Do mini-publics reflect the mass public? Patterns of participation for deliberative mini-publics

Joanna Massie, McMaster University

Correspondence email: massij1@mcmaster.ca

Working draft submitted to the Deliberative Democracy Summer School, February 2024.

Do not cite without permission of the author.

Abstract

To understand the claim that DMPs attract a truly representative mini public, I analyze the extent to which citizens who express willingness to volunteer for a deliberative mini public (DMP) – specifically a Citizens' Assembly - are representative of the wider population.

I analyze response data from two primary sources: population surveys, in which people were asked about interest in participating; and actual response data from Canadian DMP convenor MASS LBP, from their over a decade and over fifty Citizen Assemblies. I seek to understand factors that contribute to (un)willingness to participate, as well as who does (does not) respond positively to an actual invite to participate in a deliberative policy-making process. I also aim to elucidate trends in participation over the last decade, including variables such as method of invite (email versus mail), level of government, and topic. From triangulating these data, I explore steps that can be taken by practitioners to further enhance recruitment processes, such that they can more accurately claim to be a truly representative "mini public".

Earlier iterations of this paper were presented at the Canadian Political Science Association Annual Conference, the Deliberative Democracy and Public Opinion Summer School, and the American Political Science Association Annual Conference. The author would like to thank all participants who gave feedback, and in particular, Dr. Florence Vallée-Dubois, Dr. Nanuli Silagadze, Dr. Graham Smith, and Dr. Hans Asenbaum for their thoughtful comments. All errors and omissions remain the fault of the author.

Introduction

Deliberation is heralded as one of the potential solutions to crises of democracy. Deliberation is defined as the process of providing meaningful opportunities and time to discuss topics and arriving at decisions through informed and considered opinion (Chambers 2003; Fishkin 2018). Advocates argue that deliberation creates a sense of citizenship and engagement, encourages greater openness and fairness, and captures reasoned and considered public opinion (Fishkin 2018; Font and Blanco 2007). While deliberative processes have been organized since the 1980s, there has been a notable increase in the last twenty years, especially the deliberative mini-public (DMP) (OECD 2020). A DMP is a "carefully designed forum where a representative subset of the wider population come together to engage in open, inclusive, informed and consequential discussions on one or more issues" (Curato et al. 2021, 3). Particularly important to their validity is that they are representative: they largely use a system of civic lottery to select participants, so that the population is (broadly) descriptively representative of the population of interest.

However, the extent to which DMPs are a true microcosm of the public is ultimately defined by the criteria endowed to provide representative validity. While achieving descriptive representation of the population of interest, this may not correct for social inequities (Steel et al. 2020). Despite a long-standing acknowledgement in political science that political participation can be affected by socioeconomic status and civic capacity as well as demographic distribution (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995), there is very limited research about the extent to which DMPs truly represent the population at large. Analysis is often done at a micro-level, focusing on the demographics of those invited at random. I sought to understand at a macro level to what extent deliberative mini publics do indeed attract a representative panel of respondents. I combine survey data in which we ask both how likely people were to volunteer, and if they had received an invite in the past, whether they did volunteer, alongside a novel data on actual response rates from sixteen civic lotteries provided from MASS LBP, and population averages, I interrogate the deliberative mini public's claim of representativeness. I find that those expressing willingness to volunteer are both more left-leaning and more interested in politics than those who are not interested to volunteer. I also find that despite being the most interested in participating, the youngest age group (18-29) are least likely to volunteer compared to their population make-up. Furthermore, Indigenous individuals, visible minority individuals, and renters are all less likely to volunteer compared to their population average. I therefore suggest that these findings may be indicative of wider barriers to participation, and more can be done to incorporate such populations.

Claims of representation in deliberative mini publics

DMPs purport to provide *descriptive representation*, defined as the extent to which there is resemblance between the representative and the public being represented (Brown 2006; Mansbridge 1999; Pitkin 1967). Through their approach to selection that adopts random or near-random (stratified) sampling, they offer resemblance to the population at large (Brown 2006, 221).

