

**America in One Room Climate and Energy: Discussion Results from a National Deliberative Poll
Webinar Audience Q&A**

Question	Answer
In an era of massive disinformation, how do deliberative groups "accept" that the experts are, indeed, neutral?	The experts and the advisory groups vetting the briefing materials are balanced and evidence-based. As people participate they get engaged in the evidence based discussion as they weigh competing arguments. We find that the briefing materials and the experts uniformly get very high ratings in the evaluations from the participants. We think the design stimulates what psychologists have called "accuracy based motivated reasoning."
Are there plans to examine how long the opinion changes last among participants using longitudinal methods?	We have done that in other projects and found some diminution but also some very surprising persistence. We would like to do that here, returning both to the participants and the control group, but we are looking for extra funding for that. The surprising high response rate we got burned through our resources to do the core project.
What are the relative percentage of Independents to Democrats to Republicans in the poll?	Democrats (Party members plus leaners) 46%; Republicans (party members plus leaners) 36%; Pure Independents 18%. These match up to other national data.
What efforts were made, and how generally can you overcome the fear (especially among those Republicans most likely to "change"), that the structure (of facts fed to participants, of the automated moderation, of the experts answering questions in plenary) lead to manipulation (which will of course be resisted)?	Mere exposure to information will produce resistance or may backfire, as you point out. But engagement in extended, moderated dialogue with diverse others produces the opposite effect. See our recent article in the American Political Science Review that explains these dynamics: Is Deliberation an Antidote for Extreme Partisan Polarization: Reflections on America in One Room." https://cdd.stanford.edu/2020/is-deliberation-an-antidote-to-extreme-partisan-polarization-reflections-on-america-in-one-room/
Also, how does this information-deficit oriented model take into account (if at all), the criticisms that have emerged that it's values, not facts, that are the main drivers of polarization and mis- and dis-information on this and other highly charged, emotional issues?	When people engage in moderated dialogue they bring their values to the discussion and consider the trade-offs among competing values, but in a context that is also evidence-based about the facts. It is the combination of the two that allows disinformation to be overcome.
Subsequent to participation, what did participants actually do in terms of changed behavior or choices that reflected the changed attitudes towards climate change?	We do not have data on their behaviour following the event as our data is from first recruitment until the end of the weekend. However, we followed up with the original America in One Room participants and found large effects on behaviour (including voting); https://cdd.stanford.edu/mm/2020/10/a1r-followup-summary.pdf
I'm curious why you didn't deliberate on Climate and Economy since most regular folks are concerned about the impact of taking action on the former wrecking the latter. Energy for most people can be comparatively abstract.	There were a number of economic issues among the 72 substantive proposals. See http://cdd.stanford.edu for detailed information
Is there evidence that opinions translate to voting	Yes. See our election follow up from the previous America in One Room: https://cdd.stanford.edu/mm/2020/10/a1r-followup-summary.pdf
Was it always the same people who changed their opinions?	Not always the same but on this issue quite a few of the same Republicans changed significantly.
I am seeing some big swings in opinion, but why are people switching? What exactly convinced people to switch?	Generally they learned more about climate change (see the percentage increasing, especially among Republicans in the belief that human action is causing climate change). They engaged in evidence based balanced dialogue on the pros and cons of each proposal. We will be doing analyses of all the discussions with automated text analysis to find out more specifically why they changed. We also have more quantitative analyses to do and will report in due course.
2020 IPCC Emissions Gap Report says that the world has to reduce carbon emissions 56% by 2030. Could you organize deliberation around this imperative about how we in the US need to get there?	Yes we could. It is a question of funding and timing.
Do you have any sense as to how "sticky" these changes in opinions are? Do people move back to their old opinions when they go back to their bubbles?	They do what you say to some degree.

