

## Scenario Experiments

*Hannah Werner and Lala Muradova*

The systemic turn in deliberative democratic theory (Mansbridge et al. 2012) has expanded not only the breadth of research questions on deliberation, but also the methodological repertoire with which they can be studied. In this chapter, we present scenario experiments as a method that is suitable to study deliberation at two different poles of the spectrum: micro processing in deliberation and macro effects of deliberative events on the wider public. In scenario experiments, people read a text or they hear and watch a video (a vignette), which is embedded within a survey. The vignette typically describes realistic deliberative processes using real examples and issues. At the same time, scenario experiments enable researchers to manipulate the variables of interest and precisely and randomly allocate respondents to treatment groups, which strengthens causal inference.

It is not the goal of this chapter to provide a comprehensive introduction to the experimental method (for this purpose, see Chapter 11 by Grönlund and Herne) or scenario experiments in general because several excellent handbooks are already available (e.g. Druckman et al. 2011; Mutz 2011). Rather, our goal is to carve out its advantages for the study of deliberative processes. Scenario experiments cannot capture the complex interpersonal processes underlying a democratic deliberation, but they can be used as a complementary and powerful tool to study the processes which are either overlooked or impossible to disentangle by only studying real-world deliberation cases, especially when we look at the micro mechanism of internal deliberation and at the macro effects of deliberative events. In the following, we will briefly introduce vignette experiments, and then discuss how they can facilitate deliberation research. We then present innovations in the field of experimental research that can be useful for deliberation research. Lastly, we present recent examples of scenario experiments in deliberation research and end with a discussion of its limitations.

### Scenario Experiments: A Brief Introduction

Scenario experiments, also called vignette experiments, are a subcategory of survey experiments. In general, survey experiments represent a marriage between two methods that are deeply rooted in the canon of the socio-scientific methods: large-N survey studies (see Chapter 14 by Gastil) and (previously mostly laboratory)

experiments (see Chapter 11 by Grönlund and Herne). The *survey* in ‘survey experiment’ refers to the use of survey sampling techniques to produce a large and heterogeneous sample (ideally representative of the target population, but not necessarily, since the causal inference is drawn from random allocation to treatment groups) on which the experiment is conducted. As Diana Mutz puts it, ‘it is the only kind of research design capable of simply and straightforwardly estimating population average treatment effects without complex statistical machinations’ (2011, 20). This is typically done through the use of online survey programming tools, such as Qualtrics. *Experiment* refers to the type of design where participants are randomly assigned to different treatment groups that vary on the independent variable (e.g. a citizens’ assembly is/is not convened to discuss a policy issue prior to a referendum). This clarification is important because it is different from the common use of the word ‘experiment’ in the deliberative field, where we often speak of a ‘deliberative experiment’ when talking about the (novel) implementation of a deliberative process (Gastil 2018). Likewise, the deliberative interventions initiated by researchers that include a pre- and post-design are thus not always experiments if they do not include random assignment to a treatment and a control group, or where the experimenter does not have full control over the manipulation (for a related discussion see Chapter 11 by Grönlund and Herne; see also Karpowitz and Mendelberg 2011). In recent years, survey experiments have become immensely popular in political science due to the possibility of programming them digitally, resulting in almost infinite possibilities for design with regard to the amounts and combinations of treatments or presentations of stimuli, and of filling in the surveys online, hence minimizing the costs of data collection and enabling a wider reach (Mullinix et al. 2015; Mutz 2011).

Scenario experiments are based on a particular type of experimental stimulus. Respondents are typically asked to imagine a hypothetical scenario. Often, these scenarios are described in short paragraphs of text (for alternative presentations, see the innovation section of this chapter). In deliberation research, this could be the description of a deliberative mini-public or a specific element thereof. Afterwards, respondents are asked questions about their perceptions of the described scenario, possibly including preferences, policy opinions, or assessments of legitimacy.