DMPs can be descriptively representative in two ways: (1) statistical, where the population and the mini-populous are mirrored, or a statistically representative microcosm of democratic society (e.g. Fishkin 2018; Parkinson 2006); and (2) cross-sectional, where some groups may be overrepresented to ensure diversity of perspectives (e.g Brown 2006) (Steel et al. 2020). In both instances, this is commonly achieved through a two-stage random stratified sample; invitations sent at random to a subset of the population, to which citizens respond to express their interest. The representative claim is that no individual or group can be systemically excluded from participating; it respects the equality of claims of participation from citizens (Farrell and Stone 2020; Fishkin 2018; Smith 2009; Stone 2011). In statistical descriptive representation this is followed by stratified random sampling to ensure that those selected to participate are demographically representative of the population (Curato et al. 2021). In cross-sectional representation, participants are selected based on relevant demographics, but so as to overrepresent certain population groups (Steel et al. 2020).

Through using stratified recruitment techniques, organizers can assert that first, there is no undue influence on the selection criteria by stakeholders; and second, that the group represent people as a whole (Farrell and Stone 2020). Their selection procedures are "constructed precisely to validate their claim to be representative for the citizenry as a whole, at least sufficiently to raise the legitimacy conferred by political equality" (Bohman 2012, 87). In fact, some even suggest that through selecting in this way, the panel will sufficiently comprise any variable they choose to adopt at a future point (Farrell and Stone 2020). Stratified recruitment techniques for representation are critical for conferring legitimacy on these processes. However, the effect of representation on legitimacy remains an open question: more recent research finds that while not having a *negative* effect on public perceptions of deliberative processes, there is limited evidence to suggest that sortition adds any process legitimacy to the wider public (Bedock and Pilet 2021; Pow 2021).

Despite the importance of recruitment for the legitimacy of the process, the mechanism of recruiting for DMPs remains not well understood. There are three key points at which representation is critical: (1) at the stage of sending invites; (2) at the stage of selecting participants; and (3) at the stage of meeting. There is emerging research exploring fairness in the sortition algorithms (Flanigan et al. 2021; Geisler, Pospieszna, and Mrożek 2023). Similarly, there is research on the inter-group dynamics of deliberation; for example, equity in discourse, and how the structure of a group contributes to building and reaching consensus (Beauvais 2018; Suiter, Farrell, and O'Malley 2016). Yet there remains little research on the tools for selection, despite the fact that both subsequent stages are ultimately moot if the first stage – the invite stage – does not sufficiently achieve its goal of ensuring that all affected citizens have an equal opportunity to participate.

The invite stage is critical and suggests an important role for organizers of DMPs, who craft and send such invites. These are the actors who design the invites, and choose the values on which

representation is defined (Gül 2019). Without sufficient evidence to support Farrell and Stone's earlier claim that all variables are incorporated if only we conduct descriptive representation using race, gender, and socio-economic class, we have to assert that sortition is representative only insofar as the variables chosen to stratify on (Parkinson 2006). Although some consideration has been given to the incorporation of attitudinal and behavioural variables (Fishkin and Luskin 2005), these are critiqued for treating "potential selection mechanisms as, in effect, nuisance variables" (Neblo et al. 2010, 567). There may be pragmatic reasons for limiting the number of variables used for selection. MASS LBP, a firm who specializes in deliberative processes in Canada, offer the following warning: "The more criteria you add to the process of selection the more difficult the lottery will become to conduct and less opportunity volunteers within the lottery will have of being selected. With too many criteria the lottery will become "locked up."" (MASS LBP 2017). Similarly, many practitioners acknowledge the limitations of deliberative mini publics, while also believing that stratified random sampling and DMPs can create conditions that are more equitable and inclusive than traditional methods of representation (Carson 2017).

Unlike juries in criminal justice, citizens are under no obligation to respond to the invite (Devillers et al. 2021; Smith 2009). As such, we may see that exclusion pervade even in systems designed to incorporate representation and enable participation. Inequalities of power and resources may lead to contexts in which people have formal rights to participate, but lack real access to the formal procedures – or what Young calls "external exclusion" (Young 2000). There is a wealth of literature about who engages in democratic processes; socio-economic status, gender, and age affect capacity to participate (Carpini and Keeter 1993; van der Does and Kantorowicz 2022; Ellison, Pollock, and Grimm 2020; Lee and Schachter 2019). Although many of these variables may be "randomized out" through the selection process, not all may be fully mitigated through stratification processes. Yet at present, there remains a dearth of such evidence – in both academia and practice – to ensure that the selection mechanisms, especially at the first stage, sufficiently address traditional barriers to participation. While there are some limitations in the ability to control for all variables – for example, Canada Post may still retain control over who they send invites to – understanding where certain groups are over- or under-represented in response rates is the first step to removing barriers that prevent people from participating.

