

GENDER AND POLITICAL TALK: COLLEGE WOMEN'S  
PARTICIPATION IN DELIBERATIVE DISCUSSION SESSIONS

Carmen J. Burlingame

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements of  
Master of Arts

Department of Political Science

Central Michigan University  
Mount Pleasant, Michigan  
February 2013

Accepted by the Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies,  
Central Michigan University, in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the master's degree

Thesis Committee:

J. Cherie Strachan, Ph.D.

Committee Chair

Thomas Greitens, Ph.D.

Faculty Member

David Jesuit, Ph.D.

Faculty Member

February 22, 2013

Date of Defense

Roger Coles, Ed.D.

Dean  
College of Graduate Studies

March 21, 2013

Approved by the  
College of Graduate Studies

Copyright by  
Carmen J. Burlingame  
2013

This is dedicated to Conner McFarland who has continued to inspire and encourage me these past few years. Had it not been for you, Conner, I never could have done this.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several people that I must express my gratitude to for their assistance with both the completion of this project and for the maintenance of my sanity through the process. First, I would like to thank the faculty members of my thesis committee, Dr. Thomas Greitens and Dr. David Jesuit, for their feedback, comments, and critiques that they provided. I must also thank Becky Bailey, for her assistance with the content analysis portion of this thesis, the hours we spent coding the videos of the discussion sessions in Anspach will never be forgotten, for better or for worse! Next, I must acknowledge my roommate, Nicole, for enduring my late nights, for providing sustenance, and brief periods of entertainment when she knew it was necessary. I offer my thanks to Laura Orta, who was certainly willing to provide a firm hand when necessary, bribing me with breaks for page completions, and withholding electronic devices from me, but more importantly for her support and encouragement throughout the process. Thank you to all of the other graduate assistants and my friends in the department who have heard me complain and moan and have gained amusement at the repercussions of my sleep deprivation over the past several months and who offered feedback after attending a practice defense (offense). Finally, I offer my sincerest gratitude to the person who made all of this possible, my committee chair, Dr. J. Cherie Strachan. I cannot begin to thank you enough for the countless hours and literally the thousands of emails we have exchanged as you have guided me through the completion of this thesis. I could never have asked for a better mentor and advisor and I cannot thank you enough for everything you've given me.

## ABSTRACT

### GENDER AND POLITICAL TALK: COLLEGE WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION IN DELIBERATIVE DISCUSSION SESSIONS

by Carmen J. Burlingame

Political scientists have long realized that civic duty is an essential component of political participation (Brady, Verba, & Lehman Schlozman, 1995; Downs, 1957; Riker & Ordeshook, 1970). Yet declines in associational life and civil society have minimized opportunities to cultivate civic identity through natural political socialization (Putnam, 1995; Skocpol, 2003; Strachan & Senter, 2013). The loss in socialization is particularly devastating to young people who have an increasingly passive and apolitical view of citizenship (CIRCLE, 2013; Zukin et al., 2006). While some high schools address this missing experience through open discussion of political issues, few have the time and resources to do so (Campbell, 2008). An alternative is to embrace deliberative pedagogy into the college curriculum as a way to compensate for current students' missing experiences. This solution may appeal to advocates of deliberative democracy (Bohman, 2003; Fishkin, 1995; Galston, 2005; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Habermas, 1989; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009), although critics of this approach would warn that such approaches will only be effective if marginalized groups, such as women, are able to deliberate as equals (Bohman, 2003; Carli, 2004; Fraser, 1992; Sanders, 1997).

Hence this work, based on an experimental design conducted in the fall of 2007, explores whether different treatment conditions affect male and female undergraduate students' participation in deliberative discussion sessions.

Results, which are based on content analysis of video recorded discussion sessions, indicate that gender parity in either proportion of time spoken or proportion of turns taken were in the groups that relied on formal rules such as parliamentary procedure. Contrary to previous findings, gender composition (Johnson & Schulman, 1989; Karpowitz, Mendelberg, & Shaker, 2012) and issue topic (Conway, Steuernagel, & Ahern, 2005) had no consistent impact on men's or women's willingness to participate. The implications of these findings are important to other professors dedicated to implementing deliberative pedagogy as a means for enhancing civic engagement, as introducing formal rules seem to be the most useful way to establish equality in deliberative settings.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW .....	3
	<i>Political Participation in the United States</i> .....	3
	<i>Civic Identity and Youth Political Participation</i> .....	4
	<i>Deliberative Pedagogy as a Solution</i> .....	5
	<i>Deliberative Democracy</i> .....	8
	<i>Cause for Concern: Women’s Historical Exclusion from Deliberative Democracy</i> .....	9
	<i>Previous Efforts to Encourage Women’s Participation</i> .....	10
	<i>Egalitarian Deliberative Pedagogy</i> .....	11
III.	METHODS .....	13
	<i>The Intervention</i> .....	13
	<i>Treatment</i> .....	15
	<i>Gender Role Identities</i> .....	16
	<i>Topic Selection</i> .....	16
	<i>Time</i> .....	17
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	18
	Results .....	18
	<i>Treatment</i> .....	18
	<i>Gender Role Identity</i> .....	19
	<i>Topic Selection</i> .....	20
	<i>Time</i> .....	21
	Discussion .....	22
	<i>Treatment</i> .....	22
	<i>Gender Role Identity</i> .....	23
	<i>Topic Selection</i> .....	24
	<i>Time</i> .....	24
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION .....	25
	Recommendations .....	25
	Conclusion .....	29
	APPENDICIES .....	30
	REFERENCES .....	46



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Political scientists have conducted research to determine which demographic factors are most related to political participation with a particular emphasis on voting behavior. Socioeconomic status was identified as the principle predictor for determining voting behavior for a number of years, but this knowledge has transitioned to include more insightful models taking resources into consideration as well as expanding voting behavior to non-traditional types of political participation (Brady, Verba, & Lehman Schlozman, 1995; Leighley, 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). Several models of political participation were created, but it was not until the addition of civic duty as a variable into the calculus of voting model, that voting behavior was thoroughly explained (Downs, 1957; Riker & Ordeshook, 1970). Even with resources, those without civic duty will avoid expending those resources on political participation.

However, the insight provided by Riker and Ordeshook is only reassuring in a democratic society where citizens have a strong civic identity, a characteristic that is quickly declining in the United States. For a number of reasons, including a sharp decline in associational life both on campus and society as a whole, one of the main sources for political socialization and the creation of social norms has been eroded. As such, the current generation of young people, the Millennials, have a passive and apolitical view of political participation (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003; Strachan & Senter, 2013; CIRCLE, 2013; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006).

Social norms, the source of civic identity, are best cultivated in homogenous communities during adolescence (Campbell, 2006; Youniss, McLellan, & Yates, 1997). However, research

shows that classrooms in schools can serve as a pseudo community, providing the type of setting essential to the development of social capital and norms of reciprocity that occur in more traditional communities (Carnegie Corporation of New York and Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2003). High schools, which often provided this type of educational experiences that cultivated healthy civic norms in the past, now have difficulty dedicating time to student deliberation and decision-making; thus, college campuses provide the next logical place for this type of learning to occur. In order for civic engagement pedagogy to be successful, however, it must encourage an open discussion of current political issues and, ideally, be tied to tangible outcomes (Bandura, 1977).

This type of pedagogy incorporates deliberative interactions that many political theorists argue are vital to a successful democracy (Bohman, 2003; Fishkin, 1995; Galston, 2005; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Habermas, 1989; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009). However, one of the fundamental criteria that must be achieved in deliberative democracy is equality amongst the deliberators—a condition that many theorists believe is not present, especially for historically marginalized groups of people such as women (Bohman, 2003; Carli, 2004; Fraser, 1992; Sanders, 1997). Scholars have argued that the key to creating an egalitarian deliberative experience for women is to ensure that females enjoy majority status in the groups (Johnson & Schulman, 1989; Karpowitz, Mendelberg, & Shaker, 2012). However, this is often not feasible even in many classrooms, let alone in the real world. As such, further efforts need to be taken to determine whether different versions of deliberative pedagogy can enhance female participation without relying on manipulations of group composition.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### *Political Participation in the United States*

Many scholars have found that the key demographic characteristics leading to heightened levels of political participation, voting behavior in particular, are socioeconomic (SES) factors such as education and income. Other political behaviorists have made contributions to this research by determining that demographics such as age and marriage are also large contributors, along with education and occupation, in creating the gap between voters and non-voters (Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). However, these contributions referred primarily to voting behavior, which is only one form of political participation, and are based on the assumption that attitudes precede behavior (Leighley, 1995). A more accurate model, providing insight beyond SES characteristics, is the resource model of political participation which demonstrated that time, money, and civic skills are the factors most conducive to predicting political involvement (Brady, Verba, & Lehman Schlozman, 1995).

