough. And over 70 percent of participants felt that those that disagreed with them believed some things that aren't true. At the same time, close to 60 percent of participants, after deliberations, disagreed that those that disagreed with them are not thinking clearly. There were two questions that changed statistically significantly - 'they have good reasons, there are just better ones on the other side' and 'they are looking out of their own interests'. On the first question, close to 80 percent of participants agreed that those that disagreed with them "have good reasons." This mean increased from 6.464 to 6.816. And, on whether others were looking out of their own interests, the percent in agreement decreased from 87 to 80 percent, the mean decreased from 7.391 to 7.043.

Event Evaluations

Overall, 85 percent of students felt the deliberations were 'valuable', with a mean of 7.154, out of a 10-point scale, with 10 being extremely valuable. Between the small-group discussions, briefing materials, and plenary sessions, the participants rated the small-group discussion the highest at 90 percent (valuable), briefing materials second highest at 79 percent (valuable), and rated the plenary sessions the lowest in being valuable, at 56 percent.

With regards to the small-group discussions, 92 percent felt the deliberation platform 'provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion'. While the majority of participants (69 percent) felt the platform did not try to influence the views of the group, the majority of participants (72 percent) also felt 'the discussion platform tried to make sure the opposing arguments were considered'. 87 percent of the participants felt 'the important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions'. In terms of participation, 59 percent agreed that 'the members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions'. And in regards to people that were different from themselves, 62 percent felt that 'I learned a lot about people very different from me - about what they and their lives are like'.

Representativeness

The following data used sample sizes of 188 and 73, respectively, for participants and non-participants. In our analysis, we found that the majority of differences were not statistically significant, meaning that, broadly, the demographics and views of the participating and not participating groups were similar. When we compared the demographics of our participants and non-participants groups, we found no statistically significant differences.

When our demographic data is compared to overall data for the Stanford undergraduate community, various differences arise. The following description relies on data that is not comparable, so the differences should not be taken as statistical. The reason for this is that many of our data-gathering methods and categories differ from Stanford, rendering comparisons imperfect. One of the primary differences is that Stanford is often reporting verifiable internal data while we were gathering self-reported responses from students. Another consistent difference is our inclusion of a “Prefer not to say” option. The comparisons that follow are between our data for participants and Stanford data; however, as there were no statistically significant differences between the demographics of our participants and non-participants groups, any of the differences between participants and Stanford data below should either be attributed to differences in data gathering methods or differences between our original random sample and the Stanford undergraduate population.

Looking at financial aid receipt and converting our numbers to exclude non-responders (originally 6% of participants), we found that 38% of our respondents received no financial aid, while 62% received some financial aid. This is compared to the 68% of students who receive financial aid and the 32% who do not, according to Stanford. In this comparison, we saw that the participants group had a lower percentage of financial aid recipients than Stanford as a whole, though the differences are small.

According to Stanford, “approximately 900”⁷ of its 6,994 undergraduates participate in intercollegiate sports. We can safely approximate the percentage athlete of the undergraduate population as 12%. Converting our numbers to exclude non-responders (originally 1% of participants), our participants group was only 4% athlete, reflecting a lower percentage athlete than Stanford as a whole.

Stanford R&DE claims that Stanford Greek orgs “represent 25% of the undergraduate student population.”⁸ Excluding non-responders (originally 3%), only 16% of participants

⁷ Stanford University. “Cardinal Athletics.” *Stanford Facts*, Stanford University, 26 Feb. 2020, facts.stanford.edu/campuslife/athletics/.

⁸ R&DE. “Greek Houses.” Residential & Dining Enterprises: Creating a Culture of Excellence, Residential & Dining Enterprises, rde.stanford.edu/studenthousing/greek-houses.

were in Greek life, meaning that less percent Greek life members were in the participants group than at Stanford as a whole.

