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## Shaping Our Future: Participating Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corning Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory &amp; Henry College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Geneseo Center for Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City College of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Parkside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaping Our Future 2021
On May 1-2, 2021, 617 young people ages 18-29 participated in the “Shaping Our Future” event, the largest national deliberative polling event ever carried out for this age group in the United States. Pioneered by James Fishkin at Stanford University’s Center for Deliberative Democracy, Deliberative Polling® is an attempt to use public opinion research in a new and constructive way.¹ The polling process reveals the conclusions the public would reach if people had the opportunity to become more informed and more engaged by the issues.

This virtual event, hosted by Stanford University, Berggruen Institute, and Equal Citizens, brought together students from 35 postsecondary institutions across the country for a weekend of democratic deliberation.² Participants were randomly sampled volunteers and represented various backgrounds, ethnicities, geographical locations, and education levels to mimic the American population. In terms of demographics, the participant group was 56% female and 38% male, with the majority currently enrolled in college (69%) and living in urban or suburban areas (81%). The breakdown of race and ethnicity was 45% White, 12% Black, 20% Asian, 8% Hispanic, 10% multiple, and 5% other. Political party preferences also indicated 61% of participants being Democrats, 25% being Independent, 7% being Republicans, and the last 7% preferring another political party. Household income levels ranged from 24% of participants being from households earning less than $19,000, 10% each in the $20,000-29,999 and 30,000-39,999 bracket, 9% in the $40,000-49,999 bracket, $50,000-99,999 bracket, 19% in the $100,000-199,999 bracket, and 8% in the more than $200,000 bracket.

Regarding education levels, 12% of participants had never been enrolled in a higher education institution, while 69% were currently enrolled and 19% were higher education degree-holders. 31% were not enrolled in education and 69% were at the time of the event. Overall, the participant sample was diverse in many ways, which made it possible to include the various perspectives young people often have towards the proposals discussed during the deliberations.
Throughout the weekend, participants engaged in small group discussions about the Electoral College, climate change, and economic inequality policy proposals. All participants were provided with briefing materials prior to the event to better inform their understanding of the proposals, which summarized arguments for and against each proposal and were vetted by experts. Then, using a customized online platform developed by the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University, participants in over 50 different groups discussed proposals on Electoral College reform, President Biden’s Civilian Climate Corps, regional minimum wage, universal basic income, and the implementation of a new wealth tax.

The discussion on Electoral College reform, initiated by the Berggruen Institute and Equal Citizens, explored three proposals to modify the current system that has governed presidential elections throughout the history of our nation. These proposals explored a national popular vote, fractional proportional voting, and ranked-choice voting as possible replacements to the current Electoral College. Some of these alternative voting processes are being seriously considered for use on the state level; for example, Alaskan voters approved ranked-choice voting for federal and state elections in 2020.³ As such, it was debated whether or not more states, if not the nation as a whole, should follow in the footsteps of such states.

Next, participants considered President Biden’s January 2021 “Executive Order on Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad,” which was issued with the intent of establishing a Civilian Climate Corps (CCC) to “mobilize... and maximize the creation of accessible training opportunities and good jobs” in order to “conserve and restore... and address” climate change.⁴ Participants considered the specifics of implementing a CCC, including questions such as "How will the proposed CCC be funded?" Finally, participants considered several proposals relating to economic inequality: a regional minimum wage that would reflect the differences in prevailing wages and cost of living across the United States; a universal basic income program that would see the federal government give cash grants to all Americans on a monthly basis; and a national wealth tax.
On May 1, the first of the two days of deliberations, Lawrence Lessig, the Roy L. Furman Professor of Law and Leadership at Harvard Law School and founder of Equal Citizens, moderated the conversation on Electoral College reform, featuring input from the following contributors:

**Alexander Keyssar** is the Matthew W. Stirling Jr. Professor of History and Social Policy at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He is the author of “Why Do We Still Have the Electoral College?” which traces the origins of the Electoral College and the historical efforts to reform it.

**Cynthia Richie Terrell** is the founder and executive director of RepresentWomen and a founder of FairVote. She is an advocate for electoral reforms to advance women’s representation and leadership in the United States, including ranked-choice voting.

**David Kopel** is the research director of the Independence Institute; an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute; and adjunct professor of advanced constitutional law at Denver University’s Sturm College of Law. He has authored scholarly articles on the constitutionality of a national popular vote.

**Eileen Reavey** is the national grassroots director of National Popular Vote Inc., a nonprofit dedicated to the promotion of the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact.

**Norman Williams** is the Ken & Claudia Peterson Professor of Law at Willamette University College of Law and the director of the Willamette Center for Constitutional Government. In addition to teaching constitutional and election law, he has authored numerous scholarly articles on the constitutionality of Electoral College reform.
On May 2, Mia Charity, the chief development officer of the Close Up Foundation, led a conversation covering the Civilian Climate Corps, regional minimum wage, universal basic income, and a new wealth tax with the following contributors:

Anat Admati is a professor of finance and economics at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, director of the Corporations & Society Initiative, and senior fellow at the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research.

Stephen Nuñez is the lead researcher on guaranteed income at the Jain Family Institute, where he focuses on testing the practical application and design of guaranteed income policy. Previously, Nuñez was research manager at ImpactMatters and a research associate in MDRC’s Low-Wage Workers and Communities policy area.

Kif Scheuer is the Climate Action Corps director at California Volunteers, Office of the Governor, where he leads development and growth of the California Climate Action Corps, the country’s first state-level climate service corps designed to foster opportunities for all Californians to act on climate change.

Violet Saena is the executive director of Climate Resilient Communities. Saena has served as an international climate change expert for over 10 years and has worked with various groups in a wide range of less developed countries to protect their communities from the impacts of climate change.
SHAPING OUR FUTURE: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To measure the impact of the deliberative polling event on participants’ viewpoints, all participants were surveyed before and after the event. The analysis of these data, combined with the qualitative trends from the discussion rooms, show how deliberative polling can influence and shape public opinion.

A National Popular Vote

The first proposal advocated for replacing the Electoral College with a national popular vote to elect the President of the United States. This would mean that the candidate who gains the majority of votes cast in the presidential election would be elected the president. In the pre-deliberation survey, 72.5% of participants supported the proposal, while 18.5% of participants opposed it. It is also worth noting that very few participants had no opinion on the proposal; only 6.3% denoted “No Opinion” on the pre-survey upon entering the event. After the event, even more participants had formed opinions on the proposal, with the percent of participants in the “No Opinion” category falling to 2.1% of total participants. Although support for the national popular vote proposal was still above two-thirds of participants after the event’s conclusion, there was an overall decrease in support, which fell by 3.9% while opposition rose by 4.5%.

Fractional Proportional Voting

The next policy proposal advocated for a fractional proportional model for awarding Electoral College votes, as opposed to the current winner-take-all system. In a fractional proportional system, a share of a state’s electoral votes goes to each of the top two candidates based on the fraction of the vote they win in that state. Overall, support for fractional proportional voting increased. Prior to the event, 63% of participants supported the proposal, whereas 73.8% of participants supported the proposal after the event. Opposition to the proposal also decreased from 24.3% to 15.8%. Additionally, over half of people with no opinion before the deliberation had an opinion in the post-survey.

Ranked-Choice Voting

This policy proposal discussed the usage of a ranked-choice voting system, wherein voters are able to rank all candidates on the ballot in order of their preferences, rather than only selecting their top choice. Initial support for the ranked-choice proposal was at 62.4%, while opposition was 25.9%. After the deliberations, support for ranked-choice voting went up significantly. Support saw an increase to 76.3%, which is 13.9% higher than the pre-survey. Opposition also fell by 10.2%. Finally, 10.5% of participants abandoned the “No Opinion” option.
Civilian Climate Corps Funding

This policy proposal advocates for the Civilian Climate Corps—a U.S. national service program—to receive enough government funding to have three million corps members compensated with a living wage. Prior to the event, a vast majority of participants supported the proposal, at around a 73.3% support rate. Those opposed to the proposal represented 12.8% of participants. After the event, a majority of participants still supported the proposal (71.6%). However, opposition for the proposal did grow by 5.4%, amounting to a total of 18.2% of participants. In the pre-survey, a great deal of participants (34%) denoted “No Opinion” on the policy proposal. After the deliberation, only 4.7% of participants denoted “No Opinion,” representing how the event aided participants in forming their individual opinions on the policy proposal.

Vulnerable Communities and the CCC

This proposal pertains to the structure of the Civilian Climate Corps and suggests that the communities most vulnerable to climate change should determine the projects and the priorities of the CCC. Pre-survey data showed 79% of participants in favor of this proposal and only 11.9% in opposition. However, after the event’s conclusion, opposition for the proposal grew. Post-survey data reflect 74.5% of participants in support of the proposal and 15.8% of participants in opposition.

Regional Minimum Wage

Most Americans are familiar with the federal minimum wage. However, this proposal introduces the idea of adopting regional minimum wages that reflect the differences in prevailing wages and cost of living across the United States. Out of all the proposals, the regional minimum wage policy proposal had the highest pre-survey support rate, at 81.6%, in addition to the lowest “No Opinion” rate, at 5.5%. Opposition to the proposal prior to the event consisted of 12.7% of participants. After the event, support drastically decreased by 20% to a rate of 61.6% of participants. Additionally, opposition grew by 16.4% to a total of 29.1% of participants.