These models are largely a response to rational choice scholars who have also tried to determine what causes the difference between voters and non-voters. First, the calculus of voting model stated that people will only choose to vote when the probability of casting the deciding ballot, multiplied by the benefit of having the preferred candidate win, outweighs the cost of voting (Downs, 1957). However, based on that principle, the costs of voting would never outweigh the benefits, thus the contribution of the “duty” variable of the equation, which conceptualized the notion that certain citizens feel a sense of civic obligation responsibility, to vote despite the costs (Riker & Ordeshook, 1970). As it is nearly impossible for political scientists to manipulate demographic and SES factors, nor significantly increase the amount of

resources Americans have, scholars with an applied interest in promoting political participation and voting should focus on ways to cultivate this sense of civic “duty” among the citizenry, as it is the most likely to lead to a significant increase in political participation.

### *Civic Identity and Youth Political Participation*

Historically, a sense of civic identity was cultivated in part through membership in associational life. America has been termed a “nation of joiners” meaning that despite the paradox of the individualistic culture and focus on individual rights in the United States, citizens as a whole were apt to join organizations that promote collective action (Schlesinger, 1944). This observation was made at a time when the “Dutiful” generation (those born prior to 1945) dominated American politics, but organizational membership remained high for the Baby Boomer generation that followed, including people born between 1946-1964. However, scholars such as Robert Putnam (1995) have shown that membership in these organizations has been in a steep decline over the past half century. Skocpol (2003) has also noted the decline in associational membership and claims that the professionalization of the political sphere, and the infiltration of interest groups, has led to a society where ongoing organizational activity by the citizenry is no longer valued or present.

These losses in natural political socialization seem to disproportionately affect the youngest generation of citizens, the Millennial generation, born after 1976. Recent studies have shown that nearly one quarter of young people aged 18-29 years old are completely civically alienated and 57% of this cohort believes that they have no obligation to change society and that engaging in collective action is an individual choice (CIRCLE, 2013). Almost twice as many Millennials, 58%, compared to 32% of the Dutiful generation agreed that “simply being a good person” satisfied the criteria for good citizenship. In short, most young Americans reject a

traditional definition of good citizenship that included a sense of political responsibility or obligation. Despite the slight peaks in voter turnout in 2008 and in 2012 for members of the Millennial generation, many scholars are troubled by the possibility that these elections resulted in an isolated uptick that will not be sustainable in the future, unless these views of obligation and duty are reframed. Their skepticism is clearly warranted as survey responses have indicated that college students prefer to solve social problems through volunteering and community service activities, not through traditional political processes. This strong preference further exemplifies their missing civic identity (Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006).

College campuses have traditionally provided an infrastructure where deliberative civil society could flourish and where young people could gain experiences likely to cultivate healthy civic identities; however, there has been a decline in these types of organizations on college campuses as well (Strachan & Senter, 2013). Yet it is through participation in these organizations, where people are given the opportunity to participate in deliberative decision-making, that young people are socialized to think of themselves as active citizens who will participate in politics throughout their lives. Declining opportunities for young people to garner a political identity through campus organizational life, combined with their increasingly passive views of citizenship, raises concerns for the likelihood of sustaining democracy through an active and engaged citizenry.

### *Deliberative Pedagogy as a Solution*

While the decline in opportunities for joining voluntary associations on college campuses is problematic, revitalizing the structure of a deliberative civic culture is still possible. Much research has shown that high school civic education interventions are highly successful in creating sustained political participation later in adulthood. Involvement in extracurricular

activities in high school, specifically organizations that require deliberative interaction among students, is the best predictor of adult political participation (Brady, Verba, & Lehman Schlozman, 1995). Youniss, McClellan, and Yates (1997), for example, assessed the effects of high school students' involvement in student government and community service projects on their likelihood of participating politically as many as 15 years later. Campbell (2008), meanwhile, examined the effects of having a civics course in high school where open conversation and discussion about politics was encouraged. Again, he found that the strongest indication of participating actively in politics 15 years later was exposure to this particular type of classroom instruction. However, high school teachers largely are no longer able to dedicate the same amount of time to deliberative civic education in high school as state and national education policies have increased incentives tied to standardized testing. Teachers who are preoccupied with "teaching to the test" often have little time to spare for open-ended discussions of current events. Just as troubling, research indicates that there is a wide disparity between the type of students who receive a deliberative education and those who do not, as teachers at more affluent school districts are much more likely to incorporate deliberative interactions into their classroom activities (CIRCLE, 2013).

As many young adults are now entering college without these skills and identities, college professors must consider ways to remedy these oversights in prior political socialization before it is too late for these students to cultivate the civic identities that will transform them into an active and engaged citizenry. It is not enough to only teach political knowledge, or assume that students are receiving this type of education through general education courses, as is evident by the response to the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement where college seniors reported that their college experiences had no substantial impact on their decision to vote in the

future (Kuh & Umbach, 2004). Additionally, the research conducted on high school students has shown no connection to heightened levels of political participation in the short or long term following formal curriculum on civic engagement (Campbell, 2006). While it may not be possible for academics to recreate the infrastructure of deliberative civil society on or off campus, professors can encourage deliberative decision-making through role-playing simulations in classroom settings. The best method for doing this is to create deliberation that is tied to an important outcome that the students will see worth engaging in discussion (Ryfe, 2005). Bandura (1977) argues that while it is most ideal for people to engage in real life situations, such as first-hand deliberation in civil society, to have the greatest impact, self-efficacy can still be fostered through vicarious experiences, such as deliberative pedagogy in the classroom in order to reach the widest range of students. The most effective means for doing this are through role-playing simulations in which students are encouraged to create a resolution. The aim of the simulation is not to achieve consensus, but rather to encourage equal participation by all students and to have a variety of different views brought to the table.

The important aspect of deliberative pedagogy is to cultivate social norms, as these norms are the source of civic identity. The socializing characteristics that have been shown to cultivate civic identities are particularly prevalent in homogenous communities where social norms are shared; creating similar bonding social capital between students can also be cultivated in classrooms. The 2003 report by the Carnegie Corporation and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement demonstrate this principle:

Schools are communities in which young people learn to interact, argue, and work together with others, an important condition for future citizenship. Schools have the capacity to bring together a heterogeneous population of young people-with different

backgrounds, perspectives, and vocational ambitions-to instruct them in common lessons and values. They can also bring young people into significant relationships with adult role models. (Carnegie Corporation of New York and Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2003).

The implications from this report lend a tremendous amount of optimism for individuals wishing to cultivate the missing component of young people's political socialization. These pseudo communities, classrooms, are the key infrastructure for civic educators, specifically, college professors, to help the current undergraduate population cultivate their missing civic identity.

### *Deliberative Democracy*

Theorists of deliberative democracy have long argued that deliberation is the ultimate source of democratic governance and as such, the focus of deliberation as the key mechanism of civic education and political socialization in this pedagogical technique would be highly recommended by these scholars. Although there are many theorists of deliberative democracy (Bohman, 2003; Fishkin, 1995; Galston, 2005; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009) perhaps the most prominent, Jürgen Habermas provides four criteria that must be present to constitute true deliberative democracy: (1) there must be equality amongst the people, (2) deliberation should breed consensus rather than a multitude of ideas, (3) private and personal issues should be ignored in order to focus on the public good, and (4) a large distance between civil society and the state should be maintained in order to maintain a properly functioning public sphere (Habermas, 1989). Other theorists claim that reason-giving, as a form of deliberative democracy, will increase understanding and tolerance amongst people of different backgrounds to create feelings of mutual respect and reciprocity (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Mutz, 2006). This



recommendation mirrors Robert Putnam's concept that bridging social capital that brings together people of diverse backgrounds to reach shared opinions and thus narrows the divides that previously created cleavages based on differences in demographic characteristics (Putnam, 2000). Hence while there are varying definitions of deliberative democracy, the underlying characteristics for all of these deliberative democracy theorists is the reliance on a perceived equal playing field for the deliberative component to be effective (Bohman, 2003; Fishkin, 1995; Galston 2005; Lawrence, Cook & Delli Carpini, 2009).

