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On November 6, 2021, a nationally representative sample of 242 young people between the ages of 18 - 29 participated in “Voices of the Future”, a Deliberative Polling event. In addition, this event included a pre-survey only and control group, therefore, across the three groups (pre survey only, Deliberative Polling participants, and control group), over 1500 people in the 18 - 29 age cohort participated.

Developed 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. The goal of the polling process is to reveal the conclusions people would reach if they had the opportunity to become more informed about the topics under consideration. To date, Deliberative Polling has been implemented in over 30 countries and jurisdictions, over 120 projects, and on a variety of topics at varying levels of governments.

This virtual event was the product of Communication 138/238 students enrolled in a Deliberative Democracy Practicum at Stanford University, along with students from Yale University, Slippery Rock University, and Marquette University. The event was supported by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. YouGov, the polling firm, recruited a nationally representative sample of participants for the Deliberative Poll, as well as a control group, and pre-survey only group. Breaking down the demographics, the participant group was 55% female and 40% male, residing in urban and suburban areas (73%). As far as race and ethnicity are concerned, the group was composed of 60% White, 15% Black, 9% Hispanic, 7% Asian, 6% multiple, and 3% “other” participants. Political party preferences noted 48% of participants identifying as Democrat, 38% as independent, 11% as Republicans, with the remaining 2% identifying with other parties or being unsure. Household income levels differed with 16% of participants from households earning less than $19,000, 15% in the $20,000 - $39,000 bracket, 14% in the $40,000 - $59,000 bracket, 22% in the $60,000 - $99,000 bracket, 10% in the $100,000 - $199,999 bracket, and 3% in the more than $200,000 bracket.
In regards to the educational level of participants, 18% never attended a higher education institution, with 30% currently enrolled in college and 11% being higher education degree holders. 61% were not enrolled in educational institutions and 24% were at the time of the event.

Throughout the event, participants engaged in group deliberations about policies regarding social media and democracy, as well as those concerning civic responsibility, and representation. All participants were provided with briefing materials and briefing videos prior to the event to better inform their understanding of the proposals, which provided arguments for and against each proposal that were vetted by experts. Then, deliberations were held virtually on the Stanford Platform for Online Deliberation developed by the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University and the Crowdsourced Democracy Team at Stanford University.

Participants considered the role of social media in our democracy. One discussion had participants explore alternatives to private social media platforms such as a publicly-funded social media platform or a non-profit social media platform. Participants also considered proposals regarding taxes on digital advertising to fund digital literacy initiatives, data privacy and whether social media companies should release this data for academic purposes, and if users have the right to decide how their data is used, and if it should be deleted, lastly whether social media companies should be regulated like other news media organizations.

Following this, the discussion on voter access focused on proposals that would enable a higher degree of voter accessibility. These proposals explored making the federal election a national holiday, adopting same-day voter registration for all states, establishing universal automatic voter registration at the state and federal levels, and restoring voting rights to released felons. The proposals about election reform explored the federal government mandating all states to use non-partisan redistricting commissions, full transparency, and regulation of campaign contributions and spending, and rank choice voting as an alternative in federal, state, and local elections.
A SELECTION OF IMAGES FROM THE VOICES OF THE FUTURE EVENT

THE EVENT WAS HELD ON THE STANFORD PLATFORM FOR ONLINE DELIBERATION.
EXPERT PANELISTS FOR SOCIAL MEDIA

AT THE EVENT

Erhardt Graeff is an assistant professor of social and computer science at Olin College. His work focuses on designing and implementing technology for civic engagement and learning.

Julie Owono is Executive Director of the Content Policy & Society Lab at Stanford University. She is an advocate for global and multi-stakeholder partnerships for the creation of rights-based content policies and regulations.

Richard Epstein is the inaugural Laurence A. Tisch Professor of Law at NYU School of Law. He is the author of “The Classic Liberal Constitution”, which advocates for the return of limited government.

Will Duffield is a policy analyst in the Cato Institute’s Center for Representative Government. His research focuses on the web of government regulation and private rules that govern Americans’ speech online.
Martha Kropf is a professor of public policy at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her research focuses on election administration, political participation, and the policy process.

Miles Rapport is a Senior Practice Fellow at the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at the Harvard Kennedy School. He has written, spoken, and organized widely on issues of American democracy.

Tova Wang is a Senior Practice Fellow at the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at the Harvard Kennedy School. She has focused on issues related to greater political inclusion in the United States, including major studies on increasing voter participation rates among a range of marginalized groups.

Walter Olson is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute’s Robert A. Levy Center for Constitutional Studies. He has written extensively on law, public policy, and regulation.
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, shows how Deliberative Polling can influence and shape public opinion. Significant data findings from a selection of the proposals are discussed in this executive summary.

Proposals Related to Social Media

The first set of proposals revolved around social media, asking participants for their opinions on issues such as the responsibility of social media platforms to not harm public interest, the creation of a publicly-funded social media platform, and the creation of a non-profit social media platform. Support for all three proposals increased after the event, by 5%, 8%, and 4% respectively. While those who identified with the 'in the middle' category decreased by 11% for the first proposal, there was no change in this category for both the proposals regarding the creation of a publicly-funded platform and a non-profit platform. Participants also provided their opinions on the regulation of social media companies. Regarding the proposal that would seek to hold social media companies to stricter federal regulations, support increased by 7% and opposition increased by 2%. On the proposal that advocates for social media companies to be regulated like other news organizations, support decreased from 62% to 59%
Proposals Related to Data Usage

Several policy proposals were related to data usage. One proposal advocated for social media companies to release anonymized user data for academic research. This would mean that social media platforms would be asked to allow academic researchers to view their data for academic purposes. After the event, support for this proposal rose from 37% to 47%, while opposition remained the same, and those in the middle decreased by 1%. Other proposals focused on allowing individuals to decide how social media platforms would utilize their data and granting users the right to delete their data from social media records. While opinions for the former proposal did not change significantly following the event, support for the latter proposal increased by 2% and those in the middle increased by 3%.

Proposals Related to Voting

A number of proposals discussed voting. For example, one proposal advocated for all states to adopt same-day voter registration, meaning that citizens would be able to register at the time of voting. Support for this proposal increased by 7%, while opposition increased by 1%. One proposal advocated for the restoration of voting rights to released felons. This would mean that citizens with a felony who are not currently incarcerated would be eligible to vote. Prior to the event, support for the proposal started at 67% and opposition began at 15%. After the deliberation, the support for the proposal increased to 81%, while opposition dropped to 14%. Participants also provided their opinions on proposals that advocated for the use of ranked choice voting in presidential, congressional, state, and local elections. With the use of ranked choice voting, voters would rank their most to least preferred candidates, rather than selecting one. Support for ranked choice voting in all the proposals increased, while those 'in the middle' dropped for all the proposals after the event.
Proposals Related to National Service

Several policy proposals related to national service. One proposal advocated for everyone to complete one year of national service. This would strongly encourage all people over 18 years old to spend one year in public service. Support for this proposal began at 22% with opposition to the proposal beginning at 47% and those 'in the middle' at 14%. After deliberation, the support for the proposal increased to 27%, and opposition decreased to 44%, while those 'in the middle' remained the same. Another proposal focused on the federal government providing significant incentives for national service. This would mean that the federal government would provide incentives for taking part in and/or completing national service. Initial support for this proposal began at 52% rising by 7% after deliberation. The opposition to the proposal began at 23% and remained the same post-event. Those 'in the middle' started at 18% and decreased by 2% after the discussion.
ON BEING A CITIZEN

In addition to exploring perceptions held by 18-29 year olds on specific topics related to how social media impacts democracy and civic representation and responsibility, participants were asked about the relative importance of a variety of activities as expressions of one’s citizenship. The following five items were ranked highest among the 14 activities listed in the survey.