Socioeconomic status and level of education have a positive effect on likelihood to participate in democratic processes, and despite random selection purporting to resolve issues of disadvantage, evidence suggests that people who have a socioeconomic status and are less educated level less likely to participate in politics broadly, and in deliberation (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995; Carpini, Cook, and Jacobs 2004; Devillers et al. 2021; Ryfe and Stalsburg 2012).

Existing literature suggests inconclusive findings on the reciprocal relationship between interest in politics and participation; while some suggest that those interested in politics are more likely to be politically active (Gastil and Xenos 2010), others find that political participation has a stronger effect on political attitudes and interest than the reverse (Carpini, Cook, and Jacobs 2004;

Quintelier and van Deth 2014). Participation in civic activities may indeed nurture civic skills and interest, and organizational membership can reduce inequalities in participation (Ryfe and Stalsburg 2012). However, democratic innovations have been purported to attract those disillusioned with traditional parliamentary politics, seeking an alternative to "politics as usual" – yet again, findings on what is called "disillusionment logic" are at best mixed (van der Does and Kantorowicz 2022; Neblo et al. 2010).

There is a rich history of theory around representation in deliberative processes; however, there remains a dearth of equivalent literature on the practice of representativeness in DMPs, including how variables are selected for stratification and the extent to which these are reflective of variation in likelihood to volunteer. Despite this, little is understood about precisely *who* volunteers. I aim to fill this gap using two novel datasets, exploring both interest in deliberative processes and actual response rates to invites to participate.

Methodology

Canada was an early demonstrator of deliberative processes. The British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform and subsequent Ontario Citizens' Assembly both garnered attention, and were both notable in their legislative empowerment, the recommendations of each being presented for public referendum (although notably, both failed at referendum) (Carty, Blais, and Fournier 2008; Fournier et al. 2011; Warren and Pearse 2008). Despite arguably facing less stark polarization than other countries face, purported to be a result of its' "brokerage" method of politics (Kymlicka 2021), it faces similar trends as other developed nations, with declining voter turnout, party membership, and interest in politics (Gidengil 2020; Gidengil et al. 2004). Furthermore, despite emerging research on representation and rates of volunteering in Europe (Devillers et al. 2021) there is a dearth of literature exploring comparable trends in Canada.

The analysis is constituted of two sets of data analysis. The first is survey data from Vox Pop Labs' 2021 Vote Compass Canada Post Election Survey (PES). Data are responses to an online public opinion survey to Vox Pop Labs' Canadian panel, comprised of residents who have used Vox Pop Labs' data tools or have signed up to complete surveys. Vote Compass is an online voting advice application developed by Vox Pop Labs and used in in Canadian federal, provincial, and municipal elections by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (see https://www.votecompass.com). Vote Compass users are self-selected; however the size, composition, and profile of the sample lends itself to the effective application of raking weights by marginal distributions to control for the bias in the sample (van der Linden 2020).

The Canadian survey was fielded in October 2021 to approximately 750,000 adult Canadians who had either previously used a Vote Compass tool or had signed up to receive surveys from Vox Pop Labs; The data are weighted to be representative of the Canadian adult population based on age, education, gender, region, language, and vote choice in the preceding Canadian federal election.

Although the survey is opt-in and thus participants are self-selecting, given the sample size and robust composition across sociodemographic criteria, we correct for bias by applying weights to the sample. This is consistent with other research (e.g. Savoie et al. 2018), and furthermore, this is also a limitation of random samples with lower response rates (Lees-Marshment et al. 2015).