The link between deliberation and participation has also been established in empirical studies. Previous research on juries, for example, has shown that the act of engaging in deliberation in a specific context leads to increased voting behavior (Gastil, Deess, Weiser, & Meade, 2008). This work reinforces the finding that participation in classroom discussions of controversial political issues as young adults has a significant impact on voting fifteen years later, the solution of deliberative pedagogy seems even more clear (Campbell, 2006). However, if this act of engaging in deliberative pedagogy is to function as one of the primary ways to cultivate civic identity for all citizens, it may only be effective for marginalized demographic groups if the criterion of having an equal playing field is achieved.

#### *Cause for Concern: Women's Historical Exclusion from Deliberative Democracy*

Many scholars have shown that deliberative democracy is great in an idealized world, but that the component of equal status is hard to achieve; in particular cleavages in class, gender, race, and religion can represent deep conflicts making deliberative democracy far more challenging (Bohman, 2003; Fraser, 1992). Additionally, women are thought to be at a disadvantage because they do not exhibit epistemological authority, without agency, women are left in a power-down position (Carli, 2004; Sanders, 1997). This position leads to women's

opinions being ignored because they fail to exude the same amount of competence and expertise as their male counterparts. Based on an extensive review of literature on gender and persuasion in small group settings, Carli (2004) concludes that the only way that women can achieve the same level of influence as men is to defy gender norms. Yet this act leads to women being disliked. Women must then find influence by framing their goals as communal and other-oriented, which is seen as an appropriate role for women to have when deliberating (Carli, 2004). It is for these reasons that women, and other minority groups, have traditionally chosen to act outside the realm of traditional forms of political participation. When groups who have lower levels of agency attempt to engage in traditional political behavior, they are often unheard and ignored, as such, they resort to adversarial politics such as the Civil Rights Movement and Women's Right's Movement (Young, 2001). Hence it remains unclear whether deliberative pedagogies can be effective for women and minorities.

#### *Previous Efforts to Encourage Women's Participation*

A great deal of research has been conducted to determine the settings most conducive to achieving equality in deliberative democracy (Bohman, 2003; Fishkin, 1995; Galston, 2005; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Habermas, 1989; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009; Lawrence, Cook, & Delli Carpini, 2009). Most recently, however, research on egalitarian deliberative democracy has focused on the effects of gender in group composition. Initial studies indicate that when either gender is in the minority, members of that gender group resort back to gender expectations and norms in order to engage in discussion, a concept known as gender-role entrapment. This effect is far more damaging to females than males, as their stereotypical behavior naturally yields less engagement in the political discussion (Johnson & Schulman, 1989). Additional research to further examine the degree to which gender composition influences

the amount of political discussion in deliberative pedagogical settings yielded the conclusion that women are most likely to engage in deliberation when they held majority status in the group (Karpowitz, Mendelberg, & Shaker, 2012). These two articles seem to show that the key to increasing female participation is to increase the number of females within each deliberative setting. Yet this finding seems to contradict the findings in Patricia Gurin's seminal work on gender and group consciousness, which determined that women often do not identify with one another and have low levels of group consciousness especially in comparison to racial and ethnic minorities (Gurin, 1985). As such, it seems less probable that female participation would increase purely due to majority status, as Gurin demonstrated that most females prioritize demographic traits other than their gender, which shapes their identity more than their status as women.

### *Egalitarian Deliberative Pedagogy*

Regardless of whether gender role entrapment truly affects females or if a lack of gender consciousness prevents this phenomenon from occurring, creating deliberative settings when females are always in the majority is not feasible in the real world, or even in many college classrooms. A small cause for optimism is that it seems that women's perception of backlash for violating gender norms and actively participating in politics politically may truly only be perception. For example, when women run for political office, a violation of gender norms, they have an equal chance of winning (Lawless & Fox, 2010). As such, it appears that gender may impact women's participation in deliberative settings by hindering their own willingness to engage, even though others no longer react negatively to their participation. However, women's willingness to participate is an essential prerequisite for effective deliberative pedagogy. Deliberative pedagogy thus needs to be examined in different contexts other than

majority status to determine which factors, if any, can promote equality in women's contributions to deliberative decision-making.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

#### *The Intervention*

While efforts to cultivate a civic identity in young adults through deliberative pedagogy have been implemented, they are rarely assessed. However, an experimental design that was executed in fall 2007 by Dr. J. Cherie Strachan to determine which environments were most conducive to cultivating the social norms that drive political participation later in adulthood. This research was conducted on the campus of Central Michigan University, a large Midwestern university, and was composed of 150 undergraduate students enrolled in two introductory American Politics course, each taught by the same professor. Students received extra credit to participate in a series of four deliberative discussion sessions where they were required to discuss a variety of controversial political views and come to consensus by writing a joint resolution on the topic being discussed. As this particular course satisfies a general education requirement, students enrolled in the class came from a wide variety of majors and disciplines, thus they are relatively representative of undergraduate students at Central Michigan University.

Students were randomly assigned into one of five different conditions, a control group or one of the four treatments, each led by a trained graduate student moderator. Students who were assigned to the control group received instructions similar to those used by the National Issues Forum. In the first treatment group, the Persuasion Group, students were also given the National Issue Forum instructions, but also were required to watch a short persuasive film that depicted the role of deliberation in several successful collective action movements ranging from the push for the GI Bill by the American Legion to Mothers Against Drunk Driving's successful attempt

to raise state drinking ages. The second treatment group, Robert's Rules Group, was trained to use a shortened version of Robert's Rules of Order so that they could practice using parliamentary procedure. A third treatment group, Round Robin Group, was created by accident when one of the graduate student moderators, who was originally assigned to the Robert's Rules treatment, instead relied on a Round Robin format of discussion. Although he violated protocol for the experimental design, this moderator provided consistent instructions through all of the discussion sessions, and as a result, Round Robin emerged as a third treatment for the deliberative setting. The final treatment group (Both Group) received the parliamentary procedure instructions and also watched the persuasive film. In an effort to minimize moderator effects, all directions on deliberative procedure throughout all of the experimental conditions were administered by a flash film recording of Dr. Strachan. Students were assigned to the same group across all four discussion sessions held throughout the semester.

Each of these sessions was video recorded. Trained graduate students then conducted a content analysis of each of the sessions where they recorded the number of seconds each student talked and the number of turns the students took during each session; a sample moderator code sheet is included in Appendix A. During each discussion session, participants were assigned three topics on which to deliberate and form a resolution. As such, each student is represented roughly twelve times in each of the treatments, assuming they were present for all four sessions and that the group discussed all three issues. Students, however, were not required to complete all three resolutions to earn extra credit, but were awarded points for the actual act of deliberating, as such; there were multiple instances when the groups would not deliberate on all assigned topics. Additionally, there are substantially fewer students in the Robert's Rules and Round Robin treatments due to equipment failure that resulted in not having a clear video of

several discussion sessions. Finally, there are fewer participants in the second session as compared to the other three as one class session was canceled.

One of the goals of this experimental design is to identify if deliberative settings affect women's likelihood of participating in decision-making. Several hypotheses were developed to assess the impact of various factors on participation, including: the treatment, gender role identities, such as being in the majority or minority of the group, the topics assigned, and time. For the purposes of all of the hypotheses, participation will be operationalized by the amount of time that students spoke in each of the sessions. Since the amount of time spoken by individuals varies greatly, the proportion of time talked was also calculated. This number refers to the number of seconds that each individual spoke divided by the number of seconds that the group as a whole spent deliberating on that specific topic. The same calculation was performed on the number of turns each student took during each of the sessions displaying a proportion of turns taken for each student as well.

### *Treatment*

The purpose of the experimental design was to determine which settings led to the most gender parity in deliberative interactions. This goal led to the formation of the following hypothesis:

*H1: Women will participate the least during the the Control Group.*

*H2: Women will participate the most during the Both Group.*

If women find it difficult to overcome gender norms to participate, the Control group would make it more difficult for them to do so. Under this condition, women are not explicitly encouraged to participate. In addition, they cannot rely on formal procedures, such as the directions given to the Robert's Rules and Round Robin groups that intended to create a situation in which women

did not have to violate gender norms in order to easily insert themselves into an on-going deliberation. On the other hand, women were exposed to both encouragement and rules in the Both Group.

