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INTRODUCTION

There is a growing interest and attention to the practice of deliberative democracy. However, with few exceptions, many of these scholarly works “[treat] deliberation as a black box” (Stromer-Galley and Muhlberger 2009, 174). Similarly, few works have looked at the key antecedent to deliberation: willingness to invest one’s time and energy to participate in a deliberation. This paper uses the term deliberative orientation to refer to both the initial interest and willingness on a person’s part to invest their time and resources to engage in a deliberative engagement as well as their inclination and ability to engage in a conversation with others in a respectful, reflective, and constructive way by engaging in positive deliberative behaviors and refraining from engagement in negative deliberative behaviors.

Drawing on a mix of unique and original quantitative and quantitative data, it examines gender differences in both willingness for participation in deliberation as well as the capacity to engage in behaviors desired by deliberative democratic theorists using original data at a research university in Canada. To examine gender differences in willingness for deliberation, this article relies on survey data collected from 437 students. To look at the gender differences in the capacity to engage in positive deliberative behavior, this article relies on coded transcriptions from deliberative experiments involving 40 students on the topic of permitting religious arbitration for the resolution of civil cases in British Columbia.

The results show that women are much more willing than men to express willingness to engage in a deliberation on three of the topics proposed to them—general unspecified public policy issue, LGBTQ policy in Vancouver schools, and violence against women in minority communities. They are not any less likely than men to express willingness for participation on the other topics proposed. The results from the deliberative experiments demonstrate that when participants
deliberate under control conditions, women more than men engage in positive deliberative behavior such as respecting fellow participants, taking into account what has been said, and offering compromises or mediating proposals. Meanwhile, men much more than women engage in negative deliberative behavior by disrespecting fellow participants, ignoring what others are saying, or not responding to challenging arguments. Both results indicate that power relations affect interactions within deliberation.

However, when two innovative facilitative treatments were used, the gender difference all but disappeared. These facilitative treatments were simulated representation (getting participants to switch places literally by learning, presenting, defending each other’s views for a portion of deliberation) and deliberative worth exercises (getting participants to rate each other based their positive/negative deliberative behaviors and choosing the best deliberators of each round). Both were aimed at encouraging positive deliberative behavior and discouraging negative deliberative behavior. Both treatments were successful at reducing the gap between men and women within deliberation by, mainly, increasing the instances where men engaged in positive deliberative behavior.

This article makes a number of key contributions to the scholarship on gender and deliberative democracy. First, it demonstrates that there is a gender difference in deliberative orientation. Women are much more willing than men to engage in deliberations—particularly on difficult and contentious topics. When present at a deliberation, women are also more likely to engage in positive deliberative behavior than men. Second, it develops and tests ways of improving and democratizing deliberation—especially between genders—by focusing on facilitation methods rather than institutional design or decision rules. Third, it examines differences in willingness for deliberation in cases where deliberation is both necessary and difficult: under
conditions of cultural and religious difference.

**GENDER AND DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY**

The literature tells us that there is a gender gap in political participation as well as political ambition\(^1\). A great amount of scholarly work has been devoted to examining the difficulties that women face before and upon entering politics. Women “have often found themselves relegated to lower levels in hierarchies and to community mobilization work” (Cornwall and Goetz 2005, 788) and have had to forgo their “feminists sympathies” (784) in order to gain and maintain their political office. It is not, therefore, surprising that with the increasing scholarly interest in deliberative democratic theory and practice, many have looked to such engagements and their promise of inclusiveness and equality as a space for women to participate without the burdens imposed by unequal power relations.

Deliberative democracy is premised on the assumption that under the right conditions, people are able and willing to communicate with each other in an open and rational manner. Through such an exchange, deliberative democrats hope and expect to see a better-informed and more engaged public (Barber 1984), who have become more aware of their own values and interests through deliberation (Chambers 1996), and who are more tolerant of differing opinions and values (Gutmann and Thompson 1996). Such an engagement, can lead people to come to a more inclusive and democratically legitimate compromise or, ideally, a consensus (Habermas 1996, Habermas 2002, Habermas 2006).

However, many have argued that deliberative democracy is not the panacea it appears. In fact, Ilan Kapoor notes that “an unequal division of labor” means that “women’s inclusion in

---

Habermas’s deliberative democracy would be no guarantee of the representation of their concerns in decision making” (Kapoor 2002, 470). Moreover, research has shown that “both men and women perceive women to be less knowledgeable about politics and men to be more knowledgeable, regardless of the actual level of knowledge each discussion partner holds” (Mendez and Osborn 2010, 269). This means that within a deliberative engagement, women are seen as less knowledgeable and, therefore, are less persuasive. Moreover, while women talk in a more “tentative, exploratory, or conciliatory” way, men are more “assertive and confrontational” (Young 1996, 123) which can also lend itself to being perceived as more persuasive.

One of the more serious criticisms lodged against deliberative democracy is one which defines it: “a deliberative democracy is one in which citizens use reason and give reasons in dialogues aimed at making decisions about what to do” (Hall 2007, 82). Since reason has been historically associated “with masculinity and whiteness” (85), deliberative democracy, in essence “tends to silence or devalue some people or groups” (Young 1996, 120). As Cornwall and Goetz succinctly summarize:

Despite the promise of deliberative institutions as more inclusive and participatory, the challenges faced by women are effectively little different to those in more formal arenas. Gender-based inequalities are embedded even in the range of permissible subjects for deliberation and the language and culture of public debate (Cornwall and Goetz 2005, 793).

Few works, with the exception of Karpowitz et al. 2012, Mendelberg et al. 2014a, 2014b, and Hickerson and Gastil 2008, have engaged in an empirical examination of gender and deliberation. In particular, there is a gap in the literature looking at whether gender has an effect on the

---

2 As Mendelberg and her colleagues argue: “there is a substantial gender gap in voice and authority, but as hypothesized, it disappears under unanimous rule and few women, or under majority rule and many women. Deliberative design can avoid inequality by fitting institutional procedure to the social context of the situation” (Karpowitz, et al. 2012, 533). See Mendelberg, et al. 2014a, Mendelberg, et al. 2014b.
willingness for deliberation or the capacity to engage in positive deliberative behavior within a deliberation. In other words, is there a gender difference in the deliberative orientation of participants? In the next sections, this paper attempts to answer this question.

**GENDER DIFFERENCE IN WILLINGNESS FOR PARTICIPATION IN A DELIBERATION**

Participation in a deliberative engagement—particularly one that asks for time and cognitive commitments—entails high costs and effort; even more so than other forms of political and social participation. This can particularly be the case when the deliberation is conducted under conditions of deep diversity—when the topic concerns issues of identity politics and when the diversity in the participants can lead to inherently uneven power distributions.