## What Scenario Experiments Can Do for Deliberation Research

Deliberative democrats may be sceptical when considering the application of online-administered experiments to study deliberative processes. They may refer to a potential mismatch between methodological assumptions underlying scenario experiments and normative theories of deliberation. Scenario experiments require a high level of experimental control with small manipulations of specific contexts that individuals are exposed to. One might argue that deliberation is not what happens in

isolation but *between* people, in interaction with others (Dryzek et al. 2019). Online surveys with experimental stimuli, one might presume, can hardly create the same experience as an actual small-group deliberation. As Karpowitz and Mendelberg (2011) correctly suggest, experiments ‘may be particularly vulnerable to the disagreements between theorists and empiricists to the extent that their heightened levels of control bring more stylized and more artificial operationalizations of complex and multifaceted theoretical concepts’ (267). We agree that scenario experiments are not always suited to study *interpersonal* deliberation as a complex communicative and social phenomenon.<sup>1</sup> But we want to make the case that scenario experiments can advance our knowledge about specific elements of the deliberative processes, particularly when studying micro mechanisms of deliberation (see section on zooming in) or their connection to other spheres (see section on scaling up). Meanwhile, for those studying deliberative systems, scenario experiments can provide insights into causal relationships for isolated elements of a deliberative system, which should ideally be complemented with other methods, for instance, small-n methods that are more authentic and can account for the interconnectedness of elements.

We identify two potential families of research questions that we consider crucial to our understanding of deliberation and deliberative systems and for the study of which scenario experiments are ideally suited.

## Research Area 1: Zooming In

First, even though theorists and qualitative researchers rightly note that deliberation is more than the sum of its parts, understanding the role each individual factor plays in enhancing deliberative outcomes is crucial (Karpowitz and Mendelberg 2011; Mutz 2011). This is particularly important for a systemic understanding of deliberation. Most scholars have moved away from considering only those interactions that fulfil high normative ideals as deliberative and towards embracing more *less-than-perfect* forms of deliberation. The argument is that these forms of deliberation, although imperfect on their own, could altogether contribute to larger deliberative systems. Thereby, gaining an understanding of causal inference in terms of the role of individual characteristics of deliberation has become a crucial task. This is especially the case for the study of individual cognitive processes in deliberation, sometimes referred to as *deliberation within* or reflection (Goodin 2003; Muradova 2020). Thus, tracing back the assumptions and goals of deliberative theory to micro processes of cognition has brought deliberation research ever closer to political psychology (see also Karpowitz and Mendelberg 2018; Muradova 2021; Myers and Mendelberg 2013). We consider scenario experiments as relevant tools for research because they enable: (a) more exact and controlled manipulation of key features; (b) cleaner causal

<sup>1</sup> Experimental designs do not, however, preclude us from recreating this kind of deliberation in subjects’ imagination, via scenarios (we discuss this more in the sections that follow).

inferences about their effects; and importantly (c) data collection across a heterogeneous group of respondents who go beyond the usual suspects who may participate in deliberative mini-publics. For example, if we want to study whether personal narratives within interpersonal deliberative settings can foster more engagement amongst underrepresented groups, for example citizens with lower levels of formal education or women, we can use scenario experiments. Although the scenario experiment in this case would not entirely approximate the real-world deliberation, it can give us some idea about the role and effect of these communicative elements for citizens' political reasoning and deliberation.

## Research Area 2: Scaling Up

A second area of research question relates to recent expansions of the focus from what happens inside the deliberative minipublics to the embeddedness of such forums in the wider democratic system (e.g. Curato and Böker 2016; Fung 2015; Lafont 2017; Niemeyer and Jennstal 2018). Upscaling of deliberative events is a crucial task for deliberation scholars and practitioners. Since deliberative forums are typically rather small-scale, it is not enough to study whether they can have effects for the handful of people that are involved directly in these processes. To understand the role that deliberative events can play in democracies at large, their potential to affect the broader public is pertinent. Two linkages are of importance.