### *Gender Role Identity*

In order to determine if women are uncomfortable participating in deliberative settings, it will be necessary to see the number of participants who choose not to participate in the discussion sessions at all, leading the development of the following hypotheses:

*H3: The greatest proportion of people who choose not to speak across all treatments will be women.*

Prior findings (Johnson & Schulman, 1989; Karpowitz, Mendelberg, & Shaker, 2012) suggest women are able to overcome gendered norms when they are in the majority. Hence the fourth hypothesis states:

*H4: When females have majority status, they will have higher participation, than when they are in the minority, regardless of the treatment condition.*

### *Topic Selection*

Students were assigned to deliberate on an array of topics, ranging from the War in Iraq to the death penalty and abortion. As research indicates that women are perceived to be more competent on domestic, social issues, than on international issues pertaining to war and violence, issue type may also affect women's willingness to participate (Conway, Steuernagel, & Ahern, 2005). As such, the following hypothesis was developed in order to determine whether women have internalized these stereotypical competencies:



*H5: Women will have higher rates of participation when topics focus on domestic issues than when they focus on international issues.*

#### *Time*

The discussion sessions were held four times (three times in the group with the canceled session), roughly one month apart, over the course of the semester, and students remained in the same groups, with the same moderator, and deliberated under the same conditions. Hence time can be assessed as a potential variable, to see if students' participation increased throughout the course of the semester. One would expect that students will feel more comfortable participating as the semester progresses, which led to hypothesis seven:

*H6: There will be an increase in participation in deliberative discussions across the course of the semester for both genders.*

This will be viewed as a whole regardless of treatment to determine if students are more comfortable participating in these activities as they become more socialized to participate in this manner.

Through testing these seven hypotheses, the groundwork will be laid for determining which conditions, if any, affect deliberative pedagogy in the college classrooms. It will help to assess whether variables other than majority status can help to create egalitarian environments that are most conducive for political participation regardless of gender.

CHAPTER IV  
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

*Treatment*

The first hypothesis predicted that the greatest disparity between male and female participation would be in the Control Group, where students received no instructions on the importance of collective action nor did they receive any training on formal rules. An Independent Samples *t*-Test was conducted and results are displayed in Table 1. The difference column subtracts female scores from male scores, such that positive scores indicate a male advantage and negative scores indicate a female advantage. Notably, the proportion talk time among the control and the first three conditions fluctuates very little, however, males have a considerably larger, statistically significant advantage ( $p < .001$ ), in the Both condition. The same is true in regards to the proportion of turns taken. Aside from the Both Group, the Control Group does have the highest levels of gender disparity in relation to the other three treatments, with females having much lower participation levels.

Females never have an advantage in the proportion of time spoken in any of the treatments, but they do have an advantage in proportion of turns taken in the Robert's Rules Group and in the Round Robin Group. This pattern supports the conclusion that when formal rules are put in place women have a better ability to gain the floor, even if they are choosing to speak for shorter periods of time. These preliminary results are limited by the fact, however, that a large proportion of students chose not to speak at all in these discussion sessions, with specific numbers of students who do not participate broken down and displayed in Table 2. Just over

31% of students from each gender chose not to participate at all. Thus these students were filtered out of the analysis to see the differences in participation level without the students who did not participate at all, and these results are found in Table 3. This finding, showing that just as many men as women chose not to speak at all undermines support for the third hypothesis. Just under 1/3 of each gender avoids participation in deliberation when offered the opportunity to do so. These patterns vary according to treatment, so it is possible that men and women have different reasons for choosing not to participate. It is not clear from the content analysis alone what the underpinning reasons are for their lack of participation.

The findings reported in Table 3, eliminating non-participants from analysis, yield even greater disparities for women. Aside from a small gain in the proportion of turns taken in the Control setting (males still have the overall advantage), the rest of the conditions showed losses for women, including losing their advantage in the proportion of turns taken in the Robert's Rules Group. The Both condition remains the least apt to promote egalitarian participation for females, and the Both Group is also where there was the greatest number of females who chose not to participate; as noted in Table 2, 44% of females who were assigned to the Both treatment did not speak at all.

### *Gender Role Identity*

The existing research has suggested that gender composition promotes increased female participation. Thus in tables 4-8, group composition is evaluated in each of the five conditions, with Table 4 analyzing the Control Group and 5-8 evaluating the Persuasion, Robert's Rules, Round Robin, and Both conditions, respectively. Table 4 indicates that the only time that women have an advantage over men is in the proportion of turns taken when they are in the minority status, having a proportion of female group composition less than .50. Table 5 shows

that when females have the majority status in the Persuasion group, they have an advantage over males in the proportion of turns they take. Table 6, the Robert's Rules condition, shows that women consistently have an advantage over men in the proportion of turns taken and that the gap actually increases to women's favor when they are in the minority. The proportion of turns taken is always to female's advantage under the Round Robin condition, and to the same degree, regardless of any group composition, and females gain advantage of proportion talked when they are in the minority, according to the results of the Independent Samples *t*-Test listed in Table 7. Table 8 shows that women never have the advantage in proportion of turns taken or in proportion of time spoken in the Both treatment when all students are included, when only students who reported speaking are included, and when females are in the minority, however, there was not a situation in which females held majority status in the Both Group. Tables 9 and 10, show the effect of minority and majority status on each of the five treatments, respectively.

### *Topic Selection*

Table 11 displays an Independent Samples *t*-Test showing the portion of time talked as well as the proportion of turns taken by men and women for each of the twelve topics that were assigned for the discussion sessions. Hypothesis 5 predicted that women would have higher proportion of talked time when asked to discuss domestic issues. Of the twelve individual issues that were discussed, women never reached parity in proportion of time talked to men. They did achieve equality with the proportion of turns that were taken on three issues: Preemptive War, Abortion, and Guantanamo Bay. On the topic of Iraq Refugees, women had a higher proportion of turns taken than men. These variables were then coded into being domestic or foreign issues, topics one through three, and seven through were considered international, with the remainder was categorized as being domestic. There was no difference in the proportion of time talked for

males, but women did have a higher proportion of time talked on domestic issues than international, although, the same pattern was not reflected with the proportion of turns that were taken. Men had a higher proportion of turns taken with domestic issues, and females had a higher proportion with international.

### *Time*

The final hypothesis, H6, predicted that both male and female participation would increase between each discussion session. In looking at the results from the Independent Samples *t*-Test displayed in Table 13, there was very little difference between the sessions for men or women. The proportion of time talked for men did increase slightly with each session, and aside from a small dip of 1% in the second session, the proportion of turns taken also increased for males for each discussion session. Women also saw a dip in session two of the proportion of time talked, but a subtle increase, with a proportion of 0.10 in the first session, 0.09 in the second, 0.11 in the third, and 0.12 in the fourth session. The proportion of turns taken did not vary much for women, they took 12% of the turns in the first and fourth session and 11% in the second and third. But the fact that aside from the second session, the increase in proportion talked for both genders increased as each discussion session occurred does show that the predicted behavior from hypothesis seven did occur. An additional notable finding is that the proportion of turns males took, compared to the proportion that females took rose between the beginning and end of the semester, and they consistently had the same advantage on the proportion of time talked across all four sessions, thus showing that the variable has a greater implication for men than women.

## Discussion

### *Treatment*

The implications from these findings are of interest to civic educators. Perhaps the most important stem from the finding that the Robert's Rules and Round Robin conditions create the most egalitarian settings for women, and in fact create a female advantage under certain circumstances. This reaffirms the claim that women choose not to engage in deliberative interactions because they have to defy gender norms and expectations to do so (Carli, 2004). Yet when rules are in place that makes deliberation appropriate and acceptable, women are able to participate and hold the floor as much as men, and in certain cases even have an advantage.

It is also interesting to note that the amount of people who chose not to participate did not vary at all by gender. This finding may result from connecting participation to rewards and outcomes that the students valued –extra credit points. More gender differences may occur in natural political settings, where women have not been given explicit instructions from an authority figure, asking them to participate in deliberative decision-making. Yet just as many females wanted to participate in the classroom setting as males, and this participation may even help to compensate for inequalities that occur outside of the classroom.