The racial-ethnic breakdown demonstrated a large difference between our participants and Stanford as a whole. In comparison to our categories below (c.f. Table 1), Stanford's racial-ethnic breakdown included the following categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, International, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, Unknown, White. In comparing, we drew the following comparisons and excluded non-respondents and any categories not mentioned in the rest of the paragraph (originally 11% of Stanford students and 4% of participants). The percentages of "American Indian or Alaska Native" students were the same, at 1%. The percentage of Asian students was higher in our participants group, with 41% of participants identifying as "Asian; Far East, Southeast Asia, Indian" compared to 26% of Stanford students identifying as "Asian". The percentage of black and African American students was higher in our participants group as well, with 11% of participants identifying as "Black; African American" compared to 8% of Stanford students identifying as "Black of African American". The percentage of Hispanic or Latino students in our participants group was lower, with only 10% of participants identifying as "Hispanic or Latino", compared to 19% of Stanford students. The percentage of multiracial students was also lower in our participants group, with only 7% of participants identifying as "Multiracial", compared to 10% of Stanford students identifying as "Two or more races". Finally, the percentage of white students in our participants group was lower as well, with only 30% of participants identifying as "White; European, Middle Eastern, North African", compared to the 36% of Stanford students identifying as "White".⁹

To our knowledge, Stanford does not publish data on its students' political affiliations. However, we will be comparing our data to a self-selected survey *The Stanford Daily* conducted in 2016. Excluding non-participants and those who were "Unsure" on our survey (originally 10% of participants), we found that most categories had a similar pattern. The percentages of Democrat, Independent, and Other were all very close between our survey and the Daily's survey, with a slightly higher percentage in each category in our survey: respectively, we had 64.1%, 23.5%, and 10.0% compared to the Daily's 62.6%, 21.9%, and 7.9%. The largest discrepancy was seen in the category of Republicans- while 7.4% of respondents identified as Republican in the Daily's survey, only 2.4% identified as Republican in our participants group.¹⁰

⁹ Stanford University, *Stanford Facts 2020*

¹⁰ Kuang, Cindy. "Undergraduates Strongly Favor Clinton, but Vary More in Political Ideology." *The Stanford Daily*, The Stanford Daily Publishing Corporation, 4 Nov. 2016, www.stanforddaily.com/2016/11/04/undergraduates-strongly-favor-clinton-but-vary-more-in-political-ideology/.

While Stanford only accounts for women and men in its demographics, we collected data for the categories Male, Female, and Both/neither in addition to the non-response option. Excluding non-responders (originally 2% of participants) we found that 54% of respondents identified as “Female” and 44% identified as “Male”, compared to the 50/50 split Stanford reports for its undergraduates.¹¹ While 2% of participants identified as “Both/Neither”, we had no data with which to compare this.

We also collected data on class year, the general amount of financial aid students received, whether or not they are transgender, and their sexual identity. However, Stanford has not collected and/or published data in those categories with which we could compare our data.

Moving away from comparisons to Stanford, in terms of differing opinions, there were only two statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants. While more non-participants agreed that the one-time cash grant in response to COVID-19 was sufficient, both participants and non-participants were decidedly on the “insufficient” side of the spectrum. And, while both participants and non-participants disagreed with jail time as a response for stay-at-home order violations, non-participants were more opposed to the policy.

Despite the general trend of representativeness throughout our data, some issues arose purely from an issue of quantity. For example, the numbers of participants who self-identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native, Republican, nonbinary, transgender, and asexual were present in small enough numbers to make comparisons within those categories difficult.

¹¹ Stanford University, *Stanford Facts 2020*

Appendix I: Transcripts of Deliberation

Please note: Transcript excerpts have been edited to remove the filler word “like” to increase clarity of expression. Unedited transcripts can be found in the Appendix. All names are pseudonyms. Ellipses (“...”) indicate pauses and they do not indicate that a statement has been condensed.

Unedited Transcript for Group 1 Deliberating Mandatory Vaccination

A: Yes. Yes, they should be I mean herd immunity is not really working right now because like a bunch of moms or just refusing to vaccinate their children because the wall there is educational programming a lot of people are listening to like Mom forms instead and not vaccinating their children. Yes, they should be mandatory.