Deliberative forums can impact the wider public by shaping citizens' policy decisions by either motivating citizens to become interested in the issue and to get informed about it or by directly informing their preferences (Goodin and Dryzek 2006). Following Warren's (2017) account of a problem-based approach to democratic theory, a core function that can be fulfilled through deliberation is collective will formation. This alludes to deliberation in a broader sense than deliberative mini-publics, but it is still consequential for the role that mini-publics might play: stimulate collective will formation, not only amongst the participants but also the wider public (see Gastil 2018; Gastil et al. 2016; Ingham and Levin 2018; Suiter et al. 2020a). The case of the Irish Citizens' Assembly and its role in shaping public preferences with regard to the issue of abortion is an excellent example (Suiter 2018). For instance, research has found that statements from the Citizens' Initiative Review, presented in the context of a scenario experiment to the subjects, substantially improved knowledge about the issue (Gastil et al. 2016).

Deliberative forums are also often expected to foster perceived legitimacy of authorities and decisions that result from deliberative consultation. Again, while the legitimacy perceptions of the participants of the mini-publics are worth investigating, the bigger challenge is to boost perceived legitimacy amongst citizens who did not personally participate in these processes, who are mere *observers* of the process (Curato and Böker 2016; Goodin and Dryzek 2006; Pow et al. 2020).

For the study of both these outcome variables of interest, we make the case that scenario experiments are suitable. They provide information cues that mimic

information that citizens would encounter in the real world about the existence, procedural character, and outcome of a deliberative forum. At the same time, they allow for the exact manipulation of the type and content of information and the conditions under which the desired effects on policy opinions and legitimacy beliefs can occur.

## Using Scenario Experiments in Deliberation Research

We identify five advantages of scenario experiments in complementing the existing methodological canon in deliberation research. The obvious advantage of any experimental approach is that it enables inferences about causal relationships. Since this major advantage is already discussed elsewhere (e.g. Mutz 2011), we will not address it here and will instead focus specifically on the advantages of scenario experiments.

### Disentangling the Relative Role of Individual Design and Context Factors

While laboratory or field experiments have many other advantages, they usually constrain the number of independent variables that can be studied in conjunction. This has to do primarily with efforts related to introducing new treatments and, probably more importantly, with small sample sizes that are typical of ‘offline’ experiments. Survey experiments, in contrast, allow for the manipulation of a range of specific design and contextual factors of the deliberative process. This not only increases our knowledge of the individual role of these factors in achieving deliberative outcomes, but also further provides insights into their *combined effects* (Mutz 2011). Scenario experiments enable us to study a new range of research questions. For instance, is it more important for citizens’ perceptions of legitimacy that deliberative forums are demographically representative on the national level rather than on the local level? Or are different designs desirable depending on the conflictual nature of the policy issue in question?

### Increasing Experimental Realism

A challenge to all experimental studies is achieving high levels of external validity. The same holds true for experiments on deliberation. Often, laboratory experiments create highly abstract decision-making situations, such as the division of money between members of a group, that are in many ways detached from actual political processes in the real world (see, for instance, Dickson et al. 2008; Sulkin and Simon 2001). Other times, laboratory experiments involve citizens discussing a policy issue in small groups (Muradova 2020), but the results of these discussions are not

connected to realistic policymaking. Scenario experiments can depict processes that mimic policy decision-making processes in the real world. The freedom and flexibility of the method allows for modelling of scenarios that directly connect to processes and policy debates in the region or community under study. Issues can be selected based on ongoing public debates at the time of data collection or on real recommendations made by an existing deliberative organ (see, for example, Suiter et al. 2020a). Lastly, online survey tools allow for individual adaptations of the scenario, for instance, by inserting the name of the respondent's municipality into the text.

When thinking particularly about the emerging research agenda on the macro effects of small-scale deliberation processes, scenario experiments can realistically convey similar amounts and types of information as citizens would receive in the real world. Stimuli could, for instance, take the form of media coverage, such as newspaper articles or television clips (see, for example, Suiter et al. 2020b).