However, it is apparent that men and women appear to be dropping out for different reasons, despite similar overall rates of nonparticipation. The percentage of women who chose not to speak at all in the Both treatment groups may have resulted from the small number of women who were assigned to that treatment in the first place. The assignment of students to each of the treatments was entirely random, they were not sorted on the basis of gender, and as such, if a greater number of women had been assigned to that treatment, perhaps the drop-off rate could have been less significant. It is also possible that the both treatment was the most similar

to a real-life political situation. Formal rules were in place and the students were given the persuasive framing on the importance of collective action, as such, this setting was the most explicitly political and women may have been acutely aware of this. While it is possible that there could have been an impact of women not having majority status in the both condition, the fact that it did not make a difference in any of the other treatments makes it implausible that this was the lynch pin behind women's decreased participation in the Both Group. The Robert's Rules and Round Robin treatments have the smallest amount of women who chose not to participate at all, as fewer than 4% of females chose not to participate in the combined two treatments while over 18% of males chose not to participate in the combined treatments. This pattern reaffirms the necessity of incorporating formalized rules into deliberative pedagogy in order to promote equal participation across genders.

### *Gender Role Identity*

In an attempt to assess the reliability of the previous research on role composition, Independent Samples *t*-Tests were also run to see what happened to when women constituted the majority or minority of the groups. The fact that there was no consistent increases or decreases in participation when females held majority status, and the finding that females actually fared better in some of the treatments when they were a minority, fails to adequately justify the gender role entrapment theory (Johnson & Schulman, 1989). Instead, females seem to be unaware of whether they are in the majority or the minority. This pattern may occur because women lack gender consciousness, which minimizes the impact of group composition (Gurin, 1985). For deliberative civic educators, this means that group composition may not matter as much as scholars have claimed, and that other factors must lead to increased or decreased participation, such as formal rules.

### *Topic Selection*

The slight increase that women had on proportion talked in the domestic issues shows that there may be some correlation between the topics that are discussed and the amount that females participate. Perhaps the reason that more significant results were not found, could be because the one cancelled class included discussion of several domestic issues, including: gay marriage, abortion, and the death penalty, was one of the days that the discussion session was canceled. Thus, the number of students deliberating on these issues was much lower than on international issues. This may have led to a lesser degree of significance than what may have occurred with a greater sample size. The implications this study provides for topic choice are inconclusive, but civic educators may want to take these suggestive patterns into consideration when selecting the issues for student deliberations.

### *Time*

The finding that time spent in discussion sessions had a more significant impact on male behavior than on female behavior mirrors similar conditional effects from college experiences overall. When women and men are both provided with the same college experiences men typically accrue more beneficial outcomes than women. Men, for example, benefit from time spent studying, engagement on campus, participation in diversity workshops and interactions with faculty members more than women (Sax, 2008). A similar effect may be occurring here. Both young men and young women currently suffer from weak political socialization. Yet men appear to compensate for these lost experiences more quickly than their female peers. Perhaps professors should consider implementing deliberative pedagogy even more frequently, as it seems to take women longer to acquire the new socialization that will hopefully lead to the development of civic duty later in life.



## CHAPTER V

### RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

#### Recommendations

The implications of this research have shown that the most successful deliberative pedagogy, in terms of promoting egalitarian participation across gender, occurs in settings where formal rules are in place, a wide variety of topics are discussed, and frequent repetition of these practices occur. As such, it is with these criteria in mind that college professors should take on the role of becoming civic educators. Teaching the role of government as a formal curriculum does not have the same effect as engaging actively in the open discussion of controversial issues (Campbell, 2006). Future research should try to create settings where these criteria are in place, but should perhaps occur outside of the political science classroom.

One potential problem is that there may be a discrepancy inherent in the number and types of students who enroll in introductory American politics courses. If students are taking the course because of a future political science major or minor they wish to pursue, it is likely that they have some knowledge and interest in politics, which would likely make them more apt to participate than other students. The fact that this course satisfies a general education requirement helps to integrate a wider range of students, but as students have a number of choices of courses to take to fulfill that requirement, there must still be some degree of a selection bias among those who chose to take a political science class over other social science courses. Thus, the self-selection of the students may have an impact on these findings and civic educators should seek to implement deliberative pedagogy in settings likely to attract a more diverse array, and possibly more apolitical, set of students.

An even greater issue is the fact that while a large majority of Millennials are now going to college; those who do not are rarely offered the opportunity to participate in these types of deliberative interventions. If these experiences are occurring as infrequently as they are on college campuses, the likelihood of them happening in the real world without deliberative pedagogical interventions is very rare. As such there is likely a large portion of the population that will not experience comparable political socialization, and thus may never manage to cultivate healthy civic identity. Hence expanding formal deliberative pedagogy into the high school setting would be ideal, even though interventions designed for college campus interactions seem the most feasible.

Additionally, some of the inherent methodological issues with this experimental design stem from equipment failure and under/over-representation of each gender in the different treatments as a result. While it is important to make sure that random selection is administered when assigning students to different treatment, a stratified random assignment to ensure desired gender composition in each group could be implemented. Also, more training with graduate moderators could be administered. While in this case the development of the Round Robin treatment was an asset, if the moderator had not been consistent across all four sessions, the violation of protocol would have resulted in a great quantity of unusable data. However, all of these issues can easily be solved when different implementations occur in the future.

Finally, while the usage of formal rules is important, perhaps more could be done with the priming of the discussion session. Incorporating a form of a feminist framing could encourage females to participate at higher rates. By creating a sense of gender consciousness, women may choose to participate more than they typically would without that frame. This

would be a suggestion for future deliberative pedagogy, to determine if viewing deliberation through a feminist lens could lead to heightened female participation.

The analyses that have been discussed have only focused on bivariate relationships in order to determine best practices in the classroom setting by looking at each variable in isolation, however, in order to grasp a wider picture of the actual phenomenon that is occurring, it will be necessary to run multivariate analyses. This is especially essential, when trying to consider the impact the deliberative pedagogy in the classroom can have on natural political settings where variables are harder to control and isolate. Such multivariate analyses will combine gender along with other demographic characteristics and many of the variables that have been discussed, such as time, the topics being discussed, and the treatments students were assigned to.

However, participation is only one aspect of deliberative pedagogy that needs to be assessed. Given conditional effects in higher education, it is necessary to consider the possibility that participation may have different impact on men's and women's likelihood of participating in politics in the future, as well as their political efficacy and civic identity. For example, challenging a professor in the classroom has a positive impact on male students (increasing their confidence in their academic abilities), while it has a negative impact on women (resulting in higher levels of self-reported stress and anxiety) (Sax 2008). If challenging fellow students has the same conditional effects on men and women, women may be so uncomfortable that they decided to avoid political participation to avoid discomfort. It may be that participation does not affect men and women in the same ways. Hence participation combined with pre/post questionnaires designed to assess increases in efficacy and likelihood of participating in politics in the future should be examined in conjunction with looking purely at levels of participation.

Further, perceived influence must also be measured, beyond looking only at levels of participation. Women are expected to communicate in different ways, as women communicate to establish relationships, while men communicate to establish hierarchy (Tannen, 1990). If advancing political preferences violates these norms, women may not be influential in shaping outcomes – even though they are participating at equal rates. In order to determine the perception of influence that women have, it will be necessary to ask peers to evaluate their group members, by gender, to determine how they perceived each individual in the discussion. This could be another potential reason that women participate less over time, if they realize that their participation is having little impact on the decisions being made, it is irrational to expect women to continue to participate. This is another reason why women may choose to participate in alternative forms of political participation, such as adversarial politics, when they find that they are alienated by traditional means of participation (Young, 2001). If this truly is the phenomenon that is occurring, perhaps efforts of encouraging females' political participation should be spent on teaching them how to organize mass-movements, rather than how to deliberate.

In short, the data that has been presented, demonstrates a preliminary overview of the impact of deliberative pedagogy in the classroom from a gendered perspective. As future multivariate analyses are conducted assessing participation, and measurements of efficacy and perceived influence are taken into account, a more thorough assessment will be achieved having implications in the classroom and in the real world.

## Conclusion

The results of this deliberative intervention have solidified the argument that there is a gender gap in participation in deliberative settings, as is present in all political settings. As young people lack political interest and are largely civically apathetic, the implications for young women who already are predisposed to lessened political participation are even more severe. According to Jennifer Lawless and Richard Fox, it still takes a candidate (Lawless & Fox, 2010). This conclusion, the title of their book, refers to the difference in ambition for women to seek political office, exemplifying the fact that it is not because of an unwillingness of the American electorate to support women officeholders, but is because of women's disinterest in running for office (and their own perceived incompetence to hold these positions) that creates the disparity in numbers of females in office. It is frightening to consider that there are so few females in office within generations that have cultivated a civic identity and that the lacking of that identity in the Millennial generation, may lead to even fewer women running, and thus being elected into office in the future.