In many ways, willingness to participate in a deliberation over a public issue should be considered as part of the larger question of participation in politics as it requires individual investments for a larger social, often political, goal. However, participation in a deliberation is different in the degree of investments—in time and effort—it requires as well as the potential returns it promises. Is there an expectation of a gender difference in the willingness to participate in deliberative engagements?

There is an argument to be made “that women may be particularly sensitive to maintaining relationships by shunning conflict” (Belenky, et al. 1986 in Djupe, et al. 2007, 907). Similarly, while situations of “competition and partisan conflict can promote learning for men, women can gain more knowledge in communal rather than combative environments” (Wolak and McDevitt 2011, 527). While deliberative democratic practices might hold consensus to be an ideal—less now than before—the process itself can still be a contentious exchange of ideas and positions.

---

3 In other words, when the topic involves issues concerning gender, cultural or religious difference, or sexual orientation, among others.
Moreover, the only scholarly work looking at the willingness for deliberation showed that there are, indeed, differences in the willingness for deliberation. Neblo et al. showed that while participants in deliberations are most often “wealthy, educated, and professional” (Fung 2003, 342) as well as “whiter [and] older” (Goidel, et al. 2008, 801), “younger people, racial minorities, and lower-income” individuals “expressed significantly more willingness to deliberate” (Neblo, et al. 2010, 574). They also showed that to a lesser—and, mostly, statistically insignificant—degree women, less partisan people, and non-churchgoers” also expressed more willingness (574).

This article builds on this scholarship by looking at the willingness for deliberation and differs from this literature in three significant ways. First, this article looks at both willingness for participation in a deliberation on general and unidentified policy areas as well as the willingness for deliberation on specific policy areas. This allows one to gauge the difference, if any, in the willingness for deliberation across topics. In particular, the work undertaken by Neblo, et al. 2010 is not able to shed light on areas where deliberation is most necessary and most difficult: under conditions of deep diversity where both the diversity in the participants as well as the topic concerning identity difference can be an impediment to willingness. Second, while Canada has seen the rise in deliberative engagements on a variety of policy areas, there has been no scholarly examinations of the willingness for deliberation on topics that can touch upon people’s divergent values and practices in the increasingly multicultural milieu of Canada. Finally, in order to uncover the origins of gender gap in deliberative orientation, this article looks at a sample of university students. Drawing on this diverse set of research, this article makes the following hypotheses:

**H1a:** Much like the literature on gender and politics suggests, women will be less likely than men to express willingness for deliberation on issues.

**H1b:** This will be especially true for more contentious topics.
Case selection:

A note about case selection is in order. Both the survey discussed in this section as well as the experiment discussed in the next rely on data collected from students at a university in Vancouver, British Columbia. Focusing on Vancouver, British Columbia has a number of advantages. First, and most importantly, Vancouver can be seen as a critical case when analyzing gender difference in willingness for deliberation on issues that can touch upon cultural and religious diversity. “More than half (54%)” of Canadians identify multiculturalism as a key symbol of Canadian identity (Environics Institute 2015). Moreover, in the most recent Canada-wide survey, only 17.5% believed that there should be less done for racial and ethnic minorities while the rest believed that the same amount (41%) or more (41.5%) should be done (Fournier, et al. 2015). Finally, as noted before, nearly half of the population in Vancouver is comprised of visible minorities. Therefore, in terms of descriptive representation and support for cultural and religious diversity, Canada in general and Vancouver in particular present excellent cases. Widespread support for multiculturalism and racial minorities allows us to better discern differences in willingness for deliberation attributed to gender.

Also, some other factors make this an ideal case. As it will be discussed later, the sample of students—much like the general population in the metropolitan area of Vancouver—is comprised of individuals from diverse cultural, religious, and ethnic backgrounds. This diversity allows the researcher to look at gender difference in willingness for deliberation under conditions of deep diversity where both the diversity in the participants as well as the particular topic can pose challenges. Finally, while using a student sample imposes certain limitations, it is ideal for researchers interested in roots of gender difference. Young adults, much more than the general population, are unencumbered from the various responsibilities than can reduce willingness for
deliberation in older adults. Indeed, it should go without saying that unequal division of responsibilities at home, often times, reduces the more active participation in politics by women. Therefore, looking at a sample of diverse young adults allows the researcher to focus on whether there are differences between men and women in their deliberative orientation.

Data and methods

The data was collected through an online survey. The 437 participants were all students at a university. This university is a large public research institution in a large, multicultural city. There are 53000 students enrolled at the university, 23% of whom are international students. The study was approved by Behavioural Research Ethics Board of the university prior to the recruitment of the participants. More information about the recruitment process can be found in the appendix. The data is analyzed through logistic regressions and post-estimation calculations\(^4\).

The decision to use students instead of the general public was based on a number of reasons. The appendix provides a detailed explanation for this decision. However, it is worth noting that many within the field of experimental political science believe that the use of students does not inherently problematize survey and experimental research (Druckman and Kam 2011). Indeed, Druckman and Kam note,

students and the nonstudent general population are, on average, indistinguishable when it comes to partisanship (we find this for partisan direction and intensity), ideology, the importance of religion, belief in limited government, views about homosexuality as a way of life, the contributions of immigrants to society, social trust, degree of following and discussing politics, and overall media use (85-86).

\(^4\) An ordinal logistic regression was deemed to be the best fit as the dependent variables have more than two categories and the values of each category have a meaningful sequential order where a value is indeed ‘higher’ than the previous one. In order to test the validity of each of the models likelihood ratio tests (omodel logit as well as brant tests) were carried out on each of the regression models.
In the case of the survey data, the participants share a number of significant similarities with the general population adding to the representativeness of the sample. 43.4% of the participants in the survey identified as visible minorities. This number closely resembles the 45.1% of the population in the metropolitan area of Vancouver (Canada 2011). Similarly, 25% of the participants in the survey identified as ethnically Chinese which is comparable to 27.7% of the general population.

While the percentage of participants in the survey who identified as Christian was significantly lower than the general population (30% compared to 45%), the percentage of participants identifying as having no religious affiliation (50%) is comparable to the general population (44.6%) (Canada 2011). The smaller percentage of Christians in the sample can be explained by looking at the trends of religious affiliation in British Columbia which shows while there has been a decline in percentage of the population identifying as Christian, other religions, particularly Sikhism, are on the rise (Canada 2011). It, therefore, makes sense that the younger population at the university would mirror this trend more explicitly.

