## Study Information

1. Title (required)
[redacted]

2. Authors (required)
[redacted]

3. Description (optional)
A “deliberative wave” with increasing uses of deliberative citizen forums (DCFs) is sweeping the globe (OECD, 2020). Whereas DCF enthusiasts claim that they represent appropriate tools to re-connect citizens with politics and demand a stronger empowerment of DCFs (e.g., Buchstein, 2019; Landemore, 2020), critics argue that they will reduce rather than increase democratic legitimacy (e.g., Lafont, 2019; Parkinson, 2006). This study sheds new light on roles of DCFs in democratic system from the perspective of the citizens. It not only asks whether citizens support the use of DCFs (e.g., Bedock and Pilet, 2020; Jacquet et al., 2020), but takes DCFs as a given institutional practice and asks *how DCFs must be designed* in order to solicit support *among (different strata of) non-participating* citizens. It employs conjoint experiments with representative samples of citizens in the USA, Ireland, and Finland and considers various institutional design elements that are crucial both from a theoretical and a practical perspective in connection with issue characteristics, outcome favourability, and heterogeneous citizen preferences.

4. Hypotheses (required)
Notes:
Empowerment: *more* open to strong empowerment = privileging binding results; *less* open to strong empowerment = privileging non-binding results
Coupling: *more* open to coupling = privileging top-down processes and mixed-group memberships; *less* open to coupling = privileging bottom-up processes and groups composed of citizens only
Extra provisions: *more* interested in extra provisions = privileging random selection, large groups, clear majorities, and appropriate consideration of all affected interests; *less* interested in extra provisions = privileging self-selection, narrow majorities, and efficient decision-making

   A) Specific hypotheses about how each feature of DCFs will influence the perceived legitimacy of the hypothetical DCFs

H1.1: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF when participants were recruited randomly and less supportive when anyone could sign up (self-selection).

H1.2: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF if it engaged a large number of participants and less supportive if it engaged a small number of participants.
H1.3: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF when majority opinion is a larger majority (e.g., 71%) and less supportive when it is a smaller majority (e.g., 52%).
H1.4: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF when all interests were considered (even if this implies inefficiency) and less supportive when certain interest were excluded (even if decisions might have been made more efficiently)
H1.5: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF when the results are non-binding (recommendations to elected representatives or recommendations put to a referendum) and less supportive when the results are binding.
H1.6: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF if it was organized top-down (government) and less supportive if it was organized bottom-up (NGO or thinktank).
H1.7: Citizens will be more supportive of the DCF when they deliberate with politicians or other public authorities and less supportive when citizens deliberate only amongst themselves.

B) Specific hypotheses about how substantive considerations will influence the perceived legitimacy of the hypothetical DCFs

H2.1: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF when it is on a more technical issue (measures on reducing greenhouse gases) and less supportive when it is on a less technical issue (admitting refugees).
H2.2: Under conditions of less technical issues, citizens are less open to strong empowerment, more open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions.
H2.3: Citizens will be more supportive of a DCF when the outcome of the DCF corresponds to their own preferences and less supportive when the outcome of the DCF does not correspond to their own preferences.
H2.4: Under conditions of substantive preference divergence, citizens are less open to strong empowerment, more open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions.

C) Specific hypotheses about how each feature of DCFs will influence the perceived legitimacy of the hypothetical DCFs across various “types” of citizens

H3.1: Overall support for DCFs is higher among *political disaffected citizens* compared to allegiant citizens.
H3.2: *Political disaffected citizens* (including populist and stealth citizens) are more open to strong empowerment, less open to coupling, and less interested in extra provisions compared to allegiant citizens.
H3.3: Overall support for DCFs is higher among *political enlightened citizens* compared to less enlightened citizens.
H3.4: *Enlightened citizens* are less open to strong empowerment, more open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions compared to less enlightened citizens.
H3.5: Overall support for DCFs is higher among *participatory citizens* compared to delegative citizens.
H3.6: *Participatory citizens* are more open to strong empowerment, less open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions compared to less participatory citizens.

H3.7: *Delegative citizens* are less open to strong empowerment, more open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions compared to less delegative citizens.