Universal Basic Income

A universal basic income is a process by which the federal government gives cash grants to all Americans on a monthly basis. This proposal introduced the idea of $1,000 per month cash grants to all American adults at least 18 years old. A majority of participants (60%) supported this proposal prior to the event. After the event, support decreased slightly to 57% of participants. Opposition for the proposal rose by 5%, with 29.5% of participants opposing the proposal in the pre-survey and 34.5% opposing it in the post-survey.
Taxes on the Wealthy

This proposal states that the federal government should impose an annual wealth tax of 2% on any wealth over $50 million and 3% for wealth over $1 billion. Overall, participants' opinions remained more or less the same between the pre-survey and the post-survey. Support for the proposal dropped from 86.6% of participants prior to the event, to 83.8% after the event. As for opposition, 9.1% of participants opposed the wealth tax before the event and a slightly higher 11.4% opposed the proposal after the event’s conclusion. The slight increase in opposition to the proposal may be a result of the greater number of participants who marked an opinion on the post-survey, as the number of participants who denoted “No Opinion” decreased by 4.7% after the deliberation.

Participants' Views

82% of participants in the post-survey reported that they had opinions on politics worth listening to.

72% of participants left the event with the belief that they had learned a lot about people that are very different from themselves.

92.6% agreed that the group discussions hosted on the online platform gave everyone the opportunity to participate.
Before attending the event, participants were asked to fill out two surveys. Both surveys included general knowledge questions surrounding American systems of federal government. In comparison to the pre-survey, post-survey results indicated an improvement in general knowledge questions. When asked whether or not it was true if “Each state has the same number of electoral votes as it has members in the United States Congress,” 50.6% of the respondents answered correctly. This was a 15% increase from the 35.1% of participants who answered correctly on the pre-survey.

It is also important to note that after participating in “Shaping Our Future,” participants reported an increase from 74.6% in the pre-survey to 82% in the post-survey that they had opinions on politics worth listening to. The surveys included a question asking, “Those who disagree strongly with me on the issues are not thinking clearly.” On the pre-survey, 35.9% of respondents agreed while 48.1% disagreed, whereas the post-survey displayed that 33% of respondents agreed (down 2.9% from the pre-survey) and 49.7% disagreed (up 1.6% from pre-survey) with the statement. Mutual respect for other opinions thus improved as a result of deliberations.

In the final survey, participants were also asked to evaluate their experience taking part in the event. 92.6% of individuals agreed that the group discussions hosted on the online platform gave everyone the opportunity to participate. The majority of individuals also believed that people participated equally in discussions (60.6%), had the opportunity to consider opposing arguments (80.2%), and were able to address the important points of each issue (88.5%). In addition, 72% of participants left the event with the belief that they had learned a lot about people that are very different from themselves. The next few pages will provide more details on how participants' views on specific issues changed.

In the following data tables, note that the percentages for "No opinion" and "Not applicable" are raw percentages, while percentages reported for the other categories are valid percentages, meaning percentages of the population after the No opinion / Not applicable responses are excluded. The statistical significance of changes in opinion (in the "Average" row) were also calculated; such changes in opinion that are statistically significant are denoted by stars (***).
**CHANGE IN OPINIONS: ELECTORAL COLLEGE**

**Current System**

The pre- and post-deliberation data highlight that on average, people’s confidence in the current system of democracy increased.

Concurrently, participants are largely dissatisfied with current systems, and in fact, participants’ opinion of current systems—such as the Electoral College, winner-take-all, and plurality voting—became more negative. This may be because the participants better understood the shortcomings of existing systems and became more interested in the potential for change.

**Outlook 1:** How poorly or well would you say the system of democracy in the United States works these days?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.660</td>
<td>4.944</td>
<td>0.284 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal 7:** We should continue to elect the president through the Electoral College, in which the presidential candidate that receives a majority of electoral votes wins. (The average change for this proposal had a p-value of 0.056, which is not statistically significant, but at the borderline of being so.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal 9: We should continue to use winner-take-all to award electoral votes to presidential candidates, in which all of a state’s electoral votes goes to the candidate that gets the most votes in that state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>3.015</td>
<td>-0.479***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal 11: We should continue to use plurality voting when casting votes for president, in which each voter selects one presidential candidate on their ballot and the candidate with the most votes wins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.553</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>-1.268***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Popular Vote**

Participants reported a decrease in support for the national popular vote proposal, although a large majority of people (over two-thirds) still supported the proposal.

Proposal 8: We should elect the president through a national popular vote, in which the presidential candidate that receives the most votes nationwide wins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.963</td>
<td>6.616</td>
<td>-0.347***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fractional Proportional Voting

Overall, support for fractional proportional voting increased. Over half of people with no opinion before the deliberation ended up having an opinion following the deliberation.

Proposal 10: We should use fractional proportional voting to award electoral votes to presidential candidates, in which a share of a state’s electoral votes goes to each of the top two candidates based on the fraction of the vote they win in that state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.960</td>
<td>6.804</td>
<td>0.844 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranked-Choice Voting

Support for ranked-choice voting went up significantly, with an increase of over 10%. An overwhelming majority (over three-fourths) of people supported the proposal post-deliberation. Additionally, a significant proportion abandoned the “no opinion” option and a small percentage strayed away from the “In the middle” position.

Proposal 12: We should use ranked-choice voting when casting votes for president, in which each voter ranks the presidential candidates on their ballot and the candidate with a majority of votes wins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.247</td>
<td>7.256</td>
<td>1.010 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across both the pre- and post-surveys, each of the three economic inequality proposals was supported by a majority of participants. However, support for a regional minimum wage (proposal 3) and for a universal basic income (proposal 5) decreased after deliberation, while support for a wealth tax (proposal 6) remained constant.

Proposal 3: The federal government should adopt a regional minimum wage that reflects differences in the cost of living and wages across the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Deliberation</th>
<th>Post-Deliberation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.561</td>
<td>6.177</td>
<td>-1.384***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ ratings of the regional minimum wage proposal generally went down after the deliberation event. The proportion of participants in favor of the proposal dropped by 20%, while the proportion in opposition increased by 16.4%. Participants were more likely to express an opinion on the proposal after the deliberation, yet they were also more likely to take a stance in the middle. Although the percentage of participants supporting the regional minimum wage remained in the majority, it is clear that there was a substantial shift away from favoring this proposal overall.

Proposal 5: The federal government should give cash grants of $1,000 per month (also known as universal basic income) to all adults at least 18 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Survey</th>
<th>Post-Survey</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.150</td>
<td>5.879</td>
<td>-0.271***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes in opinion between pre- and post-deliberation were less dramatic regarding the universal basic income proposal than the regional minimum wage proposal, yet they followed a similar trend. The average rating for the proposal dropped by around 0.3, a small but statistically significant amount. Participant support for the universal basic income proposal decreased slightly while opposition increased. The greatest change occurred among those who had originally held “no opinion;” the proportion of these participants dropped 6.8% to only 1.3% of the total group, the lowest proportion of “No opinion” answers for proposal discussed on Day 2.
Proposal 1: The federal government should impose an annual wealth tax of 2% on any wealth over $50 million and 3% for wealth over $1 billion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Survey</th>
<th>Post-Survey</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.272</td>
<td>8.162</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike for the first two economic inequality proposals, ratings for the wealth tax proposal did not change in a statistically significant manner \((p=0.234)\). However, it is notable that participants consistently rated this proposal quite high and that their opinions of it did not significantly change after deliberation.

**Influence of Demographics on Opinions Regarding Economic Inequality Proposals**

The opinions regarding the economic inequality proposals remained fairly consistent when disaggregated by political party preference. While participants who identified themselves as Independents rated their initial support lower than self-identified Democrats on each proposal, and self-identified Republicans rated them even lower than Independents, all statistically significant changes of opinion for each group trended in the same direction as did the overall averages before and after deliberation.

Meanwhile, the opinions disaggregated by education level—never enrolled, currently enrolled, or higher education degree-holder—unlike the groups divided by party preference, tended to share similar initial and subsequent average ratings across categories. The one exception to this pattern is with the universal basic income proposal. On average, participants who had never been enrolled in higher education rated this proposal much higher than their peers; never enrolled participants gave it an average score of 7.35, compared to 5.79 by those currently enrolled and 6.61 by those with higher education degrees.

Finally, disaggregating the results by gender, participants who identified themselves as male tended to rate the proposals lower than those self-identified as female or other. All statistically significant changes in opinions for each group followed the direction of the overall average change in opinion for each economic inequality proposal.
The results listed below from the pre- and post-survey responses to climate change are inconclusive about overall changes in opinions about the proposals related to the Civilian Climate Corps because the average changes are not statistically significant. Nevertheless, the data collected shows that there was a general shift away from people with "No opinion" to actually have an opinion.

Proposal 1: The Civilian Climate Corps should receive enough funding to have three million corps members, compensated with a living wage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Survey</th>
<th>Post-Survey</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.038</td>
<td>7.053</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>-29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average change in opinion for this proposal was not statistically significant (p=0.896). However, there was a large percentage of individuals that did not have an opinion on Proposal 1 at 34.4%. The post survey results showed a -29.7 percentage point difference from the pre-survey results, with the post-survey results indicating that 4.7% did not have an opinion. This suggests that after the deliberation, there was a better understanding of funding for compensation with a living wage.

Proposal 2: The communities most vulnerable to climate change should determine the projects and priorities of the Civilian Climate Corps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Survey</th>
<th>Post-Survey</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.034</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average change in opinion for this proposal was also not statistically significant (p=0.621), though this proposal also saw a similar shift away from people with "No opinion."
BEYOND THE NUMBERS

What is behind participants' changes in opinions? Equally important, what underscored their original stances? This section brings to light some of the reasoning behind the stances participants had on the different topics they were presented.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Introduction
This section looks at the groups’ responses to the different proposals for electoral reform: a national popular vote, fractional proportional voting, and ranked-choice voting. While some participants argued that the Electoral College should remain unchanged, many agreed that some type of reform was necessary. However, many also argued that the following proposals would work best in tandem with one another in some way.