This study has six dependent variables. Half of the participants were asked about their willingness for participation in a deliberation on a public policy issue and half were asked about their willingness to engage in a deliberation on a public policy issue pertaining to multiculturalism and accommodation. All the participants were then asked about their willingness to participate in a deliberation on four specific policy areas: instituting a LGBTQ policy in the Vancouver School Board, looking at increasing or maintaining the minimum wage in British Columbia, examining the causes and solutions to violence against women in cultural/religious minority communities in BC, and funding for cultural and religious groups in British Columbia through programs like Embrace BC. All four of these specific questions dealt with a local (Vancouver or British

---

5 The new census was carried out in 2016. The data from the new census have not been made public.
6 This article has singled out the Chinese population as it is the largest minority group in British Columbia.
Columbia) issue in order to ignite the same levels of interest\(^7\). Moreover, they were all featured in the news in the run-up to the survey. The logic was that participants would be more likely to know and have formed opinions about these issues that others that were not in the news. The appendix includes full text of the questions that were posed to the participants.

The independent variables were gender, religiosity, and self-identification as a visible minority as well as two variables capturing the respondents’ assessments of their personality and capacities: introversion and opinionated\(^8\). The appendix includes more descriptive information about the independent variables as well as the logic behind their inclusion in the model.

**Results and discussion**

**Table 1** summarizes the calculated predicted probabilities for a participant choosing the response category “I would do it for sure if I was invited” for each of models, going from the lowest to the highest value in the independent variables\(^9\).

The finding that needs to be highlighted here is that across all the statistically significant models, women are more willing than men to participate on the more contentious issues. They are 12% more likely to express willingness to participate in a deliberation on the issue of LGBTQ policy and 16% more likely than men to express willingness to come to the table on the issue of violence against women in minority communities. They are also not any less likely than men to express willingness to participate in deliberation on other topics. In fact, they were 17% more

---

\(^7\) All of the dependent variables are coded from 1-4: I definitely wouldn’t participate; I don’t think I would do it, but maybe; I would think about it; and I would do it for sure if I was invited. While these categories are non-standard, they were chosen to get the best possible measurement of the grey area between intentions of non-participation and participation. The language is purposefully colloquial. The main reason has to do with ensuring that participants with lower degrees of competency in English could understand the choices clearly.

\(^8\) Education, age, and income are left out due to the particularities of the sample. Since the respondents are all students, education and age do not vary significantly. Similarly, their assessment of the income of their parents might not be accurate.

\(^9\) I have included the regression tables in the appendix. The results of logistic regressions are not readily self-evident and hence are not included in the body of the paper.
likely to express willingness for deliberation on a general, but unspecified, public policy issue.

Table 1  Change in predicted probabilities “I would do it for sure if I was invited” for each independent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness for deliberation on:</th>
<th>Unspecified general public policy issue</th>
<th>Unspecified multicultural policy issue</th>
<th>LGBTQ policy in schools</th>
<th>Minimum wage in British Columbia</th>
<th>VAW in minority groups</th>
<th>Funding for cultural and religious groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender*</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Minority**</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinionated</td>
<td>+25%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+22%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Male=0  Female=1  Boided numbers signify statistical significance in the original model.
** No=0  Yes=1

Therefore, based on these results, it can easily be argued that women are more interested in participating in deliberative engagements. This both confirms and strengthens the finding by Neblo, et al. 2010 that women express more willingness for participation in deliberative engagements. This article finds that not only this is true, it is especially true when the deliberation topic is likely to lead to contentious disagreements.

There are further interesting and important findings. For instance, those who identify as very religious are 11% less likely than those who identified as not-religious to express willingness for participation in a deliberative engagement on the topic of instituting a LGBTQ policy in Vancouver schools. Such a conversation will likely touch upon the religious values of participants will presumably be uncomfortable for those who see themselves as very religious. This finding validates the notion that we may shy away from contentious discussions that can challenge our deep-held religious values. In particular, it provides credence to the works that argue that people would be unwilling to participate in conversations that would be conflictual. This is a key fact put forth by Elizabeth Theiss-Morse and John R. Hibbing who argue that for some, if not many, “clashing interests are a source of discomfort” (Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002, 142) and most
prefer to move away from conflict and “return to the warm feelings generated by consensus” (Theiss-Morse and Hibbing 2005, 234). Moreover, empirical evidence seems to suggest that individuals generally prefer to talk to those with whom they already know they agree as opposed to those with whom they (might) disagree (Huckfeldt and Sprague 1995, Mutz 2001; also see Mutz 2006 and Eveland and Hively 2009).

The focus of this article, however, is whether gender is a strong predictor of deliberative orientation. The results show that women are much more willing than men to express willingness on three of topics—general unspecified public policy issue, LGBTQ policy in Vancouver schools, and violence against women in minority communities. There are not any less likely than men to express willingness for participation on the other topics proposed. Women, more than men, appear to be willing to invest and come to a deliberation. Even accounting for variables such as being opinionated or an introvert, the relationship between gender and willingness for participation in a deliberation is clear. Moreover, the fact that women expressed more willingness to participate on the most contentious of the issues listed shows that women do not appear to be any more conflict avoidant than men. In fact, they seem to be much more willing to partake in engagements that are likely to be more conflictual rather than communal and consensus-oriented.

This finding runs counter to much of the existing research. A few factors are at play here. First, a similar, albeit statistically insignificant, finding was seen in Neblo et al.’s work. In their findings, women were slightly more willing than men to express willingness as well. Second, the sample is made up of female students who are comparatively less burdened with extra responsibilities at work and at home. While recognizing that many have both responsibilities, there is little argument that students are less consumed with such burdens. This might explain higher levels of willingness in women in this study than those found by Neblo et al.
Finally, some of the willingness can be due to gender difference in issue importance. In her review of the literature on “women’s interest legislation”, Kathleen Bratton surveys the “recent approaches of five scholars in the field, including Thomas (1991, 1994), Beth Reingold (2000), Swers (2002), Chistina Wolbrecht (2000), and Kathleen Bratton (2002)” (Bratton 2005, 106) and identifying health, education, and domestic violence as “women’s issues”. Similarly, Rosie Campbell, relying on the 2001 British Election study finds that “women are more likely to prioritise education and healthcare issues and men are more likely to select the economy as their most important election issue” (Campbell 2004, 41). Both deliberation on LGBTQ policy in schools and violence against women in minority communities can be seen as issues in which women would particularly be interested. However, based on the logic of this literature, men should be more interested and willing to talk about minimum wage and there is no evidence of this. Moreover, the higher rates of willingness of women to deliberate on a general public policy issue is also unexplained by the literature as it is not an issue that is gendered.

In the next section, the focus of the article shifts to the dynamics within a deliberative engagement. In particular, are women, who appear to be more willing to invest their time to come to a deliberation, also more likely to invest in deliberation by adhering to the deliberative standards?