D) Specific hypotheses how each feature of DCFs will influence the perceived legitimacy of the hypothetical DCFs contingent on familiarity and experiences with DCFs

H4.1: Overall support for DCFs is highest under conditions of proper information and positive experiences.
H4.2: Under conditions of proper information, citizens are less open to strong empowerment, more open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions.
H4.3: Under conditions negative experiences, citizens are less open to strong empowerment, more open to coupling, and more interested in extra provisions.

## Design Plan

In this section, you will be asked to describe the overall design of your study. Remember that this research plan is designed to register a single study, so if you have multiple experimental designs, please complete a separate preregistration.

5. Study type (required)
   Experiment - A researcher randomly assigns treatments to study subjects, this includes field or lab experiments. This is also known as an intervention experiment and includes randomized controlled trials.

6. Blinding (required)
   No blinding is involved in this study.

7. Is there any additional blinding in this study?

8. Study design (required)

   Survey respondents are presented with a conjoint-style (both choice-based and rating-based) survey experiment (see below). The conjoint consists of nine attributes with between 2-3 levels. Attributes and attribute levels are:
   1) (Policy) What measure is at stake?
   a) Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to net zero
   b) *#USA:* admission of undocumented residents; *#Ireland:* Replacing Direct Provision; *#Finland:* Increase in the refugee quota

   2) (Initiative) Who convenes the citizen forum?
   a) Think tank / NGO
   b) Government

3) (Recruitment) How are the participants selected?
a) Random selection
b) Self-selection

4) (Group size) How many citizens do participate?
a) about 20
b) about 500

5) (Group composition) How is the group of participants composed?
a) only citizens discuss
b) citizens discuss with politicians, civil servants, and stakeholders

6) (Aim of the forum) How should different interests be dealt with?
a) Efficient decision-making (even if this implies the exclusion of certain interests)
b) Appropriate consideration of all interests (even if this implies inefficiency)

7) (Degree of consensus) By which majority did the participants decide?
a) 52%
b) 71%

8) (Output) What is the result of the citizens' forum?
a) in favor of the measure
b) against the measure

9) (Authorization) How decisive is the result?
a) Binding decision
b) Recommendation to public officials
c) Recommendation to a public referendum

Respondents are randomly presented with 5 comparisons of hypothetical DCFs. For each comparison, respondents are asked to choose the scenario they prefer (choice). In addition, they are asked to evaluate each scenario (rating).
The surveys also include questions on respondents' preferences for political decision-making, awareness of/ experiences with/ and expectations on DCFs, political attitudes, and social demographics.
All respondents will be presented a short video on DCFs (about one and a half minute) and argument sheets on critical design features. During the conjoint experiment, respondents will also have the opportunity to access a glossary.

9. Randomization (optional)
Respondents are randomly presented with five comparisons of hypothetical DCFs; the order of the attributes and their levels are randomized (see below).

## Sampling Plan

In this section we'll ask you to describe how you plan to collect samples, as well as the number of samples you plan to collect and your rationale for this decision. Please keep in mind that the data described in this section should be the actual data used for analysis, so if you are using a subset of a larger dataset, please describe the subset that will actually be used in your study.

10. Existing data (required)
    Registration prior to creation of data: As of the date of submission of this research plan for preregistration, the data have not yet been collected, created, or realized.

11. Data collection procedures (required)
    CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interviews). Selection of respondents according to official statistics with marginal cell quotation. The sample will be drawn from the US, Irish, and Finish population aged 18 and older and will be representatively quoted and weighted by age, gender, education and residential region. Respondents are being recruited through Qualtrics (Finland) and Psyma (USA and Ireland). Respondents are compensated for participating in the study. Both Psyma and Qualtrics use its own incentive system, in which panel members earn a certain number of points for their participation.

12. Sample size (required)
    Approximately 2,000 respondents per country.

13. Sample size rationale (optional)
    We used the used the user-friendly power analysis tool for conjoint experiments provided by Stefanelli and Lukac (2020) (https://mblukac.shinyapps.io/conjoints-power-shiny/). We performed power analysis for assessing the quality of sample size in conjuncture with the number of choice tasks and the number of attribute levels. With 2000 respondents, five conjoint tasks, a maximum of three attribute levels, and an estimated effect size of 0.05, the design of the study will have a sufficient statistical power, noticeably above 0.8, even when including interaction models. (Recommendation for representative studies is a minimum sample size of 200 respondents per subgroup (cf. Orme, 2020, p. 65). However, Stefanelli and Lukac (2020) warn that the sample size for interaction effects must be significantly increased to meet the criteria of statistical power).