Some participants argued that only the latter two options, fractional proportional voting and ranked-choice voting, would work together because these two would ensure the most voices could be heard by eliminating the winner-take-all system. This data is reflective of the quantitative analysis, in which support for both fractional proportional voting and ranked choice voting went up:

"I guess if ranked-choice voting was paired with fractional proportional vote and then my vote would be heard more, it wouldn't be heard more if it was more of a winner-take-all. But yeah, I definitely agree with that—that if it's not both fractional proportional and RCV that it's not going to work that much" (1A2I).

Please note: Transcript excerpts have been edited to remove the filler word “like” to increase clarity of expression.
All names are pseudonyms. Ellipses (“...”) indicate pauses and not that a statement has been condensed.
However, others did not completely write off the efficacy of combining the national popular vote option with the latter two. Some participants expressed interest in combining all three proposals but did not see how it would be feasible. Instead, they looked for ways to combine the different proposals so that they could work:

“I think when it comes to my opinion I agree with...an electoral college like proportion. I don’t know if there’s a way to incorporate all of it but ...I agree with...proportional voting along with ranked-choice in the electoral college system style like for the Electoral College” (1B2E).

The question of feasibility then led into questions for the plenary speakers. Most of the questions dealt with the procedural challenges of implementing any type of change to the current electoral process. Specifically, some asked about the logistical challenges of implementing more than one of the proposals. They asked questions like:

“Can you speak more about the relationship between ranked-choice voting as well as fractional proportional voting and voter turnout (total number as well as demographics of voters)?” (1B1E)

And:

“Can national popular vote and ranked-choice voting be combined? What are the pros and cons?” (1A1M)

Some participants were open to any of the proposals, or any combination of them. One group summed up the spirit of this attitude:

“Which is the most economical and feasible system to implement, and who would finance it?” (1B2N)

While their proposals varied, and groups did not necessarily agree on how to combine the different types of voting systems, most rooms acknowledged that electoral reform was necessary.

**National Popular Vote**

The national popular vote proposal produced what was perhaps the most heated debate out of the three proposals, likely because it was the first topic discussed of the entire weekend, and because it invited participants to question the status quo: the Electoral College. Some participants turned to history to advocate to keep things the way they are:

“I don't think people appreciate the genius that went into that, that document and the entire purpose was to prevent what's called the tyranny of the majority...So I’m a huge fan of the Electoral College” (1B2D).
“That's the difficulty in governing is to keep it representative and not just have, you know, a small group of people which is kind of like we have plenty of issues in our political system with corporate money in the process. But if you're aware of that... endemic issue to representative democracy...then you have to do something to counter it, and that's the point of the Electoral College and that's why it's worked for 300 years thus far” (1B2D).

However, some ardently disagreed, arguing that the Electoral College made them feel like they had no political voice and that it just perpetuates political polarization:

“I don't feel like my vote matters that much. And I know plenty of people who don't vote, because they feel like their vote doesn't matter as much, especially in national elections. So I've always been in favor of a national popular vote” (1B2F).

“The Electoral College really polarizes the country. So, in our current system, if you vote third party outside of Democrat-Republican, your vote almost doesn't matter. So with the national popular vote, I feel like we could have other ideas and not be as polarized to Democrat-Republican” (1B2F).

To some people, a national popular vote felt like an intuitive answer to questions of democracy:

"Oh honestly, I thought that's how we voted already. I didn't know really what electoral votes were...So, I mean, I would also like to see one vote count for each person. That's just me. I thought that I was in first place” (1A2B).

Many participants voiced fears that getting rid of the Electoral College and instituting a national popular vote would result in a “tyranny of the majority,” and that smaller states would get left behind in favor of states like California, Texas, and New York. However, many participants did not see that necessarily as a bad thing:

"If you give...the electoral college example, I would say that it's just a minority taking over the majority situation” (1A2A).

Others argued that the United States already has fail-safes in place to counter the disproportionate influence of some states in government:

“I think...the argument that... certain states should have... disproportionate influence just because they are like a different culture and like we need to balance it out... has merit but that's also like what the Senate is for. So I don't understand why the presidential system needs it too if the Senate has it“ (1B2C).
"If the majority of people want someone as their president,... I think that it makes sense to have that person be the president, and I feel like the states still have... their state governments and... their local governments. So I don't see why those people aren't still being... represented" (1A2U).

Others extended this argument, and expressed their frustration at the idea that the Electoral College sometimes works against democracy:

"We're still going to have Senators. We're still going to have the House of Reps. We're not asking to abolish those and get rid of those, but when it comes to the Electoral College, it definitely has to go and be something better, and actually more democratic because as a country, that's one of the biggest problems I feel like we're facing... this idea that we are so polarized. But why are we polarized, right?" (1A2E)

"We've seen multiple examples in modern history that the electoral college has gone against what the general public in the U.S. wants. So I think if we get rid of that, we'll have more of an equal saying power of like what the actual public wants instead of what the Electoral College then decides" (1A2E).

Some rooms decided that, in efforts to maximize representation, a national popular vote could only come after some structural change:

"Maybe delegating more to the local government, right?... I think it's more of a shift of how the government works a little bit if you're going to talk about the national vote" (1A2A).

However, while some participants came into the discussion with strong, preconceived opinions on the Electoral College or a national popular vote, other participants treated the weekend as an opportunity to learn more about the topic and form a new opinion or find middle ground:

“I think, before coming into this, I would have said that I supported the Electoral College. And after listening to some of you speak and reading the briefing materials, I would still say that I support the idea of the Electoral College, but I'm very open to changes to the system. If there's a way to make it better, then I definitely think that that should happen” (1B2D).
Fractional Proportional Voting

The second proposal discussed on electoral reform was fractional proportional voting. Participants from non-swing states noted that fractional proportional voting would make their vote feel more important:

“I like this proposal a bit more than the national popular vote because, for instance, I live in Louisiana and it’s not a swing state at all. And so, with the winner-take-all system, my vote doesn't really count in certain ways” (1B2B).

Many people also noted that fractional proportional voting seems much more feasible than a national popular vote because it does not discard the Electoral College in its entirety:

“I think it would be a good middle ground for the people who like the Electoral College and the people who want the popular vote” (1A2D).

“I'm pretty sure getting rid of the Electoral College and making it one person, one vote is pretty much impossible because it's enshrined in the Constitution. Both parties really have too much to lose from getting rid of the Electoral College as it stands today. So maybe proportional representation would be a good compromise” (1A2M).

Some noted that this is not a perfect solution, as some states get less representation per vote:

“I think one of the big arguments against removing the Electoral College overall would be tension between states, because some states will get noticeably less representation” (1B2J).

“California has a bigger population but their voices are not counted like one person, one vote” (1B2C).

Some also feared that fractional proportional voting would actually place the election further from the hands of the people. They expressed the concern that fractional proportional voting would lead to contingent elections, in which election outcomes would be determined by the members of Congress, who may not reflect or advocate for the people’s needs:

“The biggest concern I have is what was actually brought up earlier, is that fractional proportional could make contingent elections more likely, in which I think Congress decides who the president is. So unless you can fix that 270 electoral requirement, I don't think fractional proportional voting is a good idea” (1A1H).

“The House of Representatives deciding the fate of a presidential election, may or may not be a fair portrayal of our country’s views at large” (1A2A).
The final proposal discussed on electoral reform was ranked-choice voting. Many participants felt that ranked-choice voting would expand American voting politics beyond the two-party system:

“I would vote for a different candidate, most likely if we had this system just because I do tend to prefer third-party candidates and I don't want to, I guess waste my vote. So I like that” (1B2C).

“I personally think that RCV would actually encourage people to do more research into the candidates and actually know who they're voting for and their policies a lot more than just political parties that are just polarizing” (1A2C).

“So I've noticed that there's a general consensus in the population, that voting for third-party or independent candidates is like a waste of your ballot...I think it will give the nation an idea of which third-party candidate or independent candidate might actually be gaining traction in the population. Even if they don't win, you might be able to see trends over time in terms of people’s support. I think that's useful” (1A2P).

As the participants of one group noted, ranked-choice voting may be good for American democracy, as it would encourage more people to vote:

“I wonder if it would encourage people to be more politically engaged. In the 2016 election, a lot of people didn't vote at all because they didn't like Clinton or Trump. So I wonder if the ranked-choice would make people feel like they have more autonomy over the choices instead of having to pick one or the other, even if they don't like either of those options” (1A2O).

“I think that's one of the main reasons people might not vote because they can only choose one or the other candidate. So, having more options, may increase voter turnout” (1A2O).

Though many people did not think the ranked-choice voting system is complicated, some participants were concerned that the system’s complications could confuse voters or deter them from voting:

“If we were to go to this, it would be a dramatic change of how everyone's used to elections happening. So, there'd be a large learning curve for the average voter. This would require not just a change in how we've always thought about voting, but also a national campaign of educating people about how the new system works and how to make it work most effectively. So that might be a difficult thing for the first few elections” (1B2B).

“Ranked choice voting might be a little too complicated and therefore we're going to have a lot of votes placed that are just careless or maybe not given a lot of thought” (1B2I).

“I want voting to be so simple for people. People think, ‘I'm going to go to the polls because I want to vote for this person. And if this person wins the votes then they're going to be elected’...I don't want to overcomplicate that by making it too difficult” (1A2V).
CIVILIAN CLIMATE CORPS

Introduction

This section explores the arguments considered by participants when evaluating the proposals regarding the CCC, including CCC funding and vulnerable communities directing the fight against climate change. Most participants agreed that climate change was a pressing issue; however, there was disagreement about how best to tackle it. Participants wondered what kinds of programs and initiatives the CCC would be involved in, and whether this was the best approach to fighting climate change. Moreover, several people wondered how vulnerable communities are defined, and whether—when speaking about a universal issue that will affect the entire planet—a group of people can reliably be singled out as “most vulnerable.”