Survey respondents were provided with a short paragraph that outlines a DMP, and then asked three questions, presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Survey questions

Introductory text	A Citizens' Assembly—also known as a Citizens' Jury, Citizens' Reference Panel or 'Mini-Public'—is a body of randomly selected citizens who meet over a period of days to learn about, discuss, and make recommendations on government policy at the municipal, provincial, or federal level. Citizens receive a letter at random, inviting them to volunteer for a process on a specific policy area.
CAN_Q288	Have you ever received an invitation to participate in a Citizens' Assembly? / Avez-vous déjà reçu une invitation pour participer à une assemblée de citoyens?
CAN_Q289	(If yes to CAN_Q288 or AUS_164) If you did receive ,an invitation, did you volunteer to participate? / Si vous avez reçu une invitation, vous êtes-vous porté(e) volontaire pour participer?
CAN_Q290	If you were to receive an invitation to participate in a Citizens' Assembly, how likely would you be to volunteer to do so? / Si vous receviez une invitation pour participer à une assemblée de citoyens, dans quelle mesure seriez-vous susceptible de vous porter volontaire pour le faire?

For the first two questions, participants were provided with yes and no options; for the final question, they were provided with five options: *Very unlikely*; *Somewhat unlikely*; *Somewhat likely*; *Very Likely*; and *Don't know*. Don't Know responses were grouped with NAs and removed.

Additional variables used in the analysis include level of education (high school or below, college or trade school, and university), interest in politics (not at all interested, not very interested, somewhat interested, very interested), and position on the left-right political spectrum (where left is 0 and right is 1). Control variables used in the analysis include gender (male/female/diverse), age category (18-29, 30-44, 45-64, 65+), Indigenous self-identification (yes/no), Visible Minority identification (yes/no), and household status (own/rent).

The second dataset is actual response rates to Civic Lottery invitations. This was collected from MASS LBP's Civic Lottery archives. MASS LBP has run over 50 civic lotteries dating back over the last twenty years, although not all data was available for this analysis. Data was collected in-house, deidentified, and shared with the researcher for analysis. At the time of writing, data has been collected and shared for 16 civic lotteries. The dataset contains basic demographic criteria, including additional questions used for selection during that specific civic lottery. In instances where recruitment was conducted not through Canada Post, or through a combination of methods, this was also recorded. All processes and individual response data was given a universally unique identifying number. Only individuals who responded positively to the invite to apply were

recorded. Response data was compared to Canadian 2021 Census data; while this may not allow for a completely accurate population comparison, as these processes ran between 2012 and 2023, the 2021 data provide a comprehensive framework for comparison, and the differences between population groups in earlier iterations of the census and the 2021 census are so small as to be negligible for a sample of this size. All data was analyzed in r.

Results

Table 2 presents respondents to CAN_Q288 (Have you received an invite?) and CAN_Q289 (If you received an invite, did you volunteer?). After weighting the data, a total number of 2 percent of the total responses reported receiving an invite. Of those who reported receiving an invite, half of respondents reported responding positively to the invite to participate. Table 3 presents respondents to Question 290, *If you were to receive an invitation to participate in a Citizens' Assembly, how likely would you be to volunteer to do so?* NA or Don't Know responses were removed from analysis.

Table 2: Responses to CAN_Q288, CAN_Q289

	No	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	***n***
Received invite (CAN_Q288)	97.38 %	2.62 %			*49,279*
(If CAN_Q288 = yes) Positive response (CAN_Q289)			50.01 %	49.99 %	*1,224*

Table 3: Responses to CAN_Q290

	Very unlikely	**Somewhat unlikely**	**Somewhat likely**	**Very likely**	***n***
Summary_interest *(CAN_Q290)*	12.89%	13.05%	35.37%	38.68%	*47,540*

The positive response rate is markedly above the average response rate of 6 percent reported in other deliberative processes (Devillers et al. 2021; OECD 2021). This could be indicative of lack of understanding about volunteering for a DMP versus other participatory processes. However, when looking at actual positive responses to DMP invites distributed by population (Table 5), the population who indicated that they responded positively largely mirrors the population who actually responded positively – with the notable exception of gender - suggesting that the data is indicatively accurate, if not completely reflecting actual volunteering rates. In total, 72.93 percent responded positively - that they would be somewhat or very likely to volunteer.

The results of the generalized linear model are presented in Table 4. The analysis is binary, with somewhat and very likely to volunteer as 1. The constant was 0.587.