There was consistency among the top five items between the pre- and post surveys, and the perceived importance of all five of these activities increased between the pre and post-surveys. The relative order remained the same between surveys with the exception of “voting” and “being well-informed on your country’s issues,” which flipped order with respect to importance. “Being well informed about your country’s issues” was the only element that experienced statistically significant positive change between the pre- and post-survey.
Clearly being informed on issues, whether local, national, or global, is associated positively with conceptions of citizenship, as is respecting the rights of others and speaking up for those who do not have a voice. It is not surprising that voting ranks highly, given the amount of national discourse related to voting, and that it is widely viewed as both a right and a responsibility of citizenship.

The most significant positive change in perception was in how participants felt regarding the importance of “being well informed on your country’s issues.” Conversely, the only significant negative changes in perception were in how participants felt about “participating in protests.”

Interestingly, while both military service and participation and national service ranked relatively low on both the pre and post-surveys, the Deliberative Polling event seemed to have had a positive impact on perceptions of the connection of these activities to citizenship. One might speculate that this shift may be related to the lack of national discourse on either subject, and that when 18-29 year olds engage in conversations about these issues, they naturally begin to associate them more closely with concepts of citizenship.
Over the course of the deliberation, participants’ opinions on social media changed significantly. Several responses show that people hold a distrust for social media that perhaps grew over the course of the deliberations. Support grew for the statement that “social media should not harm the public interest” while participants saw their opinions towards social media companies deteriorate (as measured through a clear drop in the feelings thermometer question) and a consistently low level of trust in social media companies to “do the right thing.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL MEDIA SHOULD NOT HARM THE PUBLIC INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the mean, the difference will not be the post event minus the pre event because it is an average difference in response for each person and some people gave no response for before the event, after the event, or both, so their responses were not counted for the difference, even though some may have been counted for the pre or post event score.
# Changes in Opinions: Social Media

## Social Media Companies Feelings Thermometer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>33.83</td>
<td>-3.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>61.42</td>
<td>68.22</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social Media Companies to Do the Right Thing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>-5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>64.42</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While there was broad agreement that “social media should not harm the public interest,” there was disagreement on the proposals that would make social media better. On the one hand, support for regulating social media companies increased after the deliberation. For the delineation of College/No College (participants that currently attend college and/or have 4 year degrees or more in comparison to those who have never, are currently not enrolled in college, and/or have less than a 4 year degree), support from the College group on the regulation of social media increased by 14.7%, and support from the No College group increased by 1.8%.

On the other hand, support decreased for the proposal to “regulate social media companies like other news media.” This suggests that people may have wanted social media to be regulated, but grew aware of the complexities of regulation like other news media. Nevertheless, there remains strong support for social media platforms to be regulated. For the tax on digital advertising, support was initially lower than that of the proposal to “tax digital advertising to fund digital literacy,” but rose after the deliberation. One explanation for this phenomenon may be that deliberators’ opinions changed after discussing the implications of the proposal. It is also possible that people are viewing the tax on digital advertising similarly to a “sin tax” and that their support for the tax is more based on a hope that it would decrease digital advertising than a wish for the additional government revenue it might bring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>67.39%</td>
<td>74.33%</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>17.15%</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>-4.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>-1.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes in Opinions: Social Media

#### Social Media Companies Should Be Regulated Like Other News Media Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>62.58%</td>
<td>59.58%</td>
<td>-3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td>14.79%</td>
<td>-3.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td>19.21%</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The Federal Government Should Implement a Tax on Digital Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>45.09%</td>
<td>56.69</td>
<td>11.60%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>23.18%</td>
<td>18.54%</td>
<td>-4.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD IMPLEMENT A TAX ON DIGITAL ADVERTISING THAT WOULD FUND DIGITAL LITERACY PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>50.16%</td>
<td>51.73%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>16.12%</td>
<td>20.56%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>21.97%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy proposals that focus on protecting individual data privacy rights received very broad support. Large majorities of participants supported statements that individuals should both be able to determine how their data is used and have the right to delete their data. Support for both of these statements remained strong before and after deliberation.
### Changes in Opinions: Social Media

#### Individuals Should Be Able to Decide How Their Data Is Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>87.83%</td>
<td>87.53%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>-1.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Individuals Should Have the Right to Delete Their Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>84.81%</td>
<td>87.55%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>-4.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for individual data privacy rights might have contributed to relative skepticism about proposals that would give other institutions access to data. For example, the proposal to make data accessible for academic research did not receive majority support either before or after deliberation, despite support for the proposal increasing by around 10% during deliberation. The final level of support for this proposal, 46.96%, is low compared to the 87.53% of participants who support the statement that individuals should have the right to determine how their data is used. For the College/No College delineation, participants 'in the middle' in the College group decreased by 2% and participants 'in the middle' in the No College group decreased by 11.9%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SHOULD BE MADE ACCESSIBLE FOR ACADEMIC RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One finding that might counter the narrative emphasizing the importance of data privacy is that there was a significant increase in opposition to the statement that data privacy is too important for social media platforms to share data. While this could reflect a decrease in how much data privacy is valued, this finding could also suggest that during deliberation participants became more considerate of the potential benefits of sharing data in specific contexts; as noted earlier, support for sharing data with academic researchers increased. This is one way in which participants became more inclined to support sharing data in a specific context even though they remain very conscious of data privacy.
While participants overall supported a non-profit or third party social media organization, support was weaker than the support for regulations. Between the two proposals, a non-profit social media organization was slightly more popular at first (with statistical significance); however, after the deliberations, support for both proposals was no longer significantly different, though the changes in support for the publicly funded social media platform were not quite significant. This adds some evidence, however inconclusive, that some skepticism of a government-funded social media platform went away over the course of the deliberation in comparison to a privately funded non-profit social media organization. Regarding the delineation of College/No College for the proposal on creating a public-funded social media platform, those 'in the middle' for the No College group decreased by 14.5%, while support for the proposal increased by 7.9%. Those 'in the middle' for the College group decreased by 5.1%, while support for the proposal also increased by 7.5%. These results suggest that a significant number of participants gained a more clear understanding of their positions on this policy after deliberation.
### CHANGES IN OPINIONS: SOCIAL MEDIA

**CREATE A PUBLICLY-FUNDED SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORM, LIKE PUBLIC RADIO OR PUBLIC TELEVISION, WHERE FUNDS COME FROM PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DONORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>37.39%</td>
<td>45.12%</td>
<td>7.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>22.28%</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td>-3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CREATE A NON-PROFIT SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORM, WHERE THE COMPANY IS OWNED BY AN INDEPENDENT THIRD PARTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>41.40%</td>
<td>45.70%</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>24.97%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>17.77%</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGES IN OPINIONS: SOCIAL MEDIA

PUBLICLY FUNDED SOCIAL MEDIA VS NONPROFIT SOCIAL MEDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly Funded Mean</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Mean</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in support for proposals</td>
<td>-0.49*</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant increase in the belief that your opinion on social media mattered, potentially suggesting an increased appreciation of the power of individual voices on social media for any purpose, benevolent, or nefarious.