K: I don't think that it's realistic for the u.s. To make any sort of medical like treatment in a way mandatory. I just don't think that's what how this country works at all but I do think that it's really possible like a lot of like schools like Stanford, for example, like a lot of like schools make it mandatory to like have certain students have to have certain vaccinations to come to school or like if you're a workplace like you have the right to say that like your employer's your employees have to have a certain vaccinations to come to school. Cool, so I think it's like it's kind of would be like a push whereas like certain spaces are requiring it rather than the government is requiring of every like individual citizen.

O: Yeah, I agree that it would be it would be difficult to get the government to do it as a whole but I do think that like just listening to the question like it should be mandatory and looking at some of the cons that we could just like have educational programs and get people to then to the vaccine. Like we don't have that much time and I feel like this is too urgent like once a vaccine comes out which is going to be months then we don't want to wait months for the vet for the educational programs.

A: I mean, I think from a moral perspective. I think that like this is one of the few areas where I think like we need to sort of take a utilitarian framework when thinking about civil liberties because you don't like I think with with every sort of you know thing where you're only affecting yourself you absolutely have the right to do what you want like with your body, even if I you know think that it's not ill, you know, its own informed but when it comes to things that like hurt other people, I think that you don't have that right. And in this case, like the primary benefit of vaccines is actually herd immunity which comes from the entire population or like nearly the entire population having it. So I think that people is a moral matter don't really have the right not to get it.

M: I think that I don't know. I don't like the word like mandatory. I don't really think that's goes again with like this country. Like people do have their own reasons. Like it's not just always that Mom that reads that thread online the maybe had their own religious reason. This is like just different reasons and I mean herd immunity. I think I've read some research

that herd immunity the rate of herd immunity for a coronavirus is going to be somewhere around like 65 to 70% and I don't think that 30 percent of population is not going to get vaccinated. Once the vaccine does come out. So I don't know like if this requires should be like mandatory along with only a 70% immunity herd immunity rate like to be able to create the herd immunity. Yeah.

***M:** Yeah, I agree. I don't think it's going to be like something that we see like the federal government like requiring everyone together think it's going to be more schools and and employee employers that require you to get it and then obviously with that like you have an option to file for an exception if you have like certain medical or religious beliefs, but otherwise, I'm in the option would be similar to what we see with like a flu vaccine where it's like, you know, you can get at your local CVS and like it's like recommended but obviously it's like no one's requiring it. And with that I think under 50% of the population gets it which would not be enough for a cute herd immunity. So I think it's important that schools and employers, you know, enforce it.*

***A:** oh, yeah, I agree with the general idea of enforcement like a basis of like organizations like work places in schools my primary concern for the implementation of the like Nationwide mandatory vaccine is an inequitable enforcement of what mandatory looks like and how practically I could see the government making a vaccine mandatory and then not doing the work that's needed to make it practically accessible to everybody who needs it. So then you've made something mandatory and then you've not made it so that everybody has access to it, which is you know in a way causing the Discrimination that you'd be trying to avoid in.*

Unedited Transcript for Group 2 Deliberating Mandatory Vaccines

***Z:** I personally think that without providing the basic facilities like enough Healthcare Healthcare, like, you know ability to pay for individuals being making the vaccine mandatory is not a very reasonable idea because like there definitely are many people who might not be able to especially because at the beginning when the right vaccine is going out and threw at least in the beginning there would be a lot of like requests for it and it there might be a rise in the price of the vaccine and it would cause like hardship for some people to pay for it.*

***K:** Yeah, I mean I totally agree that it should be mandatory but consider how the Health Care system in the u.s. Works. I'm not sure if it's like the vaccines prize will probably be really really high especially when it was just produced and I'm not sure how like if the u.s. If*

the government gives some sort of like package that allows for like free vaccination then this makes total sense, but I'm not sure how we can force people to do it. Otherwise

G: *Also, I do think there's something to be said with the fact that the this condo like a hundred percent of the population doesn't need to be immune and I mean eyes to like cancel out the like herd immunity thing. So I think that like, I don't know I think like people also have some sort of like right and like freedom to not get the vaccine especially like if it seems like other countries are able to like achieve those like really high percentages without making it mandatory. I don't know. No, yeah, I don't know if people have inside like what what happened with like the other countries with like mumps and measles and things but I'd be curious to hear about that.*

