

REPORT ON IMPROVING *PARTICIPEDIA*'S DATA COLLECTION CAPABILITIES

Edana Beauvais^{1†} and Şule Yaylaci^{2‡**}

¹University of British Columbia

²University of British Columbia

May 30, 2016

Report prepared for the Participedia Meeting, June 06-08 2016
Vancouver, B.C., Canada

[†]edana.beauvais@alumni.ubc.ca

[‡]suleyaylaci@alumni.ubc.ca

******We would also like to thank Robert Richards and Paolo Spada for their earlier comments on the problems with (and potential solutions for) the fixed fields. Richards wrote a very useful 2013 report, and Spada has written some very useful comments, which are available in a Dropbox folder. To access this Dropbox folder, please contact Pat Scully (pscully@clearviewconsultingllc.com).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Participedia holds great potential as data collection tool for participatory processes. *Participedia* currently collects crowd-sourced qualitative data in the form of descriptive text about cases of participatory processes. *Participedia* also collects crowd-sourced quantitative data, in the form of fixed-field entries about cases of participatory processes.

The *Participedia* data has proven useful. Graham Smith, Robert Richards, & John Gastil (2015) have already published “The Potential of Participedia as a Crowdsourcing Tool for Comparative Analysis of Democratic Innovations.” Their second article with Matt Ryan, “Testing Assumptions in Deliberative Democratic Design” (Gastil, Richards, Ryan, & Smith, 2016) is under review at *Politics & Society*. Edana Beauvais, Sule Yaylaci, and Mark Warren (2016) have also drafted a manuscript entitled “Democratic Innovations as a Tool for Citizen Empowerment.”

Unfortunately, the existing dataset produced by the fixed fields cannot be used for analysis “as is.” Time consuming and costly efforts at cleaning and recoding the data is required before any analysis is possible. This is due to problems including: confusion over what counts as a case, the problem of multiple entries for a single case, and unreliable measures. Fortunately, these problems are solvable. To solve these problems, we suggest: Creating a new protocol for assigning case IDs, creating a new set of criteria for categorizing participatory processes by “degree of empowerment” (see Beauvais et al. 2016), and adding and deleting certain fields (for the proposed revised fixed fields, see Appendix A).

There are also plans to use *Participedia* to collect individual-level survey data from respondents who were directly involved with participatory processes, including “participants” (for instance, a citizens’ assembly’s members), as well as “experts” (for instance, a citizens’ assembly’s organizers or facilitators). We have designed a “Core Participants’ Survey” (Appendix B) to collect data from participants, and a “Core Observers’ Survey” (Appendix C) to collect data from those with more specialized knowledge. In addition to the core surveys, some researchers will want to address specific research questions related to facilitation, social capital, and so on, or to include items from existing survey tools (such as the ProDep surveys). As such, we have designed a variety of potential modules (see Appendix D) that can be added to the core surveys. The surveys will be hosted on the *Participedia* site, and anonymized individual-level data will eventually be available through the site. This proposed research has been approved by the University of British Columbia’s, and Pennsylvania State University’s research ethics boards.

Some of the *Participedia* survey items have tested already been. For instance, in Sule Yaylaci and Edana Beauvais’s “Study of Student Participation” (see Beauvais & Yaylaci, 2016a, 2016b; Yaylaci & Beauvais, 2016), and in Edana Beauvais and Mark Warren’s “Study of the Grandview Woodland Citizens’ Assembly” (see Beauvais & Warren, 2016). John Gastil will be the first to test the current survey templates in their entirety, for the upcoming CIR project. However, there remain some ongoing questions related to the core surveys that should be discussed at this meeting. The modules also require further development.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
COLLECTING QUANTITATIVE CASE-LEVEL DATA: FIXED FIELD CASE ENTRIES	5
Introduction to the Fixed Fields	5
Confusion Regarding the Unit of Analysis and what Counts as a “Case”	5
Addressing the Unit of analysis problem	5
What counts as a “case”? Confusion caused by temporal and geographic diversity	5
Problem of Repeated Entries for the Same Case	6
Need to Create a New Schema to Meaningfully Categorize Cases	6
Improving Basic, Descriptive Case Information (“Easy Fixes”)	7
Location	7
Date	7
The Twin Problems of too Many Response Options and “Select all that Apply”	8
Suggestions for Deleting Items	8
Unreliable Data	8
Problematic Items We Have Not Been Able to Make Suggestions For.....	8
Number of Participants	8
Other Suggested Improvements for Existing Items	9
Suggestions for Adding Items.....	9
Problem of Multiple, Disjointed Datasets (“Cases,” “Methods,” and “Organizations”)	10
COLLECTING INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL SURVEY DATA	11
Introduction to the Surveys	11
Core Participants’ Survey (and Modules) Discussion	12
Looking forward/ongoing challenges with the Core Participants’ Survey	12
Core Observers’ Survey Discussion	13
Looking forward/ongoing challenges with the Core Observers’ Survey	13
REFERENCES.....	14
APPENDIX A: PROPOSED BRANCHING AND NEW QUESTION WORDING FOR FIXED FIELDS	15
Introduction (Explaining Unit of Analysis)	15
Rules for Assigning Case Codes.....	15
Categorization by Empowerment.....	15

Organizational Features	19
Features of Interaction	20
APPENDIX B: CORE PARTICIPANTS' SURVEY	23
APPENDIX C: CORE OBSERVERS' SURVEY	33
APPENDIX D: POTENTIAL MODULES	46
Module 1: Personality	46
Argumentativeness.....	46
Need for Cognition	46
Big-five	46
Rosenberg's Self-Esteem	47
Toronto Empathy Questionnaire	47
8-Item Empathy Questionnaire (EQ-8).....	48
Module 2: Democratic Dispositions	48
Political Trust.....	48
Social Trust	49
Efficacy.....	49
Tolerance.....	49
Others.....	50
Module 3: Normatively Important Outcomes of Deliberation.....	50
Perspective-taking/Empathy	50
Learning about/appreciating alternative viewpoints	50
Tolerating views.....	50
Political Efficacy.....	50
Communication networks	51
Module 4: Deliberative Dispositions	51
Module 5: General Political Knowledge.....	51
Module 6: Learning and Information.....	51
Module 7: Social Capital Excluding Trust (see Democratic Dispositions) & Family Composition (see Extended Demographics).....	52
Social Ties.....	52
Church Attendance.....	52
Associational Memberships (Number, Type, and Extent)	53

Module 8: Extended Demographics.....	53
Extended Employment Info	53
Family Composition.....	54
Module 9: Discussion Group Characteristics.....	55
Diversity.....	55
Reciprocal Interactions	55
Mutual Respect	55
Egalitarian Participation.....	55
Policy Group’s Items from Gastil (1993) & Garnier (1999).....	55
Policy Group’s “Obstacles to democratic deliberation”	55
Module 10: Complexity	55
Module 11: Faith and Trust in the Process	55
Module 12: Organizational Features/Logistics	56
Module 13: Legitimacy of the Process	56
Module 14: Facilitation.....	56
Module 15: Participatory Democracy Project (ProDep Survey Items).....	56

COLLECTING QUANTITATIVE CASE-LEVEL DATA: FIXED FIELD CASE ENTRIES

Introduction to the Fixed Fields

Since its launch, *Participedia* has been collecting crowd-sourced data, including quantitative data (“fixed field entries”) about cases of democratic innovations. When a person creates a new case, they are prompted to include descriptive information about the case under categories such as location, purpose, participants, etc. The purpose is to create a kind of census of the different democratic innovations taking place around the globe, and to gain insight into what different processes look like. The content from the fixed fields can be downloaded freely as a CSV file by clicking on the CSV icon on [this](#) page.

Participedia’s fixed field data has been used for research. Notably, by Gastil, Knobloch, and Kelly (2012), Gastil (2016), and Beauvais, Yaylaci, and Warren (2016). However, although the data is in theory freely available to anyone, the existing dataset produced by the fixed fields cannot be used for analysis “as is.” Due various problems we will outline, time consuming and costly efforts at cleaning and recoding the data is required before any analysis is possible.

In order to achieve the goal of producing a freely accessible dataset that can be downloaded from the website and used “as is,” the fixed fields must be improved. In this section we outline problems with the existing fixed fields, building on previous suggestions from Robert Richards (2013) and Paolo Spada (various documents available available by contacting Pat Scully [pscully@clearviewconsultingllc.com]), and propose suggestions for improving the fixed fields. Below is a summary of the problems and proposed solutions. For our proposed *template* for the new fixed field entries and survey branching, see Appendix A.

Confusion Regarding the Unit of Analysis and what Counts as a “Case”

Confusion regarding what the unit of analysis is (the case, or specific participatory process), and what counts as a case seems to have caused some problems.

Addressing the Unit of analysis problem

We propose that the first item in the fixed fields submission form be a simple introductory paragraph, explaining what the unit of analysis is.

What counts as a “case”? Confusion caused by temporal and geographic diversity

As Richards (2013) notes in his report on the *Participedia* data, confusion stems from the fact that the fixed fields work best for cases with a single, participatory (and deliberative) meeting. But a case may be one process with multiple events (a citizens’ assembly with many meetings), or repeated occurrences of the “same case” at different times (different Oregon Citizens’ Initiatives occurred in different years). An event may also take place at multiple locations at the

same time. This can result in the problem of repeated entries for the same case, or invalid data, as it might not be clear how to answer questions asking for the “date” or “number of participants.”

To address this, we propose: (1) creating a better process for identifying case ID numbers (see Problem of Repeated Entries for the Same Case in the subsequent paragraph), (2) better explanations to people filling in fixed fields, and (3) creating new fields clarifying whether the item is one-time, or part of a series, etc.