HOW MUCH DOES YOUR VOICE MATTER ON SOCIAL MEDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Change Treatment-Control*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in support for proposals</td>
<td>30.11%</td>
<td>37.72%</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Mean</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>-2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>42.24%</td>
<td>40.11%</td>
<td>-2.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This row is included because there was a slight drop in support for this statement in the control group by an average of -0.16, which resulted in there being a statistically significant difference in average change before and after the poll between the deliberation group and the control group.
On this particular topic, comparing the results from the treatment to the results from the control is particularly important. There were significant increases in the level of support for a tax on digital advertising and a tax on digital advertising to fund a digital literacy program, a significant decrease in support for regulating social media, as well as a significant drop in belief in the importance of a safe online community. In the case of regulating social media and having a safe online community, however, there was a statistically significant increase in support for each in the treatment group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Means</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.14°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>40.64%</td>
<td>47.72%</td>
<td>7.03%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>24.55%</td>
<td>18.32%</td>
<td>-6.23%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

° Refers to treatment mean minus control mean
## Changes in Opinions: Social Media

### The Federal Government Should Implement a Tax on Digital Advertising That Would Fund Digital Literacy Programs (Control Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Means</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>42.35%</td>
<td>46.83%</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>18.34%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>19.45%</td>
<td>16.73%</td>
<td>-2.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Media Platforms Should Be Regulated (Control Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Means</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>63.37%</td>
<td>61.01%</td>
<td>-2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>11.13%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGES IN OPINIONS:
SOCIAL MEDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Means</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>75.15%</td>
<td>68.85%</td>
<td>-3.30%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Middle</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>3.97%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible explanation for this is that during the time of this Deliberative Poll, Facebook and other social media platforms were regularly in the news. Facebook was under scrutiny for a leaked report that detailed its challenges with fighting hate speech on the platform, which was the subject of a congressional hearing. Soon after, Facebook Inc. rebranded to Meta, marking a shift away from a social media focus for the parent company of Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp. With this level of news coverage, it is likely that opinions were influenced. With that being said, there were still statistically significant changes among those who attended the deliberations relative to those who did not. Notably, participants had a significant increase in support for regulating social media relative to the control group who had a significant decrease in support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Treatment</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Control</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Means</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGES IN OPINIONS:
VOTING AND CIVICS

Voting Logistics:

Make Federal election day a national holiday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>70.32%</td>
<td>72.10%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>13.58%</td>
<td>14.17%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>9.83%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first proposal discussed on this topic was to make federal election day a federal holiday. This would entail all nonessential federal employees being granted a day off from work, a day which many state and private employers would also grant their employees off from work. Prior to the deliberation, 70.32% of surveyed participants supported such a policy, 13.58% were 'in the middle' towards such a policy, and 9.83% opposed such a policy. After the deliberation, support for the policy increased by 1.78%, while opposition decreased by 0.31%; the percentage of participants with a 'in the middle' stance towards the policy ticked up by 0.58%.
All states should adopt same day registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td>72.07%</td>
<td>8.47%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
<td>11.89%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second policy presented was to institute nationwide same-day voter registration. This means that citizens would be able to register to vote when they went to a polling place the day of an election. Before the event, 63.60% of surveyed participants supported such a policy, 11.87% were 'in the middle' towards such a policy, and 9.88% opposed such a policy. After the event, support for the policy increased by 8.47%, while opposition increased by 0.98%; the percentage of participants with a 'in the middle' stance remained almost unchanged.
Establish universal automatic voter registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>64.97%</td>
<td>68.48%</td>
<td>3.51%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
<td>4.70%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal calls all eligible voters to be automatically registered to vote rather than having to actively seek out and complete registration paperwork. Before the event, 64.97% of surveyed participants supported such a policy, 10.42% were neutral towards such a policy, and 9.54% opposed such a policy. After the event, support for the policy increased by 3.51%, while opposition increased by 4.70%; the percentage of participants with a neutral stance remained similar.
CHANGES IN OPINIONS:
VOTING AND CIVICS

Restore voting rights to felons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>68.65%</td>
<td>82.20%</td>
<td>13.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
<td>-8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td>-1.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal calls for released felons who have had their voting rights eliminated or curbed on account of their felon status to have their status as eligible voters restored. Prior to deliberation, 68.65% of surveyed participants supported such a policy, 17.65% were 'in the middle' towards such a policy, and 7.90% opposed such a policy. After deliberation, support for the policy increased by 13.56%, amounting to a total of 82.20% support, while opposition decreased by 1.91%; the percentage of participants with a 'in the middle' stance towards the policy decreased by 8.40%.
Federal government mandate all states must use non-partisan redistricting commissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>62.44%</td>
<td>68.84%</td>
<td>6.40%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>-2.54%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>-1.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal would give the responsibility for drawing congressional district lines to “Independent Redistricting Commissions,” and take this responsibility away from state legislatures. Before the discussion, 62.44% of surveyed participants supported such a policy, 13.90% were 'in the middle' towards such a policy, and 5.27% opposed such a policy. After the discussion, support for the policy increased by 6.40%, while opposition decreased by 1.13%; the percentage of participants with a 'in the middle' stance towards the policy decreased by 2.54%.
CHANGES IN OPINIONS:
VOTING AND CIVICS

Campaign Contributions and Spending:

Full transparency in campaign contributions and spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>84.27%</td>
<td>84.74%</td>
<td>0.47%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>6.95%</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal would ensure that there is transparency with regards to who donates to campaigns and where the money goes. The participants started off strongly in favor of requiring transparency, with over 84% supporting transparency. After deliberation, that number grew even more. Less than 2% of participants opposed transparency after deliberation.
### Regulate campaign contributions and spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>77.37%</td>
<td>75.38%</td>
<td>-1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>-2.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal would limit individuals and candidates with regards to how much they can spend on campaigns. Overall, people became less strongly opinionated on both sides of the issue, but the vast majority of people were in favor of limiting spending. Over 75% of respondents before and after the deliberation supported regulation of campaign contributions and spending.
### Ranked choice voting in presidential elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>49.39%</td>
<td>61.84%</td>
<td>12.45%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>-1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>-3.47%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The policy proposal would have the presidential election take place under Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) system where voters rank candidates by preference. Initially almost exactly half of the participants showed support for this proposal. As this policy was discussed, the support for RCV increased significantly and the opposition for the policy decreased significantly as well. The support increased from 49.4% to 61.8%. The average support for the policy rose from 6.7/10 to 7.1/10.
Ranked choice voting in congressional elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>57.96%</td>
<td>66.81%</td>
<td>8.85%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
<td>12.98%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td>-1.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal would have congressional elections take place under a Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) system where voters rank candidates by preference. The initial support for using RCV for congressional elections was 58%, higher than the 50% support for using RCV for presidential election. Deliberation saw the increase in support for RCV that rose to 66.8%, a significant increase. Average support for the policy proposal increased from 7.13/10 to 7.51/10.
This policy proposal would have state elections take place under a Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) system where voters rank candidates by preference. The support for the proposal was at 59% before deliberations started and significantly increased to 67.5%. The average support for using RCV for state elections increased from 7/10 to 7.6/10.
Changes in Opinions: Voting and Civics

Ranked choice voting in local elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>57.32%</td>
<td>65.69%</td>
<td>8.36%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>13.72%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>11.07%</td>
<td>9.85%</td>
<td>-1.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy proposal would have local elections take place under a Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) system where voters rank candidates by preference. As with other RCV policy proposals, deliberation saw a significant increase in support of using RCV in elections. Comparing the initial support for RCV in presidential, congressional, state and local elections, we are able to see that opposition to the use of RCV decreases as elections become more local. For local elections, the opposition to the RCV proposal was as low as 11% before deliberation and further decreased to 9.85%. Support for the proposal significantly increased from 57% to 66%, with average support also increasing from 7.2/10 to 7.7/10.
National Year of Service:

Everyone should complete one year of national service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>20.99%</td>
<td>25.91%</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>13.02%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>-1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>58.02%</td>
<td>58.46%</td>
<td>0.45%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposal would strongly encourage that all people between 18 and 29 complete either one year of national service in a community of their choice, or military service. Although support grew considerably for this proposal after deliberation, just over 25% of participants supported this form of national service.
Federal government should provide incentives for national service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Pre-Event</th>
<th>Post-Event</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>51.47%</td>
<td>62.55%</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The Middle</td>
<td>17.38%</td>
<td>12.92%</td>
<td>-4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>21.78%</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
<td>-4.32%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposal would have the government provide significant incentives for young people to participate in national service. Support for this proposal was just over 50% before deliberation but shot up eleven percent to 62.5% after deliberation. Under 20% of participants opposed having strong incentives for national service.
Beyond the Numbers

In this section, this report continues analysis of participant and group interactions and trends as observed in the deliberations undertaken. This section focuses on four phenomena of interest: time and its impact on opinions, preservation of opportunities for dissent, the epistemic considerations around which deliberations progressed, and the factors which contribute to dominance in a deliberation.