Civilian Climate Corps Funding

Some participants brought up the fact that college education is very expensive in the United States and that, therefore, taking some time off to work for the CCC may give some young people the opportunity to save up money to later invest in a college education or to gain skills that would allow them to be employable without needing to attend college.

“I think that having an alternative for college with the Climate Change Corps is a great idea because college is very expensive nowadays, and not everybody is able to access higher education. The Climate Change Corps would be able to train people to do climate change-conscious jobs at a younger age and train them to do those jobs without needing additional funding” (2A2F).

The urgency of the climate crisis was often noted, and participants expressed disappointment at arguments put forth in the briefing materials which stated that opponents of the CCC see young people as not motivated enough to take on the work that a civilian corps would require:

“One of the things that the video mentioned was that they did not feel young people would know enough to tackle this issue, but I feel like if young people aren’t going to do it, then who is?! I think that our generation is probably the one that cares the most about climate change and would be the most willing to do something about it. So, personally, I don’t really think that that’s a valid point” (2A2H).

Some were not sure about why the proposal specifically endorsed that three million people be needed. Despite others’ concerns of enough young people being interested in joining, they were supportive of the proposal so long as enough people could be recruited as needed:

“I’m not sure where the three million number comes from, but my take on it is that the CCC should receive enough funding to have as many members as is needed. The counterpoint to this is ‘Well, it’s not really an immediate crisis...’ Which if someone says is... well, you’re wrong. So that’s kind of a moot point. I think that when it comes to budgeting, we shouldn't hold back, really, at all when it comes to this. And, of course, they should be compensated with a living wage” (2A1A).
“I think we can probably all agree that the CCC does sound like a good idea. I think my only hold-up though is for three million people to be completely compensated with a living wage. Are there even close to three million people interested in this? Because I noticed before, in like the AmeriCorps and Peace Corps... They have a lot of trouble now and in the past in finding people that actually want to get involved and to help, and so in a perfect world, I'm sure there would be three million people that would want to help, but three million is a lot of people. And I don't know if they really are going to find that many people who are willing to volunteer their time to this corps” (2A2E).

Perhaps inspired by the historical significance of FDR’s New Deal, some participants expressed the opinion that the CCC could help ameliorate problems with aging infrastructure in the United States. Opposition came mainly in the way of questioning the burden the government should take on. In particular, participants inquired about the responsibility of corporations and expressed the belief that corporations often contribute to climate change but can still profit. Thus, some groups advocated that corporations be the ones to take on the financial burden of alleviation projects or that such projects be funded by taxing corporations for their environmental impact:

“I do think that funding this organization would be helpful and climate change is obviously an issue, but I really do think that we should place the responsibility on large corporations that are causing a lot of the climate change, because that's probably the biggest contributor, honestly. So, I just think that they have the most responsibility in this case” (2A2B).

“Environmental harm is caused not by the average consumer. The average American... it's caused by corporations. There are huge corporations, mining companies, energy production companies. It's ridiculous” (2A2B).

“So, I think that the focus of climate change efforts should be on corporations. I think that a lot of this money could go towards enforcement measures to make sure that corporations are doing what they need to do in order to combat climate change” (2A2G).

“I don't think [the corps] is the best way to address climate challenges. I think it's more effective for the government to put regulations on businesses. Some people have suggested a carbon tax. We can put a lot of regulations in place where either if a business damages the environment, they pay penalties or we enforce it by requiring them to use certain technologies and certain practices to mitigate climate change. And so, I think that those methods are generally more effective than doing something like a civilian climate corps” (2A1B).

Vulnerable Communities
This section highlights the main topics, concerns, and opinions expressed in the conversations about to what degree the projects and priorities of a CCC should be determined by communities most affected by climate change. Throughout groups, there was empathy expressed for regions that experience the effects of climate change more severely:

“A lot of those communities in south Texas, and south Louisiana, and anything along the Mississippi River... You know, those are the people that are affected day-in and day-out, and they've watched the change in their communities. They've watched their parents and then their friends all get sick from the quality of the air, the rising water levels. The lack of the food... rice and crawfish that are grown there...
“They see these changes day in and day out maybe a little bit differently than the politicians that don't. So, it would be a lot more fair to have those people kind of guide the conversation and bring up what their issues are” (2A2D).

“I understand where this point is coming from because, as someone from the Midwest, I don't experience the same climate troubles as those who are on the coast. Let's say that in a place like Florida, which has to deal with the rising sea levels and the greater amounts of natural disasters that happen due to climate change... I think they should have somewhat of a say or just to designate those communities that are most vulnerable are” (2A2E).

“I think that it needs to be regional. I think if we make a widespread or national thing there is going to be a lot of input from large corporations, large cities that maybe don't see it... rather than having small-town, West Virginia, Flint, Michigan, reservations. I think that a lot of people of color, minorities, and poor rural areas are often left out of the conversation easily. Someone could say, 'Well, we should build wind energy' and then put it in the middle of a community and sort of break things up. I think that people in the community deserve a voice to advocate for what's done to sort of help nationwide” (2A2B).

Many participants agreed that the communities most vulnerable to climate change’s effects should have a greater say in dictating the agenda for combating climate change:

“I can get all the points that are coming in. I just think that people... I don't think that they should have the overall say, definitely. I think they should have a bigger say than they have in the past. I think that's more so where it's going rather than they should have all the say. I think that's a little bit unfair, because professionals should have the highest opinion. But I feel like underrepresented communities should have a better say than they have in the past because it is affecting them a lot worse than it is” (2A2E).

“I think that it would be a great idea for marginalized communities. Communities of color and disabled communities to have priority in determining what projects are best for climate change. For example, like, I know in the disability community, sometimes we have people who really do need plastic straws, and that sometimes can go against plastic straw bans. Bans that are very popular but don't actually address climate change in a massive way. So by pushing up those voices we can have people focus on other bans. Instead of just like plastic straw bans” (2A2F).

“One thing that I also wanted to point out is that this sort of thing would be really good for us to address the differences between rural, urban areas, and suburban areas, because in a rural area, farmers and such are going to be the ones who are going to face a lot of it—a lot of the effects of climate change. And so it's really important that they are involved in the process to make sure that they can work together to ensure that their businesses don't fail” (2A2F).
“I think one thing to also mention is that a lot of times there is a bit of a disconnect between what climate activists want to achieve, and what farmers are capable of. Because I live in a rural area, that's also got a lot of conservative people and a lot of them do you know, like really harmful farming practices, and to the farmers that I've spoken to... a lot of them just don't know where to start. They don't have the education and so they're starting at this place where a lot of climate activists kind of have a bit more knowledge about sustainable farming practices that the farmers don't have and so we need a bridge that education gap as well and I think including them in the conversation. Other people. And they might have more insight on how it is affecting people rather than you know because some studies might not see that” (2A2F).

Others expressed that though affected communities should have more of a say, they should not control the conversation, as common ground is needed:

“Yes, I believe that since they are most susceptible and that these things affect them disproportionately, they ought to take priority and say what to prioritize. We ought to listen to projects [they want]. And I think that's the middle ground that we can find with this. That, yes, we ought to prioritize what they need, because they are so susceptible, but the full scope of projects that we ought to do to combat this and make sure that we're making change shouldn't be focused only on these areas. I don't think we need the bottleneck ourselves like that” (2A2C).

In terms of specifics of the plan, many expressed uncertainty and potential difficulty in defining who the most affected are:

“Yeah, I agree... there's no way to really define communities most vulnerable. It's a global issue and the best way to do it is to have everyone involved” (2A2B).

“Yeah, I think that's a very good point. I think they're going to have to be specific by what they mean by vulnerable communities. But one thing I would like to add is that we've been talking a lot about how professionals should be in charge of decision-making because they've had the ability to study it. A lot of these vulnerable communities have not been able to become professionals in this field. And so, I think giving them the opportunity is very important since they've been historically underrepresented and due to climate change, they can't, you know, go the training and the jobs they need to fix it. So I think it's important to give them that opportunity in this CCC” (2A2E).

However, people largely agreed that, when initiating a project that deeply involves a community, there must be community agreement, as opposed to complete federal or local government control:

“I just want to put out there that there's more than the federal government. There's also local and state governments which are inherently more local and technically are supposed to be more responsive to local communities. One kind of problem I have with this question is like what about projects that the government would have—whether it's federal or local—that they want to implement. What if the community majority of members in the community say, 'No, we don't like this project. We want nothing to do with it.' That seems a little messed up—in my opinion—forcing any kind of project whatsoever on a community that thinks it's very wrong. It's in the wrong direction or shouldn't exist in the first place” (2A2C).
In this section, we look at the variety of opinions, commentary, and suggestions that were particularly prevalent or of interest in the discussion about the possible implementation of a regional minimum wage in the United States, which would reflect the cost of living of different regions.

There was widespread agreement that people receiving the minimum wage in the United States are currently not paid enough to be able to afford necessities, so change is needed. Many even made references to personal difficulties:

“I definitely agree that most workers aren’t getting paid enough for the work that they’re doing, especially in minimum wage jobs. However... I go to school in Missouri, but in the summer, I live in a very rural place in Illinois, and it makes sense to me that like, the work I would do—I just work at Subway—wouldn’t get paid as much as someone working in Subway in Chicago, because the price of living is so much higher just two hours away. But that’s just kind of like my thought. And also that already happens because a Subway sandwich costs more in Chicago” (2A2C).