S: *Yeah, we'll just to just to have them to I think Gracie is point, right? I think that that mean I think there are sort of right just as a free Society right? You just have to be cognizant to certain concerns related to one's ability to consent or not consent regarding the vaccine. I certainly think that people just naturally will choose the vaccine just like they did a survey where if all stay home orders were lifted 80 80 percent of people. ould still abide by them and think allowing people to voluntarily choose to opt into the vaccine is is I think a good solution just in that part.*

K: *Yeah, so you need 90 percent of the population to be vaccinated in order to attend her immunization. And so that basically means that a majority of the country would have to opt in if this is the case for vaccination and I find it hard to believe that I can just people enough with you know. Like health and my own health to do that. So kind of like at rest the freedom question. I think you're free to choose what you want to do unless it hurts other people and this is the case where that could potentially*

J: *Yeah, I totally agree if we could, you know, maybe initially figure out that over 90% of people would opt in and get the vaccine and the I don't think anything should be done. But if we have like a good idea that less than ninety percent will I think it makes sense to you know, maybe put some enforcement sin and as for like European countries, this is like totally evidence-based but it feels like maybe education based approaches might work better out there because I feel like we have a lot of issues with that in America. Like I don't know abstinence only that type of stuff.*

J: *Yeah, I this isn't like gospel or anything. I just like quickly googled this and found a poll that said like 84% of Americans would accept a coronavirus vaccine if it were given and then like another sex said they would wait like six months and then there's like a five percent of people who said they would only get it if Trump got it. But yeah those just like aren't super encouraging numbers and I think on like the measles mumps issue. I think those are easier because the vaccine Effectiveness for things like 95 plus percent. Whereas if this is anything like the flu vaccine the flu vaccine is 50% effective. So this is only 50% effective. That means a good number of people could be like walking around having gotten the vaccine and still transmitting the disease which seems like why herd immunity so*

G: Yeah, I think that's all like super valid. I just I think there's something that still feels odd to me to like make something mandatory that like causes risks to someone's own body because I mean, I don't know much about the vaccine obviously still being developed but to but to like tell people they have to get like I don't know. I I just think like that sets like a weird present obviously like I think that it should be required for this specific issue, but I can just think of like what that means for like the law and like precedent with the law down the line and like looking at like I don't know just like where that could go and people using this instance to like validate other concerns if you're not seeing me.

J: Yeah, kind of agreeing with G just a little bit. I think it's important to recognize also that like if there were to be a vaccine for this even in like the next year, he would be like the quickest developed vaccine human history. And so like saying like everyone should get a measles vaccine when like we know that that means was actually like a hundred percent say is I think a lot different than saying that everyone should get this vaccine because like it's not even like anti-vaxxers think this vaccine would be saved like very legitimate scientists or like if you develop a vaccine and like 12 months. Like there's a decent chance that it's not completely safe, especially because it bypasses so many of the FDA steps because it's an emergency testing. So I think like once you get to a certain point of guaranteed safety that I think it should be mandatory, but I think in the interim there's a little leeway.

Unedited Transcript for Group Deliberating Punishment for Violating Stay-at-Home Orders

D: Yeah me personally. I'm not a hundred percent sure where I stand on parts of the matter...I think I'm leaning towards fines being okay. But I think imprisonment is definitely not okay, like you look at like people who smoke marijuana for instance like in prison like they definitely do not belong with like people who've done actual like harmful things like other people and I think that like this case isn't very much. I think there's a lot better ways to impose some sort of like punishment system or keep people in check then imprisonment, which is really extreme.

J: This is actually already being done and police are using it to like disproportionately like fine or imprison people of color. So I think as with really any like I feel like this is one of those examples of a law that like gives the just police the freedom to really do like kind of incarcerate or fine whoever they want. And I think that's a pretty dangerous right to bestow upon police.