Limitations/Methods of Analysis

Due to the volume of the data presented in all of the small group discussion rooms, this section analyzed a subset of samples in order to assess the quality and nature of deliberations. Unless explicitly noted otherwise, analysis was conducted with respect to a limited subset of samples. The section acknowledges that this may result in limitations of this analysis, as such the results are liable to miss out on the data presented in the unselected rooms; however, the sample selected should still give a fair insight with respect to the general trends observed in the deliberations.

Time Allocation

Time allocation was analyzed for each participating group and was generally evenly distributed during both sessions, each lasting approximately 60 minutes. During the Social Media and Democracy session, most groups spent roughly 10 minutes discussing each of the four sets of proposals (A1, A2, A3, and A4). When time allocated was unevenly distributed, the most time was typically spent on A1 (regulation of social media companies), the least time spent on A3 (taxes on digital advertising), and roughly equal time spent on A2 (public and non-profit social media companies) and A4 (data privacy). During the Civic Responsibility and Representation session, most groups spent roughly 12 minutes discussing each of the three sets of proposals (A1, A2, and A3). When the distribution was uneven, the most time was typically spent on A1 (election access and integrity), the next most time spent on A3 (national service for young adults), and the least time spent on A2 (election reform). During both sessions, groups spent around 10 minutes creating and discussing questions to ask experts at the following plenary session.

* For a primer on the Deliberative Polling® methodology employed, see https://cdd.stanford.edu/what-is-deliberative-polling/.
Solidification of Participant Speaking Time Distribution

A feature of the online platform used for this deliberative event is the automatic visualization of speaking time. This visualization showed that while there were fluctuations within every group, the distribution of participant speaking time tended to solidify between 15-20 minutes into the deliberation. Solidification refers to the fact that the participants’ level of participation remained consistent for the remainder of the deliberation. Frequent talkers continued to contribute heavily to the discussion and infrequent talkers continued to contribute less. Every group during the Civic Responsibility and Representation section conformed to this trend, and nearly every group in the Social Media and Democracy section did as well, with the remaining groups taking up to 25 minutes. Additionally, the specific time that speaking time distributions solidified generally corresponded to the last few minutes of the discussion on the first set of proposals (A1), regardless of how long each group spent discussing A1. For example, Social Media and Democracy group a finished discussing A1 at just under 20 minutes into the deliberation, and their participant speaking time distribution solidified around minute 17. Social Media and Democracy group b finished discussing A1 roughly 27 minutes into the deliberation, and their speaking time distribution solidified around minute 22.

As each group was made up of strangers, these first 20 minutes or so are a time for participants to get familiar with each other and work out group dynamics. Since the time taken to solidify speaking time distribution corresponds to the completion of A1, it also suggests that becoming used to the format of a deliberative discussion, as well as, the unique way the group will approach deliberation, is a key part of this group formation.

Impact of Unstable Internet

Unlike many in-person deliberations, this event was held on an online platform, which created some unique challenges. During the event, several participants experienced technical issues that disconnected them from the platform, either briefly or for an extended period. For those who experienced brief connectivity issues during the deliberation, their level of participation in the discussion was not impacted and they were able to rejoin the discussion smoothly. This occurred in Civic Responsibility and Representation groups d and j. The distribution of participant speaking time remained stable despite the connectivity issues. However, participants who were disconnected for substantial periods of time at the start of the deliberation struggled to join the discussion once they reconnected, as shown by Social Media and Democracy groups f, g, h, and k.
Each group had at least one individual who was disconnected from the start of the discussion and did not rejoin until well into the conversation. The impacted individuals in groups g and h spoke very little after reconnecting, and their share of the speaking time did not increase over time. In groups f and k the individuals did not speak at all. This could be the result of something common amongst these individuals - perhaps they were less likely to speak regardless - but it suggests that being present for the group formation that occurs at the start of the deliberation is important for encouraging participation.

Opportunities for Dissent

Turning to a separate trend of interest, one worry surrounding group decision-making and reasoning within deliberation concerns the possibility of problematic ‘groupthink’ or group polarization. As has been well-articulated in the literature on group reasoning, individuals operating in group contexts are liable to seek and maintain, where present, consensus, often at the cost of mentioning relevant and salient considerations to the question under discussion.*

A similar worry for deliberative contexts concerns group polarization. Here, the threat involves group members moving towards “a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ ‘pre-deliberation tendencies.’” (Sunstein, 2002: 17)*. Simply by participating in deliberation with one another, individuals are liable to grow more polarized, and not because of any now-revealed arguments in favor of their views but as a result of many potentially epistemically irrelevant factors (candidate explanations include social comparison, limited argument pool, as well as social identity and self-categorization). Worries about group polarization animate a number of theorists who propose alternative procedures for group decision-making and inquiry which eschew deliberation.

---

* Irving Janis defines this phenomenon of groupthink as, “the mode of thinking that persons engage in when concurrence-seeking becomes so dominant in a cohesive ingroup that it tends to override realistic appraisal of alternative courses of action” (Janis 1971: 43)*. As Solomon Asch’s 1951 experiments* and subsequent meta-analyses show (Nemeth 2018, Ch. 2)* groupthink is an example of irrationality that pervades much of our reasoning and deciding together, even for simple tasks and which persists in face of clear and obvious errors.

In face of the challenges posed by groupthink and group-polarization, the value of deliberation may seem under threat. Fortunately, many results have shown that deliberative groups which encourage and preserve opportunities for dissent can counteract the deleterious effects groupthink and group polarization pose. This bodes well for the Deliberative Polling methodology employed. In the deliberations observed, dissenting opinions were frequently voiced, even when such dissent came against a background of burgeoning consensus. In one group, for example, discussion centered around proposals to regulate social media. At a certain point, in group 1b participant 2576 suggests that consensus has emerged with respect to at least the need for regulations, “I think one thing we all agree on is like there’s a need for regulation.” This brief comment serves to characterize participant 2576’s appraisal of the current state of play—consensus has emerged with respect to at least this issue, and serves to foreground subsequent comment on the merit of specific implementation of certain regulations. If the deliberation were invariably subject to the effects of groupthink we should expect little push back on matters here. After all, consensus has emerged so pressures to conform may serve to silence any dissenting opinions. The analysis showed, however, immediate and sustained dissent. Rather than agree even on the need for regulations two participants immediately pushed back and suggested that efforts are better served by focusing on education. One participant questioned whether such regulations would be legal, and citing his experience as an attorney, concluded any regulations might be subject to significant First Amendment challenges. Was this the case of just one participant prematurely citing some consensus? No. In fact, preceding discussion had included a number of participants voicing support for regulations of some form. What this suggests then is that meaningful dissent is not preempted by emerging consensus.

Importantly, this is not an isolated phenomenon. Indeed such responses to nascent or almost formed consensus (or attributions thereof) were observed across deliberations. In another group, the conversation was trending in the direction of support for taxation of digital advertising, with participants indicating how their new proposals (also in favor of taxation) were supported by others. To this emerging consensus, however, two participants were clear in their dissent citing concerns about the purported efficacy of such a tax. Again, examples like these highlight the preservation of opportunities for dissent in the observed deliberative set-ups. Not all voiced dissent to perceived or emerging consensus was in direct opposition to what was taken to be the dominant thread of discussion, however. In another group, participants recognized growing consensus and explicitly left room for dissenting voices, as exemplified by the following quote, “Okay. So what I’m hearing from this point on, is that every single one of these proposals is [...] supported by every single speaker. [...] so far [sic]. I was wondering if there was any, like,
dissent against any of these... just because it seems like there's a consensus here. Almost.” In response to this, participants did voice dissent, particularly about the voting rights of convicted felons. These examples highlight how emerging or nearly-formed consensus did not preclude opportunities for dissent, opportunities which other participants took up.