## Going beyond the Usual Suspects: Representative Samples

A key advantage of survey experiments, as outlined above, is the combination of causal inference methods with diverse and heterogeneous sampling techniques. The opportunity to study the relationships of interest amongst representative or at least heterogeneous samples of the population holds two key advantages for deliberation research. First, a prominent concern amongst deliberative democrats and their critics is that deliberation and deliberative forums are primarily appealing to a specific set of people—those who are already highly interested in politics, hold high levels of formal education and socioeconomic status, and belong to ethnic and cultural majorities in society.<sup>2</sup> Since these groups already have access to political power through representation, providing them with extra channels for policy input may actually be a bad idea, so the argument goes. Irrespective of whether this critique actually holds empirically (for counterexamples, see Neblo et al. 2010), scholars should take these concerns seriously when studying deliberation. Studying participants' views, experiences, and preferences alone will give us only an incomplete picture of deliberation. Following Karpowitz and Mendelberg's (2011, 268) recommendation that 'how those who were not part of the discussion understand deliberating groups is a topic worth considerable additional study', we emphasize here that survey experiments facilitate the study of people who would not usually turn out to a deliberative event (as well as those who would). By posing an extremely low barrier for participation (fast, practical, flexible), survey experiments can enable us to study groups that usually refrain from all things political.<sup>3</sup> However, one must be sensitive to other types of

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, other groups of people, although not necessarily unwilling to participate in these processes, may be faced with other, structural inequalities.

<sup>3</sup> Of course, the actual representativeness of the sample depends on the sampling technique, which in turn depends on the agency that recruits respondents. This can range from market research companies (cheap, but they usually sample from their own pre-recruited subject pool and not from the whole

exclusion that may occur through this method, such as Internet access that may be less available to older people or in regions of the world where access is more restricted.

Second, the opportunity to obtain representative samples of the population allows for the study of heterogeneous effects across subgroups. One strand of literature within deliberative theory points out the potentially exclusionary and elitist nature of ‘rational arguments’. To remain inclusive of all groups in society, the acknowledgement of other types of communication styles was called for, such as personal stories, narratives, or other forms of emotional speech, as part of the repertoire of legitimate reasoning techniques (e.g. see Sanders 1997; Young 1996 for the initial critique; Bächtiger et al. 2010 for a recent perspective). These theoretical debates can be enriched and complemented by survey experimental research. For instance, it could be tested whether certain types of reasoning indeed speak to different demographic groups better and thus can serve as measures to make deliberation attractive to, and useful for, everyone. Accordingly, survey experiments can be important tools in studying how to overcome inequalities in deliberation.

## Thinking about Statistical Power

A common although little-discussed problem in quantitative deliberation research is that of statistical power. Simply put, power describes the probability of obtaining significance values that reject the null hypothesis (below the chosen alpha level, for instance .05) when the alternative hypothesis is true. Thus, the more power a study has, the less likely it becomes to falsely accept the null hypothesis (to make a Type II error). Power is a function of the *size* of the effect and the *sample size* of the study. This means, particularly when studying small effects, that sufficiently large sample sizes are required to detect these effects. Indeed, as in most social science research, deliberation research usually yields small effects. At the same time, actual deliberative events often involve only a small number of people, hence they struggle to achieve sufficient levels of power (usually considered above 80 per cent). Survey experiments with bigger samples and enough power thus provide the opportunity to obtain valid and reliable estimates of causal relationships.

## Last but Not Least: Costs

While there is great value in conducting real-life deliberative experiments, they are also immensely costly. Survey experiments cost only a fraction (depending on the sampling method), both in terms of the price of data collection itself and of time and

population) to panels set up for research practices, such as TESS at the University of Pennsylvania (more expensive or application based, but often use probability samples drawn from registry data).

personnel. This has two important implications for deliberation research. The first relates to the questionable generalizability of findings obtained from countries with high research resources, the so-called WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) countries. By developing low-cost tools to conduct deliberation research, we can open the doors to scholars working in countries with limited resources (e.g. in the Global South but also Southern and Eastern Europe). In this vein, low-cost survey experiments also facilitate comparative research projects, with the same experiments being run in several regions of the world, which are to date rare in deliberative research. Second, as outlined by Mutz (2011), the affordability of survey experiments makes it possible to spread resources across several studies, opening up avenues for replication and follow-ups on interesting research findings. As such, they can contribute greatly to cumulative and reliable knowledge creation in deliberation research.