Problem of Repeated Entries for the Same Case

A major problem is that there are multiple entries for the same case. Approximately one quarter of the “cases” in the CSV downloaded from *Participedia* are duplicates.

This is often a problem of submissions in different languages. Instead of, for instance, an English, German, and Spanish version of one case, there will be three separate (ostensibly identical) cases for the same process—one in each language.

To deal with the problem of repeated entries (and Confusion Regarding the Unit of Analysis and what Counts as a “Case”) we propose a more systematic method of assigning case IDs.

Each process will be assigned a single case ID number. The next value will be the year the event took place (if the process was repeated in multiple years, the case ID number will be the same, but the year will differ). If the process was repeated multiple times in the same year the processes will have the same case ID number and the same year, but a different “repeat” number. The next value will be the language code (if the submission is a translation of an existing case, the case ID number and year will be the same, but the language code will differ).

For example: The Oregon Citizens’ Initiative is a repeated event, and let’s assume it is assigned the case id of 123.

Oregon Citizens’ Initiative in 2002 in English would read like: **123_2002_EN**

Oregon Citizens’ Initiative in 2014 in Spanish would read like: **123_2014_SP**

Need to Create a New Schema to Meaningfully Categorize Cases

In his report on *Participedia*’s fixed fields, Robert Richards (2013, p. 3) noted the “considerable variety” of cases, and difficulty in applying the same fixed fields to all the cases. Richards recommended that “an intermediate categorization step” be developed. We strongly endorse this suggestion.

We have developed a schema for categorizing democratic innovations by “degree of empowerment” (Beauvais et al., 2016). Our proposed schema is based on a modified version of Smith’s (2009) categorization of democratic innovations. The categories range from “most empowered” innovations (participants are empowered to make binding decisions) to “least empowered” innovations (participants talk or express themselves, but do not make *any* decisions). The categories are:

1. **Direct democratic innovations:** Participants make binding decisions (act as an executive). This almost exclusively refers to referenda/plebiscites.
2. **Co-governance innovations:** Participants work directly with decision-makers for policy-making, but do not replace decision-makers' executive capacities. Most often participatory budgeting.
3. **Consultative innovations:** Participants do not work directly with decision-makers, but will present decision-makers with suggestions that may or may not be implemented. For instance, often citizens' assemblies or citizen juries.
4. **Deliberative innovations:** The purpose is purely deliberative or expressive. Participants do not aim to make decisions or propose policies. Examples include civic intergroup dialogue groups, such as those in Walsh's (2008) study.

We do not expect that people submitting cases will necessarily be able to correctly categorize cases based on level of empowerment. To properly categorize the cases according to our schema, we will use a number of fixed fields asking about "intended purpose" (e.g. to make a decision or not), "organizing body" (e.g. government or governance body or not), etc. (see our supplementary). This schema will help identify common attributes among democratic innovations according to a theoretically informed and interesting criteria (empowerment), and will allow us to design meaningful follow-up questions. For instance, non-deliberative and deliberative events, or events where a decision is made where one is not, can have different follow-up entry fields.

Improving Basic, Descriptive Case Information ("Easy Fixes")

There are a few "easy fixes" for basic descriptive information such as location and date.

Location

This open-ended option creates very messy data, replete with typos and ambiguous abbreviations.

We propose drop-down menus with a standard, comprehensive list of country names. Selecting a federal country will open a follow-up menu with a comprehensive list of state, region, or province names. It may also be useful if selecting a country opens a follow-up menu of major cities in that country (with an "Other: ____" option).

Date

Currently, there is no set format to submit the dates a case commenced and ended. Cases can be input in the formats DD-MM-YY, YY-MM-DD, YY-MM, etc. It is not clear if values (or missing values) represent years, months, or days.

We propose using a standardized "calendar" option so that all dates are input in the same format. This item must be designed so years can be submitted (in the same, standard format) allowing

day and month to be missing (or so years and months can be submitted, allowing days to be missing).

The Twin Problems of too Many Response Options and “Select all that Apply”

Many fixed fields include a large number of fixed response options (for instance, “issue areas” includes over 20 potential issue areas). Furthermore, those submitting the cases can “select all that apply” (and quite often literally select every option). This makes recoding the cases into a variable with fewer categories essentially impossible (since the options are not mutually exclusive). And presenting this descriptive data in an intelligible way is thus limited (a crosstab or table of means with 20 rows would be essentially unintelligible).

We propose reformatting these response options so that those filling in the fixed fields “select the option that BEST describes the case” or to at least rank-order the top three options (instead of select all). We also suggest re-thinking the categories so that there are fewer, but broader categories for each.

Suggestions for Deleting Items

We might propose removing “type of interaction.” Although it is important to ascertain whether there was some kind of discourse or deliberation, do we need to know whether there was “formal testimony,” versus “story-telling,” versus “informal social activities,” or all of the above? We might propose removing this field.

Unreliable Data

We are not sure if data regarding “budget” is reliable. It may be possible that this is something the researcher will have to find out on their own, and we cannot reliably measure with *Participedia*. We might propose removing this field.

Problematic Items We Have Not Been Able to Make Suggestions For

Number of Participants

While it is important to know the number of participants, it is not clear what the best way to measure this is. Consider the Grandview-Woodland (GW) Citizens’ Assembly, with 48 randomly selected assembly members. It may seem obvious that the number of participants is 48. But there were approximately 150 members of the public participating in each public roundtable (with three roundtable meetings), and other members of the public attending the assembly meetings as spectators. Never mind dozens of experts giving testimony, a dozen or so part-time facilitators, a half-dozen full-time employees of the private firm organizing the assembly, and a similar number of municipal civil servants supporting them. So, how many participants were there? If the answer is still 48, how do we ask for this in the fixed field? We have no easy answer for these questions.

Other Suggested Improvements for Existing Items

- Edit “method of interaction” so submitters can clearly indicate whether there was discussion (face-to-face, online, or both), or *no* discussion/interaction
- Changing “decision-method” so submitters can first clearly indicate whether the purpose of the process was to reach some kind of decision or *not* (if the purpose was purely deliberative)
 - Then allowing participants to indicate how empowered they were in their decision-making capacities (voting in a referendum or making decisions that will directly impact law, working directly with decision-makers, making recommendations for consultative purposes)
 - Then a follow-up with decision rule. Include “consensus” as a decision rule.
- Clean participant selection/method of recruiting participants.
- Ensure “facilitation” is a branching question
- Simplify “method of interaction”
- Simplify “issue areas” (see comments in The Twin Problems of too Many Response Options and “Select all that Apply” section)
- Clarify the “public interaction” field, and make it into a branching item. First ask if the process engaged with a broader audience.
 - Then ask who the audience was and what the method of communication was.
- Edit the “Organizers” item
- Edit the “funding entity” field
- We might suggest a cleaner way of listing “methods” (e.g., if the process is “Participatory budgeting,” a “citizens’ assembly,” a “Deliberative Poll,” etc.).

Suggestions for Adding Items

Besides adding or modifying items to help classify the democratic innovations by degree of empowerment (and more relevant follow-up items for processes that involved, for instance, decision-making, deliberation, and/or facilitation), there are a number of items that might be worth adding. These suggested items come especially from comments on the “Observer Survey,” and from Spada’s thoughtful comments on the fixed fields.

Concepts that should be included into the fixed fields include:

- Ask if the process is ongoing
- Learning (Did the process include a formal learning component?)
- Balance information (Was the information presented balanced?)
- Resources (Items asking about whether childcare, compensation, travel, accommodation, or food was provided)
- “Geographic scope of the issues addressed”
- Modules (if “Participatory budgeting” is selected, there can be better follow-up fields specific to PB)

Problem of Multiple, Disjointed Datasets (“Cases,” “Methods,” and “Organizations”)

Currently, *Participedia* is generating three, unconnected datasets. The first treats the case (e.g., a specific process, such as the BC Citizens’ Assembly on Electoral Reform) as the unit of analysis. The second treats the “method” (participatory budgeting, citizens’ assembly, Deliberative Poll, etc.) as the unit of analysis, and collects data on the method *separately* from the dataset with information on the cases (they are not linked by a case ID). The third does the same for “organizations” (for instance, the “Chicago Police Department,” or “California Citizen's Redistricting Commission.” This last dataset contains only five variables, many of which are redundant (annual budget, country) or unclear (number or staff, number of volunteers—is this in the whole organization? Or number of staff at a particular process?).

If three datasets are necessary (we strongly argue they are not necessary nor desirable), then they should at least (1) connect participatory processes to their respective “methods,” and to the organizations that organized the processes, so they can be appended into a single usable dataset, and (2) not contain redundant information.

However, it seems obvious that it would be better to generate a single dataset. This single dataset should include participatory processes as the unit of analysis (cases), and include information about “methods” and organizations as variables. Researchers can use this single, comprehensive dataset even if their interest is in particular methods or particular organizations.

COLLECTING INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL SURVEY DATA

Introduction to the Surveys

Currently, the *Participedia* platform is only collecting “census” type data on democratic innovations. However, it is our goal to use the platform to collect individual-level data from respondents who were directly involved with some kind of participatory process. There are two ways in which respondents might be involved with the process. They might have been “participants” (for instance, a citizens’ assembly’s members), or they may have been “experts” (for instance, a citizens’ assembly’s organizers or others involved in an official capacity with specialized knowledge, such as facilitators). We have designed a “Participants’ Survey” to collect data from participants, and a “Observers’ Survey” to collect data from “experts,” or those with more specialized knowledge of the process (although note the Observers are also welcome to take the Participants’ Survey if they so choose).