Furthermore, observed across groups was the continued offering of novel considerations, even when a view on the proposal under consideration was clearly widely endorsed. This also suggests that deliberators in these groups were concerned not only with fitting in to what others had already accepted, but with getting at an answer for good reasons. In one case, participants offered novel considerations to support emerging consensus, suggesting that deliberators cared about the reasons underlying proposals they all accepted.

This, in light of the widely observed dissent in response to perceived consensus, suggests to us that deliberators were conscientious epistemic agents really aiming to get at a ‘correct answer’ for good reasons and doing so in ways that pushed back against worries about groupthink and which perhaps suffice to ameliorate worries about group polarization as well.

**Epistemic Considerations in Deliberation**

Of equal importance concerning the promise of deliberative approaches to democracy and group decision-making are the kinds of considerations which groups took up and to which they responded. The threats of groupthink and group polarization highlight the pernicious influence of “irrelevant” factors on participants in deliberation. The desire to conform and other potential factors influencing increased polarization, like social comparison, suggest that the currency of deliberation is not often what it hopes for: evidence, and truth-oriented considerations*. Some might worry that deliberators fail to be responsible epistemic agents, letting irrelevant factors detract from their ability to evaluate proposals in light of the most meaningful truth-directed considerations.

---

In the deliberations analyzed, however, the analysis showed a very welcomed trend: participants seemed most responsive to considerations which themselves offered relevant evidence, and seemed to ignore, or outright criticize less relevant considerations, like mere anecdotal impressions. For example, another group discussed proposals to implement certain election regulations and whether such regulations should be implemented via a national voting system. Discussion took up different avenues including whether such a nationalized system could effectively circumvent various logistical hurdles, adequately address ways in which voting laws are influenced by prejudicial Jim Crow laws, and if, at all, they would up the chances of fraud. In this discussion a number of clear evidentially supported statements were made, as well as a number of anecdotal claims. Of the latter, one clear example is a participant citing their family’s experience serving as staff at a polling place where “they spent in [my] precinct half the day staring at the inside of their eyelids because [voter fraud] is such an uncommon issue.” This consideration, anecdotal in nature and certainly of dubious epistemic import, was almost entirely ignored in the subsequent discussion. This was in marked contrast to the other kinds of considerations raised which were given far more attention. These considerations, in contrast, were appeals to potentially relevant (and non-anecdotal) evidence; claims about the district mappings of Maryland, the need for states to agree on abolishing the Electoral College, and the potential limitations of algorithms for district mapping. These considerations were given significantly more attention and discussion. Of course, not all anecdotal evidence is epistemically questionable, and groups seemed to respond appropriately to anecdotal evidence/claims—where its relevance and import was clear. For example, as previously discussed, the estimation of an attorney about the potential legal challenges to a proposal were taken quite seriously and informed subsequent discussion. These trends, observed across deliberations support the following conclusion: deliberators are concerned with getting things right, and seem to be able to separate the epistemically relevant wheat from the misleading and anecdotal chaff.

**Who Tends to Dominate Discussions?**

Prior to measuring “dominance” in a deliberation, it is important to establish that “domination” can be defined and perceived in several different ways, including, but not limited to: which individual spoke the most, which individual caused the greatest singular shift in topic or approach throughout the course of the deliberation, which individual appeared to consolidate the most agreement or respect from other participants, etc. The section acknowledges the differing forms of “dominating” a conversation, and will thus look at its differing forms, and which form corresponds with which traits.
First, the analysis shows understanding of “dominating” a conversation through impact; for example, an opinion that dominates the conversation may be one that causes a structural shift in the flow of conversation, such as by changing the general outlook or approach the group possesses towards an issue at hand. To this end, participants who were willing to be more confrontational and present an opposing viewpoint to the general group approach stated upfront that they were more interested in the issue; consider Participant 455 in Room 1g, who stated that they were “[intent] on having interesting discussions.” Participant 455 proceeded to oppose or argue against the viewpoints presented thus far in the conversation, notably shifting the flow in the conversation throughout the deliberation. Participant 455, for example, pointed out flaws in the proposals given by other participants, noted caveats to the trends that other participants supported, and served to generate discussion that illuminated more than one dimension of a topic. Take, for example, a discussion on the regulation of social media; while participants initially seemed to support less regulation due to First Amendment rights, Participant 455’s tendency to note the limitations of such rights on private companies’ platforms prompted discussion from following participants, balancing anti-regulation viewpoints with pro-regulation viewpoints. Overall, a deliberator’s interest in a given subject appears to positively influence their willingness to oppose previous viewpoints, disrupting groupthink and increasing their “dominance” in a conversation, in that they shift the flow of the deliberation.

Another alternative to approach “dominating” a discussion is to examine the number of times a participant spoke in a discussion. (It is helpful to note that the rooms prevented any one participant from speaking continuously past a certain time limit; thus, the analysis correlated the total time used by an individual with the number of times an individual spoke up throughout the discussion, then with the amount of time they spoke during each instance). Perhaps contrary to one’s expectations, those with divergent lived experiences—when introduced as such—appeared to dominate discussions the least. Consider Participant 890 in Room 1j (Social Media), who spoke the least number of times throughout the deliberation and whose first instance of speaking was invoked when other participants audibly moved to include them in the conversation, notably by introducing them as a person who had the most “divergent experiences.” Unlike all other participants in the discussion, Participant 890 possessed no postsecondary education and was the parent of two young children, in contrast with a room full of current, or recently graduated, college or university students at generally accredited institutions. Participant 890 was generally more likely to agree with the group consensus, and not bring up controversial viewpoints; further, they were likely to emphasize that their lived experiences (e.g: not...
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having gone to college) that may be at odds with the group’s did not prevent them from sharing the same opinions as the rest of the group’s (e.g: believing in the value of higher education, even when they had not pursued it themselves). While Participant 890 had referenced their divergent lived experiences in later instances of speaking, it is notable that these experiences were first introduced by other deliberators, rather than being self-introduced. In such an instance, being unintentionally distinguished by one’s divergent lived experiences is shown to correlate with being less likely to “dominate a conversation,” in that they not only see less speaking time, but also less tendency to disrupt groupthink.

In contrast, individuals with divergent lived experiences who made the decision to divulge such information about themselves voluntarily tended to dominate the conversation; consider Participant 2867 in Room 1, who had the greatest total speaking time and the greatest number of total speaking intervals. Participant 2867 brought up the fact that they were very recently naturalized as a US citizen, when nobody else had divulged information about their personal citizenship status. Participant 2867 also gave the greatest number of explanations regarding technical voting concepts, and prompted shifts in conversation (e.g: bringing up morals and philosophy, having prompted, “is [a money-based incentive] inherent in humans, is it a trait of being raised in a capitalist society?” in a discussion about the technicalities of national service), which we have noted to be a factor in influencing a deliberator’s dominance in a conversation. Participant 2867’s question was also ranked the highest by the greatest portion of participants (3/7); while this is not definitive, it alludes to their having garnered higher levels of respect among participants (a component of Discourse Quality Index, or DQI)*. While Participant 2867 demonstrates having been “dominant” in the conversation in several different ways, the nature of their participation suggests that possessing divergent lived experiences that have yet to be fully exposed to others and is done so at a participant’s will contributes positively, or at least does not diminish, their level of influence in a conversation.

1046 total participants engaged in a pre-survey to express their political preferences and their perceptions of challenges that modern American democracy faces. In the pre-survey, participants were asked about their opinions on policies related to topics including social media, the responsibilities of the federal government, and elections. Participants also voiced their opinions on the importance of certain policy statements and values.