## Illustrative Examples

In this section, we showcase some examples of how survey experiments have been used in the study of deliberation.

### Micro Processes in Deliberation

Strickler (2018) conducted two scenario experiments (one online and another telephone-based) to examine the extent to which individuals' adherence to deliberative discursive norms is conditioned by their partisanship. More specifically, he tested the effect of partisan social identities on citizens' attitudes to reciprocity when exposed to disagreement. Subjects in his scenario experiment were first asked about the extent and dimensions of their partisan attachment. Further, individuals were asked to indicate their position on two policy issues—immigration and civil liberties. The subjects were exposed to a counterargument, which was attributed to either a Democrat, a Republican, or a person without a party identifier. After the stimuli, respondents were asked to answer a set of questions tapping into the concept of reciprocity. The results of the research indicate that party cues moderate the relationship between disagreement and citizens' attitude of reciprocity. In other words, subjects in the experiments were more likely to consider in-party disagreement with an open mind while they were less likely to do so for out-party disagreement. Thereby, by researching two crucial components of deliberation—exposure to disagreement and reciprocity—with the help of a scenario experiment, the author could examine one of the conditions under which citizens are more (or less) willing to adhere to deliberative discursive ideals.



## The Effects of Deliberative Mini-publics on Opinion Formation amongst the Broader Public

Ingham and Levin (2018) conducted scenario experiments in the United States to investigate whether knowledge of deliberation outcomes can stimulate citizens to update their opinions on policy issues. Their experiment was included in a national-representative online survey. Participants first read a short introductory text about the potential changes to social security on different issues. Afterwards, they were randomly assigned to one of the issues and received either no text (control group) or different texts that described the occurrence of a citizen assembly, resulting in different recommendations and different reactions by a congressional panel. The respondents were then questioned on their opinions on the policy proposals. The authors find that, while information cues about a mini-public and their recommendation can increase support for the policy proposal, this is not the case for all issues. Further, it seems that hearing about the advice by a mini-public prompts people to doubt their initial policy preferences by increasing their uncertainty about the policies. This experimental approach allowed the authors to study citizens' reactions to a simple deliberative cue under different conditions. By including two different policy issues in the design, they were able to detect differences in effects, depending on the issue at hand.

## The Effects of Deliberative Mini-publics on the Legitimacy Perceptions of the Broader Public

Boulianne (2018) similarly studied the macro impacts of small-scale deliberation processes, also focusing on perceptions of legitimacy. She conducted two scenario experiments that were connected to real ongoing deliberative processes in Edmonton (climate change) and Alberta (energy efficiency) in Canada, that had received little media attention. Both experiments had two conditions: a control condition in which respondents did not receive any information, and a treatment condition in which respondents read a short text. The vignettes described the mini-publics' processes and policy recommendations. After reading the paragraph, respondents were questioned about their policy preferences, trust in government in the respective policy areas, and political efficacy. The findings differ between the two studies, which can be due to several factors, such as the different policy issues or other features of the process. This study illustrates the trade-offs that scholars face when designing scenario experiments. While using a real case increases external validity, it also constrains the freedom to manipulate elements of the process or the recommendations of deliberative minipublics, which would consequently help uncover a more precise understanding of the mechanisms.

## Innovations in Survey Experimental Research

Survey experimental research is an exciting field with many innovations in the design, fielding, and analysis of experiments. Some of these innovations are fruitful for deliberation research. First, as the previous examples have shown, the challenge in web-based experiments is the design of clear and realistic stimuli that explain often-unknown deliberative processes to respondents while maintaining a high level of attention and engagement. One potential solution to this is to present the stimuli with the help of audio-visual material rather than text (for an example, see Werner and Marien 2020; Suiter et al. 2020b). This can improve citizen engagement with the content, increase attention, and clarify and emphasize the important pieces of information.<sup>4</sup> This mode can also approximate the real-world information flow for many people, who mostly find out about local and national events by watching television. One straightforward and comparatively cost-efficient approach is to create animated movies with voice-over text. Multiple tools to create such movies are available online and require only basic knowledge of image and sound editing. While we consider this a fruitful innovation for deliberation research, studies that compare the effects of texts and audio-visual material are needed.