Table 4: Likelihood to volunteer

		Likelihood to volunteer
Gender (Male)	Female	-0.015 *** (0.004)
	Diverse	0.021 (0.031)
Age category (18-29)	30-44	-0.046 *** (0.006)
	45-64	-0.076 *** (0.006)
	65+	-0.229 *** (0.007)
Visible Minority (No)	Yes	0.011 (0.006)
Indigenous (No)	Yes	0.032 ** (0.012)
Household Status (Rented)	Owned	-0.021 *** (0.005)
Education (High school or below)	College or trade school	0.036 *** (0.005)
	University degree or above	0.039 *** (0.005)
Self-placement on political spectrum	0 - 1 (left-right)	-0.071 *** (0.008)
Interest in politics (Not at all interested)	Not very interested	0.080 *** (0.022)
	Somewhat interested	0.236 *** (0.021)
	Very interested	0.341 *** (0.021)
Constant		0.587
Log likelihood		-39454
AIC		78941
BIC		79080
Observations		43654
Notes: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001 Reference group is indicated in brackets.		
Regression output from a generalized linear model (Gaussian link function). Coefficients are log odds for willingness to participate in a citizen's assembly.		

Contrary to expectations, the youngest age group (18-29 year olds) are most likely to be interested in volunteering for a DMP when compared to other age groups. Consistent with models of participation, those with a higher socioeconomic status – as measured by education level – are more likely to indicate a positive response when asked if they would volunteer. However, those renting were more likely to indicate support for volunteering compared to those who owned their houses. Both Indigenous and Visible Minority populations were more likely to be interested in volunteering than those who indicated that they were not from those backgrounds. Those who self-report on the left side of the political spectrum were more likely to volunteer for a mini public than those on the right. We also note a trend in political interest: perhaps unsurprisingly, those who are least interested in politics are also least likely to volunteer. Those very interested in politics are significantly more likely to volunteer for a mini public than those who are not at all interested in politics.

Responses to the likelihood of volunteering are compared to three additional datapoints: those who indicated that they volunteered, in response to the Vote Compass PES survey; those who actually volunteered for panels, as organized by MASS LBP; and the Canadian adult census population. Table 5 presents the percentage of respondents within each category.

Table 5: Response rates

		Self-reported volunteer	**Somewhat or very interested**	**Actual volunteer**	**Census (2021)**
Age *	18-29	4.66 %	17.13 %	5.58 %	18.22 %

		Self-reported volunteer	Somewhat or very interested	Actual volunteer	Census (2021)
	30-44	18.1 %	23.59 %	20.95 %	24.96 %
	45-64	31.96 %	36.33 %	44.91 %	33.23 %
	65+	45.28 %	22.95 %	28.55 %	23.59 %
Gender	Diverse	N/A	0.02 %	1.01 %	0.33 %
	Female	28.59 %	37.33 %	52.97 %	50.83 %
	Male	71.41 %	62.65 %	46.01 %	48.84 %
Visible Minority **	VM	11.47 %	18.77 %	19.05 %	25.45 %
	Not VM	88.53 %	81.23 %	80.95 %	74.55 %
Indigenous ***	Indigenous	2.64 %	4.85 %	2.39 %	4.44 %
	Not Indigenous	97.36 %	95.15 %	97.61 %	95.56 %
Household status ****	Own	78.28 %	74.23 %	69.9 %	66.64 %
	Rent	21.71 %	25.77 %	30.1 %	29.44 %
	Other	N/A	N/A	2.98 %	3.93 %
n		*710*	*37,512*	*4,733*	*30,979,190*

Statistics Canada. 2023. (table). *Census Profile*. 2021 Census of Population. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2021001. Ottawa. Released November 15, 2023. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E

Notes
* 12 Civic Lotteries included these age categories. Civic Lotteries that did not were excluded from the analysis.
** 13 Civic Lotteries included VM status. This includes both whether people identify as a VM, or whether they identify as an ethnicity other than white.
*** 15 Civic Lotteries included Indigenous status. This includes Aboriginal, First Nations, Metis, Inuit, and Indigenous peoples.
**** 5 Civic Lotteries included household status. *Other* includes subsidized housing and co-op.