14. Stopping rule (optional)

## Variables

In this section you can describe all variables (both manipulated and measured variables) that will later be used in your confirmatory analysis plan. In your analysis plan, you will have the opportunity to describe how each variable will be used. If you have variables which you are measuring for exploratory analyses, you are not required to list them, though you are permitted to do so.

15. Manipulated variables (optional)

We present conjoints to respondents that describe hypothetical DCFs. We manipulate nine variables:

1) What measure is at stake? (Policy)
2) Who convenes the citizen forum? (Initiative)
3) How are the participants selected? (Recruitment)
4) How many citizens do participate? (Number of participants)
5) How is the group of participants composed? (Group composition)
6) How should different interests be dealt with? (Aim of the forum)
7) By which majority did the participants decide? (Degree of consensus)
8) What is the result of the citizens' forum? (Output)
9) How decisive is the result? (Authorization)

Conjoints will be presented in a tabular form with two scenarios each. The table below presents an example. Attributes will be randomly assigned, with manipulations listed in brackets:

[Policy] = [measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions / *#USA:* admission of undocumented residents; *#Ireland:* Replacing Direct Provision; *#Finland:* Increase in the refugee quota]
[Initiative] = [a committee of the Government / a non-partisan organization]
[Recruitment] = [random selection / self-selection]
[Group size] = [about 20 / about 500]
[Group composition] = [only citizens discuss / citizens discuss with politicians, civil servants, and stakeholders]
[Aim of the forum] = [Efficient decision-making (even if this implies the exclusion of certain interests) / Appropriate consideration of all interests (even if this implies inefficiency)]
[Degree of consensus] = [52% / 71%]
[Output] = [in favor of the measure / against the measure]
[Authorization] = [Binding decision / Recommendation to public officials / Recommendation to a public referendum]

| | Citizens' forum A | Citizens' forum B |
|---|---|---|
| Policy | | |
| Initiative | | |
| Recruitment | | |
| Group size | | |
| Group composition | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aim of the forum | | |
| Degree of consensus | | |
| Output | | |
| Authorization | | |

16. Measured variables (required)

Our quantities of interest are responses to two legitimacy questions (*choice-based responses* and *rating based responses*). Both types of questions will be asked for each of the five comparisons after reading the scenarios (H1.1 to H1.7). The questions are:

[choice] As a general matter, which of the two scenarios do you prefer?
<1> Citizens' forum A <2> Citizens' forum B

[rating_A] As a general matter, how strongly do you support or oppose Citizens´ forum A
[rating_B] As a general matter, how strongly do you support or oppose Citizens´ forum B
<1> I strongly oppose <7> I strongly support

To test H2.1 to H2.4, the survey includes questions on two political issues (climate change and refugees). In order to assess *issue salience*, respondents are asked how important or unimportant these issues are to them personally (1 "not important at all" to 7 "extremely important"). In order to assess *outcome favorability*, participants then will be be presented with concrete measures for both problems and asked to indicate how much they personally support or oppose the (1 "strongly oppose these measures" to 7 "strongly support these measures").

[issues:salience] Different issues are currently being discussed in politics. How important or unimportant are these issues for you personally?
[issues:salience_1] climate change
[issues:salience_2] immigration
<1> not at all important to <7> extremely important

[issues:preference] You will now be presented with concrete measures for both problems. Please indicate how much you personally support or oppose the measures.
[issues:preference_1] How strongly do you personally support or oppose these measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to net zero?
<1> I strongly oppose these measures to <7> I strongly support these measures

*#country specific for the US*
[issues:preference_2] How strongly do you personally support or oppose aggressive measures to stop undocumented immigration?
<1> I strongly oppose these measures to <7> I strongly support these measures
*#country specific for Ireland*
[issues:preference_2] How strongly do you personally support or oppose replacing Direct Provision with not-for-profit accommodation?