**GENDER DIFFERENCES IN TENDENCY TO ENGAGE IN POSITIVE DELIBERATIVE BEHAVIOR**

What does it mean to engage in positive and negative deliberative behavior within a deliberation? Positive deliberative behavior refers to instances of adherence to particular deliberative standards

---

10 Also see, Poggione 2004 and Thomas and Welch 1991.
or norms of reason giving, respect, reflection on and incorporation of the views of others, sincerity, empathy, and productive dialogue. These particular norms are not original contributions. They have been identified by the literature on deliberative democracy as standards that contribute to better quality deliberation. Instead of providing a normative argument or an ethical rationale for why each of these norms contribute to discourse quality, this article, for the most part, takes them as established cornerstones of deliberative democratic scholarship. However, this article provides a guideline for the particular indicators of these positive deliberative behaviors in Table 2 or rather lists the factors that we should look for in a deliberative engagement as an indication of adherence to these standards.

Negative deliberative behavior refers to instances where participants do not offer a justification for their positions, when they share or process information in a biased manner, or when they engage in cognitive apartheid, disrespect, hermeneutical exclusion, and rhetorical

---


14 For a more complete account of the way sincerity has been discussed within the literature see Fishkin 2011, Lenard 2008, Ratner 2008, van Gelder 2012, and Warren 2006, to name a few.

15 For ways that scholars have incorporated the concept of empathy in their discussion of deliberative democratic theory and practices see Dryzek 2009, Fearon 1998, Mansbridge 1980, Morrell 2007, 2010, and Williamson and Fung 2005, to name a few.

16 This refers to offering mediating proposals or accepts compromises. See Steenbergen, et al. 2003.

17 Cognitive apartheid refers to a “[failure] to engage with one’s interlocutor as a person of intelligence” by “reconsidering” her views on basis of reasons” (Bohman and Richardson 2009, 270).

18 When hermeneutical exclusion happens, “[arguments] are not extended because they go past each other by using incommensurate terms and meanings […] Key terms for one side are passed over as unimportant by the other or are defined and used differently” (Pearce and Littlejohn 1997, 72).
action\textsuperscript{19}, and unproductive dialogue. Table 3 details the indicators for each of them—what one needs to look for in a deliberation to see if negative deliberative behaviors are taking place. This article will not delve further into these particular positive and negative deliberative behaviors. Instead it focuses on whether there are differences between men and women in their tendency in engage in positive and negative deliberative behaviors.

\textit{Table 2} \hspace{1em} Indicators of positive deliberative behavior in a deliberation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason-giving</th>
<th>Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Absence of negative statements in expressing disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation to make the meaning more intelligible</td>
<td>Absence of interruptions in longer speech acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asking others what they think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rephrasing/repeating what someone else has said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologizing for a disinvestment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using “we” or “our”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and incorporation</td>
<td>Connect one’s point to general ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect one’s point to others’ ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asking clarifying questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Admittance of ignorance or lack of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency in reasons given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Identifying one’s own emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging/communicating the feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecting one’s own feelings to others’ emotion (Can be an example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive dialogue</td>
<td>Offering concessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offering mediating proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separating personal feelings from positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{19} Rhetorical action refers to engaging in deliberation in order to simply “justify [one’s] own standpoint” (Bächtiger, et al. 2010, 51) instead of engaging in a real back-and-forth with others. Also see Schimmelfennig 2001.
The scholarly literature on this topic has shown that there are gender imbalances in conversation time and ease in a deliberation (Karpowitz, et al. 2012, Mendelberg, et al. 2014a, Mendelberg, et al. 2014b). These works have shown that within deliberations there is a “substantial gender gap in voice and authority” (Karpowitz, et al. 2012, 533). Furthermore, they argue that simple facilitation may not be enough to democratize deliberation by mitigating this gender inequality as “moderators often focus on airing various views than on assuring equal floor time and opportunity to influence for disadvantaged populations, and tend not to focus at all on gender” (Mendelberg, et al. 2014b, 34). Similarly, research on women in the legislature shows similar results. For example, Bäck et al. argue that even within the Swedish parliament where women have
descriptive representation, there is a distinct gender gap: “male MPs deliver more speeches in debates on ‘hard’ policy issues, while women in parliament can ‘close the gap’ in the number of delivered speeches when ‘soft’ topics” (513).

Extending from this line of work, this article asks: “are there significant differences between men and women in their tendencies to engage in positive and negative deliberative behavior within a deliberation?” Furthermore, just as Mendelberg and her colleagues focus on the ways in which institutional design measures can be employed to democratize deliberation, this article looks at particular facilitative treatments or methods in doing the same. They find that in order to offset the gender imbalances—men speaking more and women being systematically silenced—simply increasing the number of women is not enough. Instead, they find that “when women are outnumbered by men” (Karpowitz, et al. 2012, 545) unanimous rule helps balance the conversation time and authority by ensuring that women “take up their equal share of the conversation” (544). However, when women form a majority within a deliberative setting, majority rule ensure the same. Drawing on this diverse set of research, this article makes the following hypotheses:

**H2a:** Much like the literature on deliberative democracy suggests, men would be more likely to engage in strictly defined deliberative behavior including reason-giving.

**H2b:** Facilitative treatments would increase the instances of deliberative behavior for all participants.

**Data and methods**

The data, is once again original and, was collected through deliberative experiments. The 40 participants were all students at the same university. The study was approved by Behavioural Research Ethics Board of the university prior to the recruitment of the participants. More
information about the recruitment process as well as participants can be found in the appendix.

The students were divided into three groups for three different sessions of deliberation on three separate days\textsuperscript{20}. The first group of participants—14 students—constituted the control group. The second group, made up of 16 students, deliberated while the facilitative treatment of deliberative worth was utilized. The facilitative treatment of simulated representation was used with the third group of students made up of 10 students.

As with the general approach of the survey study discussed in the previous section, the topic under deliberation for all three sessions was whether or not British Columbia should consider allowing the resolution of some civil cases through the process of religious arbitration. A week before each of the deliberation days, participants were sent an information pamphlet on religious arbitration, a timetable for each day, as well as rules of deliberation. The three deliberative engagements were held at the university. All events started at 10 am and ended around 2:15 pm. Audio-recording devices were used at each table on all of the days as a way to record the conversation. All of the sessions were moderated by trained facilitators.

A preliminary round of coding was done on the transcription pages. Afterwards, the coder entered a series of “hypothesis codes” into the nVivo program—a Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software. Three more rounds of coding, days apart, took place during which time both the identifying information of participants as well as previous coding was stripped from the document. This was done to reduce bias of coder and to check for accuracy of codes.

The first session was conducted under control conditions. While there was a facilitator present, no facilitative treatment aimed at encouraging positive and discouraging negative deliberative behavior was used. Two of sessions included particular facilitative treatments.

\textsuperscript{20} The deliberations were held on November 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2015; November 7\textsuperscript{th}, 2015; and November 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2015.
Facilitative treatments are mechanisms or exercises that can be utilized during a deliberation either at the start of the deliberation or during the course of the deliberation to encourage positive and discourage negative deliberative behavior. The two that were employed were deliberative worth exercises—employed on November 7th—and simulated representation—utilized during the deliberation on November 8th.