A majority of participants expressed concerns on the impacts of social media on society. Although there was general agreement that “social media should not harm the public interest,” participants’ opinions on how social media platforms and companies should operate differed. The proposal to create a publicly-funded social media platform received support from 39.8% of participants, and the proposal to create a non-profit social media platform received support from 45.9% of participants. While 60.9% of participants agreed that social media platforms should be regulated, participants held mixed opinions on how the federal government should interact with social media companies. 45.6% of participants supported the federal government implementing a tax on digital advertising. On the proposal for the federal government to “mandate social media companies to make data... accessible for academic purposes” opinions were split with 35.3% of participants in support of the proposal and 29.9% in opposition. Regarding the topic of individuals’ rights to their data, there was broad agreement that “individuals should have the right to decide how their data is used by social media platforms” and individuals should have the right to request social media platforms to delete their data; the formal proposal received support from 78.4% of participants and the latter received support from 79.9% of participants.
Participants also expressed their opinions on proposals related to voting and elections. The proposals to “make federal election day a national holiday”, “to mandate all states to adopt same-day voter registration”, and “establish universal automatic voter registration at the state and federal levels” all received more support than opposition, at 62.6%, 61.4%, and 63.1% respectively. Participants then indicated their preferences on the use of ranked-choice voting in elections. While support for ranked-choice voting in congressional, state, and local elections all neared around 21%, support for ranked-choice voting in presidential elections received the most support, at 43.7%. There was also broad support for keeping campaign contributions and spending in check. 69.7% of participants were in favor of the proposal to “regulate campaign contributions and spending” and 75.9% of participants supported the proposal to “ensure full transparency in campaign contributions and spending.”

Towards the end of the survey, participants voiced their perspectives on certain policy statements and values. Overall, 76.7% of participants noted that it was important for the government to do what the people want. However, participants seemed to hold less faith in the government’s ability to meet their expectations, as suggested by these findings from the results: (1) The statement “Public officials care a lot about what people like me think” received 52.9% in opposition and 19.9% in agreement; (2) the question “How much do you trust your elected officials to do the right thing?” received 44.9% for “distrust” and 28.2% for “trust”; (3) the question “How much do you trust the federal government to do the right thing?” received 50.2% for “distrust” and 21.5% for “trust”; and (4) the statement “Government policies represent the voices of the wealthy and powerful” received support from 68.7% and opposition from 10.2% of participants.
Despite these attitudes from a portion of the participants, many participants valued their political voices and ability to create meaningful impact. 74.3% of participants noted “Voting in elections” as important, 76.5% of participants noted “Speaking up for those that are unable to” as important, and 73.8% of participants noted “Seeing to it that everyone that wants can participate in politics” as important. 64.3% of participants agreed with the statement, “I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to” and 56% of participants agreed with the statement, “I have the ability to create change in my community.” A significant number of participants also established the importance of being politically informed, and their willingness to listen to individuals with contrasting perspectives. 77.7% of participants noted “Being well-informed about your country’s issues” as important, and 36% of participants disagreed with the statement, “Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on.” On the topic of engaging with people with opposing opinions, 56.8% of participants noted that they respected the views of people who disagreed with them, and 61.1% of participants expressed that they would willingly compromise to find a solution that they, and the opposing party, can both support.

Results from the initial survey suggest that many participants held genuine interest in a variety of policies and believed in the importance of their voices and political literacy. Despite coming from different backgrounds across the U.S., participants articulated the importance of finding common ground and upheld similar democratic values.
RESULTS OF CONTROL GROUP

This experiment included a 500 persons control group. These participants answered the same pre-deliberation and post-deliberation surveys that the rest of the participants answered, but did not engage in deliberation between the two surveys. Answers from the surveys show that opinion change among the control group was not as significant as the opinion change of participants who engaged in deliberation.

Participants’ opinions on proposals related to social media did not change drastically. Comparing answers from the first and second survey, support for the statement that “Social media platforms should not harm the public interest” decreased by 0.3% and opposition decreased by 0.4%. Support for a public-funded social media platform decreased by 0.4% and support for a non-profit social media platform decreased by 2.6%. The most significant changes in opinion within the social media realm was related to digital advertising. Regarding the proposal for the federal government to implement a tax on digital advertising, opposition decreased by 8.5% and support increased by 6.5%. On the topic of individuals’ rights to their data, most participants’ answers remained the same. Looking at the proposal for individuals to “have the right to decide how social media platforms use their data”, opposition decreased by 0.1% and support increased by 1.6%. Similarly, looking at the proposal for individuals to “have the right to request social media platforms to delete their data” opposition decreased by 0.1%, and support decreased by 2.8%.
Participants’ standing on proposals related to voting and elections also did not change significantly. The proposal to make federal election day a national holiday received a 0.8% increase in support and 1.7% increase in opposition. The proposal for the government to mandate the use of non-partisan redistricting commissions for all states did not experience any changes in support and received a 1.9% increase in opposition. Regarding the use of ranked-choice voting in different types of elections, presidential elections received a 3.4% increase in opposition and 1.5% increase in support, congressional elections received a 3.7% increase in opposition and no change in support, state elections received a 3.9% increase in opposition and 0.7% decrease in support, and local elections received a 1.1% increase in opposition and 1% increase in support.

Similar to the lack of significant opinion change on the majority of proposals, participants’ views on certain policy statements and values did not differ greatly in the 2 surveys. Participants who marked “Voting in elections” as “important” decreased by 1.5%, and those who marked it as “unimportant” increased by 3.2%. “Speaking up for those that are unable to” gained a 1.3% increase as “unimportant", and 0.4% decrease as “important." Prompts that focused on participants’ perceptions of their political voice and those who hold contrasting opinions received more significant changes in answers. The statement, “I think people who disagree strongly with me about these issues are not thinking clearly” had a 2.1% increase in disagreement and 5.3% decrease in agreement. The statement, “Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on” received a 2.4% increase in disagreement and 3.1% decrease in agreement. Regarding participants’ levels of trust towards the government and social media, survey answers did not change as much. On trusting the “elected officials to do the right thing,” there was a 1.6% increase in distrust and 1.8% decrease in trust. On trusting “social media companies to do the right thing,” there was a 1.6% increase in distrust and 2.8% decrease in trust.
YouGov recruited 2,811 American adults aged 18 to 29 years to complete a pre-survey about contemporary events in the United States, which was run between October 15th and November 4th, 2021. 1,046 respondents completed the pre-survey. From the 1,046 respondents, 263 respondents completed the pre-survey and participated in the Deliberative Poll that occurred on November 6th, 2021. 242 of these attendees passed YouGov’s quality control checks and completed the post-survey, which was used to gauge any changes in attitudes after deliberation, between November 8th and November 10th.

In addition, this study included a control group which included 500 individuals who answered the pre and post-survey, but did not participate in the deliberation. While there are 242 “participants” who completed the pre-survey, deliberation, and post-survey. YouGov weighted the population samples for the 1,046 that completed the baseline survey, the 242 participants that completed the Deliberative Poll, and the 500 respondents in the control group.

The 242 participants were weighted to match a sampling frame that represents American adults between the ages of 18 and 29 on age, region, gender and race. This frame was created using stratified sampling of a subset of the total 2019 American Community Survey 1-year sample with selection within strata by weighted sampling with replacements. By employing propensity scores, the participant cases were weighted to the sampling frame. YouGov then combined the cases with the frame, and a logistic regression was estimated for inclusion in the frame. YouGov’s propensity score function included age, region, gender and race/ethnicity. Consequently, the propensity scores were grouped into deciles of the estimated propensity score in the frame and post-stratified according to these deciles. The control group was similarly weighted. Finally, to generate the final weight, both groups’ weights were post-stratified on a three-way stratification of age (2-categories), gender, and race (4-categories).
In our chi-square analysis, the results showed that most differences between the participant and control groups were not statistically significant, which means that there is no evidence of unrepresentativeness. In fact, the demographics of both groups were similar in the following categories: race, voter registration status, gender, sexuality, enrollment status, marital status, employment status, political party, minors in household, residence location, religion, born again status and importance of religion. For instance, the participating and control groups were very similar with regard to gender. Both groups included more women than men, and the same percentage of people identified as genderfluid, agender and other.