<1> I strongly oppose replacing Direct Provision to <7> I strongly support replacing Direct Provision
*#country specific for Finland*
[issues:preference_2] How strongly do you personally support or oppose an increase in the refugee quota?
<1> I strongly oppose the increase of the quota to <7> I strongly support the increase of the quota

To test H3.1 to H3.7, the survey includes questions on respondents' political attitudes. For political disaffected citizens, the survey contains questions on the overall *satisfaction with democracy* in [USA / Ireland / Finland], *external efficacy*, *political trust* [parliament / government / politicians], *stealth democracy*, and *populism*. For political enlightened citizens, the survey contains questions on *internal efficacy*, *political interest*, and *education*. For participatory and delegative citizens the survey contains questions on respondents' preferences for political decision-making where they need to assess questions on *deliberative and participatory involvement of citizens*, *expert decision-making*, and *representative decision-making*.

A) Disaffected citizens:

*#country specific for the US*
[satisfaction] On the whole, are you not at all satisfied, not very satisfied, fairly satisfied, or very satisfied with the way democracy works in the United States?
<1> not at all satisfied <7> very satisfied
*#country specific for Ireland and Finland*
[satisfaction] On the whole, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in [Ireland/Finland]?
<1> extremely dissatisfied to <7> extremely satisfied

[trust] How much do you personally trust
[trust_1] the parliament?
[trust_2] the government?
[trust_3] the politicians?
[trust_4] experts?
<1> do not trust at all to <7> do extremely trust

*#country specific for the US*
[efficacy:external] How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
[efficacy:external_1] People we elect to Congress try to keep the promises they have made during the election.
[efficacy:external_2] Most government administrators can be trusted to do what is best for the country.

<1> strongly agree to <5> strongly disagree
*#country specific for Ireland and Finland*
[efficacy:external_1] How much would you say the political system in [Ireland/Finland] allows people like you to have a say in what the government does?
[efficacy:external_2] And how much would you say that the political system in [Ireland/Finland] allows people like you to have an influence on politics?
<1> not at all <5> a great deal

[populism] Here are other opinions about politics and society some people agree with and others disagree with. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these opinions.
[populism_1] Ordinary citizens share a good and honest character.
[populism_2] The people should have the last say on important political issues through referendums.
[populism_3] The ordinary citizens pull together.
[populism_4] The differences between the people and the so-called elite are much greater than the differences within the people.
[populism_5] People and not the politicians should make the most important political decisions.
[populism_6] The politicians in parliament must follow the will of the people.
[populism_7] The ordinary people share the same values and interests.
<1> strongly disagree to <7> strongly agree

[stealth] Please read through the following statements. Do you agree or disagree?
[stealth_1] Elected officials would help the country more if they stopped talking and just take action on important problems.
[stealth_2] What people call “compromise” in politics is really just selling out one’s principles.
[stealth_3] Our government would run better if decisions were left up to successful business people.
[stealth_4] Our government would run better if decisions were left up to non-elected, independent experts rather than politicians or the people.
<1> strongly disagree to <7> strongly agree

B) Enlightened citizens:

[interest] How interested would you say you are in politics?
<1> not at all interested to <5> very interested

[efficacy:internal] How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
[efficacy:internal_1] People like me don't have any say about what the government does.
[efficacy:internal_2] I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our country.

<1> strongly agree to <5> strongly disagree

C) Participatory and delegative citizens:

[preferences] What is your opinion on the following forms of political decision making? Provide your opinion on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 means 'the worst way of making political-decisions' and 7 'the best way of making political decisions'.
[preferences_1] Regularly ask citizens about their opinions
[preferences_2] Let experts in different areas make decisions
[preferences_3] Make it easier for people to participate and discuss important political decisions
[preferences_4] Let elected politicians make decisions
<1> the worst way of making political decisions to <7> the best way of making political decisions

To test H4.1 to H4.3, the survey includes questions on respondents' *expectations and previous experiences with DCFs*. Respondents will be presented with a short description if DCFs ("We are now concerned with a special kind of political decision-making: Citizens' Forums. A citizens' forum is a group of selected lay citizens (similar to a jury) in which participants discuss an issue and make a joint recommendation to policymakers. In principle, citizens' forums can also make binding policy decisions") and then be asked how familiar, if at all, they ate with citizens' forums. Those who have at least heard about DCFs will then be asked how they would on average value citizens' forums based on their experiences or knowledge. Finally, they will be asked whether they have any specific ideas about what roles or tasks DCFs should have in policymaking.