Deliberative worth exercises are based on the need to keep and maintain reputation and are rooted in the scholarly works on “face-saving” from sociology which highlight the degree to which people generally try to maintain their image (Goffman 1967, 1972, 2003; also see Lim and Bowers 1991 and Ting-Toomey 2009). Face-saving can motivate people to act in a way that would protect their face and promote its continuation and acceptance by others as well as oneself. Within a deliberative setting—especially one with explicit ground rules regarding the positive deliberative behaviors—participants can be encouraged to engage in face-saving strategies based on the need “for others to acknowledge their friendliness and honesty” and to see them as “‘likeable’, ‘acceptable’, ‘friendly’, ‘agreeable’, ‘cooperative’, ‘alike’, and ‘affiliated’” (Huang 2014, 180). They work as follows: at the end of each round of deliberation, participants will be asked to write down the name of a fellow participant they deem to have been best at engaging in positive deliberative behavior and refraining from engaging in negative deliberative behavior as well as a one sentence rationale for their choice. This is followed by the facilitator collecting the names and reasons, reading them to the group, and keeping a tally during the deliberative process.

The facilitative treatment of simulated representation is based on the insights of scholars of both psychology and education. Within psychology literature, perspective-taking and imagined contact has proven to be good technique in changing the stances and cognitive outlooks of people in a more positive way (Ku, et al. 2010, Galinsky and Moskowitz 2000, Galinsky, et al. 2008, Shih,
et al. 2009, Wang, et al. 2014, and West, et al. 2015). Role-playing in classrooms as a way to teach students the ability to understand one another as well as the motivations of different historical, fictional, and imagined characters is widely practiced at different levels of education (Jarvis, et al. 2002, Sumler-Edmond 2013, Kodotchigova 2002, Douglas and Coburn 2009, Wender 2014). The purpose behind this facilitative treatment is, as the name may suggest, to get participants in a deliberation to try to better understand each other and the ways in which they may be defining certain key terms and then to represent those views as if the views were their own. It works as: after one round of deliberation, participants are paired up or put in groups of three. An interview process will follow with the participants asking each other about their positions and reasons for them; as well their motivations and feelings. After this interview process, deliberation will resume but for the next round, instead of each participant presenting and defending their own viewpoints, they will be asked to present and defend views and opinions of the other. For example, Participant A will be asked to present and argue for the positions, reasons, and feeling of Participant B as if they were her own and vice versa. After this, deliberation resumes in a normal fashion.

Results and discussion

Are there any differences between men and women in their respective tendencies to engage in positive deliberative behavior? Figure 1 summarizes the percentage of positive and negative deliberative behavior by gender under control conditions.

---

21 Within deliberative democracy, Michael Morrell has also showed how empathy exercises can change the perspective of participants to be more inclusive and, yes, empathic (Morrell 2007, 2010).
22 This article took into consideration the unequal ratio of females and males within each deliberative setting. The analysis is based on this ratio taken into account. In order to do this, the number of instances of positive and negative positive/negative deliberative behaviors for each category made by female participants was divided by the number of females in each group and the same was done for males. This was the easiest way to standardize the numbers to see the average number for each category for each demographic group.
As it can be seen in the figure, there were significant gender differences in the percentage of positive and negative deliberative behavior under control conditions—in other words, when there was a facilitator present but no particular facilitative treatments were put in place. Under these conditions, 77% of all of the coded speech acts by women are positive deliberative behavior compared to 40% for men. Correspondingly, 60% of speech acts made by males were coded as negative deliberative behavior compared to 23% by women. Under control conditions, women engage in more positive and men engage in more negative deliberative behaviors. Two conclusions can be drawn from this finding. The first is that power dynamics affect interaction within deliberation. The finding that men engage in negative deliberative behavior—including instances of cutting others off—more than women is congruent with those of Mendelberg and her colleagues. In many ways, the negative deliberative behavior of men reduces women’s speaking time and confidence. This finding is similar to a recent study on the interactions in the Supreme Court in the United States by Jacobi and Schweers who find that “judicial interactions at oral argument are highly gendered, with women being interrupted at disproportionate rates by their male colleagues” (Jacobi and Schweers 2017). The second conclusion is that women are much more willing and capable of engaging in the desired behaviors identified by deliberative democratic theorists. In other words, women are more deliberatively oriented.
Do facilitative treatments change this difference? **Figure 2** summarizes the percentage of positive and negative deliberative behaviors by gender under the facilitative treatments.

*Figure 2  No gender difference in positive/negative deliberative behavior under facilitative treatments*

Looking at the breakdown of positive and negative deliberative behaviors under the two facilitative treatments, it becomes clear that the percentage of positive deliberative behaviors for all participants increased when either treatment was enacted. However, what is particularly of note here is that facilitative treatments are capable of wiping out the gender difference which characterized the deliberation under control conditions. In particular, under the facilitative treatment of deliberative worth—with the participants being pushed to remain mindful of their behavior—94% of all of the coded speech acts by women count as instances of positive deliberative behavior compared to 93% for men. Correspondingly, only 7% of all speech acts by men and 6% by women were coded as instances of negative deliberative behavior.

A similar pattern can be seen when the facilitative treatment of simulated representation—with participants switching places and presenting each other’s views for a brief period of deliberation—was used, 92% of all of the coded speech acts by men count as instances of positive deliberative behavior compared to 91% for women. Therefore, 9% of all speech acts women and 8% by men were coded as instances of negative deliberative behavior. Facilitative treatments were
successful at encouraging, if not facilitating, engagement in positive deliberative behavior in all participants. Most importantly for the purposes of this article, these treatments were able to eradicate the gender difference between men and women in their tendencies to engage in positive and negative deliberative behavior.

Due to the small sample size, these results are somewhat exploratory. However, they clearly indicate that facilitative treatments are successful tools in democratizing deliberation by reducing the differences between the behavior of women and men. “In structured deliberation[s], face-to-face disagreement is often mediated through moderators, facilitators, debating rules, civility codes, turn taking, shared information, and many other mechanisms designed to manage disagreement” (Chambers 2013, 205). However, simple mediation is often not enough to eradicate the gender differences within deliberation. Facilitative treatments are another tool in the box of strategies and innovative designed aimed at making deliberation more democratic and equal. Another way that this can be achieved is through adjustment of institutional rules of deliberation as was clearly demonstrated by Tali Mendelberg and her colleagues. These treatments, similarly, are particularly good at discouraging negative deliberative behavior in both men and women. They have a bigger effect for men because, perhaps, they need these treatments more.