Efforts to prevent an even greater disparity of women in elected office need to begin by recreating the missing political socialization that young people today are experiencing. Cultivating a strong civic identity is the key to creating an engaged citizenry, as has been evidenced by rational choice scholars of political participation (Downs, 1957; Riker & Ordeshook, 1970). However, because of declining opportunities to cultivate this identity through historical means, such as participation in voluntary organizations (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003), encouraging deliberative civic interventions in college settings seems like the most plausible for recreating this identity in both young men and young women.

## APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

Moderator Coding Sheet

Moderator:

Date:

Condition:

Topic:

List the # of students attending the discussion session: \_\_\_\_\_

List the number of male students attending: \_\_\_\_\_

List the number of female students attending: \_\_\_\_\_

Did a student take charge of organizing procedural details?      Yes      No

    If yes, identify this student's gender:      Male      Female

Did the group rely on a chair?      Yes      No

    If yes, identify this student's gender:      Male      Female

Did the group have a secretary/recorder?      Yes      No

    If yes, identify this student's gender:      Male      Female

Male Ever

Female Ever

Y      N

Y      N

Propose

Propose

Facilitate

Facilitate

Contradict

Contradict

Keep track of # of seconds each participant talked on back.

APPENDIX B

Table 1. Independent-Samples *t*-Test displaying gender differences between treatments by time talked, proportion talked, turns, taken, and proportion of turns taken.

Variable	Male		Female		df	t	Difference
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Control</i>							
Time Talked	38.25	62.22	24.38	54.73	366	2.25**	+13.87
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.15	366	2.02*	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.81	3.53	2.23	3.14	366	1.65	+0.58
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.15	366	1.17	+0.02
<i>Persuasion</i>							
Time Talked	30.10	67.13	32.68	52.63	292	-0.37	-2.58
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.18	0.12	0.14	292	0.61	+0.01
Turns Taken	2.56	5.25	2.85	4.91	292	-0.50	-0.29
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.13	292	0.46*	+0.01
<i>Robert's Rules</i>							
Time Talked	40.24	42.43	26.42	22.58	61	1.51*	+13.82
Proportion Talked	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	61	0.77	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.76	1.74	2.08	1.52	61	-0.76	-0.32
Proportion Turns	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.05	61	-0.76	-0.01
<i>Round Robin</i>							
Time Talked	21.31	15.95	16.37	12.53	61	1.33*	+4.94
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.07	61	1.06	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.11	0.46	1.12	0.40	61	-0.67	-0.01
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.03	61	-1.04	-0.01
<i>Both</i>							
Time Talked	37.85	53.81	21.33	30.31	201	2.10**	+16.52
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.16	0.06	0.08	201	3.60***	+0.09
Turns Taken	2.42	3.14	2.33	3.23	201	0.19	+0.09
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.09	201	2.86***	+0.06

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\* p ≤ .001

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.



Table 2: Proportion talked by treatment displaying the numbers of men and women who do not talk at all.

	N = Prop. Talk 0	N = Prop. Talk Total	% of Prop Talk 0
<i>Males</i>			
Control	63	200	31.50%
Persuasion	56	135	41.48%
Robert's Rules	6	37	16.22%
Round Robin	1	43	2.33%
Both	51	151	33.77%
Total	177	566	31.27%
<i>Females</i>			
Control	63	168	37.50%
Persuasion	51	159	32.08%
Robert's Rules	1	26	3.84%
Round Robin	0	42	0%
Both	23	52	44.23%
Total	138	447	31.08%

Table 3. Independent-Samples *t*-Test displaying gender differences between treatments, where proportion talked >0 by time talked, proportion talked, turns, taken, and proportion of turns taken.

Variable	Male		Female		df	t	Difference
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Control</i>							
Time Talked	55.82	68.39	39.01	65.06	240	1.94	+16.81
Proportion Talked	0.21	0.16	0.18	0.15	240	1.62	+0.03
Turns Taken	4.09	3.60	3.56	3.32	240	1.16	+0.53
Proportion Turns	0.21	0.13	0.20	0.14	240	0.49	+0.01
<i>Persuasion</i>							
Time Talked	51.35	81.48	48.03	57.87	185	0.33	+3.32
Proportion Talked	0.22	0.18	0.18	0.14	185	2.03	+0.04
Turns Taken	4.33	6.30	4.17	5.48	185	0.19	+0.16
Proportion Turns	0.22	0.16	0.18	0.12	185	2.06	+0.04
<i>Robert's Rules</i>							
Time Talked	48.03	42.12	27.48	22.38	54	2.20*	+20.55
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.08	54	1.49	+0.04
Turns Taken	2.10	1.70	2.16	1.49	54	-0.15	-0.06
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.06	0.11	0.05	54	0.11	0.00
<i>Round Robin</i>							
Time Talked	21.91	15.75	16.37	12.53	60	1.50	+5.54
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.07	60	1.24	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.14	0.43	1.19	0.40	60	-0.40	-0.05
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.03	60	-0.75	-0.01
<i>Both</i>							
Time Talked	57.15	57.21	38.24	31.68	127	1.70*	+18.91
Proportion Talked	0.22	0.15	0.11	0.08	127	3.75**	+0.11
Turns Taken	3.66	3.21	4.17	3.33	127	-0.75	-0.51
Proportion Turns	0.21	0.12	0.14	0.08	127	2.81*	+0.07

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 4. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during the Control treatment displaying all students, all students with proportion talked > 0, females in the majority, and females in the minority.

Variable	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>All Students</i>							
Time Talked	38.25	62.22	24.38	54.73	366	2.25**	+13.87
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.15	366	2.02*	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.81	3.53	2.23	3.14	366	1.65	+0.58
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.15	366	1.17	+0.02
<i>Students with Proportion Talk &gt; 0</i>							
Time Talked	55.82	68.39	39.01	65.06	240	1.94	+16.81
Proportion Talked	0.21	0.16	0.18	0.15	240	1.62	+0.03
Turns Taken	4.09	3.60	3.56	3.32	240	1.16	+0.53
Proportion Turns	0.21	0.13	0.20	0.14	240	0.49	+0.01
<i>Female Minority, Proportion Female &lt; 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	40.47	68.05	32.64	71.64	247	0.86	+7.83
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.14	247	1.20*	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.60	3.51	2.62	3.72	247	-0.04	-0.02
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.17	247	-0.33	-0.01
<i>Female Majority, Proportion Female ≥ 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	29.63	29.58	14.85	19.81	117	3.25**	+14.78
Proportion Talked	0.16	0.14	0.10	0.15	117	1.74	+0.06
Turns Taken	3.59	3.56	1.77	2.23	117	3.42**	+1.82
Proportion Turns	0.17	0.13	0.10	0.12	117	2.73	+0.07

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\* p ≤ .001

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 5. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during the Persuasion treatment displaying all students, all students with proportion talked > 0, females in the majority, and females in the minority.

Variable	Male		Female		df	t	Difference
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>All Students</i>							
Time Talked	30.10	67.13	32.68	52.63	292	-0.37	-2.58
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.18	0.12	0.14	292	0.61	+0.01
Turns Taken	2.56	5.25	2.85	4.91	292	-0.5	-0.29
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.13	292	0.46*	+0.01
<i>Students with Proportion Talk &gt; 0</i>							
Time Talked	51.35	81.48	48.03	57.87	185	0.33	+3.32
Proportion Talked	0.22	0.18	0.18	0.14	185	2.03	+0.04
Turns Taken	4.33	6.30	4.17	5.48	185	0.19	+0.16
Proportion Turns	0.22	0.16	0.18	0.12	185	2.06	+0.04
<i>Female Minority, Proportion Female &lt; 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	17.52	27.66	15.68	21.77	78	0.27	+1.84
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.19	0.10	0.12	78	1.12	+0.05
Turns Taken	2.16	3.14	1.79	1.55	78	0.5	+0.37
Proportion Turns	0.15	0.19	0.10	0.09	78	1.11*	+0.05
<i>Female Majority, Proportion Female ≥ 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	40.46	86.04	34.99	55.16	212	0.57	+5.47
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.17	0.12	0.15	212	-0.22	+0.00
Turns Taken	2.88	6.51	2.99	5.19	212	-0.14	-0.11
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.13	212	-0.61	-0.02

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\* p ≤ .001

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 6. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during the Robert's Rules treatment displaying all students, all students with proportion talked > 0, females in the majority, and females in the minority.