Moreover, the employment status of both groups was very similar. For example, 24% of individuals in the participating and control cohorts were students, 1% were temporarily laid off, and 0% were retired. This is logical since adults aged 18 to 24 might not be old enough to be retired and many are likely still pursuing higher education.

Among the many demographic variables tested, only a few presented a statistically significant difference between the control and participant groups. For example, the results showed a skew when analyzing both groups on the basis of educational level. In particular, high school graduates and individuals with some college were underrepresented, making 16% and 24% of participants, and 23% and 33% of the control group, respectively. Contrastingly, 36% of participants had a 4-year college degree, which is greater than the control group, where only 27% had attained the aforementioned level of educational attainment. Hence, participants reported a higher level of education than the control group.
In addition, the results showed that there was a statistically significant difference of approximately 12% between the control and participant groups in terms of voter turnout in 2020. For instance, 81% of participants voted in 2020, while only 69% of the control group declared having voted. Conversely, 19% of participants did not vote in 2020, as opposed to 31% in the control group. In this sense, individuals who voted in 2020 were overrepresented in the participating group. This skew could be a byproduct of the aforementioned difference in education level since some researchers have found that education may have a positive causal* effect on turnout°. Therefore, if individuals in the participating group had a higher level of education, then they might have been more likely to vote in 2020 than those in the control group. Another explanation for the higher percentage of people who voted in the deliberation is that those who vote might feel more engaged with topics of democracy which might have prompted them to participate.

Looking at political ideology, almost a third of participants identified themselves as very liberal, as opposed to 21% of the control group. Similarly, 26% of participants reported being liberal, while 17% of the control group did. It is also worth mentioning that moderates were underrepresented since 21% of participants reported holding this political ideology, in comparison to 33% of individuals in the control group. As a result, the participating group was skewed in terms of political ideology since most participants leaned toward the liberal end of the political spectrum, with a lower percentage identifying as moderate. This difference makes sense since YouGov recruited adults between the ages of 18 and 29, and evidence has shown that young individuals are more likely to identify as liberal.

Even with this skew in political ideology, 11% of people in both groups reported being conservative, and there was only a small difference of 3 percentage points between the participating and control groups in terms of being very conservative and unsure.

Regardless of such differences, we found that the participating sample is overall relatively representative of the population, based on comparisons with the control group.
"Voices of the Future" was an opportunity for young people ages 18-29 to discuss topics ranging from voting representation to social media and its role in democracy. The surveys and transcripts from the event reveal that the participants gained more knowledge about the American system of government and social media, and more people developed opinions on the issues presented.

Participants in the Deliberative Poll felt the deliberations were valuable and helped them clarify their opinions on the issues at hand. On the whole, 81% of participants rated the event as valuable, with 78% of the participants reporting the small group discussions were valuable. 69% felt the briefing materials helped them clarify their positions on the issues and 61% thought the plenary sessions with experts helped them better understand their positions on the issues as well.

With respect to the discussion platform, 89% of the participants felt the platform ‘provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion.’ 82% of the participants thought ‘the importance of the issues were covered in the group discussions’ and 76% also expressed that ‘the discussion platform tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered.’ On the whole, over 62% of the participants felt they ‘learned a lot about people very different from me - about what they and their lives are like.’

This sampling has aimed to show how people in the age cohort may change their viewpoints on issues if they become more informed and intentionally engage in deliberative contexts with others.

We hope this event shows the potential of Deliberative Polling to help the public better understand and debate important policy issues.
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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/sczf35daxy7v0fpriikonfsb1f0muezv.

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://drive.google.com/file/d/1fPFXM9hiWMPQMgT8EBu0bRgBZh8tPzKI/view?usp=sharing.

Appendix III. Pre-Deliberation Survey

Link: https://stanford.box.com/s/hu12g8wmp4tgsonrdhwrsqda7klaclj7.

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

1) On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is in the middle, how poorly or well would you say democracy in the United States works these days?

2) On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all concerned", 10 is "very concerned", and 5 is in the middle, how concerned are you about the role social media plays in society?

Policy Proposals/Opinions

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. Let’s begin with some proposals on social media.
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?

a) (Proposal 1) Social media platforms should not harm the public interest.
b) (Proposal 2) Create a publicly-funded social media platform, like public radio and public television, where funds come from public and private donors.
c) (Proposal 3) Create a non-profit social media platform, where the company is owned by an independent third party.
d) (Proposal 4) The federal government should implement a tax on digital advertising.
e) (Proposal 5) The federal government should implement a tax on digital advertising that would fund digital literacy programs.
f) (Proposal 6) The federal government should mandate social media companies to make data—that is untraceable—accessible for academic research purposes.
g) (Proposal 7) Individuals should have the right to decide how their data is used by social media platforms.
h) (Proposal 8) Individuals should have the right to request social media platforms delete their data.
i) (Proposal 9) Social media companies should be regulated.
j) (Proposal 10) Social media companies should be regulated like other news media organizations.

On the same 0 to 10 scale, here are some proposals on civic responsibility and representation.

a) (Proposal 1) Make federal election day a national holiday.
b) (Proposal 2) All states should adopt same-day voter registration.
c) (Proposal 3) Establish universal automatic voter registration at the state and federal levels.
d) (Proposal 4) Restore voting rights to citizens with felony convictions who are not incarcerated.
e) (Proposal 5) The federal government should mandate that all states must use non-partisan redistricting commissions.
f) (Proposal 6) Ensure full transparency in campaign contributions and spending.
g) (Proposal 7) Regulate campaign contributions and spending.
h) (Proposal 8) Ranked-choice voting should be used in presidential elections.
i) (Proposal 9) Ranked-choice voting should be used in congressional elections.
j) (Proposal 10) Ranked-choice voting should be used in state elections.
k) (Proposal 11) Ranked-choice voting should be used in local elections.
l) (Proposal 12) All young people, between 18-29 years of age, should participate in one year of national service in a community of their choice or military service.
m) (Proposal 13) The federal government should provide significant incentives to young people to participate in one year of national service.
Now, on a different 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely unimportant" and 10 is "completely important", how unimportant or important should the following be as a citizen?

a) Voting in elections
b) Participating in protests
c) Social media activism
d) Speaking up for those that are unable to
e) Serving jury duty
f) Serving in the military
g) Participating in national service
h) Volunteering in your communities
i) Attending local public meetings
j) Being well-informed about your community’s issues
k) Being well informed about your country’s issues
l) Being well-informed about global issues
m) Respecting the rights of others
n) Respecting the law

On a different 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) Government policies represent the voices of the wealthy and powerful.
b) Campaign finance reform will limit the power of big money in government.
c) Ranked choice voting will reduce negative campaigning.
d) Ranked choice voting allows candidates with the most public support to win.
e) Ranked-choice voting is too complicated to use.
f) Felons have shown that they are incapable of being responsible citizens.
g) Mandatory national service runs contrary to the idea of personal liberty.
h) Shared national service experiences would bring people in this country together.
i) Increased opportunities for voter registration opens up more opportunities for voter fraud.
j) Regulating social media platforms would be good for democracy.
k) Regulating social media platforms would violate free speech.
l) We don’t need to pay more taxes.
m) Data privacy is too important for social media platforms to share data, even if for academic research purposes.
n) Providing incentives for social media platforms to serve the public good is better than more regulations.
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) Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities
b) Seeing to it that governing bodies are inclusive and diverse
c) Seeing to it that everyone that wants can participate in politics
d) Seeing to it that everyone can serve their country if they want to
e) Looking out for our neighbors
f) Serving in our communities
g) Leaving people and companies free to compete economically
h) Making one’s own choices
i) Making sure the government does what the people want
j) Making sure people can say what they want
k) Making sure everyone who wants to vote can do so
l) Respecting people’s rights and freedoms
m) Earning as much money as possible
n) Being able to get a good education
o) Having a well-educated society
p) Having a safe online community
q) Overcoming divisions in American society