We have designed a “core” version of each survey (for the “Core Participants’ Survey” see Appendix B, for the “Core Observers’ Survey” see Appendix C). These surveys contain the basic survey questions we would like to ask. We have received and incorporated two rounds of feedback on the core surveys, both before the Toronto meeting (2015), and again before the Vancouver meeting (2016) (for a summary of the most recent feedback, see Appendix E Summary of Feedback and Proposed Changes). In addition to the core surveys, some researchers or organizers will require additional items to address their specific research questions. For instance, researchers might be specifically interested in facilitation, or social capital. Or researchers may have a battery of items they are already using in ongoing research about participatory processes, such as the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais’s Participatory Democracy Project (ProDep) surveys. As such, we have designed a variety of potential modules that can be added to the core surveys, to create a more customized experience (see Appendix D). Note that this list is not comprehensive or complete, the proposed modules listed in Appendix D are only a starting point.

In terms of how the surveys will be administered and data collected, we envision that the surveys will be hosted on the *Participedia* site. Organizers of democratic innovations or researchers would be able to send a link to the survey (hosted online), or the organizer/researcher administering the survey could print paper copies of the survey. When respondents complete the online survey, their (anonymized) responses will be hosted on the *Participedia* site. Initially we considered the idea that this data would be freely available for download, similar to the existing fixed-field data. However, in order to ensure the data is properly anonymized, and to ensure the data is clean and the datasets consistent, it might be best to release an official *Participedia* dataset annually or semi-annually (every two or three years) in a similar way to the [Comparative Study of Electoral Systems](#), or [World Values Surveys](#). Researchers administering the survey will also immediately receive a copy of their data. If paper surveys are administered, the researcher administering the data would have to code the paper surveys themselves. We could include an

option for those administering the data to input in data from paper surveys into *Participedia*, but it is not clear how we would motivate people to do this.

That *Participedia* offers free, comprehensive, standard survey tools will motivate organizers and researchers to use our surveys, and thus contribute to the aggregation of a larger, and larger n . Of course, when the *Participedia* surveys first launch, we will have to make efforts to (1) administer the surveys ourselves, and (2) recruit and encourage organizers and researchers to administer the surveys. Aggregating data from a few democratic innovations and compiling a comprehensive dataset (and, eventually, publishing results from the dataset), will further motivate organizers and researchers to use the surveys. The surveys and proposed data collection and storage on the *Participedia* platform has been approved by the University of British Columbia and Pennsylvania State University research ethics boards.

Core Participants' Survey (and Modules) Discussion

As mentioned, the Participants' Survey is designed to collect individual-level data from respondents who participated in the process. This can include experts, but we have designed the survey so that it is comprehensible to non-experts. The Core Participants' Survey (see Appendix B) includes items related to satisfaction with the process (and outcomes of the process), and process-specific efficacy (if the outcomes will be adopted/have an impact). If there was discussion, we ask items related to the nature of discussion (participation, mutual respect, reasoning, diversity of views), and if it was facilitated whether facilitators were neutral. We also ask about a number of outcomes, including epistemic outcomes (self-reported learning), empathy, view change, and associational or behavioural outcomes (likelihood of taking personal action, joining with others to take action). In addition to the core survey, organizers/researchers administering the surveys can choose various modules to address their particular research questions (see Appendix D for a list of potential modules/survey items). We also suggest reaching out to our collaborators, to see if they have particular survey items they are using in existing research, to be included as potential modules. As in our earlier example, UFMG's ProDep survey. By including the ProDep survey as a module, our Brazilian colleagues can collect data that is comparable to their existing research, and comparable to the research done by researchers across the globe who are using the *Participedia* core surveys. This should significantly increase the appeal of our surveys to our collaborators.

Looking forward/ongoing challenges with the Core Participants' Survey

Looking forward, we propose reaching out to collaborators to see if there are existing survey items they would like to see included as modules. We need to work on the existing modules, to ensure we have comprehensive batteries of questions for the different concepts that might be of interest to researchers (such as trust, efficacy, and so on). Ongoing challenges include the questions of how we will recruit respondents (or researchers/organizers to administer surveys to respondents), and the question of how we will obtain the data from surveys administered using paper questionnaires. With respect to recruiting participants, we suggest that a couple of *Participedia* collaborators each administer the survey to a couple of local democratic innovations

(or partner with a public engagement firm, such as MASS LBP, and have the engagement firm administer the survey). Firms like [MASS LBP](#) in Canada organize between 15 and 20 participatory events per year, which is up to 15 to 20 potential cases in one year, from one country. With respect to paper surveys, we can only hope that those collating the data will be willing to share. If they are not, and we do not ever obtain the data, there is still a small benefit to *Participedia*—our surveys are being used, and becoming standard. And eventually human progress may solve this problem, as internet access becomes available everywhere to everyone, and paper becomes an historical artifact.

Core Observers' Survey Discussion

As mentioned, the Observers' Survey is designed to collect individual-level data from respondents who participated in a process, but have “expert” or specialized knowledge of the process. This survey uses asks respondents about slightly more complicated concepts (for instance, “geographic scope” and whether the process address “moral/ethical” or “technical” issues). The Core Participants' Survey (see Appendix C) includes items related to the purpose and goals of the process, the goods and benefits at stake, familiarity with the issues, contextual questions (frequency of participation in the locale where the process took place, media coverage, degree of controversy, whether decisions were already made in advance), and perceptions of legitimacy. The Observers' Core also includes organization items, such as whether the budget was sufficient, whether it was a worthwhile use of money, whether it was well-organized, a variety of questions of learning/information, and so on. The Observers' Core also collects basic demographic information.

Looking forward/ongoing challenges with the Core Observers' Survey

One ongoing challenge of the Core Observers' Survey relates to the complex nature of the concepts we are trying to measure with the existing survey. We have received feedback questioning whether we can really measure all of the concepts we are currently trying to measure with the items, and whether respondents can really be expected to know the answer to certain items (see Appendix E for a summary of feedback).

There is also the question of “unit of analysis.” Unlike the Participants' Survey—which asks respondents about *their* personal experiences with, and opinions about the process (conventional individual-level data)—many of the items on the Observers' Survey ask factual information about the *process*. In this sense, most items on the Observers' Survey are more similar to the fixed-field data. Because we are collecting more factual information about the cases, it is not necessarily clear why we need observers' demographic information (does it make sense to hypothesize that a process' reported geographic scope varies systematically by gender?). Looking forward, it might be worth having a conversation about whether the Observers' Survey might actually be a kind of “extended fixed fields.” This discussion might consider whether the Observers' Survey is really acquiring individual-level data (where a large-*n* is necessary, and variation between respondents is meaningful), or whether we are trying to acquire case-level data from experts (where instead of aggregating data in surveys, we would use crowd-sourced data collected through wiki-style fixed fields edited by experts).

REFERENCES

- Beauvais, E., & Warren, M. E. (2016). Can Citizens' Assemblies Deepen Urban Democracy? *European Journal of Political Research (Revise & Resubmit)*.
- Beauvais, E., & Yaylaci, S. (2016a). Silence in the Classroom: Exploring the Impact of Student and Instructor Attributes on Student Participation. *Journal of Higher Education, Under Review*.
- Beauvais, E., & Yaylaci, S. (2016b). The Role of Conversational Dynamics and Facilitators in Promoting Empathy in Small-Group Deliberation. *Canadian Political Science Association Conference*.
- Beauvais, E., Yaylaci, S., & Warren, M. E. (2016). *Democratic Innovations as a Tool for Citizen Empowerment*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Gastil, J., Richards, R. C., Ryan, M., & Smith, G. (2016). Testing Assumptions in Deliberative Democratic Design: A Preliminary Assessment of the Efficacy of the Participedia Data Archive as an Analytic Tool. *Politics & Society, Review & Resubmit*.
- Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, G., Richards, R. C., & Gastil, J. (2015). The Potential of Participedia as a Crowdsourcing Tool for Comparative Analysis of Democratic Innovations. *Policy & Internet, 7(2)*, 243–262.
- Walsh, K. C. (2008). *Talking about race: Community dialogues and the politics of difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yaylaci, S., & Beauvais, E. (2016). The Role of Social Group Membership on Classroom Participation. *PS: Political Science & Politics, Revise & Resubmit*.

APPENDIX A: PROPOSED BRANCHING AND NEW QUESTION WORDING FOR FIXED FIELDS

Introduction (Explaining Unit of Analysis)

An introductory blurb specifying that the unit of analysis is the case.

Rules for Assigning Case Codes

Suggested Case Code Allocation Rule:

CaseID: one number

Year: year

Language: EN, SP, TR, FR, etc....

RepeatNumber: #

For ex: Oregon Citizens' Initiative is a repeated event, and let's assume it is assigned the case id of 123.

Oregon Citizens' Initiative in 2002 in English would read like: 123_2002_En

Oregon Citizens' Initiative in 2014 in Spanish would read like: 123_2014_Sp

Suggested Steps before assigning case identification codes:

1. Check to see if the case they are about to enter is in the database. If it is, there should be an option to link their entry to the original case (so that there is only one case id) following the rule described above. If they are willing to edit an existing case, **CaseID** stays the same.
2. If they want to add a translation, we should add link embed the translation into the same **CaseID** (with the language code).
3. To determine if it is a repeated event, ask: "Some processes are discrete events; they take place only once although it may be spread across time. For example, many citizens' assemblies are ONE-TIME processes (they start and finish ONCE), although they may involve many meetings. Some other processes REPEAT (they start and finish) multiple times in the same year. Was this a one-time or a repeated process?"
 - One-time process
 - Repeated process

If it was a repeated event, we can add a number indicating which number (autogenerated).
4. If the case they want to add is not in the database, a brand-new **CaseID** will be assigned.

Categorization by Empowerment

The questions we are suggesting below are in an order, which we believe will help us parse out certain methods easily.