Second, the increasing use of *conjoint experiments* expands the possibilities for designing scenario experiments (Hainmueller et al. 2014). Conjointly simultaneously test multiple factors, resulting in a number of conditions (often above 100), which is unthinkable in standard (laboratory) experiments. Since the factors are orthogonal to each other, their independent effect can be assessed across all other independent variables, which can help ensure generalizability. There are two ways in which conjointly can be useful for the study of deliberation. First, they allow for the simultaneous study of multiple elements that characterize deliberative processes, such as the composition of the participant group, effective influence, the structure of the assembly, the role of politicians in the process, and so on. Second, conjointly can increase generalizability because they investigate one or a few variables of interest while taking contextual factors into account. Hence, the individual effect of, say, the participant recruitment method for deliberative events could be tested across contextual factors, such as different levels of government or policy issues. First studies such as Christensen (2020) or Goldberg and Bächtiger (2022) made use of conjoint analysis to study citizens' preferences for different design components of a participatory process.

## Challenges of Scenario Experiments

So far, we have demonstrated the advantages of scenario experiments. We conclude our chapter by discussing some of its limitations. First, external validity and

<sup>4</sup> Some may argue that this type of exposure makes it difficult to make a cleaner causal claim, due to the impossibility of controlling for the effect of different visual cues.

generalizability must be assessed critically with every scenario experiment. Even if experimental stimuli are designed in a realistic fashion, they are still presented in the context of a survey and hence detached from everyday political life (Barabas and Jerit 2010). To date we lack reliable systematic knowledge about whether and under which conditions the results obtained with scenario experiments match findings from real cases, particularly because it is unclear what the benchmark would be (e.g. comparing the findings to a cross-sectional survey study might be inconclusive since none of the two studies can credibly claim to hold authority over ‘true’ effects). Existing research remains ambiguous about the generalizability of scenario experiments, with some studies finding supporting evidence (e.g. Hainmueller et al. 2015; Mullinix et al. 2015) and others drawing more pessimistic conclusions (Barabas and Jerit 2010).

A second concern is that some scenario experiments may fail to meet the *information equivalence* assumption, crucial for experiments, designed with the aim of studying the real-world effects of some factor or attribute, presented as an informational piece. In other words, it is assumed that when reading about the vignette, citizens’ beliefs about background characteristics of the *treatment* are not affected. This is an important assumption, particularly for experiments aimed at examining *epistemic* effects, that is, ‘the effects of changing subjects’ beliefs about some factor of interest, holding constant beliefs about background features of the scenario (background beliefs)’ (Dafoe et al. 2018, 400). This is less of a problem when studying informational effects where the experimental treatment and the naturally occurring treatment are very similar (as is the case with the macro-research questions described previously). To the extent that this assumption holds true (citizens think about a group of *different* people coming together to talk about an important issue in an open, equal, and tolerant environment, when reading about the word *deliberation*), we are talking about the real effects. To the extent that it does not (citizens shift their beliefs, for instance, because they thought of a group of highly educated, middle-aged, male citizens coming together to show off how smart they are), the effect obtained can be easily attributable to some other aspect of the manipulation. Accordingly, the internal validity of the experiment can be questioned. Several strategies have been proposed to ensure information equivalence, such as manipulation checks (see Dafoe et al. 2018). In addition to these suggestions, we propose another strategy, perhaps more relevant to deliberation research. We believe scenario experiments can embed a short definition of the treatment—the concept we are trying to manipulate in the experiment—within the vignette. For example, if our treatment is a mini-public as a decision-making body, we could provide the respondents with a short definition of what a mini-public is and what it entails. In this way, we can prevent them from updating their beliefs about the term ‘mini-public’ and keep the definition constant in their reasoning.