An important conclusion that can be drawn from this analysis is that contrary to the common accusation that deliberative democratic theory and practice can favor a male-centric style of interaction and argumentation, the results from the control group clearly demonstrate that women are more deliberative in their orientation within an engagement than men. Similarly, research on critical mass theory is not able to explain these findings either. Critical mass theory holds that “only as their numbers increase will women be able to work more effectively together to promote women-friendly policy change and to influence their male colleagues to accept and approve legislation promoting women’s concerns” (Childs and Krook 2008, 725). However, much of the research has shown evidence to the contrary. Kathlene’s research, for instance, shows that “as the proportion of women increases in a legislative body, men become more verbally aggressive and controlling of the hearing” (Kathlene 1994, 560). However, in all of the sessions women outnumbered men. Therefore, the critical mass of women under control conditions was not enough on its own to

---

23 Similarly, research on critical mass theory is not able to explain these findings either. Critical mass theory holds that “only as their numbers increase will women be able to work more effectively together to promote women-friendly policy change and to influence their male colleagues to accept and approve legislation promoting women’s concerns” (Childs and Krook 2008, 725). However, much of the research has shown evidence to the contrary. Kathlene’s research, for instance, shows that “as the proportion of women increases in a legislative body, men become more verbally aggressive and controlling of the hearing” (Kathlene 1994, 560). However, in all of the sessions women outnumbered men. Therefore, the critical mass of women under control conditions was not enough on its own to
finding is similar to Kathlene's finding that women "made fewer interruptions than men" (Kathlene 1994, 565) in her study of gender differences in behaviour in legislatures. Indeed, the literature on gender norm behavior provides an explanation for the behavior of women in deliberation. A.H. Eagly argues that social roles are determined by how society views the division of labor between men and women (Eagly 1987) which leads women to engage in more “communal behaviour” while men engage in more “agentic behaviour” (Eagly 1997, 1381). This creates a “tendency for women to adopt a more democratic and participative style than men” (Eagly, et al. 1994, 149). Women’s more “collaborative style requires not only the soliciting of suggestions from one’s peers and subordinates, but also the preservation of good relationships with them when evaluating and perhaps rejecting their ideas” (Eagly and Johnson 1990, 248). This can explain the fact that women are more likely to engage in certain positive deliberative behaviors such as respecting and listening to others and engaging in constructive dialogue. However, it should be emphasized that women were not any less likely than men to express their views and rationales in deliberation which can be categorized as “agentic behavior”.

Another important contribution from this analyses lies in the finding that facilitative treatments of deliberative worth exercises and simulated representation are effective at reinforce these deliberative orientations and reducing negative deliberative behavior in men, as well as women. This, for scholars interested in gender difference in behavior in small groups, means that

achieve gender parity in deliberation. This finding is along the lines of Mendelberg et al. who similarly find that greater numbers do not necessarily lead to parity and therefore recommend utilizing different institutional rules of decision-making to achieve the desired end. Moreover, percentage of women was higher under facilitative treatment of deliberative worth and even more so under simulated representation. Under these two conditions, men were less verbally aggressive and did not control the conversation by dominating it. All of these point to the fact that numbers do not lead to gender parity in the process. Therefore, active measures such as institutional rules or facilitative treatments are necessary to equalize the deliberative behavior between men and women.

24 However, the hierarchy that Eagly and Johnson discuss in their study of managerial styles is absent within a deliberative setting as all participants are equal. Even if participants are not substantively equal (i.e. some will be more influential or talk more, etc...), the systematic and explicit hierarchy that exists in business organizations is absent within deliberative settings.
in a short amount of time and through an engineered setup, the behavior of men can be changed to more resemble that of women.

**LIMITATIONS**

There are a number of limitations with both empirical studies within this article. Both studies—the survey and the experiments—have relatively small sample sizes. Moreover, the sample includes only students. This allows for an investigation of the deliberative orientation of younger adults. However, it limits the variance in age of the participants as well as their education levels—and likely their political and social values and beliefs to an extent. Moreover, all the participants are, residents of Vancouver, BC or surrounding cities creating a geographical limitation to the study. The coder was female, which may spawn potential biases in interpretation. To forestall that, identifying information about participants (including gender/ethnic background) were stripped from the transcripts. The coder she read the transcripts three times, days apart, to ensure that coding is gender-neutral to the best of her ability.

An important consideration remains that university students may very well be trained to accept diversity and act respectfully in dialogue with others. As a result, this article recognizes and accepts that they would be more likely—even under control conditions—to engage in and demonstrate positive rather than negative deliberative behavior. However, the results indicate that they still engage in negative deliberative behavior and, therefore, the effect of the facilitative treatments on the behavior of participants signal their effectiveness. The results therefore are applicable more broadly.

Moreover, this work fills an important gap as very little attention has been given to the willingness and capacity of young adults who will make up the participants in future deliberative democratic engagements. The origins of gender difference in willingness and capacity for
deliberation is an important, and disregarded, issue. This gender difference is unlikely to change as young adults become adults.

In future research, however, it is advantageous to look at the public at large in order to look at gender differences in willingness for participation in deliberations as well as in capacity to engage in positive deliberative behavior. Moreover, conducting the experiments on facilitative treatments using a sample from general public will further clarify their effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

Do men and women differ in their deliberative orientation? Using surveys and coded transcripts from deliberative experiments, this article shows that indeed there is a gender difference in deliberative orientation. Women are more willing than men to express willingness for participation in deliberation. While there was some evidence of this in the seminal work by Neblo, et al. 2010, their findings showed only a small and statistically insignificant relationship between gender and willingness for deliberation. This article shows that women are indeed more willing. This is particularly the case when the deliberation concerned a contentious topic. Even if they did not express more willingness, they did not express any less willingness than men to engage in deliberation. This is contrary to the perception, most notably put forth by Belenky, et al. 1986, that women might be more conflict avoidant than men.

When present at a deliberation, women were also more likely to engage in positive deliberative behavior. This is especially the case when participants deliberated under control conditions without particularly designed facilitative treatments. This is contrary to the common criticism made against deliberative democracy that the “reason-giving” requirement of deliberative democracy can disadvantage those who are not commonly associated with such a trait (Hall 2007, Young 1996). However, the flipside of this is that men are more likely to engage in negative
deliberative behavior. The upshot is that women are more deliberative but men’s actions—
tendency to engage in negative deliberative behavior including instances of cutting others off or
ignoring the concerns of others—can undermine women’s efforts to be heard and to be effective
deliberators. However, when facilitative treatments were used, the gender difference disappeared.