Question	Answer
Can the moderated discussion tool be adapted to classrooms?	We have been piloting this in the classroom and with students. See Voices of the Future on the CDD web site and other projects at http://cdd.stanford.edu
How important is it for messaging about climate change to be focused on it being caused by humanity?	We need to do some analyses of that. Personally, I think it is key and we may be able to demonstrate that with some quantitative analyses.
How have you taken the French experience into account on moving forward?	Are you talking about the French Citizens Assembly? That is a very different model in every key aspect (preparations, sampling, design of the deliberations, what we ask of our participants, representativeness, the role of policy elites. I do not think the two projects are comparable.
Interesting. It didn't take much time to change some opinions significantly.	Yes that gives us a great deal of hope. Please remember this was not advocacy but balanced deliberation with no pre-determined conclusions. We think that is actually more effective.
How do you get enough low-information people who may not be interested in getting more info? They may be a significant percent of the population whose opinions may influence policy.	They are not normally interested because they think their voices do not matter. So our task is to convince them that their voices will matter in this project and that they will be engaging in an atmosphere of mutual respect.
What do you think accounts for the massive changes in attitudes among Republicans? Are they simply sheltered from good information here given their political social networks?	Please note we also found some significant changes among Democrats, for example, on whether there could be some continued use of fossil fuels to make pharmaceuticals or if carbon capture and sequestration can be made viable. But the most dramatic movements were among Republicans. With social media and the ideological targeting of cable news we all have a tendency to hear one side of the issue--the side that is most congenial. In the Deliberative Poll, people engage in evidence based dialogue with both sides (or multiple sides).
How about having Presidential Deliberate Formats instead of "Debates"?	We would support that.
Have you conducted any later follow-up to ascertain whether these changes in opinion are durable, even after the participants return to their respective information bubbles? Relatedly, do you think that the Republicans who participated are representative of others in their political tribe who discount the importance of climate change and the viability of renewable energy?	Not in this project. It has just happened. And we are looking for funds for a follow up survey of the participants and the control group. Not sure if we will succeed. But we have done that in other cases and found some long-term effects.
How many small groups did you have, and did you measure how much spread there was in change in attitudes between groups?	104 small groups. Our initial analyses show that all the groups moved generally in the same direction.
Does the deliberative polling approach — with Representatives the participants — have potential to reduce polarization in Congress?	Possibly. I was so very impressed by the reactions of the two Members of Congress and also in the Harvard symposium on our project, by the reactions of the two Members of the US Senate.
What tests are there or will there be for assessing the longevity of the changes in views?	Ideally, one would do a follow up survey with the participants and the control group. We do not yet have funding for that, but we have done that in other cases. Look at Center for Deliberative Democracy web site for the election follow up to America in One Room.
Were respondents asked about cost of energy transition and how much additional they would be willing to pay to reach net zero CO2?	They was some discussion of cost but there was no deliberation about willingness to pay. We did include a question but since they did not deliberate about it there was not much change
Do you think politicians would be willing to participate in such a poll? It would be interesting to see how far out of line politicians are relative to the general population.	We do not know but it is an interesting idea
What's the possible reason behind the drastic change of republican in "biofuel"?	We think it is in line with many of the other changes. We will look at the transcripts from the 104 small groups and see if we can learn more.

Question	Answer
What were the respondents' opinions on direct carbon removal?	The closest we got was the questions on carbon capture and sequestration (for which there was increased support) from 49% to 64% in the sample overall and 29% to 53% among Republicans.
Did the questions including comparing emissions from beef to those of fossil fuels?	There was nothing in the questionnaire directly on point but questions 5M and 5N might be of interest. All the results are on the CDD web site http://cdd.stanford.edu
Could you talk a little more about the experts, how they were chosen and how they were received by the participants? Were they truly trusted as experts across the board by the different political groups?	The experts represented diverse sectors and experience and according to the event evaluations the plenary sessions (where the experts answered questions) was very favorably received. See https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CHJn-IBQNY4cKbeOzYrAUHZyUohqFT/view
After all your efforts and discussions, Republicans still support the anti science and anti environment positions. What more could you suggest to change their views?	Perhaps Republicans in the broader public. But I think a fair reading of these results would not support that conclusion for the Republicans in our sample--after deliberation.
Can you comment on how much time was invested by each participant in the deliberative process?	The equivalent of a weekend.
How can we encourage deliberative discussion on climate with the people that we meet professionally and personally? What is trick to deliberation? We can't wait for the rest of America to be signed up for one of these sessions.	Yes the key is civil, evidence based discussions. You can use our briefing materials as a basis.
Are some people too ideologically "fixed, rigid, or ungrounded" that they cannot constructively participate in a deliberative process? And if so, perhaps on some topics, but not others? Finally, how large is this cohort in the general population?	See our analysis of the first America in one Room (2019): https://cdd.stanford.edu/2020/is-deliberation-an-antidote-to-extreme-partisan-polarization-reflections-on-america-in-one-room/ We found that even those taking the most extreme positions could deliberate and change their views. I am sure you are correct that there is such a percentage who could not constructively engage. But we did not find them.
Are there any solutions or technologies that you see as benefitting the economy/citizens that Republicans can get behind?	They came to support renewables of all sorts. But they were also very interested after deliberation in new generation nuclear, biofuels and the potential for carbon capture and sequestration.
Are the costs of natural disasters and drought being accounted for when considering the cost of the transition to net zero?	They were certainly a part of our deliberations.
What are the special features of the deliberative polling process that is especially useful in avoiding or shifting the typical polarization that often ensues?	<p>1) Gathering people to join in deliberating—thoughtfully weighing issues with the aid of balanced briefing papers; 2) Establishing rules for small group deliberations that require mutual respect, serious listening to others, and fairness and inclusion in allowing all voices to be heard; 3) Ensuring diversity of backgrounds and views, both among the people deliberating in small groups, and from the experts whose views they are hearing, reading and weighing.</p> <p>When people gather together as equals and listen to and reason with one another under conditions of mutual respect, good and even surprising things happen. We have seen some very powerful changes in our Deliberative Polls.</p>