DirectDemocracy: Was this process a referendum (or plebiscite)?

Yes/No

[*If Direct Democracy = NO*] **InteractionMethod:** Which of the following best describes the type of interaction between participants in this process:

- Face-to-face discussion
- Online discussion
- Both face-to-face and online discussion
- This process did NOT involve discussion among participants (for instance, it was an artistic or creative process, or involved individualized action, such as signing a petition)

DecisionMaking: Which of the following best describes the purpose of the process:

- The purpose was to talk about issues but not necessarily solve them or reach a decision.
Or,
- The purpose was to make a decision (for instance, to make policy decisions or recommendations).

[*If the purpose is not decision-making, skip to ParticipantSelection*]

[Follow-up: *If “The purpose was to make a decision” is selected*]

DecisionMaking_DecisionRole:

Please indicate which of the following best describes the relationship between participants in the process, and decision-makers (such as governments, or other powerful actors):

- 1. The participants acted as decision-makers, and made binding decisions for the larger public. In other words, the decisions made in this process *directly translated into law*.
- 2. The participants worked with decision-makers (for instance, government officials) to make decisions or provide social services, such as through participatory budgeting, local partnership boards, or community policing.
- 3. The participants did not work directly with decision-makers. But they came up with recommendations for consultative purposes. For example, recommendations for the general public to think about, or vote on, recommendations for a government agency, or for a non-governmental organization.
- 4. The participants did NOT make policy decisions or recommendations.

[*If no decision (4), skip to ParticipantSelection*]

[Follow-up: *If 1, 2, or 3 is selected*]

DecisionMaking_DecisionMethod

Please indicate which method best describes how participants reached decisions among themselves, in this process:

- Voting
[*If “voting” selected, follow-up options:*]
 - Majority (50 percent + 1)
 - “Super majority” (a threshold that is greater than 50 percent + 1)
 - Plurality (getting “the most” votes, and not necessarily a majority or votes)

- Preferential voting (i.e. ranking preferences)
- Consensus
- Other
 - [If “other” selected, OPEN TEXT ENTRY]
- Participants in this process made multiple decisions and used different mechanisms.
 - [If “multiple decisions with different mechanisms” selected, follow-up:]
 - Decision round 1 used:
 - Voting
 - [If “voting” selected, follow-up options:]
 - Majority (50 percent + 1)
 - “Super majority” (a threshold that is greater than 50 percent + 1)
 - Plurality (getting “the most” votes, and not necessarily a majority or votes)
 - Preferential voting (i.e. ranking preferences)
 - Consensus
 - Other
 - [If “other” selected, OPEN TEXT ENTRY]
 - Decision round 2 used:
 - Voting
 - [If “voting” selected, follow-up options:]
 - Majority (50 percent + 1)
 - “Super majority” (a threshold that is greater than 50 percent + 1)
 - Plurality (getting “the most” votes, and not necessarily a majority or votes)
 - Preferential voting (i.e. ranking preferences)
 - Consensus
 - Other
 - [If “other” selected, OPEN TEXT ENTRY]
 - Decision round 3, etc....

ParticipantSelection_ Recruit:

Please indicate which of the following best describes how participants were chosen for this process:

- Open to everyone (anybody could self-select into, or join the process)
- Open to all with special efforts to include certain group or community members. For instance, special efforts were made to recruit women, minorities, or residents of a particular neighbourhood.
 - [FOLLOW-UP: Special efforts were made to include which group members?]
 - Women
 - Elderly
 - Youth
 - Particular racial/ethnic group members
 - Gays or lesbians (Members of the LGBTQ2 community)
 - Immigrants or refugees
 - Students
 - Residents of a specific neighbourhood or community
 - People with disabilities

- Members of particular religious groups
- Random selection (selection by lottery)
 - *[FOLLOW-UP: Was this “stratified” random sampling? (Where efforts are made to ensure certain group members, such as women or members of a minority group, have a certain amount of representation) Yes/No*
- “Two-stage” random selection. This refers to when selection takes place in two stages. In the first stage, people self-select into a pool of potential participants. At this stage, anybody can put their names forward to be considered. In the second stage, organizers randomly select from this pool of potential participants.
 - *[FOLLOW-UP: Was this “stratified” random sampling? (Where efforts are made to ensure certain group members, such as women or members of a minority group, have a certain amount of representation) Yes/No*
- Election
- Appointment (participants are appointed by a government, private company, or other governing body)
- Other
 - *[FOLLOW-UP: OPEN TEXT RESPONSE: ____]*

Organizers

Please indicate from the following list the response that BEST describes who ORGANIZED this process.

- Government
- Local Government (e.g. Village, Town, City)
- Regional Government (e.g. Provincial, State)
- National Government
- Non-government
- International Organization
- Union
- Not for profit group
- For profit group or business
- Academic Institution
- Private Individuals

FundingEntity

Please indicate from the following list the response that BEST describes who FUNDED this process.

- Government
- Local Government (e.g. Village, Town, City)
- Regional Government (e.g. Provincial, State)
- National Government
- Non-government
- International Organization

- Union
- Not for profit group
- For profit group or business
- Academic Institution
- Private Individuals

Organizational Features

Location

Where did the event take place?

- Country: drop-down list (include superordinate category of EU)
[*FOLLOW-UP If country is a federal system:*]
 - Region/province/territory: country-specific drop-down list
 - City: If possible, a country specific drop-down list with 10-15 biggest cities, with “Other” option

NumberParticipants

We are not sure the best way to measure this (see discussion). Simply inputting a number is problematic.

StartDate

Please indicate the date this event started. [Calendar format, that allows missing month & day]

EndDate

Please indicate the date this event ended, or if it is currently ongoing. [Calendar format, that allows missing month & day] OR “This process is currently ongoing.”

IssueAreas

Processes are organized to address different issues or problems. Which of the following BEST describes the issue or problem addressed by this case?

- Budgeting (this may also involve planning but always involves making a budget)
- Urban or Neighbourhood Planning
- Gender
- Intergroup relations (such as relations between ethnic, religious, or racial groups)
- Immigration or refugees
- Redistribution or poverty reduction
- Security (law enforcement, national security, and so on)
- Science & technology (biobanks, genetically modified food)
- Environment
- Education
- Health
- Arts, artistic expression, and culture

- Political institutions
 [FOLLOW-UP:]
 - Electoral reform
 - Anti-corruption
 - Membership in a larger political union (referendums on separation, membership in the EU, etc.)
 - Other: *[OPEN TEXT BOX]*

Features of Interaction

Facilitation

Were there facilitators involved in the process?

Yes

No

[If yes, then ask q12; if no, then ask q13)

Which of the following best describes the facilitators?

Professional Facilitators ?

Peer Facilitators (other participants not professional facilitators)?

Other

I don't know

ParticipationType *[Note: this is a cleaned, simplified version of an existing fixed field, but we are not sure of the utility—why do these matter?]*

Please indicate which of the following BEST describes the type of participation that took place in this process:

- Organized demonstrations
- Formal testimony
- Story-telling
- Informal social activities
- Face-to-face discussions in small groups (3-20 people)
- Mass demonstration/Protest
- Passive listening
- Active listening
- Meeting with the public
- Giving presentations or performances

PublicInteract

Did this process engage with a broader audience? For instance, did the process communicate with the general public or decision-makers?

Yes

No

[If **PublicInteract** = NO, skip to **Learning**]

[FOLLOW-UP: If **PublicInteract** = YES:]

PublicInteract_Audience

Please indicate which of the following groups BEST describes who the audience was:

- The general public
- Elected officials
- Appointed public servants
- Organized groups (Non Governmental Associations, business associations, or other groups in civil society)

[FOLLOW-UP: If **PublicInteract** = YES:]

PublicInteract_Comm

- How did this process communicate with the selected audience?
- A public report
- Policy recommendations
- Public hearings/ meetings
- Traditional media (for instance, through television, radio, or newspaper)
- Social media (for instance, through Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, or Instagram)

Learning

Was there a formal learning component of the event?

Yes

No

[FOLLOW-UP: If **Learning** = YES:]

InforBalanced:

Was the information presented balanced between all sides of the debate, or skewed in favour of one side of the debate?

Almost completely balanced between all sides

Somewhat balanced between all sides

OR

Somewhat skewed in favour of one side

Almost completely skewed in favour of one side

Comp

Please indicate which of the following forms of compensation were provided to participants:

- Compensation in the form of money or some reward (such as gift certificates or coupons)
- Child-care
- Accommodation
- Food
- Transportation (or compensation for the costs of taking transportation)
- Accommodations (such as hotel or housing)

Budget

We are not sure if any of the answers are reliable—see our discussion.

Note: the following questions are not on Participedia's fixed fields, but we might consider adding them.

Scope

What is the geographic scope of the issue(s) this process addressed? Please rank order the applicable geographic scopes (up to three in number), with the most applicable at the top.

From the list to the left, please drag and drop up to three items in the space immediately below, and then rank the items from top to bottom, with the most applicable at the top:
<input type="text"/> Local (e.g., in a neighbourhood, city/town, metropolitan area) (1)
<input type="text"/> Regional (e.g., in a state, province, or autonomous area) (2)
<input type="text"/> National (e.g., within a single country) (3)
<input type="text"/> International (i.e. Across more than one country, but not across the entire globe) (4)
<input type="text"/> Global (5)
<input type="text"/> Other (6)
<input type="text"/> Don't Know (-99)

Modularized questions specific to each type (for instance, if participatory budgeting is the specified method, a module on participatory budgeting could appear).

Perhaps a cleaner categorization of methods

APPENDIX B: CORE PARTICIPANTS' SURVEY

Intro1 Thank you for agreeing to take this survey. We will ask a number of questions about the process you participated in. Your answers help organizers improve processes like these.