Variable	Male		Female		df	t	Difference
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>All Students</i>							
Time Talked	40.24	42.43	26.42	22.58	61	1.51*	+13.82
Proportion Talked	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	61	0.77	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.76	1.74	2.08	1.52	61	-0.76	-0.32
Proportion Turns	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.05	61	-0.76	-0.01
<i>Students with Proportion Talk &gt; 0</i>							
Time Talked	48.03	42.12	27.48	22.38	54	2.20*	+20.55
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.08	54	1.49	+0.04
Turns Taken	2.10	1.70	2.16	1.49	54	-0.15	-0.06
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.06	0.11	0.05	54	0.11	+0.00
<i>Female Minority, Proportion Female &lt; 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	47.45	60.33	35.50	29.48	17	0.52	+11.95
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.05	17	0.62**	+0.02
Turns Taken	2.27	2.10	2.63	1.60	17	-0.4	-0.36
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.06	17	-0.63	-0.02
<i>Female Majority, Proportion Female ≥ 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	37.19	33.23	22.39	18.33	42	1.71*	+14.80
Proportion Talked	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	42	0.52	+0.01
Turns Taken	1.54	1.56	1.83	1.47	42	-0.63	-0.29
Proportion Turns	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.05	42	-0.50	-0.01

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 7. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during the Round Robin treatment displaying all students, all students with proportion talked > 0, females in the majority, and females in the minority.

Variable	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>All Students</i>							
Time Talked	21.31	15.95	16.37	12.53	61	1.33*	+4.94
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.07	61	1.06	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.11	0.46	1.12	0.40	61	-0.67	-0.01
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.03	61	-1.04	-0.01
<i>Students with Proportion Talk &gt; 0</i>							
Time Talked	21.91	15.75	16.37	12.53	60	1.5	+5.54
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.07	60	1.24	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.14	0.43	1.19	0.40	60	-0.4	-0.05
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.03	60	-0.75	-0.01
<i>Female Minority, Proportion Female &lt; 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	15.11	14.78	16.00	15.83	28	-0.16	-0.89
Proportion Talked	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.10	28	-0.34	-0.01
Turns Taken	1.22	0.65	1.33	0.49	28	-0.51	-0.11
Proportion Turns	0.09	0.05	0.10	0.04	28	-0.53	-0.01
<i>Female Majority, Proportion Female ≥ 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	27.50	14.97	16.67	9.72	31	2.41*	+10.83
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.75	0.09	0.04	31	2.32	+0.05
Turns Taken	1.00	0.00	1.07	0.26	31	-1.10*	-0.07
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.01	0.11	0.02	31	-1.39	-0.01

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 8. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during the Both treatment displaying all students, all students with proportion talked > 0, females in the majority, and females in the minority.

Variable	Male		Female		df	t	Difference
	M	SD	M	SD			
<i>All Students</i>							
Time Talked	37.85	53.81	21.33	30.31	201	2.10**	+16.52
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.16	0.06	0.08	201	3.60***	+0.09
Turns Taken	2.42	3.14	2.33	3.23	201	0.19	+0.09
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.09	201	2.86***	+0.06
<i>Students with Proportion Talk &gt; 0</i>							
Time Talked	57.15	57.21	38.24	31.68	127	1.70*	+18.91
Proportion Talked	0.22	0.15	0.11	0.08	127	3.75**	+0.11
Turns Taken	3.66	3.21	4.17	3.33	127	-0.75	-0.51
Proportion Turns	0.21	0.12	0.14	0.08	127	2.81*	+0.07
<i>Female Minority, Proportion Female &lt; 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	37.85	53.81	21.33	30.31	201	2.10**	+16.52
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.16	0.06	0.08	201	3.60***	+0.09
Turns Taken	2.42	3.14	2.33	3.23	201	0.19	+0.09
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.09	201	2.86***	+0.06
<i>Female Majority, Proportion Female ≥ 0.50</i>							
Time Talked	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Proportion Talked	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Turns Taken	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Proportion Turns	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\* p ≤ .001

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Note: Women never held majority status in the Both Group.

Table 9. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during each of the treatments excluding students where Proportion Group Female < .50, by gender.

Variable	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Control</i>							
Time Talked	40.47	68.05	32.64	71.64	247	0.86	+7.83
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.14	247	1.20*	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.60	3.51	2.62	3.72	247	-0.04	-0.02
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.17	247	-0.33	-0.01
<i>Persuasion</i>							
Time Talked	17.52	27.66	15.68	21.77	78	0.27	+1.84
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.19	0.10	0.12	78	1.12	+0.05
Turns Taken	2.16	3.14	1.79	1.55	78	0.5	+0.37
Proportion Turns	0.15	0.19	0.10	0.09	78	1.11*	+0.05
<i>Robert's Rules</i>							
Time Talked	47.45	60.33	35.50	29.48	17	0.52	+11.95
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.05	17	0.62**	+0.02
Turns Taken	2.27	2.10	2.63	1.60	17	-0.4	-0.36
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.06	17	-0.63	-0.02
<i>Round Robin</i>							
Time Talked	15.11	14.78	16.00	15.83	28	-0.16	-0.89
Proportion Talked	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.10	28	-0.34	-0.01
Turns Taken	1.22	0.65	1.33	0.49	28	-0.51	-0.11
Proportion Turns	0.09	0.05	0.10	0.04	28	-0.53	-0.01
<i>Both</i>							
Time Talked	37.85	53.81	21.33	30.31	201	2.10**	+16.52
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.16	0.06	0.08	201	3.60***	+0.09
Turns Taken	2.42	3.14	2.33	3.23	201	0.19	+0.09
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.09	201	2.86***	+0.06

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.



Table 10. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken during each of the treatments excluding students where Proportion Group Female  $\geq .50$ , by gender.

Variable	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Control</i>							
Time Talked	29.63	29.58	14.85	19.81	117	3.25**	+14.78
Proportion Talked	0.16	0.14	0.10	0.15	117	1.74	+0.06
Turns Taken	3.59	3.56	1.77	2.23	117	3.42**	+1.82
Proportion Turns	0.17	0.13	0.10	0.12	117	2.73	+0.07
<i>Persuasion</i>							
Time Talked	40.46	86.04	34.99	55.16	212	0.57	+5.47
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.17	0.12	0.15	212	-0.22	+0.00
Turns Taken	2.88	6.51	2.99	5.19	212	-0.14	-0.11
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.13	212	-0.61	-0.02
<i>Robert's Rules</i>							
Time Talked	37.19	33.23	22.39	18.33	42	1.71*	+14.80
Proportion Talked	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	42	0.52	+0.01
Turns Taken	1.54	1.56	1.83	1.47	42	-0.63	-0.29
Proportion Turns	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.05	42	-0.5	-0.01
<i>Round Robin</i>							
Time Talked	27.50	14.97	16.67	9.72	31	2.41*	+10.83
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.75	0.09	0.04	31	2.32	+0.05
Turns Taken	1.00	0.00	1.07	0.26	31	-1.10*	-0.07
Proportion Turns	0.10	0.01	0.11	0.02	31	-1.39	-0.01
<i>Both</i>							
Time Talked	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Proportion Talked	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Turns Taken	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Proportion Turns	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity. Note: Women never held majority status in the Both Group.

Table 11. Independent-Samples *t*-Test displaying gender differences between topics by time talked, proportion talked, turns, taken, and proportion of turns taken.