Question	Answer
<p>How do you ensure that the education material and the answers from experts to participants' questions is not biased?</p>	<p>We worked very hard on this by vetting the material with diverse experts. And the proof is in the evaluations by participants:</p> <p>91% said the event as a whole was valuable (96% Democrats, 84% Independents, 89% Republicans).</p> <p>83% said the small group discussions were valuable in helping to clarify their positions on the issues (87% Democrats, 73% Independents, 81% Republicans)</p> <p>83% said the briefing materials were valuable in helping to clarify their positions on the issues (88% Democrats, 75% Independents, 80% Republicans)</p> <p>77% said the plenary sessions were valuable in helping to clarify their positions on the issues (87% Democrats, 73% Independents, 67% Republicans)</p> <p>73% agreed that the members of their group participated relatively equally in the discussions (73% Democrats, 74% Independents, 73% Republicans).</p> <p>The Stanford Online Deliberation Platform was also evaluated highly: 93% agreed that the discussion platform provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussions (96% Democrats, 85% Independents, 93% Republicans).</p> <p>70% agreed that the discussion platform tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered (75% Democrats, 67% Independents, 66% Republicans)</p> <p>Overall, 75% of the participants concluded, "I learned a lot about people very different from me—about what they and their lives are like" (77% Democrats, 68% Independents, 76% Republicans).</p>
<p>How can these results be achieved at scale, outside the research environment? Any recommendations about process, protocol, messengers, organizations?</p>	<p>As Jim Fishkin said, we need to get Americans deliberating in their schools and communities with this kind of methodology, balanced briefing materials, moderated small group discussions, ability to hear diverse experts answer some characteristic questions. Our platform, with an automated moderator, opens the potential to take this to scale, and in schools and community groups, teachers and community leaders and members can be trained to serve as neutral and facilitating in-person moderators of small group discussions.</p>
<p>Did you explore things that very directly impact people such as food choices. Beef is a big contributor to ghg.</p>	<p>I agree that your point re: addressing issues close to people's everyday-life concerns is incredibly important: food, jobs, education, and so on. Recognizing that environment is part of, rather than separate from or in addition to, daily life is an important path to addressing/examining environmental values and behaviors.</p>
<p>I have noticed in the past couple of years that there is a real sense of 'climate grief' that appears once in a while in group discussions and with jobs/companies that are primarily focused on climate change. Many want to hap and cannot figure out HOW to help or WHO to talk with about their stresses and concerns in the area. Any ideas of how to tackle this?</p>	<p>Great question. Our lab has been doing studies in this area. It's true that this can be an overwhelming space—an important way forward is to think about the collective action element, that is: how can people work together so that their actions aren't individual-scale but, rather, add up along with those of others in meaningful ways. Happy to continue this conversation with you if you'd like to be in touch after the webinar.</p>
<p>In Larry Diamond's slides, what's the time difference between "before" and "after" survey responses?</p>	<p>The time difference was at most a few weeks. People took the time to survey immediately upon concluding the deliberation.</p>
<p>Do you have evidence that the changes in opinion are persistent, or if they tend to revert back to their previous opinion over time?</p>	<p>I can respond from a behavioral science perspective more broadly: interventions such as this one can be powerful in terms of influencing perspective-taking, enhancing trust in others and building a broader sense of community, building self-efficacy around decision-making, and so on. We also know, however, that the impact can dissipate over time without reinforcement and an ongoing supportive community, more broadly.</p>