These facilitative treatments were designed with the aim of reducing negative and
encouraging positive deliberative behaviors. In particular, *simulated representation* got
participants to switch places literally by learning, presenting, defending each other’s views for a
portion of deliberation and *deliberative worth exercises* got participants to rate each other based
their positive and negative deliberative behaviors choosing the best deliberators of each round.
Both treatments increased the instances of positive and decreased the instances of negative
deliberative behaviors of all and were particularly helpful at increasing the deliberative orientation
of men. This article offers a new and promising method for democratizing the deliberation process.
More work needs to be carried out to not only examine gender differences in deliberative
democratic practices but also to devise ways of reducing such imbalances in order to increase the
quality of such engagements.
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APPENDIX

Table 4  (Appendix) Willingness to deliberate: Ordered Logistic Regression Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness for deliberation on:</th>
<th>Unspecified general public policy issue</th>
<th>Unspecified multicultural policy issue</th>
<th>LGBTQ policy in schools</th>
<th>Minimum wage in British Columbia</th>
<th>VAW in minority groups</th>
<th>Funding for cultural and religious groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.823*** (0.311)</td>
<td>0.0257 (0.305)</td>
<td>0.544*** (0.207)</td>
<td>-0.0152 (0.213)</td>
<td>0.694*** (0.215)</td>
<td>0.190 (0.212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>0.144 (0.243)</td>
<td>-0.238 (0.250)</td>
<td>-0.312* (0.168)</td>
<td>0.123 (0.170)</td>
<td>0.179 (0.175)</td>
<td>0.116 (0.169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Minority</td>
<td>0.265 (0.314)</td>
<td>-0.176 (0.314)</td>
<td>0.164 (0.215)</td>
<td>0.181 (0.222)</td>
<td>0.290 (0.223)</td>
<td>0.745*** (0.225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinionated</td>
<td>0.711*** (0.233)</td>
<td>0.196 (0.218)</td>
<td>0.428*** (0.157)</td>
<td>0.503*** (0.160)</td>
<td>0.420*** (0.163)</td>
<td>0.447*** (0.161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>-0.361** (0.176)</td>
<td>-0.280 (0.176)</td>
<td>-0.0499 (0.115)</td>
<td>-0.0395 (0.119)</td>
<td>-0.435*** (0.124)</td>
<td>-0.0515 (0.120)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations** 169  165  322  319  319  315

Constant cut1  -1.074 (0.760)  -3.404*** (0.810)  -1.520*** (0.505)  -2.402*** (0.590)  -1.902*** (0.581)  -0.947* (0.311)
Constant cut2  0.661 (0.679)  -1.399** (0.696)  0.0400 (0.483)  -0.306 (0.480)  0.331 (0.500)  0.608 (0.490)
Constant cut3  3.387*** (0.740)  0.954 (0.690)  1.680*** (0.493)  1.817*** (0.491)  2.223*** (0.516)  2.830*** (0.518)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 (Standard errors in paragraphs)

Note about the decision to use students as participants: One of the reasons was ethical. The topic of the deliberative experiment requires of the participants to reflect on, present, and debate their cultural and religious values and practices. Debates over deeply-held values and interests, especially those that can challenge the ontological and emotional security of participants, can potentially be uncomfortable. Therefore, the logic behind using students was to reduce the risks associated with the study. Since the other participants with whom they will deliberate are fellow students, there is a lesser degree of hierarchies between students which could make some more vulnerable. Moreover, undergraduate and graduate students will be more familiar with various research endeavors at the university. They are often asked for their participation in surveys and experiments conducted either by fellow students, graduate students, or the university. This means that they are less likely to see their engagement in either the survey or the experiment as something unknown and unfamiliar. Finally, students are used to these kinds of discussions as part of their high school and university education. This means that their level of discomfort when engaging in deliberation should be minimal. Another reason had to with financial constraints. The recruitment of participants from outside of the university would have taken posed undue financial burdens on the investigator.
Note about recruitment procedures for the survey: Recruitment for the survey was two-pronged. 175 students were recruited through contacting different departments one-by-one asking them to disseminate the survey link as well as through invitation posters around campus. Participation of these recruits was incentivized by 1/25 chance to win $50. 262 participants were recruited as part of a larger subject pool study organized through the university’s Public Opinion Lab. Their participation was incentivized through an extra credit for the course through which they were recruited.

Note about the dependent variables in the survey: There were six dependent variables in the study. The full text of each of these questions is listed below:

- General public policy issue: In the recent years, there has been an increased interest in deliberative democracy. Many organizations, for example, carry out a deliberative process where you spend some time (a day or more) learning about and discussing an important public issue and then making group recommendations on what should be done. If you were personally invited to take part in such a process, how willing would you be to participate?
- Multicultural policy issue: In the recent years, there has been an increased interest in setting up deliberations that bring people from different cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds together to talk about tensions that arise from the multicultural nature of Canada (and countries like it). Sometimes, minority ethnic, cultural, and religious groups have certain practices (for example, dress code, norms of family life, or the social roles of women and children) that many Canadians consider improper and different from their views and values. Sometimes, our differences can create conflict about what policies are best for our communities. One way to try to get past this is to bring ordinary people together to understand and discuss the different points of view and the different options. If you were personally invited to take part in such a process, how willing would you be to participate?
- LGBTQ policy: In June 2014, the Vancouver School Board changed one of their policies to better support transgendered students. Part of it included using new ways to address students in written communication, such as “xe, xem, and xyr” (gender neutral pronouns). Moreover, it allowed students to choose the name that they identified with and to be called by that name, and to choose which washroom they preferred. This policy was met with a lot of controversy and debate. Supporters of the policy pointed out transgendered students were disproportionately at risk for dropping out of school, self-harm and suicide. They said these policies could help. Opponents, however, argued that these policies threatened the traditional values they wanted to see in schools. Moreover, there is some concern that the confidentiality clause of this policy, the one preventing parents from finding out if their child discusses gender issues with a teacher or counsellor, takes some parenting responsibility away from parents and puts it in the hands of school staff. If you were personally invited to take part in a one-day deliberation over the LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, and queer) policy in the Vancouver School Board, how willing would you be to participate?
- Minimum wage: In March 2014, British Columbia's union leaders called for an immediate increase in the minimum wage to $13 an hour from the current $10.25. Proponents argue that a minimum wage increase is long overdue as adjusted for inflation, minimum wage in British Columbia has not changed much between early 1970s and 2013. They note a higher minimum wage will benefit most low-paid employees which are the most economically (and therefore socially) vulnerable. For example, in B.C., someone working full-time, year-round on the minimum wage falls far below the poverty line, especially in urban areas. A
salary based on working 35 hours per week and 50 weeks per year at the minimum wage is almost $18,000. The opponents argue that the government should not be intervening in wages. In the short term, raising business’ labor costs will force them to scale back on employee hours and jobs. A minimum wage increase, according to them, will result in job loss. If you were personally invited to take part in a one-day deliberation over the issue of minimum wage increase in British Columbia, how willing would you be to participate?