Variable	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Topic 1: The War in Iraq</i>							
Time Talked	58.81	88.72	39.04	65.8	124	1.37	+19.77
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.14	0.09	0.11	124	1.89*	+0.04
Turns Taken	3.47	4.95	2.85	4.74	124	0.7	+0.62
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.12	0.1	0.11	124	1.21	+0.03
<i>Topic 2: Iraq Refugees</i>							
Time Talked	46.07	64.95	39.79	78.69	118	0.48	+6.28
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.14	0.1	0.14	118	1.07	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.64	3.49	2.67	4.02	118	-0.04	-0.03
Proportion Turns	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.19	118	-0.43*	-0.01
<i>Topic 3: Preemptive War</i>							
Time Talked	46.27	77.06	42.55	57.62	83	0.25	+3.72
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.17	0.11	0.12	83	0.57	+0.02
Turns Taken	2.47	5.44	3	5.08	83	-0.47	-0.53
Proportion Turns	0.12	0.3	0.12	0.12	83	-0.17	+0.00
<i>Topic 4: Death Penalty</i>							
Time Talked	37.76	49.29	20.14	22.88	60	1.76*	+17.62
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.12	0.08	0.09	60	2.34	+0.07
Turns Taken	3.61	4.52	2.86	3.18	60	0.74*	+0.75
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.1	0.1	0.08	60	1.37	+0.03
<i>Topic 5: Gay Marriage</i>							
Time Talked	37.76	49.29	20.14	22.88	60	1.76*	+17.62
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.12	0.08	0.09	60	2.34	+0.07
Turns Taken	3.61	4.52	2.86	3.18	60	0.74*	+0.75
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.1	0.1	0.08	60	1.37	+0.03
<i>Topic 6: Abortion</i>							
Time Talked	56.08	80.65	54.55	70.2	70	0.09	+1.53
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.14	0.08	0.09	70	1.19**	+0.04
Turns Taken	3.54	5.36	4.67	6.07	70	-0.84	-1.13
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.09	70	0.22	+0.00

*Topic 7: Guantanamo Bay*

Time Talked	56.08	80.65	54.55	70.2	70	0.09	+1.53
Proportion Talked	0.12	0.14	0.08	0.09	70	1.19*	+0.04
Turns Taken	3.54	5.36	4.67	6.07	70	-0.84	-1.13
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.09	70	0.22	+0.00

*Topic 8: Waterboarding*

Time Talked	18.1	26.89	12.97	16.61	71	0.95	+5.13
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.18	0.1	0.12	71	1.15*	+0.05
Turns Taken	1.68	2.5	1.38	2.12	71	0.56	+0.30
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.15	0.11	0.11	71	0.94*	+0.03

*Topic 9: International Torture*

Time Talked	32	35.79	18.6	23.75	53	1.6	+13.40
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.14	0.11	0.16	53	0.49	+0.02
Turns Taken	2.43	3.23	1.64	2.58	53	0.99	+0.79
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.13	0.11	0.12	53	0.78	+0.03

*Topic 10: Access to High Speed Internet*

Time Talked	23.98	41.56	14.05	0.21	102	1.39*	+9.93
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.21	0.12	0.14	102	0.75	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.21	3.09	1.44	2.51	102	0.78	+0.77
Proportion Turns	0.15	0.19	0.12	0.12	102	0.86*	+0.03

*Topic 11: Media Consolidation*

Time Talked	18.22	25.27	11.3	16.14	84	1.46**	+6.92
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.18	0.13	0.17	84	0.58	+0.02
Turns Taken	1.31	1.6	1.03	1.46	84	0.83	+0.28
Proportion Turns	0.15	0.17	0.13	0.14	84	0.68	+0.02

*Topic 12: Newspaper Campaign Reporting*

Time Talked	23.58	33.83	14.92	19.62	87	1.42	+8.66
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.18	87	0.76	+0.03
Turns Taken	1.78	1.84	1.56	1.92	87	0.48	+0.22
Proportion Turns	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.12	87	1.55*	+0.05

---

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\* p ≤ .001

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 12. Independent-Samples *t*-Test of Time Talked, Proportion Talked, Turns Taken, and Proportion of Turns Taken by each gender sorted by domestic and international topics.

Variable	<u>International</u>		<u>Domestic</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	Difference
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Males</i>							
Time Talked	40.92	65.96	29.76	47.47	564	2.29**	+11.16
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.16	564	-0.39	+0.00
Turns Taken	2.61	4.08	2.27	3.31	564	1.09	+0.34
Proportion Turns	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.15	564	-0.67	-0.01
<i>Females</i>							
Time Talked	30.63	55.60	22.58	37.28	445	1.78**	+8.05
Proportion Talked	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.14	445	-0.33	-0.01
Turns Taken	2.35	3.86	2.36	3.56	445	-0.03	-0.01
Proportion Turns	0.12	0.13	0.11	0.12	445	0.18	+0.01

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

Table 13. Independent-Samples *t*-Test displaying gender differences between sessions by time talked, proportion talked, turns, taken, and proportion of turns taken.

Variable	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
<i>Session I</i>							
Time Talked	51.01	77.48	40.29	67.93	329	1.31	+10.72
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.15	0.10	0.12	329	2.05	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.92	4.58	2.83	4.58	329	0.17	+0.09
Proportion Turns	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.14	329	0.30	+0
<i>Session II</i>							
Time Talked	41.12	60.14	33.85	48.40	202	0.94	+7.27
Proportion Talked	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.09	202	2.54***	+0.04
Turns Taken	2.97	4.28	3.45	4.60	202	-0.77	-0.48
Proportion Turns	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.10	202	0.29	+0
<i>Session III</i>							
Time Talked	26.63	36.62	15.47	19.48	205	2.41***	+11.16
Proportion Talked	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.13	205	1.71**	+0.03
Turns Taken	2.15	3.00	1.59	2.14	205	1.54**	+0.56
Proportion Turns	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.11	205	1.43*	+0.03
<i>Session IV</i>							
Time Talked	20.22	30.49	13.59	21.28	269	2.01***	+6.63
Proportion Talked	0.15	0.19	0.12	0.16	269	1.01	+0.03
Turns Taken	1.74	2.27	1.50	2.05	269	0.95	+0.24
Proportion Turns	0.15	0.18	0.12	0.13	269	1.46***	+0.03

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Note: A positive value for the difference column indicates a male advantage; a negative value indicates a female advantage, and a value of 0 means parity.

## REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Bohman, J. (2003). Deliberative Toleration. *Political Theory*, 757-779.
- Brady, H. E., Verba, S., & Lehman Schlozman, K. (1995). A Resource Model of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 271-294.
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape our Civic Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carli, L. L. (2004). Gender Effects on Social Influence. In J. S. Seiter, & R. H. Gass, *Perspectives on Persuasion, Social Influence, and Compliance Gaining*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York and Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2003). *The Civic Mission of Schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- CIRCLE. (2013, January 30). *The Center for Information on Civic Learning and Engagement*. Retrieved February 3, 2013, from The Center for Information on Civic Learning and Engagement: <http://www.civicyouth.org/>.
- Conway, M. M., Steuernagel, G. A., & Ahern, D. W. (2005). *Women and Political Participation: Cultural Change in the Political Arena*. Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
- Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fishkin, J. S. (1995). *The Voice of the People*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (pp. 109-142). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Galston, W. A. (2005). *The Practice of Liberal Pluralism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gastil, J. E., Deess, E. P., Weiser, P., & Meade, J. (2008). Jury Service and Electoral Participation: A Test of the Participation Hypothesis. *Journal of Politics*, 1-16.
- Gurin, P. (1985). Women's Gender Consciousness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 143-163.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. (T. Burger, & F. Lawrence, Trans.) Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Johnson, R. A., & Schulman, G. I. (1989). Gender role Composition and Role Entrapment in Decision-making Groups. *Gender and Society*, 355-372.
- Karpowitz, C. F., Mendelberg, T., & Shaker, L. (2012). Gender Inequality in Deliberative Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 533-547.
- Kuh, G. D., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). College and character: Insights from the National Survey of Student Engagement. In J. Dalton, & T. Russel, *Assessing Character Outcomes in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawless, J. L., & Fox, R. L. (2010). *It Still Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lawrence, J. R., Cook, F. L., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2009). *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leighley, J. E. (1995). Attitudes, Opportunities and Incentives: A Field Essay on Political Participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 181-209.
- Mutz, D. C. (2006). *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of the American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ryfe, D. M. (2005). Does Deliberative Democracy Work? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 49-71.
- Sanders, L. (1997). Against Deliberation. *Political Theory*, 335-360.
- Sax, L. J. (2008). *The Gender gap in College: Maximizing the Developmental Potential of Women and Men*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schlesinger, A. M. (1944). Biography of a Nation of Joiners. *The American Historical Review*, 1-25.
- Skocpol, T. (2003). *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman : University of Oklahoma Press.
- Strachan, J. C., & Senter, M. (2013). Student Organizations and Civic Education on Campus: The Greek System. In E. Bennion, A. McCartney, & D. Simpson (Eds.), *Teaching Civic Engagement: From Student to Active Citizen*. Washington D.C.: American Political Science Association.



- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't Understand: Women and men in Conversation*. New York: Harper Collins.
- William, R., & Ordeshook, P. (1970). A Theory of the Calculus of Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 25-41.
- Wolfinger, R. E., & Rosenstone, S. J. (1980). *Who Votes*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Young, I. (2001). Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy. *Political Theory* , 670-690.
- Youniss, J., McLellan, J. A., & Yates, M. (1997). What we know About Engendering Civic Identity. *American Behavioral Scientist* , 620-631.
- Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2006). *A New Engagement? Political Engagement, Public Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.