In terms of relationship between interest and actual volunteering rates, despite being the most likely to be interested in volunteering, the youngest age group is in fact the *least* likely to volunteer for an actual panel. When looking at actual volunteering rates, ages 45-64 are the most likely to volunteer, making up almost 45 percent of all volunteers (compared to 33 percent of the population); in contrast, only 6 percent of volunteers were 18-29, despite making up 18 percent of the population. There is similar under-representation of both visible minority and Indigenous volunteers, compared to the general population. However, more concerning is that both visible minority individuals and renters are less likely to be interested in volunteering than their population average. Finally, renters were less likely to volunteer than owners, and they volunteered in lower numbers than their composition in the general population.

Discussion

First, it is reassuring to see that even though the proportion of those who said they responded positively to an invite was much larger than the commonly reported averages, the proportions of

those reporting that they did volunteer largely aligns with the actual response data in the categories of age and Indigeneity. This validates the initial data and suggests that future analysis could use information collected by the PES about those who have reported to volunteer to create a richer sociodemographic profile than is currently possible with only response rates. However, in instances where there is greater difference (e.g. Visible Minority status, rent vs. ownership) future analysis could weight respondents according to their actual response rates. However, this would provide only limited insights at this stage given that the size of both datasets are small.

The survey response data suggest that there are trends in likelihood to volunteer – that those interested in volunteering are more educated, more interested in politics, and left-leaning. Civic Lotteries are often heralded for their capacity to engage the "unusual suspects" in government engagement initiatives; however, to be truly representative, they may require additional controls to ensure the diversity of opinion. For practitioners, there are two potential avenues of exploration to control for political interest or affiliation: at the recruitment stage, through introducing a stratification variable; or at the panel stage, through conducting a pre-panel survey. The latter route would not allow for panel recalibration, although it would provide more comprehensive data to understand the scale of the issue. For theorists, this finding suggests that greater caution should be used when describing mini publics. Rather than heralding these as the solution to issues of participation, Civic Lotteries should be used alongside other participation improvement methods and should not replace dedicated outreach and engagement.

Looking at actual response rates, there are areas in which the volunteering population does not align with the general population composition. Age is the most notable variation, with only 5 percent of volunteers being 18-29 despite making up 18 percent of the population. This finding alone is not necessarily a critical concern for practitioners, as age is one of the most common variables to stratify on. However, it raises important questions: if so many young people are interested in volunteering, why do so few actually volunteer? As mentioned earlier, there is no mandate to participate, and obviously, panels such as these are a time commitment: commonly at least 5 full days, and over weekends, and other commitments understandably get in the way of volunteering. We know that in traditional representative politics, people who volunteer are those with time, money, and capacity: if so few young people are volunteering compared to their demographic, are those that have capacity to volunteer sufficiently representative? Likewise, people who self-identify as visible minority or Indigenous are underrepresented in the rates of volunteering compared to the population average – and while the majority of civic lotteries included these variables for stratification, not all did.

That the youngest age group is the least likely to volunteer suggests there are additional barriers to their participation, and that the youngest age group may require different formats to meaningfully engage. Further research could explore the demographic make-up of those volunteers, to understand the extent to which they are representative of the population. But this finding raises an important additional question on the criteria used for stratification. Although age

is commonly used as a selection criteria, visible minority or Indigenous self-identification are not. There is currently no universal schema of the selection criteria and conditions in which it would be beneficial to include certain criteria – either normatively or statistically. Future research interrogating the types of panels in which volunteers are more (less) likely to volunteer would aid in understanding when variables should be incorporated, and when they risk becoming nuisance variables or risk locking up the civic lottery.

Finally, despite the richness of this dataset in comparison to a number of other analyses, the populations of each subcategory may be small in some instances. For example, the number of non-binary or gender diverse respondents is in the 40s, and while some inferences can be made, we should be careful about extrapolating from a relatively small population. Furthermore, the analysis conducted here considers each category as an independent set, rather than taking a holistic, intersectional approach to the population. That is, while I have looked at the effects of gender and visible minority identification on likelihood to volunteer, I have not explored response rates for black men. This is particularly important when considering the unique barriers to participation that certain populations face. However, to conduct research in this area, the field would benefit from a larger dataset.