CaseTitle Before we get underway with the survey, please give this particular event a recognizable, descriptive title in 15 words or less. For example, you might have participated in a "Brazilian Dialogue on Diversity" or a "New York City Public Issues Forum." What was your event or process called?

IssFamil How familiar are you with the issues that were the focus of the meeting or process?

- Very familiar (2)
- Somewhat familiar (1)
- Neither familiar nor unfamiliar (0)
- Somewhat unfamiliar (-1)
- Very unfamiliar (-2)

SatProcess In general, how satisfied are you with the process as a whole?

- Very dissatisfied (-2)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (-1)
- A little dissatisfied (0)
- Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (1)
- A little satisfied (2)
- Somewhat satisfied (6)
- Very satisfied (7)

SatOutcome In general, how satisfied are you with the OUTCOMES of the process?

- Very dissatisfied (-2)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (-1)
- A little dissatisfied (0)
- Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (1)
- A little satisfied (2)
- Somewhat satisfied (6)
- Very satisfied (7)

Adopted What is the likelihood the process's recommendations will be adopted by those in power?

- Almost certain recommendations will be adopted (2)
- Likely recommendations will be adopted (1)
- I can't guess one way or the other (0)

- Unlikely recommendations will be adopted (-1)
- Almost certain recommendations will NOT be adopted (-2)

DecPrior Do you think you participated in a process that got to make important decisions, or a process that came after the important decisions were already made?

- We got to make almost all of the important decisions (2)
- We got to make some of the important decisions (1)
- We got to make very few of the important decisions (0)
- We got to make almost none of the important decisions (-1)

Impacted Think of those whose lives are most affected by the issues discussed in the process. How well represented were these people in the process?

- They were perfectly represented in the process (2)
- They were well represented (1)
- They had some representation in the process, but not a lot (0)
- They were NOT well represented. (-1)
- They were NOT represented in the process at all (-2)

AmpleOpp How often did you have an opportunity to express your views in the small group discussions?

- More than enough opportunity (2)
- Just enough opportunity (1)
- Almost enough opportunity (0)
- Not nearly enough opportunity (-1)

Respected Regardless of whether or not fellow participants agreed with you, how often did they RESPECT what you had to say?

- Always (1)
- Often (2)
- Sometimes (3)
- Rarely (4)
- Never (5)

SpeakMind Overall, how comfortable did you feel expressing what was truly on your mind?

- Very comfortable (2)
- A little comfortable (1)
- Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable (0)
- A little uncomfortable (-1)

- Very uncomfortable (-2)

NoReasons When people expressed their views in discussions, how often did they give reasons?

- Always (2)
- Often (1)
- Sometimes (0)
- Rarely (-1)
- Never (-2)

BroadRange How diverse was the range of opinions you heard from in discussions?

- Very diverse (2)
- Somewhat diverse (1)
- A little diverse (0)
- Not diverse at all (-1)

Learned How much did you learn from participating in this process?

- I learned a great deal (2)
- I learned some things (1)
- I learned a little (0)
- I learned nothing (-1)

RoleSelf How important a role did YOU play in the discussions?

- Not an important role (2)
- A little bit of an important role (1)
- A moderately important role (0)
- A very important role (-1)
- An extremely important role (-2)

ParticReas People participate in meetings for different reasons. Please indicate whether the following reasons for participating were not important, a little bit important, moderately important, very important, or extremely important?

	Not important (2)	A little bit important (3)	Moderately important (4)	Very important (12)	Extremely important (13)
I felt it was my duty as a citizen or member of the community. (1)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The issue under discussion directly impacts my family and me. (2)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The issue under discussion directly impacts other people who live in my community. (3)	•	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It was a chance to meet or talk to other people who share my interests. (4)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Because I was personally asked to participate. (5)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt that my livelihood and that of my family werewas at stake. (6)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt a personal risk if I did NOT attend. (7)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: (8)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Facilit Were facilitators and/or moderators used in this process?

- Yes (1)
- No (0)

If “Yes” Is Selected, Then Skip To “In your opinion, were the facilitators biased or unbiased?”

If “No” Is Selected, Then Skip To “In your opinion, what was the purpose of the process?”

FacilBias In your opinion, were the facilitators biased or unbiased?

- The facilitators were completely biased. (2)
- The facilitators were mostly biased. (1)
- Can't say. (0)
- The facilitators were mostly unbiased. (-1)
- The facilitators were completely unbiased. (-2)

Purpose In your opinion, what was the purpose of this process? Please rank order the top (up to three) most important purposes.

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:

_____	Measure public opinion (1)
_____	Manipulate public opinion (2)
_____	Help solve complex problems (3)
_____	Avoid political deadlock (4)
_____	Help people learn more about an issue, decision, or policy (5)
_____	Address injustices (6)
_____	Increase the chances that a policy will be implemented successfully (7)
_____	Clarify disagreements (8)
_____	Increase our ability to see how important decisions are made (9)
_____	Limit corruption (10)
_____	To get cover for decisions that have already been made (11)
_____	Set a new political agenda (12)
_____	Improve the degree to which people see political decisions as being legitimate (13)
_____	Protest (14)
_____	Pressure decision-makers (15)
_____	Other: (16)

ViewChange Did you change your opinion on this issue as a result of the discussion, or are your views mostly the same?

- My views changed completely (2)
- My views changed somewhat (1)
- My views are mostly the same as before (-1)
- My views are entirely the same as before (-2)

Empathy How much did this process help you empathize with the challenges of others?

- A great deal (2)
- Quite a bit (1)
- Somewhat (0)
- A little (-1)
- Not at all (-2)

PersAction How likely is it that you will take some type of PERSONAL ACTION to help make progress on the issues you worked on in this process?

- Very likely (2)
- Somewhat likely (1)
- Don't know, it depends (0)
- Somewhat unlikely (-1)
- Very unlikely (-2)

JoinOthers How likely is it that you would JOIN WITH OTHER PEOPLE to help make progress on the issues you worked on in this process?

- Very likely (2)
- Somewhat likely (1)
- Don't know, it depends (0)
- Somewhat unlikely (-1)
- Very unlikely (-2)

Intro2 Thank you for that information. We would now like to ask you some questions about yourself.

YearBorn In what year were you born?

Gender What is your gender?

- Male (0)

- Female (1)
- Transgender (2)
- Something else? (Please indicate): (3) _____

Immigrant What is your immigration status?

- I was born in my country of residence and so were my parents. (1)
- I was born in my country of residence and my mother and/or my father were/was foreign-born. (2)
- I am foreign-born. (3)

Education What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- No formal education (1)
- Primary (elementary) school
- Secondary (high) school
- Some post-secondary education, without degree
- Trade certification (5)
- College or university degree (6)
- Post-graduate or professional degree (7)

WorkStatus Last week were you working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what?

- Working full time (1)
- Working part-time (2)
- Out of work, looking for work
- Out of work, not looking for work
- Retired (5)
- Going to school (6)
- Keeping house (7)
- Other: (8) _____

Ethnicity What is your ethnicity? Please choose all that apply. This question is asking you about your self-identification.

- Indigenous (e.g., Aboriginal, Adivasi, Native American) (3)
- African (“Black”) (2)
- European (“White”) (1)
- West Asian (e.g., Afghani, Iranian, Kurdish, Turkish) (4)
- South Asian (e.g., Punjabi, Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan) (5)
- East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Korean, Japanese) (6)

- Southeast Asian (e.g., Thai, Vietnamese, Malaysian) (7)
- Hispanic (Latin American) (8)
- Other (9)

PolActVote Did you vote in the last election you were eligible for?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Ideology In political matters, people talk of "the left" and "the right." How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking? (Code one number):

Left 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Right

PolActivit Please indicate whether you have participated in any of the following activities in the past 12 months. Select ALL that apply.

- Joined a social movement (1)
- Contacted or visited a candidate for political office or public official. (2)
- Contacted a newspaper, magazine, or television show to express my opinion on an issue 3
- Volunteered for a political party or candidate. (4)
- Volunteered for or participated in community service. (5)
- Joined a strike, demonstration, or rally. (6)
- Boycotted a good or service. (7)
- Made a purchase for political, ethical, or environmental reasons. (8)
- Made a donation to a political campaign, party or NGO or other social or political organization (9)
- Online participation (10)

Polinterest. How interested would you say you are in politics? Are you (read out and code one answer):

- 1 Very interested
- 2 Somewhat interested
- 3 Not very interested
- 4 Not at all interested

Complic Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

- Strongly agree (2)
- Agree (1)
- Neither agree nor disagree (0)
- Disagree (-1)
- Strongly disagree (-2)

NoSay People like me don't have any say in what the government does.

- Strongly agree (2)
- Agree (1)
- Neither agree nor disagree (0)
- Disagree (-1)
- Strongly disagree (-2)

AllSides Do you usually make a decision before hearing all sides, or do you wait until you've heard from all sides of the issue?

- Almost always make a decision before hearing all sides (2)
- Usually make a decision before hearing all sides (1)
- An even mix of both (0)
- Usually wait until I've heard from all sides (-1)
- Almost always wait until I've heard from all sides (-2)

Listen Once you've made up your mind, do you find it useful or pointless to listen to other people's arguments?

- Almost always useful (2)
- Sometimes useful (1)
- Sometimes pointless (0)
- Almost always pointless (-1)

Compromise: Do you think it is more important to compromise or stick to your beliefs?

- Much more important to compromise
- A little more important to compromise
- An even mix of both
- A little more important to stick to your beliefs
- Much more important to stick to your beliefs

TrustPeop Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

- Most people can be trusted (1)
- You can't be too careful in dealing with people (2)

TrustGovt How often do you trust the government to do what is right?