“Overall, I’d say I’m for the regional minimum wage. I live in Virginia and I’m working for my university and I get paid $7.25 an hour and I’m just going to say that it’s not enough to make [it by]... it’s just not enough. And so I think that I saw that they’re proposing that it’s nine dollars, starting May 1 and so then they’re going up to 15 slowly... I actually like that idea, but I understand the cons that a lot of employers have, which we can discuss” (2A2D).

“Yeah, absolutely. I totally agree with what the two of you guys have just said, I think minimum wage is just extremely low, especially in places like Virginia. I live in Chicago, and I believe the minimum wage here is $14 [per hour]. Even for Chicago... that is sky high. You have everything that is just not balanced out, and I think that minimum wage does need to be raised in order for people to live a decent life and pay their bills instead of having to pick up two jobs” (2A2D).

“Yeah, it’s crazy. I work—just to be transparent my wage is $15 [per hour], and have to work two jobs that pay that just to live in California. And so, definitely, like when I said earlier, ‘living wages are varied, you know, everywhere,’ it’s true, like, even California, $15 is still, like, people are like, ‘Oh, that’s it?’” (2A2D).
Some noted the difference higher wages can make in terms of affordability and the disparity between rising costs and the stagnation of wages which can lead to poverty:

“I used to work at a job where I got paid $7 an hour without taxes and it took me about 42 hours a week to get paid what I’m getting paid at my current job with $11 an hour. So seeing the difference and how it’s easier for me to save up for the apartment that I’m getting for school, having a livable regional wage would be way more beneficial than what’s currently like average” (2A2D).

“Yeah, I’m sure we’re all aware of the example where... college tuition has gone up like 300% and the minimum wage has not. So I also want to talk about the thousand dollars a month. I think that would be really good and benefit a lot of people. I am not sure how that would work if that means cutting existing programs, so I’m not going to speak about that. My concern is okay, so if you were renting your living, your landlords are just going to up [your rent] another thousand dollars and then it's just gonna be gone, it's not going to affect you, not going to keep it. So if we implement that, we need to make sure that there are laws about rent spikes and laws about... what's the rent cap for this area? [It has to be] set so that they can't just adjust to take that extra thousand and then you're left with” (2A2H).

“I feel like adopting a regional minimum wage could help combat poverty, especially in my town, Pennsylvania’s minimum wage is still at $7.25 and I at one point was working at a factory where we didn't even make $10 an hour working 40 hours a week. So, I feel like the minimum wage was originally put in place to be able to be a living wage for a family. I feel like that's what it needs to get back to, but at the same time... I feel like we need a little bit more research, but I know New York has done it and their economy is doing...” (2A1C).

Some showed anger about funding going into other projects, such as military investment, instead of into things like a higher minimum wage:

“Yeah, it's $7.25 here and I don't believe anybody should have to work two jobs to support themselves. That's ridiculous. That's absolutely stupid. To put it in reference one, F-35 fighter jet costs 79 million dollars. We can find the money in the budget. They can find the money in the budget for this. Maybe not necessarily putting it down to the businesses to change the wage. But through maybe a federal stipend on top of your paycheck, kind of like the federal government takes the taxes out, maybe they put something in. I definitely think it's because it needs to help the people and especially in places like Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, where it's even worse than a lot of other places... something can be done easily” (2A2D).

The main opposition to the plan came from the fact that some people worried that industries would move to places where the minimum wage would be lower. Others also opposed raising the minimum wage due to a concern that it would unfairly reward work that they did not deem deserves more financial input:
“The money obviously has to be coming from somewhere, right? When we talk about paying people for work, that is not directly proportional to the value of that work within a market because we can't be paying people sixteen dollars an hour to put aglets on shoelaces... that value is lost. And that worth is not present, we have to falsify it and that's going to directly come out of taxpayer pockets. It’s the only place that it can be. National spending is bad enough as it is. We don’t need to be paying for other people's jobs that don't pay for themselves and have innate worth” (2A2C).

“Yeah, I just want to say I kind of agree with that. I don't think the value of your work is really determined by where you live. This doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I mean in my opinion wages are more or less driven by supply and demand, [if] there's a ton of workers the wages are going to go down. If there's a shortage... wages go up. So the whole point of the minimum wage in my opinion is to keep the wage high enough to where people aren't unable to pay rent, going hungry and stuff. And I mean if it's regional it's just like this conditions can change really quickly like covid can hit or there can be like an economic crisis in a little area and like if it's all done out of federal regional, it doesn't work” (2A2C).

Or that we already have a system similar to the regional minimum wage because some places pay higher wages:

“Well, I just think a regional minimum wage is a really terrible idea because we already kind of have that in places like Seattle, Atlanta. The minimum wage is a little bit higher than in the countryside, but... I just feel like the work isn't that different. In a lot of places like people live in rural Georgia, but they still work at Pizza Hut. That's where I'm working this summer in rural Georgia, and so many people would be helped and lift it up. If the minimum wage has risen at the end of the day, all workers in this country are paid less than what they produce for their employer, or else the employer would it make any profit. So most businesses are already kind of underpaying their workers. That's how I see it at least” (2A2C).

“I think that regional minimum wages shouldn't be adopted... We should have a flat minimum wage and then cities where it's really expensive should just create their own higher, minimum wage because the problem that I saw a lot was that it doesn't allow people to escape impoverished communities. I live in a very rural area and I would not be able to afford to move to a city for a job or an opportunity if I was getting paid ten dollars an hour when it costs like twenty two dollars an hour to live there. So I think that we should have a flat rate and then if you live in like New York or something, they should have a higher [rate]” (2A2F).

Others were concerned that if the regional minimum wage were to be implemented at a state level, businesses in smaller towns would have to pay more even if that would not correspond to a higher price of living in those towns:

“I'm assuming the regional minimum wage should be rural versus urban areas because if it was done by states that would just be stupid. I mean Atlanta is a city in the state of Georgia. There are people living way out in the sticks or living in a high-rise in downtown.... But also I mean even in rural parts of the state people need cars. [You] can't work without a car in most places, you got to drive and [pay for] car insurance. Again look if you live in a city you also spend a lot of the time medic especially in Atlanta. So regional just doesn't make a lot of sense” (2A2C).
The issue of automation was also brought up, in specific as a concern that higher wages would lead industries to simply replace workers with technology:

“So something that's going to be more and more of an issue these days is when you're looking at the sort of low-end low-skilled jobs, a lot of people are not just competing with other people. They're competing with the emerging automation technology and the higher the minimum wage, the less power the individual has to compete with these automation technologies” (2A2E).

**Universal Basic Income**

This section sheds light on the reasoning people used when deliberating on the proposal of a universal basic income (UBI). Some participants agreed that a UBI would be an effective way of reducing poverty. In this vein, some participants expressed the view that certain basic necessities should be covered, and that a UBI would be an effective way of creating an economic floor. Some mentioned that people should have enough money to pay rent and other necessities and that although $1000 was not a lot of money, it would be a good starting point. As one person shared:

“I think $1,000 a month cash grants for everybody sounds like a great idea because at very minimum it would guarantee housing for everybody. And like, I know that I know that $1,000 is not actually that much, but it can be so much to everyone because nobody can afford a single one-bedroom apartment anywhere in the United States right now with the minimum wage that we have, and this way, we can make sure that we get people off the streets and into proper housing” (2A2F).

One participant drew on their personal experience dealing with social programs to support the UBI proposal:

“I definitely agree with the idea of universal basic income. I have been having difficulty with trying to get any sort of services right now with a disability. And with unemployment I lost my job due to my disability, I wasn't able to continue working there. It was just too much for me. So having a universal basic income. I know, in my personal situation it would be incredibly helpful, I could pay for my car. I could pay for my food, I could pay for my medication [and] I would still have a little bit leftover that I could put into saving. So, if anything does happen, unexpected medical bills, I would be able to actually pay it on time” (2A2F).

Interestingly, one participant highlighted the potential benefits of a UBI in terms of changing what we value in our society:

“Another thing about UBI is that it helps to sort of reduce the idea that our value is inherently attached to our economic output. If we have enough of a, if we have enough money at our disposal to do things that aren't exactly economically productive, we can focus on things, like social capital. We can, we can do things that improve community, cohesion, and family, cohesion, which isn't exactly economically productive but does help with the quality of life, it does help with our social health, our mental health, and it overall is probably good for the economy—even if you’re worried about that” (2A1C).
Several participants brought up the COVID-19 stimulus checks, using this as a recent reference point from their own lives for what it would be like to receive a UBI. As one participant shared:

“I’m actually for this because I got a stimulus check throughout the pandemic and it was just kind of nice. I was able to get extra act courses, act courses and to help my future” (2A2A).

Another participant expressed:

“I am actually a big proponent of this especially after seeing it in action during the COVID crisis with the stimulus checks. I believe that receiving $1000 a month is more than enough to not only help you pay your bills, not fully cover your bills, but help you pay your bills and other expenses, and that money will be going right back into the economy” (2A2G).

Other participants drew a distinct conclusion from the COVID stimulus example:

“I feel like it's a nice idea, but at the same time, I know a lot of people, especially now who didn't really need it and use it to just buy whatever. So, it's kind of sad because I know there are people out there who really need it and it would help a lot. So that's why I'm saying, maybe it could be something that you apply for or that you're guaranteed, you will get it but only if you really need it. That's the only thing because I've seen people like spending on Airpods or like something that they didn't really need but I don't know” (2A2D).

“I remember reading that the stimulus payments phased out for families, making over a hundred thousand a year or something along those lines. I feel like this could do that too. So we could have sort of a scale where it phases out for people that are making enough money already to live comfortably without getting any universal basic income. And then, since we're not paying all of those people that already make plenty of money, we could focus more of the money on people actually struggling” (2B2E).