Despite the above-mentioned challenges, scenario experiments provide us with unique opportunities to disentangle and test the effects of different *types*, *dimensions*, and *components* of public deliberation under different conditions and contexts amongst larger and more heterogeneous populations. The lessons learned from

these experiments contribute not only to the advancement of deliberation research, but also to the innovation of institutional design to improve the functioning of democracies.

## Further Reading

- Auspurg, Katrin, and Thomas Hinz. 2014. 'Introduction to Conjoint Experiments.' In *Factorial Survey Experiments*, Vol. 175. London: Sage.
- Mutz, Diana. 2011. *Population-Based Survey Experiments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

## References

- Bächtiger, André, Simon Niemeyer, Michael Neblo, Marco Steenbergen, and Jürg Steiner. 2010. 'Disentangling Diversity in Deliberative Democracy: Competing Theories, Their Blind Spots and Complementarities.' *Journal of Political Philosophy* 18 (1): 32–63.
- Barabas, Jason, and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. 'Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?'. *American Political Science Review* 104 (2): 226–242.
- Boulianne, Shelley. 2018. 'Mini-Publics and Public Opinion: Two Survey-Based Experiments'. *Political Studies* 66 (1): 119–136.
- Christensen, Henrik Serup. 2020. 'How Citizens Evaluate Participatory Processes: A Conjoint Analysis'. *European Political Science Review* 12 (2): 239–253.
- Curato, Nicole, and Marit Böker. 2016. 'Linking Mini-Publics to the Deliberative System: A Research Agenda'. *Policy Sciences* 49 (2): 173–190.
- Dafoe, Allan, Baobao Zhang, and Devin Caughey. 2018. 'Information Equivalence in Survey Experiments'. *Political Analysis* 26 (4): 399–416.
- Dickson, Eric, Catherine Hafer, and Dimitri Landa. 2008. 'Cognition and Strategy: A Deliberation Experiment'. *The Journal of Politics* 70 (4): 974–989.
- Druckman, James, Donald Green, James Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryzek, John, André Bächtiger, Simone Chambers, Joshua Cohen, James Druckman, Andrea Felicetti, James Fishkin, David Farrell, Archon Fung, Amy Gutmann, Hélène Landemore, Jane Mansbridge, Sofie Marien, Michael Neblo, Simon Niemeyer, Maija Setälä, Rune Slothuus, Jane Suiter, Dennis Thompson, and Mark Warren. 2019. 'The Crisis of Democracy and the Science of Deliberation'. *Science* 363 (6432): 1144–1146.
- Fung, Archon. 2015. 'Putting the Public Back into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and Its Future'. *Public Administration Review* 75 (4): 513–522.
- Gastil, John. 2018. 'The Lessons and Limitations of Experiments in Democratic Deliberation'. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 14: 271–292.
- Gastil, John, Elizabeth Rosenzweig, Katherine Knobloch, and David Brinker. 2016. 'Does the Public Want Mini-Publics? Voter Responses to the Citizens' Initiative Review'. *Communication and the Public* 1 (2): 174–192.