- Just about always (3)
- Most of the time (2)
- Only some of the time (1)

- Never (0)

Closing Thank you again for taking the time to complete this survey. A brief summary of the results will be compiled and used in ongoing research. If there are a sufficient number of responses, investigators hope to make public a summary of the results via the participedia.net website. Now please click the "Click Here to Continue" button to complete the survey and record your results.

APPENDIX C: CORE OBSERVERS' SURVEY

Intro1 Thank you for agreeing to take this survey to help the Participedia community better understand one of the entries in its collection of cases, or to help expand its cases by adding a new one. “Cases” include examples of participatory politics and governance of all shapes and sizes. Cases can be contemporary or historical, completed or ongoing. For the purpose of this survey, we will sometimes refer to a case as a “process,” such as a "civic engagement process" or a "participatory process" that involved specific groups of people in one or more specific times and places. Many questions in this survey will ask about the 'participants' in a process, which is a shorthand for the citizens participating in discussions and deliberations.

CaseTitle Before we get underway with the survey, please give this particular case a recognizable, descriptive title in 15 words or less. For example, one case might be called “Dialogue with the City’s aim was to make Perth the world’s most livable city.”

URL If this case is already in Participedia.net, please provide the corresponding URL here. (For example: <http://participedia.net/en/cases/dialogue-city> .) Otherwise, skip ahead to the next question.

Intro2 In this main section of the survey, we are going to ask a series of questions about the case or "process" you studied, which you gave this title: [NAME OF EVENT OR PROCESS YOU ARE COMMENTING ON].

Source What is the source of your knowledge of this process? Please rank order the top (up to three) that apply.

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
<input type="text"/> I was a participant (1)
<input type="text"/> I was an organizer (2)
<input type="text"/> I was a funder/sponsor (3)
<input type="text"/> I helped run the process (as a facilitator, staff, etc.) (4)
<input type="text"/> I was an interested spectator (5)
<input type="text"/> I am a representative of a stakeholder group (6)
<input type="text"/> I am a specialist on the issue (7)
<input type="text"/> I am an academic researcher (8)
<input type="text"/> I am a journalist (9)
<input type="text"/> I am an elected representative (10)
<input type="text"/> I am a public official (11)

_____ Other (please specify): (12)

Purpose In your opinion, what was the purpose of this process? Please rank order the top (up to three) most important purpose(s).

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
_____ Measure public opinion (1)
_____ Influence public opinion (2)
_____ Help solve complex problems (3)
_____ Avoid political deadlock (4)
_____ Help people learn more about an issue, decision, or policy (5)
_____ Address injustices (6)
_____ Increase the chances that a policy will be implemented successfully (7)
_____ Clarify disagreements (8)
_____ Increase peoples' ability to see how important decisions are made (9)
_____ Limit corruption (10)
_____ Get cover for decisions that have already been made (11)
_____ Set a new political agenda (12)
_____ Improve the legitimacy of political decisions (13)
_____ Protest (14)
_____ Pressure decision-makers (15)
Providing input/feedback into policy-making for decision makers (16)

Achieved To what extent did the process achieve the goals you specified?
Link the options to previous question's response.

- Not at all (1)
- To a small extent (2)
- To some extent (3)
- Very much so (4)
- Completely
- Don't know (-99)

Stake Which of the following goods or benefits were at stake in the process? Please rank order the top (up to three) most important goods or benefits.

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
_____ Identity-and value based goods or benefits (for example: rights and values related to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, disability, etc.) (1)
_____ Public goods or benefits that are potentially available to everyone without exception (for example: fire protection, clean air, public parks, or national security) (2)
_____ Material goods or benefits that can be allocated to individuals or groups (for example: food, clothing, shelter, or money) (3)
_____ Social goods (for example: friendships, community capacities, solidarity, social capital, social relationships) (4)
_____ Recognition (for example: being recognized as a legitimate political actor in the domestic or international arena) (5)

Conflicts What type of conflict(s) did the issues involve? From the list provided, please specify the top three conflicts, with the main conflict at the top of the list.

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
_____ Moral or ethical conflicts (1)
_____ Conflicts between political parties (2)
_____ Economic class conflicts (3)
_____ Racial conflicts (4)
_____ Ethnic conflicts (5)
_____ Religious conflicts (6)
_____ Generational conflicts (7)
_____ Conflict over gender issues (8)
_____ Conflict over planning (9)
_____ Conflict about who pays or benefits (10)
_____ Conflict about economic justice (11)
_____ Conflict about security (12)

_____ Conflict about free speech (13)
_____ Conflict about political rights (14)
_____ Other (please specify): (15) NA

Scope What is the geographic scope of the issue(s) this process addressed? Please rank order the applicable geographic scopes (up to three in number), with the most applicable at the top.

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
_____ Local (e.g., in a neighbourhood, city/town, metropolitan area) (1)
_____ Regional (e.g., in a state, province, or autonomous area) (2)
_____ National (e.g., within a single country) (3)
_____ International (i.e. across more than one country, but not across the entire globe) (4)
_____ Global (5)
_____ Other (6)
_____ Don't Know (-99)

DecIssue To what extent did the following groups help decide what issues would be on the agenda?

	Not at all (1)	To a SMALL extent (2)	To SOME extent (3)	To a LARGE extent (4)	Complete ly (6)	Don't know (-99)
Participants (1)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Government (2)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Interest groups (3) (groups that seek to influence government policy)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Civil society (4) (other nongovernmental)	•	•	•	•	•	•

associations and organizations)						
The organizers of the process (5)	•	•	•	•	•	•

DecDesign To what extent did the following groups help decide how the process would be designed and conducted?

	Not at all (1)	To a SMALL extent (2)	To SOME extent (3)	To a LARGE extent (4)	Complete ly (6)	Don't know (-99)
Participants (1)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Government (2)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Interest groups (3) (groups that seek to influence government policy)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Civil society (4) (other nongovernmental associations and organizations)	•	•	•	•	•	•
The organizers of the process (5)	•	•	•	•	•	•

Familiar Going into the process, how many of the participants were familiar with the issues?

- No one (0)
- Only a few (1)
- About half (2)
- Most (3)
- Everyone (7)
- Don't Know (-99)

IssEthical Some issues require very technical knowledge, whereas others require more knowledge about what is right and what is wrong. If you had to choose, would you say that the

issues addressed in [NAME EVENT OR PROCESS IN WHICH YOU PARTICIPATED] required more technical knowledge, more knowledge about right and wrong, or about equal amounts of technical knowledge and knowledge about right and wrong?

- The issue only required technical knowledge. (-2)
- The issue mostly required technical knowledge. (-1)
- About equal amounts of technical knowledge and knowledge about right and wrong. (0)
- The issue mostly required knowledge about right and wrong. (1)
- The issues only required knowledge about right and wrong. (2)

IssGen Sometimes the nature of issues is very specific and concrete, like building a new playground. Sometimes the nature of issues is very general and messy with many interconnected parts, like hunger or poverty. With respect to the nature of the issues addressed in this process you experienced, please indicate which is closer to your own opinion:

- The problems addressed by this process were very specific and concrete. (-2)
- The problems addressed by this process were somewhat specific and concrete. (-1)
- Can't say. (0)
- The problems addressed by this process were somewhat general and messy. (1)
- The problems addressed by this process were very general and messy. (2)

KnowAdeq By the end of the process, did the participants have enough information to adequately deal with the issues?

- Definitely not enough information (1)
- Probably not enough information (2)
- Probably enough information (3)
- Definitely enough information (4)
- Don't Know (-99)

ParticFreq Is active citizen participation, beyond voting, common or rare in the locality where the process took place?

- Very rare (1)
- Rare (2)
- Occasional (3)
- Common (4)
- Very common (5)
- Don't Know (-99)

ProcFreq Is it common in this community for issues like this to be dealt with through processes like this one?

- Very rare (1)
- Rare (2)
- Occasional (3)
- Common (4)
- Very common (5)

Answer If “How much media attention was there to this process? ‘None’” Is Not Selected

MediaFavor On balance, was the media coverage favourable or critical of the process?

- Mostly favourable
- Somewhat favourable
- A little favourable
- Neither favourable nor critical
- A little critical
- Somewhat critical
- Mostly critical

Answer If “How much media attention was there to this process? ‘None’” Is Not Selected

MediaPush Was the media coverage pushing for a particular outcome?

- No (0)
- Yes (1)

Answer If “Was the media coverage pushing for a particular outcome? ‘Yes’” Is Selected

MediaPushT If you can, please describe the outcome that most media favored, in 15 words or less.

RiskWith1 Sometimes there are risks associated with participation in participatory processes (such as risks to livelihood, reputation, security, or community cohesion). Were there such risks for people who chose to be involved in the process?

- Yes (1)
- No
- Don't Know (3)

If “Yes” Is Selected, Then Skip To “What kind of risk(s) was/were associated with participating in the process?”

If “No” Is Selected, Then Skip To “Sometimes governments or political parties require political participation to mobilize support for their policies.”

RiskWith2 What kind of risk(s) was/were associated with participating in the process? Please rank order the top (up to three) most important risks associated with participating:

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
--

_____ Risk to livelihood (1)

_____ Risk to reputation (2)

_____ Risk to security of self and/or family (3)
_____ Risk to community cohesion (5)
_____ Other: (4)

RiskNot1 Sometimes governments or political parties require political participation to mobilize support for their policies. Sometimes there are risks associated with NOT participating. Were there risks for people who chose NOT to be involved in the process you studied?

- Yes (1)
- No (0)

If “Yes” Is Selected, Then Skip To “What kind of risk(s) was/were associated with not participating in the process?”

If “No” Is Selected, Then Skip To “To what extent was the budget to organize this process adequate?”