- **Violence against women:** Canada is home to people from a number of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds who practice a range of different religions. Some of these cultures and religions have values and practices that don’t fit well with liberal values that underpin Canadian democracy, like the values in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Some of these contested practices involve forced marriages, exchange of dowries, preferring sons to daughters, and, in extreme cases, honour killings. Many of them have made headlines in British Columbia, and they have sometimes involved members of the South Asian community in Surrey, BC. While most would agree that violence against women is not limited to cultural and religious communities, even groups within this ethnic community suggest that “economic dependence, rigidly defined traditional gender roles and language barriers and lack of social safety net” (Indo-Canadian Women’s Association) make immigrant women of these cultural and religious communities more vulnerable. Some argue that the way to deal with this problem is from the outside: reducing the accommodation of cultural and religious practices and forcing members of these communities to adopt liberal values as their own. Others argue that more work has to be done within different communities, teaching women about their options and pushing for change within the community. If you were personally invited to take part in a one-day deliberation over the issue of violence against women in different cultural/religious communities, how willing would you be to participate?

- **Government funding for cultural and religious programs:** In 2009, Embrace BC was launched. The aim of the program is to provide “resources and tools that help citizens of British Columbia further understand the importance of diversity and increase their level of community engagement around multiculturalism and anti-racism”. It will do this by providing funding opportunities for groups, offering resources, campaigns and events in order promote multiculturalism and reduce racism, as well as setting up historical wrongs legacy initiatives (a product of which was the May 2014 formal apology from all members of BC legislative assembly to Chinese Canadians for historical wrongs committed by past provincial governments). Embrace BC is funded through the federal and provincial governments. Some argue that this funding is necessary for a healthy multicultural society as these programs and initiatives foster understanding between citizens. Others argue that the money will be better spent in other areas that provide services to all Canadians and that programs directed towards differences between people will just make those differences more visible. If you were personally invited to take part in a one-day deliberation over government funding for cultural and religious programs and activities, how willing would you be to participate?

**Note about independent variables in the survey:** There were five independent variables in the study. Description and rationale for each of these is listed below:

- **Gender:** This is the main independent variable. The literature provides evidence that gender will likely affect willingness for deliberation as it does other forms of political participation. 49.9% of participants in the survey were male (N=218) while 50.1% were
female (N=219).

- Religiosity: The literature shows that religiosity can increase participation in traditional forms of politics (e.g. voting) while reducing the willingness for participation in the less traditional ones (e.g. protesting) (Secret, et al. 1990). Willingness for deliberation could be affected by religiosity. 59.5% of participants saw themselves as not very religious (N=251) while only 8.1% saw themselves as very religious (N=34). 32.5% of participants identified as somewhat religious (N=137).

- Status as a visible minority: The literature provides evidence that one’s status as visible minority will likely affect willingness for deliberation as it does other forms of political participation (Guterbock and London 1983, Megyery 1991, Lien 1994, Banducci, et al. 2004, Bird, et al. 2010, and Wright and Bloemraad 2012). 43.4% of participants identified as a visible minority (N=171) while 56.6% did not (N=223).

- Introversion: The logic behind inclusion of introversion in the model is simple. If I consider myself to be introverted—shy, reserved, quiet, and inhibited—then, I will likely prefer not to participate in activities that would require a degree of social interaction that might bring a lot of attention to myself (Costa and MacCrae 1992; See Mondak and Halperin 2008). Introversion is a composite variable made up of personality factors shy, quiet, and introverted which were asked separately in the survey. Furthermore, it is a standardized variable ranging from -2.08 to 2.26. Detailed factor analysis can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Introversion</th>
<th>Unstable</th>
<th>Unfeeling</th>
<th>Uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>0.7829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>0.7753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>0.7928</td>
<td>0.4926</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7564</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7609</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6313</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.7267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Opinionated: The logic behind inclusion of opinionated in the model is simple. If I am or consider myself to be opinionated—with a disposition “to create and hold attitudes” (Bizer, et al. 2000, 996), then I am more likely to want to see myself as capable of participating in a deliberation since I see myself as being able to hold my own even in an argument even against strong opposition. 11.9% of participants indicated that they had fewer opinions than others (N=51) while 51.6% believed they had more opinions (N=222). 36.6% of participants asserted that they had the same number of opinions as everyone else (N=157).

**Note about recruitment procedures for the experiment:** Participants were recruited through a number of methods: 1) An invitation at the end of the online survey discussed in the previous section of this article; 2) Invitation posters around the campus; 3) Invitation email sent to students via department and course electronic mailing lists; 4) Invitation email sent to student members of
different clubs and organizations on campus; 5) Invitation posters in department newsletters; and 6) Invitation posters in the social media sites/groups of the different student clubs and organizations. The last two methods of recruitment were used only when the researcher was asked to do so by departments or presidents of the clubs and organizations. Overall, 103 students expressed interest in participation. Sixty-one participants expressed secondary interest in the process after more details were given. Fifty-four confirmed their participation and forty participants turned out for the deliberative engagements. Participants were thanked for their participation with $30 and reimbursed for additional costs.

**Note about the demographic makeup of the participants in the experiment:** The demographic makeup of the participants was as follows: gender: 25 female, 14 male, and 1 transgender; status as visible minority: 12 identify as a visible minority, 19 identify as not a visible minority, and 9 did not know; ethnic background: 17 participants identified as white, 13 as East Asian, 3 as South Asian, 2 as West Asian, 2 as Black, 2 as Latin American, 2 as Southeast Asian, and 4 as other; and religiosity: 7 attended religious services frequently, 3 often, 5 moderately, 11 rarely, and 13 noted that they never attended religious services.

- **Control group: Gender (M=6; F=8) | Status as visible minority (Y=5; N=7; D/K=2) | Ethnic background (Black=1; White=5; East Asian=5; Hispanic=2; Burkinabé=1; Central Asian=1) | Religious attendance (Frequently=1; Often=1; Moderately=1; Rarely=5; Never=5)
- **Deliberative worth: Gender (M=5; F=10; T=1) | Status as visible minority (Y=2; N=9; D/K=5) | Ethnic background: (White=8; West Asian=2; South Asian=2; East Asian=4; Southeast Asian=1; Karen=1; South African White=1) | Religious attendance (Frequently=4; Often=2; Moderately=3; Rarely=2; Never=5)
- **Simulated representation: Gender (M=3; F=7) | Status as visible minority (Y=5; N=3; D/K=2) | Ethnic background: (Black=1; White=4; South Asian=1; East Asian=4; Southeast Asian=1) | Religious attendance (Frequently=2; Often=0; Moderately=1; Rarely=4; Never=3)

**Note about data-sharing:** Please note that the deliberative experiments reported in this article were covered by Ethics Certificate number H13-03158 of June 12, 2014. In compliance with the ethics protocol, deliberation transcripts and identity of respondents cannot be made publicly available to ensure security and confidentiality of respondents. Please further note that the survey analysis reported in this article were covered by the same Ethics Certificate. The data can be easily provided in the form of a STATA file. However, in compliance with the ethics protocol, the IP addresses cannot be readily provided to ensure security and confidentiality of respondents.