Question	Answer
Why Net Zero as opposed to Zero Emissions?	Some activities, for example airline travel or making concrete, will be very difficult to decarbonize, especially in the next few decades. Net zero provides a path for getting us to zero, while allowing people and the economy to continue to benefit from the availability of these difficult to decarbonize activities.
Could you talk a little about how the participants were selected to take part (or point to online information that goes into more detail on that)? Thanks	This online report from the survey organization, NORC, describes in detail the the sampling method and NORC's role in recruiting the sample and ensuring that it was nationally representative: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1g4hAYQ0e5tYl3MGJu8CqhPx3bhDuv
It appears like most of the questions focus on technological measures, which reduce the amount of negative environmental effects while leaving peoples' everyday lives relatively unchanged. Were there any questions on measures that would affect people more directly, such as raising taxes on plane tickets, rolling out more robust public transport or changing consumption patterns more broadly? If not, would you expect similar findings to those in the current study?	We asked one or two questions on this, and as you can imagine, people were less supportive of these kinds of directly painful changes. For example, note these big differences by party: eliminating sale of new gas and diesel-powered cars and passenger trucks by 2035 (Democrats at 71%, Independents at 44%, Republicans at 23%); and requiring all new buildings and major appliances to use only electricity (no gas) by 2035 (Democrats at 76%, Independents at 53% and Republicans at 32%).
Is it possible to watch the deliberations?	We don't have video of the online deliberations on climate, but we have some videos from the previous deliberation on diverse issues, our first America in One Room (in person, in 2019): Snapchat has launched an 8 part video series based on America In One Room. You can find our Snapchat Video series here: https://cdd.stanford.edu/2019/america-in-one-room/
Are videos or transcripts available after the deliberations? Would help us researchers understand the process, and also be useful to educate others who didn't have the opportunity to participate.	We have a lot of materials up now on our website, and more will be posted over time: https://cdd.stanford.edu/2021/a1r-climate-and-energy/
The people who are willing to join the groups are probably already open to changing thier minds. Do they really represent a large fraction of most people?	We work VERY hard in these processes to ensure that once people are selected randomly to participate in the deliberation, that they actually do so. NORC has a "concierge service" to answer people's questions and provide practical assistance to ensure that people are able to join the deliberation. Once in the past NORC event sent someone to milk the cow of a selected participant so that they could join the deliberation.
I am pretty sure that this type of methodology has been widely studied. But coming from a "polling layman", how would any group's change its response on any given topic? The methodology begs the question: How is this not manipulating the poll results by "biasing" the polled population?	We worked very hard to provide balanced briefly materials, vetted by experts with different points of view. And the expert plenary speakers were also diverse, including representatives from the oil and gas industry.
Did any of the participants feel they were inappropriately biased by the materials or experts? Was that question explored?	Yes, our results specifically asked whethether they felt each aspect of the deliberation—the briefing papers, the plenary sessions, and the small group discussions—were balanced. We report these results on our website. Participants evaluated the event very highly. Here is an overview: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CHJn-IBQNY4cKbeOzyrAUHZyyIUohqFT/view .

Question	Answer
Re the 'Before' and 'After' definition, please restate the answer in the chat - thank you.	Before was before the participants had seen any of our briefing materials or had participated in the deliberations and plenary sessions. After was after the participants had read the briefing materials and then participated in the deliberations, which extended over a weekend, or for others, over four weeknights. The deliberations included both plenary discussions with experts of diverse views and small-group discussions, with people continuing in the same small group throughout the deliberation.
How do we test to insure that these surveys aren't "push polls" intended to bias respondents?	We worked incredibly hard with the survey organization, NORC, to ensure a nationally representative sample: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1g4hAYQ0e5tYl3MGJu8CqhPx3bhDuvgc/view