RiskNot2 What kind of risk(s) was/were associated with NOT participating in the process? Please rank order the top (up to three) most important risks associated with NOT participating.

From the list to the left, please drag and drop up to three items in the space immediately below, and then rank the items from top to bottom, with the most important at the top:
_____ Risk to livelihood (1)
_____ Risk to reputation (2)
_____ Risk to security of self and/or family (3)
_____ Other: (4)

BudgetAdeq To what extent was the budget to organize this process adequate?

- Not at all adequate (-2)
- Somewhat inadequate (-1)
- Neither adequate nor inadequate (0)
- Somewhat adequate (1)
- Fully adequate (2)
- Don't Know (-99)

Empower Some processes are genuine efforts to empower members of the public, and some processes give the false appearance of public consultation. How would you describe this process?

- Completely empowering (-2)
- Mostly empowering (-1)
- Mostly false consultation (0)
- Completely false consultation (1)

- Don't know (2)

Debate How much public debate has there been on these issues before the event took place?

- None (-2)
- A little (-1)
- Some (0)
- A lot (1)
- Quite a lot (2)
- Don't know (6)

Controvers Before the event or process took place, how much did members of the public disagree about this issue?

- Not at all (-2)
- A little (-1)
- Some (0)
- A lot (1)
- Completely (2)

If “Not at all” Is Selected, Then Skip To “How well do you think those people most affected by the issues were represented in the process?”

Cntvsy_2 What was the source of controversy among the members of the public?

- Party (1)
- Ideology (2)
- Moral (3)
- Ethnic or cultural (4)
- Caste (5)
- Religious (6)
- Class (7)
- Other (please specify) (8) _____

Affected How well do you think those people most affected by the issues were represented in the process?

- Not at all represented (-2)
- Very poorly represented (-1)
- Somewhat but poorly (0)
- Well represented (1)
- Very well represented (2)
- Don't Know (-99)

DecidPrior How many of the important decisions on the issue were made by others prior to the process?

- All of the important decisions (-2)
- Most of them (-1)
- Some of them (0)

- A few of them (1)
- None of the important decisions (2)

Diverse How wide was the range of different views participants heard?

- Very wide (-2)
- Somewhat wide (-1)
- Somewhat narrow (0)
- Very narrow (1)
- Only one point of view (2)
- Don't Know (-99)

TimeUse Was this process a good use of participants' time or a waste of participants' time?

- Almost entirely a good use of time (-2)
- Mostly a good use of time (-1)
- Even mix of good use and waste (0)
- Mostly a waste of time (1)
- Almost entirely a waste of time (2)

Distract Was this issue important, or a distraction from more important public issues?

- Tremendously important (-2)
- Very important (-1)
- Somewhat important (0)
- Mostly a distraction (1)
- A complete distraction (2)

Legitimate To what extent did the general public view the process as legitimate?

- Completely (-2)
- Very much (-1)
- Somewhat (0)
- A little bit (1)
- Not at all (2)

Waste To what extent was the process a worthwhile use of money?

- Not at all worthwhile (-2)
- A bit worthwhile (-1)
- Somewhat worthwhile (0)
- Very worthwhile (1)

Organized Overall, how well-organized was this process?

- Not at all organized (1)
- Somewhat organized (2)
- Mostly well organized (3)
- Very well organized (4)
- Don't Know (-99)

LearnComp Was there a formal learning component to this process?

- Yes (1)
- No (0)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To “To what extent was the learning component sufficient?”

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To “Was the information provided balanced, or did it try to push a particular point of view?”

LearnSuff To what extent was the learning component sufficient?

- Not at all (1)
- A little bit (2)
- Somewhat (3)
- Mostly (4)
- Fully sufficient (6)
- Don't Know (-99)

InfoViews Was the information provided balanced, or did it try to push a particular point of view?

- Completely balanced (-2)
- Mostly balanced (-1)
- Mostly pushed a particular point of view (0)
- Completely pushed a particular point of view (1)

InfoUnder What kind of people could understand and use the information provided?

- Everyone including those with limited reading ability (-2)
- Anyone who could read well (-1)
- Only some of those with strong reading skills (0)
- Only those with advanced educations (1)
- Only those with technical knowledge (2)

InfoDisc Did the information provided improve the quality of the discussion or add confusion?

- A big improvement (-2)
- A small improvement (-1)
- Made no difference (0)
- Made things a little more confusing (1)
- Added a lot of confusion (2)

MadeDiff1 On balance, would you say the process helped address the problem discussed, or made things worse?

- Helped a lot (-2)
- Helped a little (-1)
- Made no difference (0)

Made things a little worse (1)

Made things much worse (2)

If “Made no difference” Is Selected, Then Skip To “To what extent did the relevant decision makers respond to the demands and/or recommendations developed in the process?”

MadeDiff2 Please rank order up to three ways this process made a difference, with the biggest change at the top of the list.

Please drag and drop up to three items from the list in rank order, with the most important at the top:
_____ Raised public awareness of the issue(s) (1)
_____ Changes in individual attitudes or behaviors (2)
_____ Changes in individual skills and knowledge (3)
_____ Changes in community capacities (4)
_____ Collaborations among organizations (5)
_____ Collaborations between organizations and government (6)
_____ Changes in public policy (7)
_____ Other, please explain: (8[S1])

DMAdopt Did the relevant decision makers adopt the process' demands and/or recommendations?

- All were adopted with no changes (5)
- Some were adopted with no changes (4)
- All were adopted but with changes (3)
- Some were adopted but with changes (2)
- None were adopted (1)
- Don't Know (-99)

Intro3 Thank you for that information. We would now like to ask you some questions about yourself.

YearBorn In what year were you born?

Gender What is your gender?

- Male (0)
- Female (1)
- Transgender (2)
- Something else (Please indicate): (3) _____

Education What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- No formal education (1)
- Primary (elementary) school
- Secondary (high) school
- Some post-secondary education, without degree
- Trade certification (5)
- College or university degree (6)
- Post-graduate or professional degree (7)

Employment Last week were you working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what?

- Working full time (1)
- Working part-time (2)
- Temporarily not working (3)
- Unemployed or laid off (4)
- Retired (5)
- Going to school (6)
- Keeping house (7)
- Other: (8) _____

Ethnicity What is your ethnicity? Please choose all that apply. This question is asking you about your self-identification.

- Indigenous (e.g., Aboriginal, Adivasi, Native American) (3)
- African (“Black”) (2)
- European (“White”) (1)
- West Asian (e.g., Afghani, Iranian, Kurdish, Turkish) (4)
- South Asian (e.g., Punjabi, Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan) (5)
- East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Korean, Japanese) (6)
- Southeast Asian (e.g., Thai, Vietnamese, Malaysian) (7)
- Hispanic (Latin American) (8)
- Other (9)

Goodbye Thank you so much for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have questions, please direct them to research@participedia.net . Now please click the "Please click here to go to the next page" button to complete the survey and record your results.

APPENDIX D: POTENTIAL MODULES

Module 1: Personality

Argumentativeness

I enjoy defending my point of view on an issue.
 I enjoy a good argument on a controversial issue.
 I consider an argument an exciting intellectual challenge.
 I feel refreshed and satisfied after an argument on a controversial issue.
 Arguing with a person creates more problems for me than it solves.
 I try to avoid getting into arguments.
 When I finish arguing with someone, I feel nervous and upset.
 I get an unpleasant feeling when I realize I am about to get into an argument.
 I hate it when people argue just because they enjoy getting into arguments.

Need for Cognition

I would prefer complex to simple problems.
 I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.
 Thinking is not my idea of fun.*
 I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities.*
 I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely a chance I will have to think in depth about something.*
 I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.
 I only think as hard as I have to.*
 I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long-term ones.*
 I like tasks that require little thought once I've learned them.*
 The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.
 I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.
 Learning new ways to think doesn't excite me very much.*
 I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.
 The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.
 I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.
 I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort.*
 It's enough for me that something gets the job done; I don't care how or why it works.*
 I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.

Big-five

The five factors of personality that the NEO-FFI measures are Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness.

Abbreviated version with 10-items:

I see myself as someone who...

- ... is reserved (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... is generally trusting (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... tends to be lazy (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... is relaxed, handles stress well (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... has few artistic interests (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... is outgoing, sociable (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... tends to find fault with others (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... does a thorough job (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... gets nervous easily (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- ... has an active imagination (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Scale is from 'Disagree Strongly to Agree Strongly'

Rosenberg's Self-Esteem

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities..
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think I am no good at all.

Toronto Empathy Questionnaire

1. When someone else is feeling excited, I tend to get excited too
2. Other people's misfortunes do not disturb me a great deal
3. It upsets me to see someone being treated disrespectfully
4. I remain unaffected when someone close to me is happy
5. I enjoy making other people feel better
6. I have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me
7. When a friend starts to talk about his/her problems, I try to steer the conversation towards something else
8. I can tell when others are sad even when they do not say anything
9. I find that I am "in tune" with other people's moods
10. I do not feel sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses
11. I become irritated when someone cries
12. I am not really interested in how other people feel
13. I get a strong urge to help when I see someone who is upset

14. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I do not feel very much pity for them
 15. I find it silly for people to cry out of happiness
 16. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards him\her

ScoringItem responses are scored according to the following scale for positively worded items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 16. Never = 0; Rarely = 1; Sometimes = 2; Often = 3; Always = 4. The following negatively worded items are reverse scored: 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15. Scores are summed to derive total for the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire.

8-Item Empathy Questionnaire (EQ-8)

1. I find it easy to put myself in somebody else's shoes.
2. I am good at predicting how someone will feel.
3. I am quick to spot when someone in a group is feeling awkward or uncomfortable.
4. Other people tell me I am good at understanding how they are feeling and what they are thinking.
5. I find it hard to know what to do in a social situation.
6. I often find it hard to judge if something is rude or polite.
7. It is hard for me to see why some things upset people so much.
8. Other people often say that I am insensitive, though I don't always see why

Module 2: Democratic Dispositions

Political Trust

TrustGovt: How often do you trust the government to do what is right?