This line of inquiry, and subsequent findings, does not undermine the concept of stratified random sampling for representation in deliberative mini-publics. It is still more diverse and more representative than relying on self-selection alone. However, these findings identify some points in which civic lotteries may over- or under-represent existing population groups, and suggest groups that would benefit from understanding participation. Furthermore, these findings suggest that some criteria – such as gender – may be important to stratify on for representative claims-making, but may not actually differ that much between actual response rates and population composition. Ultimately, stratified sampling alone may not guarantee representation, but it may provide a useful tool to develop a more representative panel – as long as the limitations of such a tool are also recognized.

References

Beauvais, Edana. 2018. "Deliberation and Equality." In *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*, eds. André Bächtiger, John Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark Warren. Oxford University Press, 143–55. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198747369.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780198747369-e-32 (January 4, 2021).

Bedock, Camille, and Jean-Benoit Pilet. 2021. "Who Supports Citizens Selected by Lot to Be the Main Policymakers? A Study of French Citizens." *Government and Opposition* 56(3): 485–504.

Boulianne, Shelley. 2018. "Mini-Publics and Public Opinion: Two Survey-Based Experiments." *Political Studies* 66(1): 119–36.

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 271–94.

Bridgman, Aengus, Rosalie Nadeau, and Dietlind Stolle. 2022. "A Distinct Society? Understanding Social Distrust in Quebec." *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 55(1): 107–27.

Brown, Mark. 2006. "Survey Article: Citizen Panels and the Concept of Representation*." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 14(2): 203–25.

Carpini, Michael X. Delli, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7(1): 315–44.

Carpini, Michael X. Delli, and Scott Keeter. 1993. "Measuring Political Knowledge: Putting First Things First." *American Journal of Political Science* 37(4): 1179.

Carson, Lyn. 2017. *Sample Size for Mini-Publics*. NSW: newDemocracy. Research and Development Note.

Carty, R. Kenneth, André Blais, and Patrick Fournier. 2008. "When Citizens Choose to Reform SMP: The British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform." In *To Keep or To Change First Past The Post?*, ed. André Blais. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199539390.001.0001/acprof-9780199539390 (March 25, 2021).

Curato, Nicole et al. 2021. *Deliberative Mini-Publics: Core Design Features*. 1st edition. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Devillers, Sophie, Julien Vrydagh, Didier Caluwaerts, and Min Reuchamps. 2021. "Looking in from the Outside: How Do Invited But Not Selected Citizens Perceive the Legitimacy of a Minipublic?" *Journal of Deliberative Democracy* 17(1). https://delibdemjournal.org/article/id/961/.

van der Does, Ramon, and Vincent Jacquet. 2021. “Small-Scale Deliberation and Mass Democracy: A Systematic Review of the Spillover Effects of Deliberative Minipublics.” *Political Studies*: 00323217211007278.

van der Does, Ramon, and Jaroslaw Kantorowicz. 2022. “Political Exclusion and Support for Democratic Innovations: Evidence from a Conjoint Experiment on Participatory Budgeting.” *Political Science Research and Methods*: 1–9.

Ellison, Mark, Gary Pollock, and Robert Grimm. 2020. “Young People’s Orientations towards Contemporary Politics: Trust, Representation and Participation.” *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 23(6): 1201–26.

Farrell, David M., and Peter Stone. 2020. “Sortition and Mini-Publics: A Different Kind of Representation.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Representation in Liberal Democracies*, eds. Robert Rohrschneider and Jacques Thomassen. Oxford University Press, 0. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198825081.013.11 (January 3, 2024).

Fishkin, James. 2018. Democracy When the People Are Thinking: Revitalizing Our Politics Through Public Deliberation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fishkin, James, and Robert Luskin. 2005. “Experimenting with a Democratic Ideal: Deliberative Polling and Public Opinion.” *Acta Politica* 40(3): 284–98.

Flanigan, Bailey et al. 2021. “Fair Algorithms for Selecting Citizens’ Assemblies.” *Nature* 596(7873): 548–52.

Foa, Roberto Stefan, and Yascha Mounk. 2017. “The Signs of Deconsolidation.” *Journal of Democracy* 28(1): 5–15.

Font, Joan, and Ismael Blanco. 2007. “Procedural Legitimacy and Political Trust: The Case of Citizen Juries in Spain.” *European Journal of Political Research* 46(4): 557–89.