However, most participants did not seem to think that a UBI was a viable option for alleviating poverty. Many participants believe that assistance to the poor and poverty alleviation efforts should be more targeted—more specifically geared to those who need it. Many participants wondered whether the money might not be better spent on revamping existing welfare programs or expanding access to healthcare. For one, participants were worried at the prospect of replacing other welfare programs with UBI. One participant expressed:

“I would love to have an extra thousand dollars in my bank account every month, but I feel like I'm not necessarily somebody who needs it. And I think that there should be some sort of like, threshold of like if you make this much money a month and you're no longer eligible for it, I would much rather have this sort of money go towards other programs like relieving student loan debt and I do think that the welfare systems in the United States could be certainly reformed” (2B2F).

Several participants wondered whether boosting consumer spending and thus stimulating the economy was more important than ensuring that those who need governmental assistance have access to it. For example, one person said:
Aside from just money, and when we talk about equal opportunity, I think another important thing is that we should also focus on resources. We should give everybody a good education system, a good healthcare system...so that everybody can have the same amount of resources. UBI will be spent on consumer spending. But how will that improve somebody's opportunities to increase their own income over time?" (2B2G).

Another said:

“I think this is more of an equality versus equity argument. I definitely think this is more towards trying to be equal when we should be focused on equity and trying to help those that need it the most instead of giving every single American above 18, $1000” (2A2Q).

Yet another person expressed:

“I'm actually against it because I think if you do this you give every person a thousand dollars a month. But then you have to cut social programs that are designed to help people who are poor or need help most. So you give a little bit of help to everybody and you reduce the amount of help you give to people who need it. Most and I don't think that's a good idea” (2A2U).

For another, many participants said that they themselves do not need the extra $1000 a month, or that people like Bill Gates and Jeff Bezos did not need it either. However, the common counter-argument here that the UBI could get “taxed back” did not get brought up much. Some did mention, though, that providing a UBI, and taxing it back from those who do not need it, can help alleviate the red tape associated with applying for welfare programs because those who depend on such public services would automatically get the money.

Several participants mentioned that $1000 is not worth the same for everyone--specifically, many people pointed out that depending on where an individual lives, that same net sum would be worth different amounts. Here it is worth mentioning that participants discussed the UBI proposal after having discussed the regional minimum wage proposal; therefore, regional differences in income might have been prevalent in people’s minds. As one participant explained:

“I think that changing that also based on the cost of living to various regions, if it were to be implemented as a good idea. But in general, I support universal basic income because I believe that gives people the opportunity to pull themselves out of poverty, by allowing them to invest in certain elements” (2A2E).

“I think that it's good to just generally give someone that extra boost of 1,000 but the problem is accounting for differences in state. Like in the state of California thousand dollars, you know, won't even get you through a month's rent. Like you know what, the prices that we have on housing and everything. It's just not enough and I think, unfortunately, like creating a generalization is great because it removes the stigma, but at the same time, I think it's just best to be honest and give the people who need more money, the money instead of giving it to people who don't need it. And I just wish that was a better focus and we could be patient with one another about it” (2A1M).
Many participants suggested that a program with certain limitations might be a better alternative to UBI. One person suggested:

“I do think that there should be requirements that it wouldn't go to everybody that is eligible to work. I think it should be everybody that is either working or is making an attempt to find a job. Like if somebody is just saying just flat out doesn't want a job. I don’t think they should be getting that extra money because that acts as incentives as to not get a job” (2A2G).

Finally, some participants brought up the funding sources of UBI. While some did note that the funding might come from cutting other welfare programs, some mentioned a wealth tax as a possible resource or even cutting military or police budgets:

“I'm just kind of like wondering why it has to come from other welfare programs. Why can't it come from like military funding or something? Especially if it's going to help the country?” (2A2U).

“So, I would 100% support this if it came out of the military budget, I mean, I think they get a ridiculous amount of money to fight wars we can't even find on a map. Amongst other budgets as well, that it could be taken from that aren't necessarily welfare” (2A2C).

“I think the key for any of this to happen would be a paradigm shift of the entire structure of our government. Because let's just say, the money does have to come from somewhere for example, the military budget, or police budget, there are so many lobbyists and people with invested interest that won’t want to see something like that happen. So as difficult as it sounds, I think a paradigm shift of our structure would be necessary” (2A2U).

A common thread among several of the aforementioned arguments is the “astronomical cost of UBI” (in the words of one participant). Whether it means being worried about reducing other welfare programs or whether it is proposing that instead of a UBI a cash grant program with certain limitations would be better, the conversation in most groups gravitated towards the central concern of the proposal’s cost.

**Wealth Tax**

There was a strong consensus among participants that a wealth tax is an efficient way to ensure downward redistribution. Many participants believe that millionaires and billionaires do not need the amount of wealth that they have and that being taxed at a higher rate would benefit society as a whole. However, although most participants seemed to agree that the wealth tax was a strong proposal, in theory, many worried that tax evasion (e.g., offshore investments, or other loopholes) would prevent this kind of tax from being effective. Therefore, it is not so much that people doubt the proposal itself, but rather that they doubt that it is feasible or pragmatic.

In nearly every single group, at least one person brought up the idea that the amount of wealth amassed by some individuals was not justified. One participant expressed:
“I want to just flat out say that I am absolutely in favor of this, you know, the people who make that much money. Like I mean you could say that you know they made some really valuable contributions or something and so they might deserve some of it but you know there’s so many people out there who just you know just got their kind of through luck, right? I mean let’s just take Jeff Bezos or you know anybody making a hundred billion dollars let’s say you know I as a software engineer might make like a hundred thousand dollars and that’s like a really good salary, right? You’re not going to say that people who made a hundred billion dollars, work like a million times better than me, because that’s how much more money than they make that me. They don’t really deserve that much money. It just so much, you can’t even comprehend it” (2A2A).

Or, as another person put it:

“I think we should totally go ahead and tax the wealthy…I think that even if they work super, super hard for the money, maybe that’s just still a little bit too much money. I don’t think it should be possible to earn like 50 million dollars even if you suffer every day. I don’t know if that should be a possible thing to do” (2A2C).

Another shared:

“I used to believe in trickle-down economics, but it just didn’t play out. So this is something that I could support as far as I know about it. But yeah, you don’t need a million a billion dollars to live, sorry. It’s just not not necessary” (2A2B).

Yet another person explained:

“I don’t feel like anyone needs to have that amount of money in general, that’s just a lot of money and you can’t ever spend that. If you’re, if you have a large income coming in every month, you’re not gonna be able to spend all of that. So I feel like taxing it is a pretty good solution so that that money can go to other people who under the poverty line or just you know regular people…I feel like it’s just a good solution” (2A2E).

As another person expressed:

“I think we need to do something. I don’t think the way that it is now…something needs to change where wealthy people are being taxed more. I don’t know exactly how but something needs to change because how it is now, it’s not working” (2A2E).

Many participants agreed that a wealth tax would be a good way to redistribute wealth within the economy. As one person articulated:

“I just agree that it should be a thing. I don’t know, I don’t think that people need that much money. And even if it were like 3% or 2%, they still have so much money to work with, like, outside of that. It’s just like, what do you need it for to buy expensive things. Nice things. So like, I just think that it would be good to implement. It would be nice to redistribute it a little bit instead of just keep pulling it apart. As in like, more people are in poverty and more people get wealthier and wealthier as time goes on. I just think it’s a nice way to redistribute” (2A2B).
Another participant expressed:

“I definitely agree on that, proposal. I think I suppose it would be amazing for us. I think I truly truly believe that person does not need over a billion dollars to live...In my opinion, I think that imposing that wealth tax would truly help everyone else a lot. And it would help that money to get back into the flow of the economy” (2A2D).

To which another person replied:

“Yes, I strongly agree. I think that this should be like going on right now. I think that no one needs to be a millionaire or even a billionaire that just is ridiculous to me. I think the two, three percent that they're going to give. It's not going to hurt them at all...I think that we need to tax those people that have this huge income instead of the ones that are struggling to live day-to-day” (2A2D).

The most frequently mentioned counter-argument to the wealth tax was the concern that it would incentivize tax evasion. As one participant explained:

“I think they're absolutely right in assuming that imposing a wealth tax would simply incentivize people to come up with more creative ways of hiding or distributing their wealth“ (2B1A).

Another contended:

“My main thought is that in this country, there's a lot of loopholes in a lot of ways that people who are that degree of wealthy are able to sort of get out of paying taxes, you know there are write-offs for things like the size of your home office, whether or not you have a certain type or size of car. I'm concerned that, you know, there will be ways to sort of get out of this. And that a lot of sort of high-level accountants will really start looking into it as soon as something like this was passed. I'm not sure about the practicality of it for that reason” (2A2B).

However, there was not a consensus on this matter. One participant noted:

“All of the cons that I'm reading here under the agenda just seemed incredibly tepid. I mean, it seems like the best argument is, well, if you pass laws raising taxes, they just won't follow the laws, okay? The tax loopholes that they are abusing are written into the laws and when they're written into the laws that's delivered because it's designed to help them do so. So yes. Obviously, another part of the equation should be, you know, taking actions to prevent these kinds of actions to evade paying fair taxes. It just seems like a weak counter-argument to me” (2A2E).