How much confidence do you have in the following institutions?

- Churches
- The Press
- The Armed Forces
- Labour Unions
- The Police
- The Courts
- The Government
- Political Parties
- Government Employees
- Universities
- Corporations
- Banks
- Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)
- Charities
- The United Nations

Do you think the government is run by a few big interests or for the benefit of all? (or somewhere in between)

Social Trust

TrustPeop: Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?

If you lost a wallet or purse that contained two hundred dollars, how likely is it to be returned with the money in it, if it was found by someone who lives close by?

Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?

Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?

How much do you trust the following types of people?

- your family
- your neighbours
- people you know personally
- people you meet for the first time
- people of another religion
- people of another ethnic or cultural group

Efficacy

Discursive Participation Survey:

Next, I am going to read you several statements about government officials. For each one tell me whether you agree or disagree with it.

"I don't think public officials care much about what people like me think.

People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

Sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

Tolerance

ANES: social tolerance

Now we are going to ask you about different types of contact with various groups of people. In each situation would you please tell us whether you would be very much in favor of it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very much opposed to it happening.

Living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors were Whites?

- Very much in favor
- Somewhat in favor
- Neither in favor nor opposed
- Somewhat opposed
- Very much opposed

What about living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors are Blacks?

Others

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- Governments tax the rich and subsidize the poor
- Religious authorities ultimately interpret the laws
- People choose their leaders in free elections
- People receive state aid for unemployment
- The army takes over when government is incompetent
- Civil rights protect people from state oppression
- The state makes people's incomes equal
- People obey their rulers
- Women have the same rights as men

Module 3: Normatively Important Outcomes of Deliberation

Perspective-taking/Empathy

This process helped me appreciate the perspectives of others.

This process helped me sympathize with the challenges that others face.

Learning about/appreciating alternative viewpoints

After this process I came to appreciate viewpoints that I had previously misunderstood.

After this process I came to appreciate viewpoints that I had previously disagreed with.

After this process I came to appreciate viewpoints that I had previously found offensive.

Tolerating views

Others expressed views that made me uneasy.

The views expressed by others were offensive.

Political Efficacy

Please indicate how much you thought your views would matter at the start and end of the process?"

To what extent do you think your contribution had an effect on the discussion?

Communication networks

- Have you talked to others about the issues discussed in this process?
- Family
- Friends
- Co-workers
- Fellow union members
- Classmates
- Neighbours
- Members of online discussion groups
- Members of a political group
- Members of a religious group
- Members of a business association
- Members of a professional association
- Members of a cultural group
- Members of a support group

Module 4: Deliberative Dispositions

- I always try to consider carefully what other people say to me.
- I don't like it when somebody interrupts another person too quickly.
- I get upset when people don't listen carefully to each other.
- When other people are talking to me about an issue that concerns them, I generally listen to what they have to say.
- When someone has talked for a long time without interruption, I begin to feel anxious.
- During a group discussion, I try to make sure that every group member gets a chance to speak.
- When a group discussion strays from its objective, I feel a need to bring the group back to its task.
- When a person is ignored during a discussion, I encourage him or her speak up.
- I become very uncomfortable when a person says something disrespectful of another person.
- I get annoyed when one person talks "over the head" of another person.

Module 5: General Political Knowledge

Most political knowledge questions ask a battery of items that are country-specific. It is difficult to come up with a list of items that anyone in any part of the world might be expected to know. It is possible that we can have country-specific lists for survey designers to choose from.

Module 6: Learning and Information

Were you given any reading materials before, during, or after the last meeting you attended to help you better understand or think about the issue?

When were you given this material: before the meeting, during the meeting, or after the meeting?

Which of the following best describes this material? Would you say it was generally neutral and objective, generally balanced between different points of view, or generally biased in favor of a particular point of view?

How much did you learn from your own study?

How much did you learn from facilitators involved in the process?

How much did you learn from experts, specialists, or professionals involved in the process?

How much did you learn from organized interests or advocates involved in the process?

How much did you learn from other participants involved in the process?

Module 7: Social Capital Excluding Trust (see Democratic Dispositions) & Family Composition (see Extended Demographics)

Social Ties

How many people do you know who you would consider close friends? ___

How many people do you know who you would consider acquaintances? ___

In an average month, how often do you see close friends? ___

In an average month, how often do you visit with family? ___

In an average month, how often do you talk with neighbours? ___

Have you done a favour for your neighbours in the past month? Yes/No

Church Attendance

How often do you attend religious services (for instance, at church, temple, or synagogue)?

- At least once a week
- Almost every week
- About once a month
- Only for special occasions or ceremonies (less than once a month)
- Never

Associational Memberships (Number, Type, and Extent)

Please indicate how often you participated in or volunteered for the following types of groups or organizations in the past 12 months:

	Never	Once or twice	Three or four times	At least once a month	At least once a week	Almost daily
Organizations to help people (such as a food bank)						
Recreational groups (such as sports leagues, or hobby clubs)						
Organizations active on political issues (such as the environment or taxpayers' rights)						
Youth oriented volunteer groups (such as Boy Scouts or youth/children's sports leagues)						
Organizations providing cultural services, excluding religious organizations (such as a museum or music festival)						
Religious organizations (church or temple groups)						
A veterans or military group						
Any other organization that we have not asked about						

Module 8: Extended Demographics

Extended Employment Info

In which area or field do you work?

Business Management

Education

Law

Health Care

Retail/Sales

Clerical support

Engineering

Research and Development?

Trades (e.g. Carpentry, Plumbing, etc)

Construction

Manual Labor

Technology, science, and communications

Military/Armed Forces
 Natural Resources (e.g. Mining, Forestry, etc)
 Agriculture
 Other: __

If Not Active in the Workforce:

Responsible for ordinary shopping and looking after the home, or without any current occupation, not working
 Student
 Unemployed or temporarily not working
 Retired or unable to work through illness

If Self-employed:

Farmer
 Fisherman
 Professional (lawyer, medical practitioner, accountant, architect, etc.)
 Owner of a shop, craftsmen, other self-employed person
 Business proprietors, owner (full or partner) of a company

Employed

Employed professional (employed doctor, lawyer, accountant, architect)
 General management, director or top management (managing directors, director)
 Middle management, other management (department head, junior manager, teacher)
 Employed position, working mainly at a desk
 Employed position, not at a desk but travelling (salesmen, driver, etc)
 Employed position, not at a desk, but in a service job (hospital, restaurant, police, fireman, etc.)
 Supervisor
 Skilled manual worker
 Other(unskilled) manual worker, servant
 Never did any paid work

Family Composition

How many children do you have, including any no longer living with you? __
 Does this child/How many children currently live with you for four or more days a week? (Yes, one, or enter number: __)

Including yourself, how many people live in your household? (A household is defined as a person or group of persons who occupy the same dwelling. It can be a family, two or more families sharing the same dwelling, a group of unrelated persons sharing the same dwelling, or a person living alone.) ____

How many people living in your household are your parents or in-laws? __
 How many people living in your household are other relatives? __

Module 9: Discussion Group Characteristics

Diversity

Different meetings attract different mixes of people. Using a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is 'not diverse at all' and 10 is 'very diverse', how racially or ethnically diverse would you say the people at the last meeting you attended were? (PROBE: 'What's your best sense?' By "not diverse at all," we mean everyone had exactly the same racial or ethnic characteristic and by "very diverse" we mean there was a fairly equal mix of all examples of that racial or ethnic characteristic.) (DISCURSIVE PARTICIPATION SURVEY)

Reciprocal Interactions

In general, participants responded to the contributions of each other

Mutual Respect

Other took my contributions to the discussion seriously.

Egalitarian Participation

A few people dominated the discussion (note: this isn't a very good measure)

Policy Group's Items from Gastil (1993) & Garnier (1999)

All responses are on a scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 7 ("strongly agree").

- (reverse coded) I felt that the other group members did not accept me a part of the group.
- I had plenty of chances to speak during our group discussion.
- I understood almost everything that other group members said during our discussion.
- I carefully considered what other group members said during our discussion.
- The other group members respected my views
- The other group members were rude and impolite towards me.

Policy Group's "Obstacles to democratic deliberation"

- The other group members were more skilled at communicating than I was.
- The other group members had a discussion style that was very different from my own style.
- There were some clear personality conflicts between some of the members of our group.
- There were some "personal" conflicts during our group's discussion.

Module 10: Complexity

Questions about temporal, geographic, and jurisdictional complexity can be moved here.

Module 11: Faith and Trust in the Process

To what extent were the participants involved in setting the agenda of the process?

To what extent did the agenda reflect powerful interests.

This process was a good use of participants' time.
This process was a waste of financial resources.
This process was a distraction from more important public issues.
This process was a genuine effort to engage the public.

Module 12: Organizational Features/Logistics

To what extent were the following needs met:

- Childcare
- Transportation
- Etc.

Module 13: Legitimacy of the Process

Legitimacy is a difficult concept to measure, but it would be good to try and tap into this.

Module 14: Facilitation

The facilitators remained neutral
The facilitators kept the discussion focused
The facilitators encouraged all members of the group to participate
The facilitators treated participants with equal respect
The facilitators helped to clarify the issues
The facilitators allowed a few people to dominate the discussion

Module 15: Participatory Democracy Project (ProDep Survey Items)

To obtain this survey please contact Pat Scully (pscully@clearviewconsultingllc.com), or [our collaborators](#) at Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG) working on the ProDep Project.