Fournier, Patrick et al. 2011. When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizen Assemblies on Electoral Reform. Oxford University Press.

Gastil, John. 2018. “The Lessons and Limitations of Experiments in Democratic Deliberation.” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 14(1): 271–91.

Gastil, John, and Michael Xenos. 2010. “Of Attitudes and Engagement: Clarifying the Reciprocal Relationship Between Civic Attitudes and Political Participation.” *Journal of Communication* 60(2): 318–43.

Geisler, Alexander Matthias, Paulina Pospieszna, and Nikodem Mrożek. 2023. “Evaluating Fairness and Accuracy of Sortition Algorithms for Citizens’ Assemblies.” In Los Angeles.

Gidengil, Elisabeth. 2020. *Take a Number: How Citizens’ Encounters with Government Shape Political Engagement*. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Gidengil, Elisabeth, André Blais, Neil Nevitte, and Richard Nadeau. 2004. *Citizens*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(3): 564–81.

Gül, Volkan. 2019. "Representation in Minipublics." *Representation* 55(1): 31–45.

Hartz-Karp, Janette, and Lyn Carson. 2009. "Putting the People into Politics: The Australian Citizens' Parliament." *The International Journal of Public Participation* 3(1): 10–31.

Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, eds. 2001. *What Is It about Government That Americans Dislike?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kymlicka, Will. 2021. "The Precarious Resilience of Multiculturalism in Canada." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 51(1): 122–42.

Lee, Yunsoo, and Hindy Lauer Schachter. 2019. "Exploring the Relationship between Trust in Government and Citizen Participation." *International Journal of Public Administration* 42(5): 405–16.

Lees-Marshment, Jennifer et al. 2015. "Vote Compass in the 2014 New Zealand Election: Hearing the Voice of New Zealand Voters." *Political Science* 67(2): 94–124.

Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes.'" *The Journal of Politics* 61(3): 628–57.

MASS LBP. 2017. *How to Run a Civic Lottery*. Toronto: MASS LBP.

Neblo, Michael A. et al. 2010. "Who Wants To Deliberate—And Why?" *American Political Science Review* 104(3): 566–83.

OECD. 2020. *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*. Paris: OECD. Policy Paper. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/innovative-citizen-participation-and-new-democratic-institutions_339306da-en.

———. 2021. *Evaluation Guidelines for Representative Deliberative Processes*. Paris: OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/evaluation-guidelines-for-representative-deliberative-processes_10ccbfcb-en.

Parkinson, John. 2006. Deliberating in the Real World: Problems of Legitimacy in Deliberative Democracy. OUP Oxford.

Parry, Lucy, Jane Alver, and Nivek Thompson. 2019. "Democratic Innovation in Australasia." In *Handbook of Democratic Innovation and Governance*, eds. Oliver Escobar and Stephen Elstub. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, US: Edward Elgar Publishing, 435–48.

Pitkin, Hanna. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pow, James. 2021. “Mini-Publics and the Wider Public: The Perceived Legitimacy of Randomly Selecting Citizen Representatives.” *Representation* 0(0): 1–20.

Quintelier, Ellen, and Jan W. van Deth. 2014. “Supporting Democracy: Political Participation and Political Attitudes. Exploring Causality Using Panel Data.” *Political Studies* 62(S1): 153–71.

Ryfe, David M., and Brittany Stalsburg. 2012. “The Participation and Recruitment Challenge.” In *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, eds. Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, Matt Leighninger, and G. Michael Weiksner. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Graham. 2009. Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steel, Daniel, Naseeb Bolduc, Kristina Jenei, and Michael Burgess. 2020. “Rethinking Representation and Diversity in Deliberative Minipublics.” *Journal of Deliberative Democracy* 16(1): 46–57.

Stone, Peter. 2011. The Luck of the Draw: The Role of Lotteries in Decision Making. Oxford University Press.

Suiter, Jane, David M Farrell, and Eoin O’Malley. 2016. “When Do Deliberative Citizens Change Their Opinions? Evidence from the Irish Citizens’ Assembly.” *International Political Science Review* 37(2): 198–212.

Warren, Mark E., and Hilary Pearse, eds. 2008. *Designing Deliberative Democracy: The British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.