Interestingly, one participant suggested:

“Well, this isn't the case for everyone who may make 50 million or 1 billion dollars. Like a lot of those people do own companies and they don't pay their employees a fair living wage. So, it means if they're so worried about getting taxed, they can also increase their employees' salaries. I guess you earn your salary and then some of that wealth can get redistributed back towards their employees instead of like the highest yield” (2B1A).
Some participants did bring up the argument that the wealthy should keep their wealth, as they have worked for it. One participant said:

“*I'm not totally for it, but if they worked hard like put their business up for that and like in a position where they no longer need to work and their business, just generates money for them. I'm not sure how they would feel personally to have to support the others and their autonomy who aren't doing as well as they are, because I feel like it's hard earned money that they put in effort way beforehand to make*” (2A1A).

One of the counter-arguments for the wealth tax that was brought up was that companies could move to other countries in an effort to evade taxes. With respect to this argument, one respondent remarked:

“*Something that just really bothers me about big businesses when they go to other countries and they exploit those workers, pay them like pennies if that to work, you know, 14-hour shifts so that way we can have our little plastic beads for Mardi Gras. Or we can have our coffee, our oil or clothing at a cheaper cost*” (2A2D).

While not explicitly related to the wealth tax, this participant’s quote reveals an interesting perspective of how a wealth tax might operate in a global context. Another participant expressed a different view:

“*If these businesses or these you know, extremely wealthy people, decide they are tired of this wealth tax and they want to move elsewhere, take the business to, you know, overseas. I don't even think that's big of that big of a problem anymore, because I think their presence in America is almost draining, you know, as a drain on the economy, they’re monopolizing other businesses, small business, putting small businesses out of business, so if they want to leave, I say you know let them, like boost the economy, get more small businesses to grow*” (2A2E).
REPRESENTATIVENESS

In this section, “participants” refers to people who completed the pre-survey, deliberation, and post-survey, whereas “non-participants” refers to people who completed the pre-survey but did not attend the deliberation.

Final Participant Sample - Demographics

In reference to demographics, the final participant sample was skewed in several ways. The most prominent skew was in the percentage of participants that were currently enrolled in an institution of higher education. 69.33% of the participants in our sample were enrolled in an institution of higher education at the time of the deliberation. This is more than three-fold higher than the general population, where only 19.28% of young adults in this age group are enrolled. Conversely, the percentage of participants who were not, and were never, enrolled in an institution of higher education was 11.98% in our sample, compared to 54.65% in the general population. The remaining portion is made up of degree-holders who were no longer enrolled in an institution at the time of the deliberation. This is a significant skew, and it moves the deliberation away from being entirely representative of the general population of this age range, and instead towards being representative of the general population of college students.

Other skews appeared in the data as well, although none as significant as the one relating to degree of education. In terms of race, Asian participants were significantly overrepresented, making up 19.69% of the sample, while only making up 6.04% of the population in this age range. Participants of two or more races were also overrepresented, making up 10.10% of the sample, compared to 4.22% of the population. Whites and Blacks were both underrepresented, making up 45.89% and 12.16% of the sample respectively, as opposed to 67.63% and 14.71% of the population respectively. The skew in race is likely to be a byproduct of the skew in university enrollment, as the racial makeup of universities differ from the racial makeup of the country as a whole, with Asians seeing a significantly higher enrollment rate than any other race within the 18- to 24-year-old age group.

Final Participant Sample - Political Affiliation

We see another significant skew when examining our participant sample based on political affiliation. According to The Institute of Politics at Harvard University, in 2014, 37% of 18- to 29-year-olds affiliated with the Democratic Party, and 24% affiliated with the Republican Party. Our participant sample was significantly skewed in favor of Democratic Party affiliation, with 61% of the sample affiliating with the Democratic Party, and only 7% with the Republican Party. Once again, this is partially explained by the overrepresentation of college students in our sample. Such a significant skew limits what conclusions can be drawn from the deliberation. Not only does it make weighting difficult, it also presents issues that cannot be accounted for through weighting.
For instance, weighting can be applied to the pre- and post-surveys in order to predict what a representative sample would look like. However, weighting cannot be applied to the experience of the deliberation, which was likely to be overly influenced by Democrat-affiliated participants. The experience itself has a skew which cannot be corrected by weighting the product of the experience.

**Nonparticipant Drop-Off**

Part of the skew in the sample can be attributed to drop-off from the pre-survey to the post-survey. Looking at the combined makeup of participants and non-participants gives interesting insight into this. Overall, 46% of people who completed a pre-survey were enrolled in an institution of higher education and 54% were not enrolled. However, 66% of the enrolled students ended up following through and attending the deliberation, compared to only 26% of not enrolled participants. This may be explained by the structure that being enrolled in a university brings; perhaps college students received more reminders from their university about the deliberation, or perhaps they are more accustomed to engaging in these types of studies. Another explanation could be that college students are less likely to work full-time, and therefore have more flexibility in their schedule than the rest of the population. This extreme skew in drop-off may be the fundamental reason for the other skews that we see in the deliberation, such as the extreme overrepresentation of Democratic affiliation and the overrepresentation of Asians.
CONCLUSION

- "Shaping Our Future" was an opportunity for young people ages 18-29 to discuss topics ranging from electoral reform to climate change to economic inequality. The surveys and transcripts from the event reveal that the participants gained more knowledge about the American system of government, and more people developed opinions on the issues presented.

- Participants emphasized the value of learning from opposing viewpoints and participating in discussions with people who held different views.

- This sampling is aimed to show how the public may change their viewpoints on issues if they become more informed and intentionally engage in this way with others.

- We hope this event shows the potential for how deliberative polling can help the public better understand and debate important policy issues.
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APPENDIX

Appendix I. Statistical Analysis

We collected data points on participants’ answers to the survey questions both before and after the deliberation. To see all the raw data, see the following link:
https://stanford.box.com/s/2kwdm5y6mudaeydn4h1g3ysaiizk7col

Appendix II. Briefing Materials

Briefing materials were distributed to each participant in advance of the event to give more context on the topics to be discussed. To access them, see the following link:
https://stanford.box.com/s/2kwdm5y6mudaeydn4h1g3ysaiizk7col

Appendix III. Pre-Deliberation Survey

Participants took a pre-deliberation survey with the following questions. Each question is introduced

1. (Outlook 1) On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “extremely poorly” and 10 is “extremely well,” how poorly or well would you say the system of democracy in the United States works these days?
2. (Outlook 2) On a different 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “extremely unconcerned” and 10 is “extremely concerned,” how concerned are you about climate change?

Now, we’re going to ask you some questions about policies that are of concern to the public. Not everyone has thought much about these, but we do need to ask them. If we come to one you haven’t thought much about, just indicate ‘no opinion’, and move on to the next one.

3. Here are some proposals on the role of young people and the environment.
   On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is strongly oppose, 10 is strongly favor and 5 is in the middle, how strongly would you oppose or support the following? If you don’t have an opinion on a proposal, feel free to select “no opinion.”
   a. (Proposal 1) The Civilian Climate Corps should receive enough funding to have 3 million corps members, compensated with a living wage.
   b. (Proposal 2) The communities most vulnerable to climate change should determine the projects and priorities of the Civilian Climate Corps.

4. Now, on the same scale, here are some proposals about capitalism.
   a. (Proposal 3) The federal government should adopt a regional minimum wage that reflects differences in the cost of living and wages across the U.S.
   b. (Proposal 4) The federal government should increase the minimum wage to $15/hour.
   c. (Proposal 5) The federal government should give cash grants of $1,000/month (also known as Universal Basic Income) to all adults at least 18-years-old.
   d. (Proposal 6) The federal government should impose an annual wealth tax of 2% on any wealth over $50 million and 3% for wealth over $1 billion.
5. And, still on the same scale, here are some proposals about electoral reform.

a. (Proposal 7) Continue to elect the president through the Electoral College, in which the presidential candidate that receives a majority of electoral votes wins.

b. (Proposal 8) Replace the Electoral College with a "national popular vote," where the presidential candidate that receives the most votes wins.

c. (Proposal 9) Continue to use winner-take-all to award electoral votes to presidential candidates, in which all of a state’s electoral votes goes to the candidate that gets the most votes in that state.

d. (Proposal 10) We should use fractional proportional to award electoral votes to presidential candidates, in which a share of a state’s electoral votes goes to each of the top two candidates based on the fraction of the vote they win in that state.

e. (Proposal 11) We should continue to use plurality voting when casting votes for president, in which each voter selects one presidential candidate on their ballot and the candidate with the most votes wins.

f. (Proposal 12) We should use ranked-choice voting when casting votes for president, in which each voter ranks the presidential candidates on their ballot and the candidate with a majority of votes wins.

6. On a different 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, how unimportant or important are the following aspects of national service in national service programs like AmeriCorps?

a. (Motivations 1) Student loan forgiveness
b. (Motivations 2) Provide career pathway after service
c. (Motivations 3) Being paid a living wage during service
d. (Motivations 4) Be mandatory for those above 18 years of age
e. (Motivations 5) Provide on the job training
f. (Motivations 6) Be part of a labor union
g. (Motivations 7) Develop community bonds with participants
h. (Motivations 8) An alternative to a four-year diploma
i. (Motivations 9) An apprenticeship component

7. And, on the same 0 to 10 scale, how unimportant or important would it be for the following entities to provide national service opportunities?

a. (Motivations 10) The federal government
b. (Motivations 11) State governments
c. (Motivations 12) Local governments
d. (Motivations 13) Private companies
e. (Motivations 14) Non-profit companies
f. (Motivations 15) Universities and colleges
8. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is strongly disagree and 10 is strongly agree, how strongly would you disagree or agree with the following statements?

a. (Motivations 16) Climate change is the most pressing global issue of the 21st century.
b. (Motivations 17) The US government has managed climate change well.
c. (Motivations 18) Corporations are better positioned to tackle climate change.
d. (Motivations 19) A national service program on climate action, even with a living wage, would draw little interest.
e. (Motivations 20) A national service program on climate action, which guarantees employment afterwards, would draw little interest.
f. (Motivations 21) The government has a responsibility to invest in economic recovery efforts aimed at helping youth populations.
g. (Motivations 22) People do not pay their fair share in taxes based on income levels.
h. (Motivations 23) Everyone has a right to be guaranteed financial income.
i. (Motivations 24) The federal government’s number one priority should be on reducing our national debt.
j. (Motivations 25) Lowering taxes on wealthy people and corporations encourages investment and economic growth.
k. (Motivations 26) Replacing the Electoral College with a national popular vote is an important proposal that should be a political priority.
l. (Motivations 27) Replacing winner-take-all with fractional proportional is an important proposal that should be a political priority.
m. (Motivations 28) Replacing plurality voting with ranked-choice voting is an important proposal that should be a political priority.
n. (Motivations 29) The Electoral College is a good system for electing presidents.
o. (Motivations 30) States are fairly represented in the Electoral College.
p. (Motivations 31) Everyone’s votes should have equal weight.