- Goldberg, Saskia and Bachtiger, Andre. 2022. "Catching the Deliberative Wave? How (Disaffected) Citizens Assess Deliberative Citizen Forums". *British Journal of Political Science*. Online first.
- Goodin, Robert E. 2003. *Reflective Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodin, Robert, and John Dryzek. 2006. 'Deliberative Impacts: The Macro-Political Uptake of Mini-Publics'. *Politics and Society* 34 (2): 219–244.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Dominik Hangartner, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2015. 'Validating Vignette and Conjoint Survey Experiments against Real-World Behavior'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112 (8): 2395–2400.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2014. 'Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments'. *Political Analysis* 22 (1): 1–30.
- Ingham, Sean, and Ines Levin. 2018. 'Can Deliberative Minipublics Influence Public Opinion? Theory and Experimental Evidence'. *Political Research Quarterly* 71 (3): 654–667.
- Karpowitz, Christopher, and Tali Mendelberg. 2011. 'An Experimental Approach to Citizen Deliberation'. In *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, edited by James Druckman, Donald Green, James Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia, pp. 258–273. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karpowitz, Christopher, and Tali Mendelberg. 2018. 'Do Enclaves Remediate Social Inequality?'. *The Journal of Politics* 80 (4): 1134–1149.
- Lafont, Cristina. 2017. 'Can Democracy be Deliberative and Participatory? The Democratic Case for Political Uses of Mini-Publics'. *Daedalus* 146 (3): 85–105.
- Mansbridge, Jane, James Bohman, Simone Chambers, Thomas Christiano, Archon Fung, John Parkinson, Dennis F. Thompson and Mark E. Warren. 2012. A systemic approach to deliberative democracy. In J. Parkinson & J. Mansbridge (Eds.), *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale* (Theories of Institutional Design, pp. 1–26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139178914.002
- Mullinix, Kevin, Thomas Leeper, James Druckman, and Jeremy Freese. 2015. 'The Generalizability of Survey Experiments'. *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2 (2): 109–138.
- Muradova, Lala. 2021. 'Seeing the Other Side? Perspective Taking and Reflective Political Judgements in Interpersonal Deliberation'. *Political Studies*. 69 (3): 644–664
- Muradova, Lala. 2021. 'Reasoning across the Divide: Interpersonal Deliberation, Emotions and Reflective Political Thinking'. Doctoral Dissertation.
- Mutz, Diana. 2011. *Population-based Survey Experiments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Myers, C. Daniel, and Tali Mendelberg. 2013. 'Political Deliberation'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, edited by Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, pp. 699–734. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Neblo, Michael, Kevin Esterling, Ryan Kennedy, David Lazer, and Anand Sokhey. 2010. 'Who Wants to Deliberate—and Why?' *American Political Science Review* 104 (3): 566–583.
- Niemeyer, Simon, and Julia Jennstal. 2018. 'Scaling Up Deliberative Effects: Applying Lessons of Mini-publics'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*, edited by André Bächtiger, John S. Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark Warren, pp. 329–347. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pow, J. & van Dijk, L. & Marien, S., (2020) "It's Not Just the Taking Part that Counts: 'Like Me' Perceptions Connect the Wider Public to Minipublics", *Journal of Deliberative Democracy* 16(2), p. 43–55. doi: <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.368>
- Sanders, Lynn. 1997. 'Against Deliberation'. *Political Theory* 25 (3): 347–376.
- Strickler, Ryan. 2018. 'Deliberate with the Enemy? Polarization, Social Identity, and Attitudes toward Disagreement'. *Political Research Quarterly* 71 (1): 3–18.
- Suiter, Jane. 2018. 'Deliberation in Action: Ireland's Abortion Referendum'. *Political Insight* 9 (3): 30–32.
- Suiter, Jane, Eileen Culloty, and Lala Muradova. 2020b. 'COVID-19 Misinformation and Minipublics'. Presented at the *Irish Political Science Association Annual Conference*, Dublin [online].
- Suiter, Jane, Lala Muradova, John Gastil, and David M. Farrell. 2020a. 'Scaling-up Deliberation: Testing the Potential of Mini-Publics to Enhance the Deliberative Capacity of Citizens'. *Swiss Political Science Review* 26 (3): 253–272.
- Sulkin, Tracy, and Adam Simon. 2001. 'Habermas in the Lab: A Study of Deliberation in an Experimental Setting'. *Political Psychology* 22 (4): 809–826.
- Warren, Mark. 2017. 'A Problem-Based Approach to Democratic Theory'. *American Political Science Review* 111 (1): 39–53.
- Werner, Hannah, and Sofie Marien. 2020. 'Process vs. Outcome? How to Evaluate the Effects of Participatory Processes on Legitimacy Perceptions'. *British Journal of Political Science* 52(1): 429–436
- Young, Iris Marion. 1996. 'Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy'. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, pp. 120–135. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.