E: I agree with you Joey like more incarceration is absolutely not the answer and it's kind of ironic to me that the third Pro says that it's about protecting lives. But one of the most vulnerable populations are people who are incarcerated because it's not possible to do social distancing. So if you want to save lives, you shouldn't put more people in jail or in prison.

H: I think even in places like San Francisco where there are fines in place, but not like imprisonment. You're already seeing huge disparities. Like I was walking by Dolores Park yesterday and it was just like packed with people and I was very disturbed and you didn't have anyone enforcing but then you walk by the BART station at 24th and Mission, which is like usually a hangout spot for people of color and it's all fenced off no one can stand there and it's just very stark the difference.

A: Out of curiosity. I also agree that jail is like the wrong way to approach this epidemic. How do you think we can incentivize people to stay at home and follow social distancing guidelines without threatening without threatening like the possibility of fines or jail time. I'm just curious to hear peoples ideas thoughts.

E: I feel like making a distinction between people who are genuinely genuinely need to who genuinely like feel economic pressure to open up and not comply and others who are actively just protesting the government use of power during the pandemic. I'm personally totally fine with fines for individuals who are like the Michigan protesters who are actively serving up civil unrest but I think that they're greater systems that need to be fixed for the majority of people who are complying.

E: I think I agree with that. It's not that I don't think there should be any enforcement of stay-at-home orders. It's just that our enforcement options are so unequal and biased that we can't use them fairly.

E: Yeah, I totally agree. I feel like having more options in place to ensure that people aren't feeling the pressure to violate stay-at-home orders would be a better alternative and that would also do well to separate people who like the Michigan protesters from ordinary people who might just be truly desperate.

Unedited Transcripts for Group Deliberating Emergency Money for the People Act

M: With regards to the cons. Like I really want to hear some stronger cons in the ones that are given here because just being concerned about the national debt. I feel like nobody's concerned about national debt when the when the country wants to go to war for no real reason. Nobody's concerned about national debt when we're like, you know, when the federal government wants to give big payouts to like huge corporations and and whatnot. Like what is the I mean whether you're for or against like a government that's like super

involved in your life at the end of the day. The government should be for the public like it should be serving the people so I mean, what is the money for if not for the people big question mark.

R: *I have a question. I remember yesterday. Somebody said they were Canadian and I think the federal government in Canada has implemented something somewhat along these lines. I don't remember if someone if I made that up enough, but*

Q: *Yeah, they have and include college students. And yeah, it's basically the same age group and yeah, they've already started that pay up sis.*

K1: *I think for me just point the biggest con is like how do we pay for this? Because like what the government does is like they just print the money and that's like kind of how you get inflation. So I do agree that something should be done but like paying this much for this long seems a bit excessive but like I don't know like what a viable like alternative is and I do think that something should be done to like especially now to like help the people who are excluded from the original cares act like from the first pair of.*

G: *Oh, I'm sorry. Well, anyway, I haven't I was going to say that haven't hasn't a much larger payment been made towards towards corporations already and that was like pass very quickly. I thought so I think like most point argues like the government is for the people not just for the corporations and if we're not going to let them suffer like what about people who you know don't have you know large corporations large employers back in them*

J: *I totally agree. I think that's the most important thing is like if the question is, where is this money going to come from? I feel like so much money has already gone to supporting these big corporations. And I mean Amazon is doing great right now. Like I feel like they could just get really taxed. I mean, I know that that's not like I think that's probably going to happen because Americans are afraid of taxing big corporations because all of our politicians are under their thumbs, but I feel like that would be a good solution in an Ideal world.*

K1: *My question is more. So like where's the money going to go? Like I know it can go for like rent and water and electricity and all of those things to help people live. They could also go to health care if anybody gets sick, but then I feel like an alternative is that we could like like certain counties. I know like put was the word like a moratorium like they were like, you don't have to pay rent for this month instead. And then so I wonder if like people don't have to pay rent and if like in this ideal perfect world where they said you don't have to pay rent or utilities.*

Is where people going to spend the money because they want to use it to start up. The economy is always going to keep going to Amazon. So yeah, that's if anyone has opinions. I'd like to hear that.