[experiences] How familiar, if at all, are you with citizens' forums?
<1> I am not familiar with citizens' forums
<2> I have heard about citizens' forums before
<3> I know well about citizens' forums, but have not yet participated myself
<4> I have already participated in one or more citizens' forum myself

*#base: [experiences]= <2>, <3>,<4> or <5>*

[experiences:direction] On average, how would you value citizens' forums based on your experience or knowledge?
<1> extremely negative to <7> extremely positive

[expectations] Do you have specific ideas about what roles or tasks citizens' forums should have in policymaking?
<1> yes <2> no

Finally, to test the effect of *information*, respondents will be presented with a short video on DCFs and argument sheets on critical design features directly before the conjoint tasks (see above)

17. Indices (optional)

## Analysis Plan

You may describe one or more confirmatory analysis in this preregistration. Please remember that all analyses specified below must be reported in the final article, and any additional analyses must be noted as exploratory or hypothesis generating.

A confirmatory analysis plan must state up front which variables are predictors (independent) and which are the outcomes (dependent), otherwise it is an exploratory analysis. You are allowed to describe any exploratory work here, but a clear confirmatory analysis is required.

18. Statistical models (required)
    A key strength of conjoint analyses is that they do not require that researchers observe all possible attribute combinations. We estimate various effects of each manipulated attribute in a conjoint experiment. The most popular and common way is to estimate the average marginal component effects (Hainmueller et al., 2014).
    For subgroup analyses (H3.1 to H4.3), scales will be split at the median into two groups. Two test tests will be used to formally check whether there are statistically significant differences between the two groups. First, the two-sided t-test indicates significant differences in means for the [rating] outcome variables. Second, nested model comparisons test whether any interactions between the grouping variable and attribute levels differ from zero (Leeper, 2020).

19. Transformations (optional)

20. Inference criteria (optional)

21. Data exclusion (optional)

22. Missing data (optional)

23. Exploratory analysis (optional)

    Additionally, we will use alternative estimands for subgroup analyses, for example, Marginal Means (Leeper et al., 2020) and causal random forest models to identify

heterogeneous treatment effects (e.g., Abramson et al., 2020) since critics argue that average marginal component effects may be sensitive to reference categories which often leads to a confusing presentation of results.

## Other

24. Other (Optional)
The surveys are conducted in English (USA and Ireland) and Finnish (Finland)

References:


Abramson, S., Kocak, K., Magazinnik, A., & Strezhnev, A. (2020). Improving Preference Elicitation in Conjoint Designs using Machine Learning for Heterogeneous Effects. Retrieved from https://www.korhankocak.com/publication/akms/AKMS.pdf

Bedock C and Pilet JB (2020) Enraged, Engaged, or Both? A Study of the Determinants of Support for Consultative vs. Binding Mini-Publics. Representation, 1–21.

Buchstein H (2019) Democracy and lottery: Revisited. Constellations 26(3), 361–377.

Hainmueller J et al. (2014) Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments. Political Analysis 22(1), 1–30.

Jacquet V et al. (2020) Sortition, its advocates and its critics: An empirical analysis of citizens' and MPs' support for random selection as a democratic reform proposal. International Political Science Review, 1-22.

Lafont C (2019) Democracy Without Shortcut: A participatory conception of deliberative democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Landemore H (2020) Open Democracy: Reinventing Popular Rule for the Twenty-First Century. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Leeper, T. J. (2020). Cregg: Simple Conjoint Analyses and Visualization. R package version 0.4.0. Retrieved from https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/cregg/cregg.pdf

Leeper, T. J., Hobolt, S. B., & Tilley, J. (2020). Measuring Subgroup Preferences in Conjoint Experiments. Political Analysis, 28(2), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2019.30OECD (2020) Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions Catching the Deliberative Wave. Paris.

Parkinson J (2006) Deliberating in the real world: Problems of legitimacy in deliberative democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.