9. Here are some things that people find more or less important for themselves or society to have. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is in the middle, how important or unimportant would you say each of the following is to you?

a. (Values 1) Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities
b. (Values 2) Seeing to it that governing bodies are inclusive and diverse
c. (Values 3) Seeing to it that everyone that wants can participate in politics
d. (Values 4) Ensuring that everyone who wants to can participate in national service programs
e. (Values 5) Making sure policymakers come from communities that have been historically underrepresented
f. (Values 6) Leaving people and companies free to compete economically
g. (Values 7) Making sure the government does what the people want
h. (Values 8) Earning as much money as possible
i. (Values 9) Being able to get a good education
10. Now we’d like you to think about the people who disagree strongly with you on the issues we’ve been asking you about. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is strongly disagree and 10 is strongly agree, how strongly would you disagree or agree with the following statements?

a. (Mutual Respect 1) They just don’t know enough.
b. (Mutual Respect 2) They believe some things that are untrue.
c. (Mutual Respect 3) They are not thinking clearly.
d. (Mutual Respect 4) They have good reasons; there just are better ones on the other side.
e. (Mutual Respect 5) They are looking out for their own interests.
f. (Mutual Respect 6) They are motivated by wanting their political party to win more presidential elections.

11. On the same 0 to 10 scale, how strongly would you disagree or agree with the following statements?

a. (Political Efficacy 1) Public officials care a lot about what people like me think.
b. (Political Efficacy 2) Most political issues are so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on.
c. (Political Efficacy 3) People like me don’t have any say about what the government does.
d. (Political Efficacy 4) People who are disproportionately impacted have important contributions to make in public policy conversations.
e. (Political Efficacy 5) I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to.
f. (Political Efficacy 6) I have a good understanding of how the Electoral College works.
g. (Political Efficacy 7) My vote is important in a presidential election.
h. (Political Efficacy 8) I will likely vote in future presidential elections.

Now here are some factual questions to which not everyone may know the right answers. Please note only one answer is correct. If you come to a question to which you don’t know the answer, don’t worry about it. Just select “can’t say” and move on to the next one.

(The correct answer choice is underlined for the following knowledge questions.)

12. (Knowledge 1) Which political party holds the majority in the Senate?
   () Democrat
   () Republican
   () Independent
   () Can’t say

13. (Knowledge 2) Which political party holds the majority in the House?
   () Democrat
   () Republican
   () Independent
   () Can’t say

14. (Knowledge 3) Which of the following is true about how presidents are elected?
   () The candidate who wins the most votes nationwide becomes the president.
   () The candidate who wins the most states becomes the president.
   () The candidate who wins the majority of electoral votes becomes the president.
   () Can’t say.
15. **(Knowledge 4)** Which of the following is true about electoral votes?

( ) Each state has the same number of electoral votes.
( ) Each state has the same number of electoral votes as it has members in the United States Congress.
( ) Each state has a certain number of electoral votes in exact proportion to its population.
( ) Can’t say.

16. **(Knowledge 5)** Most states give their electoral votes to candidates in which of the following ways?

( ) They award all electoral votes to the candidate who gets the most votes.
( ) They award a share of their electoral votes to each candidate depending on what proportion of the vote each candidate receives.
( ) They award electoral votes to the candidate who gets the most votes in each Congressional district.
( ) Can’t say.

17. **(Knowledge 6)** Which of the following is true about swing states?

( ) They have the most electoral votes in the country.
( ) They contain the majority of the nation’s population.
( ) Most general-election campaign appearances occur in them.
( ) Can’t say.

18. **(Knowledge 7)** Which of the following is true about ranked-choice voting?

( ) It has never been used in a presidential election.
( ) It ensures that the winning candidate has majority support.
( ) It ensures that the winning candidates has the most first-choice votes.
( ) Can’t say.

19. **(Knowledge 8)** Which one of the following Presidents used national service programs to address an unemployment crisis caused by the Great Depression?

( ) Calvin Coolidge
( ) William H. Taft
( ) Herbert Hoover
( ) Franklin D. Roosevelt
( ) Can’t say

20. **(Knowledge 9)** Approximately how much is an Americorp volunteer’s living stipend?

( ) less than $5,000
( ) about $15,000
( ) about $40,000
( ) over $60,000
( ) Can’t say

21. **(Knowledge 10)** Which of the following countries have experimented with Universal Basic Income?

( ) Finland
( ) Thailand
( ) The United Kingdom
( ) South Africa
( ) Can’t say
22. **(Knowledge 11)** What's the definition of a wealth tax in the United States?

( ) An annual tax on the net wealth of a person above an exemption threshold
( ) A tax on individuals income
( ) A tax that would substitute existing forms of taxation
( ) A tax on corporations
( ) Can’t say

And lastly, here are some demographic questions.

23. **(Registered to Vote)** Are you registered to vote?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Unsure

24. **(Voted Before)** Have you ever voted in a presidential election?

( ) Yes
( ) No

25. **(Political Ideology)** Some people consider themselves liberal, some consider themselves conservatives, and others place themselves in-between. Where would you place yourself on this spectrum from extremely liberal (0) to extremely conservative (10)?

26. **(Political Party Preference)** What is your political party affiliation?

( ) Democrat
( ) Independent
( ) Republican
( ) Other political party

27. **(Independent Party Lean)** Towards which political party do you lean, if at all?

( ) Lean Democratic
( ) No lean
( ) Lean Republican
( ) Lean towards another political party

28. **(Democratic Party Loyalty)** Do you consider yourself a strong Democrat or a not-very-strong Democrat?

( ) Strong Democrat
( ) Not-very-strong Democrat

29. **(Republican Party Loyalty)** Do you consider yourself a strong Republican or a not-very-strong Republican?

( ) Strong Republican
( ) Not-very-strong Republican
30. (Region) Do you live in a metropolitan area (urban and suburban) or non-metropolitan area (rural)?
   () Metro area
   () Non-metro area

31. (Sex) What is your gender?
   () Female
   () Male
   () Nonbinary
   () Other

32. (Race and Ethnicity) What racial or ethnic group best describes you?
   () White, non-Hispanic
   () Black, non-Hispanic
   () Asian, non-Hispanic
   () Hispanic
   () Other, non-Hispanic

33. (Education Category) At any time in the last three months, have you been enrolled in school or college?
   () No
   () Yes, in high school
   () Yes, in college
   () Yes, other

34. (Enrollment Status) What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   () Less than high school
   () High school graduate or equivalent (GED)
   () Bachelor’s degree or above

35. (Employment Status) What is your employment status?
   () Working
   () Not working, looking for work
   () Not working, not looking for work
   () Not working, student
   () Other: ____________________________________________

36. (Household Income Level) What was your estimated household income level last year?
   () Less than $19,999
   () $20,000 - $29,999
   () $30,000 - $39,999
   () $40,000 - $49,999
   () $50,000 - $99,999
   () $100,000 - $199,999
   () More than $200,000
   () Prefer not to state
37. **(Interest in Political Issues)** Generally speaking, how interested would you say you are in politics and public affairs in the US, very interested, somewhat interested, not very interested, or not at all interested?

38. **(Interest in Social Issues)** Generally speaking, how interested would you say you are in social issues and movements within the US, very interested, somewhat interested, not very interested, or not at all interested?

39. **(Economic Situation)** When you think of your economic situation today, do you think you are much better off than most, somewhat better off, about the same as most, somewhat worse off, or much worse off than most?

40. **(Read the News on the Internet)** On average, on how many of the past 7 days did you read the news on the internet? If you didn’t read news on the internet, just say 0.

41. **(Talked with Others about Politics)** On average, on how many of the past 7 days did you talk with people about politics and public affairs? If you didn’t talk with people about politics and public affairs, just say 0.

**Appendix IV. Post-Deliberation Survey.**

The post-deliberation survey contained all the questions in the pre-deliberation survey, save for the demographic questions. It also contained the following demographic questions: Interest in Political Issues, Interest in Social Issues, and Economic Situation. Additionally, participants were asked a set of evaluation questions:

How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

a. **(Evaluation 1)** The group discussions gave everyone the opportunity to participate  
b. **(Evaluation 2)** Members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions  
c. **(Evaluation 3)** The discussion platform tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered  
d. **(Evaluation 4)** The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions  
e. **(Evaluation 5)** I learned a lot about people very different from me – about what they and their lives are like

On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is "a waste of time", 10 is "extremely valuable" and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues?

a. **(Evaluation 6)** The small group discussions  
b. **(Evaluation 7)** The briefing materials  
c. **(Evaluation 8)** The plenary session  
d. **(Evaluation 9)** The event as a whole