R: *I think that's a really good question Akasha, I think one thing I wanted to bring up is families earning less than \$130,000 a year. I think that covers a ton of essential workers, especially like sanitation workers and grocery store employees and people like that, which is something I just wanted to...*

K2: *Yeah, I guess I think a costume made a good like a really good point about like, where is this money going to go? And then I also like really agree with J that we should like in an Ideal World. We would tax like larger corporations, but it's not like we can just be like, oh like we're going to tax you right now like taxes are like a thing that have to be like implemented and like happen like during tax season and everything like it doesn't seem like a practical solution right now and I just I still think that like this is like a lot of money and we there's like a better way we could be using the money whether it's like providing Healthcare the for like cover it like like making sure that everyone gets treatment and gets tested and like*

M: *Well, sorry K, but I think you guys actually made really good points. I think my like support for this pet is now kind of like changing because my support for it is built on the I'd like kind of what Kathy was like really specifically getting at it like it has to we have to have it set up so that this can be viable and actually helpful rather than like harmful food inflation, which I did not think about but at the end of the but like also like what else could be done. And I think like Akasha talking about rent like really has me thinking about like raising rent and like like we were saying for having the government to kind of put pressure on companies to not pressure their employees to return also to put pressure on landlords to not pressure their tenants.*

K: *Yeah, okay. I completely forgot. I was just gonna say I think it was that. Oh like I don't think that like necessarily also just giving out this money to everyone is like a great use of resources because I do think that like some people who might fit this category might like still not really be using like need the money or be using it for something useful and to just like the flat out saying, oh everyone just gets this money is like not the most efficient use of like a limited Number of resources and that we if we could like, you know fly fun treatment, like help essential workers like something that's like a little bit more direct than just like a flat everyone like gets this money.*

S1: *Yeah, I feel like with this amount of money. I think it'll be better spent in to like programs such as like widespread covid testing and whatnot rather than just getting people with money because I first of all with a charismatic not everyone you can get the money because it's based on like it's need-based as well. So I don't really think even if this goes into place not everyone's going to get like two thousand two thousand dollars really there's like so many complications and delays look like getting the money or not. So I think with this money it's probably better spent if we just try to get the economy up and running again be like say say precautions such as more tempting than when I think*

G: *I'm not completely knowledgeable on the like economic history of all this but you know like in 1933 and 2008. Like I don't think this large of a stimulus package was in place*

granted. This is a different situation, but I'm just curious if people know about that and would like to share

R: *To that point actually, I know like during the 30s when FDR like rolled out the whole new deal and so many different government agencies were about having people employed who had lost their jobs and other point through the federal government. I feel like I've seen a smidgen of that through contact tracing things again. I know Michigan for volunteers, but some states have been paying people. So that's one one similarity to how things were in the 30s. I also going back to things that Kathy and I caution of brought up. I wonder how many people would take this money and actually go to spend it versus like paying off like desk that they already had or like saving it for for other reasons. Like I wonder if people would really just go around and start spending.*

K2: *Also, this is super small. But I feel like 130 dollars depending on where you are is very different to different people because for some places around me \$130 is like a lot and you aren't really that low-income especially because our minimum wage is like 725 so.*

K1: *I completely agree with a K2. Like I think it's just like to Flat of like a proposal like there's a lot more Nuance to the problem that this proposal doesn't really consider like it's every American that 16 or older. This would include college students and like a lot of college students do need this while I would like love two thousand dollars every month. I don't think I really need it. So like just like there's a lot of nuance that I think it likes.*

S2: *Thinking back to our discussion yesterday about like financial aid at Stanford and everything. I feel like this money could be way better spent like supporting specific other people who might like fall into this category, but I'm not on all honestly, like if my if I like I got this and like my younger brother got this I don't think that would like be as effective as it would be if like I'm a Stanford about it and was like able to provide like increased financial aid. Stuff to people who actually need it or like I don't know. There's just so many better uses. I think for this than giving it to people who might be like really wealthy considering like everything they've had they had like before this act gave them the two thousand dollars.*

Appendix II: Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis is on the proceeding pages.