Now we’d like you to think about the people who disagree strongly with you on the issues we’ve been asking you about. Please rate your agreement with the following statements about those people from 0 "strongly disagree" to 10 "strongly agree". If you don’t have an opinion on a statement, feel free to select “no opinion.”

a) They just don’t know enough.
b) They believe some things that are untrue.
c) They are not thinking clearly.
d) They have good reasons; there just are better ones on the other side.
e) They are looking out for their own interests.
f) They are receiving inaccurate information.
g) I respect their point of view though it is different from mine.
h) It is hopeless to try to reach an agreement with them.
i) I would be willing to compromise to find a solution we both can support.
Political Efficacy

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) Public officials care a lot about what people like me think.
b) Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
c) People like me don't have any say about what the government does.
d) I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to.
e) I have the ability to create change in my community.

On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all" and 10 is "completely", how much does your voice matter...

a) On social media?
b) In your local community?
c) In your state?
d) On the national level?

On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely distrust", 10 is "completely trust", and 5 is "neither trust nor distrust", how much would you trust the following to do the right thing?

a) The Federal Government
b) Social media companies
c) Your elected officials
d) The people in your community

Factual Questions

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 "don't know" and move on to the next one.

Who is the current President of the United States?

Which political party holds the majority in the U.S. Senate?

( ) Republican
( ) Democrat
( ) Independent
( ) Don't know
Which political party holds the majority in the House of Representatives?
( ) Republican
( ) Democrat
( ) Independent
( ) Don’t know

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
( ) Don’t know

Which of the following is true about ranked-choice voting?
( ) It has never been used by a state in a presidential election
( ) It ensures that the candidate preferred by the most voters wins
( ) It would require a constitutional amendment to be implemented
( ) It can result in someone winning without getting the most first-choice votes
( ) Don’t know

In the last presidential election, approximately, what percentage of eligible voters voted?
( ) 10%
( ) 30%
( ) 50%
( ) 70%
( ) Don’t know

How many citizens are not allowed to vote because they have been previously or are currently incarcerated?
( ) 800,000
( ) 1,250,000
( ) 3,750,000
( ) 5,000,000
( ) 15,000,000
( ) Don’t Know
In 2019, what was the advertising revenue of Facebook?

( ) $5.5 billion
( ) $15 billion
( ) $22.5 billion
( ) $30 billion
( ) $45 billion
( ) Don’t Know

How many digital ads does the average American see in a day?

( ) 200-800
( ) 1700-2200
( ) 3600-6000
( ) 4000-10000
( ) Don’t know

What is the average age at which a person in the U.S. creates a social media account?

( ) Under 10 years old
( ) Around 11 years old
( ) Around 13 years old
( ) Above 15 years old
( ) Don’t know

Personal Questions

Finally, a few questions about you:

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?

( ) Very interested
( ) Somewhat interested
( ) Not very interested
( ) Not at all interested
( ) No opinion
When you think of your economic situation today, do you think you are much better off than most, somewhat better off than most, about the same as most, somewhat worse off than most, or much worse off than most?

- Much better off than most
- Somewhat better off than most
- About the same as most
- Somewhat worse off than most
- Much worse off than most
- No opinion

On average, on how many of the past 7 days would you say you watched the news on TV? If you didn’t watch news on TV at all, just say 0.

On average, on how many of the past 7 days did you read the news on the Internet/daily newspaper? If you didn’t read a newspaper, just say 0.

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.

On average, on how many of the past 7 days would you say you volunteered in your community?

On average, how often do you use social media: never, rarely, once a week, every day, or several times a day?

- Never
- Rarely
- Once a week
- Every day
- Several times a day
- Prefer not to state

And, how often would you say you rely on social media for your news on politics and public affairs: never, very rarely, rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently?

- Never
- Very rarely
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Very frequently
- Prefer not to state
Appendix (cont’d)

On average, on how many days during the past month would you say you spent some time helping with a problem in your community?

Next, we’d like to get your feelings toward some of the US’s political parties, offices, and institutions using what is sometimes called a “feeling thermometer.” Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward a party or person or institution. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable, that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold. If you don’t know the party, person, or institution well enough to rate, just say “no opinion.”

Let’s start with the...

Social Media Companies: How would you rate the social media companies from 0 to 100 degrees?

How about the Democratic Party?

Republican party?

Congress?

The Supreme Court?

The president?

Demographic Questions

And lastly, here are some demographic questions.

Are you registered to vote?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Not sure
( ) Prefer not to state
Did you vote in the last presidential election?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Not sure
( ) Prefer not to state

What is your gender?
( ) Woman
( ) Man
( ) Nonbinary
( ) Genderqueer
( ) Genderfluid
( ) Agender
( ) Other
( ) Prefer not to state

What is your sexuality?
( ) Straight
( ) Gay
( ) Lesbian
( ) Bisexual
( ) Pansexual
( ) Asexual
( ) Queer
( ) Other
( ) Prefer not to state

What racial or ethnic group best describes you? Check all that apply.
( ) White, non-hispanic
( ) Black, non-hispanic
( ) Asian, non-hispanic
( ) Hispanic
( ) Other, non-hispanic
( ) Native American or Alaskan Native
( ) Native Hawaiian or other pacific Islander
( ) Prefer not to state
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
( ) Prefer not to state

What is the highest level of education you have completed?
( ) Less than high school
( ) High school graduate or equivalent (GED)
( ) Some college/ Associate’s degree/ Vocational/ Technical school
( ) Bachelor’s degree
( ) Post grad or above
( ) Prefer not to state

What is your employment status?
( ) Working, full time
( ) Working, part time
( ) Not working, looking for work
( ) Not working, not looking for work
( ) Not working, student
( ) Other
( ) Prefer not to state

Do you live in a metropolitan area (urban and suburban) or non-metropolitan area (rural)?
( ) Metro area
( ) Non-metro area
( ) Prefer not to state

What is your zip code?
( )
( ) Prefer not to state

What is your political party affiliation?
( ) Democrat
( ) Independent
( ) Republican
( ) Other political party
( ) None
( ) Prefer not to state
Towards which political party do you lean, if at all?

( ) Lean democratic
( ) No lean
( ) Lean republican
( ) Lean towards another political party
( ) Prefer not to state

Do you consider yourself a strong Democrat or a moderate Democrat?

( ) Strong democrat
( ) Moderate democrat
( ) Not applicable

Do you consider yourself a strong Republican or a moderate Republican?

( ) Strong republican
( ) Moderate republican
( ) Not applicable

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

Appendix IV. Post-Deliberation Survey

Link: https://stanford.box.com/s/fcr3cz2pa0og0jttpzf9g42ynnlovueb

The post-deliberation survey contained all the questions in the pre-deliberation survey, save for the demographic questions. Additionally, participants were asked a set of evaluation questions:

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 ) The small group discussions within your section
b ) The briefing materials
c ) The plenary session
d ) The event as a whole
e ) The group discussions have everyone the opportunity to participate
f ) Members in my group each participated equally in the discussions
g ) The discussion platform tried to make sure opposing arguments were considered
h ) The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions
i ) I learn a lot about people very different from me - about what they and their lives are like
Appendix V. Questions Formulated for Plenary Sessions

Link: https://stanford.app.box.com/s/ndvjmsz0tt3s5pzmfchqhe8wzff8bmrr