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Objective. Emotions in deliberative democratic practices have been of interest to researchers and practitioners of democracy for years. Yet, scholars have not fully analyzed emotions in this context. We advance this discussion in terms of both data collection and analysis with respect to Citizens’ Initiative Reviews (CIRs) in Arizona, Oregon, and Massachusetts in 2016. We respond to four central research questions: (1) What discrete emotions do participants report experiencing during mini-public deliberation? (2) How do the reported emotions vary across the period of deliberation? (3) How do the expressed emotions affect the deliberation? and (4) What work do expressed emotions do in mini-publics in terms of helping or hindering deliberation? Methods. To ensure a comprehensive analysis of the data we were able to collect, we employ a mixed-methods design and use both quantitative and qualitative methods. Results and Conclusion. Ultimately, we contend that the activities and tasks of the group, as well as the behaviors of participants and relationships among them, are all important factors that shape how people experience emotion, but that the CIR procedures have the greatest influence in mediating emotions to serve the ends of deliberation in these mini-publics.

Emotions have been of interest to researchers and practitioners of democracy for many years (see, e.g., Fraser, 1992; Hall, 2005; Johnson, Black, and Knobloch, 2017; Krause, 2008; Lukyanova et al., 2019; Mansbridge et al., 2006; Morrell, 2010; Sanders, 1997; Thompson and Hoggett, 2001), and political psychology research on their role in politics has increased over the past few decades (see Brader and Marcus, 2013; Demertzis, 2014). Despite these developments, scholars have not fully analyzed emotions in the context of deliberative democracy—especially in deliberative mini-publics. It is vital to address this research gap given the important role that affect—including emotions, moods, and passions—likely plays in innovations aimed at promoting democratic procedures and legitimacy. In this article, we conceptualize and operationalize emotions as the self-expression of an affective, occurrent mental state with a specific intentional object (see Ben-Ze’ev, 1997).
We recognize that this is a broad definition, but given that there is no scholarly consensus on the concept, and that we are engaged in one of the first studies in this area, we maintain that it is defensible and appropriate taking into consideration that the most developed theories relating deliberative theory and emotions treats the concept similarly broadly (see, e.g., Hall, 2005; Hoggett and Thompson, 2002). Employing mixed methods by analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, we aspire to make a significant contribution to understanding the role of emotions in group deliberation, democratic theory, and democratic innovations.

We begin by discussing the affective turn in deliberative theory, including previous empirical investigations of the role of emotions in deliberation. From this discussion, we develop four central research questions: (1) What discrete emotions do participants report experiencing during mini-public deliberation? (2) How do the reported emotions vary across the period of deliberation? (3) How do the expressed emotions affect the deliberation? And (4) what work do expressed emotions do in mini-publics in terms of helping or hindering deliberation? We investigate data from three deliberative mini-publics to enable us begin to answer these questions. Specifically, we explore data from Citizens’ Initiative Reviews (CIRs) in Arizona, Oregon, and Massachusetts in 2016. To ensure a comprehensive analysis of the data we were able to collect, we employ a mixed-methods design and use both quantitative and qualitative methods.

The results of our quantitative analysis provide evidence that participants experienced a range of emotions, with enthusiasm, happiness, and anxiety the most common. Across the four days of deliberation, however, the data also illuminate patterns of variation: enthusiasm remained high; happiness grew on Day 3 and spiked upward on Day 4; anxiety was most prevalent early on, especially Day 2; and anger peaked on Day 3. Despite these clear patterns, there seemed to be few strong relationships between these emotions and self-reported measures of deliberative quality, with the exception that participants who indicated that they definitely had opportunities to express themselves were more likely to report feeling happiness and less likely to reveal feeling anger after the final day of deliberation. Given these findings, as well as those of previous research, our qualitative analysis focused on examining anger to examine two complementary analytical frames for understanding the role of emotions in mini-public deliberation. The Life-Cycle Frame (Wheelan, 2005) suggests that emotions transpire as a matter of course as groups develop over time and move through a predictable set of phases, but we find that this framework does not provide a clear understanding of the work that emotions do in the context of deliberation. The Deliberative Procedures Frame, in contrast, is more indicative of how particular design features mediate emotions (Johnson, Black, and Knobloch, 2017) and serve in deepening the collective bond and shared deliberative purpose of participants. This frame enables us to see how emotions, when properly mediated, deepen and advance collective deliberation. Ultimately, we contend that the activities and tasks of the group, as well as the behaviors of participants and relationships among them, are all important factors that shape how people experience emotion, but that the procedures have the greatest influence in mediating emotions to serve the ends of deliberation in these mini-publics.

Our findings highlight the moments that pose the greatest threat to the legitimacy of a mini-public deliberation, but they also demonstrate how well-structured procedures can mitigate against such threats and harness the motivating power of emotions, frustration, and anger in particular. Taken together with our quantitative results, this unexpectedly reveals how complex the relationships among emotions and deliberations are. Participants not only feel emotions about the issues under discussion—which has been the primary focus of most theoretical and empirical research on deliberative democracy, and was the
initial target of our own research—they also do so with regard to the very democratic procedures under which they discuss those same issues. Given the limitations in our data, we can only tentatively conclude that the CIR procedures are representative of a type that can successfully mediate emotions in mini-public deliberations, but as one of the very few studies in this area, and the only of which we are aware that examines all participants from a face-to-face deliberation across time using both quantitative and qualitative data, we are hopeful that our findings provide a significant foundation that will spur further research in this important field.

Affect and Deliberation

There has been some excellent, but limited, investigations of the role of emotions in democracy. Building on the theory of affective intelligence he developed with his colleagues (Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen, 2000), George E. Marcus argues that anxiety recruits reason and disables habit, thus generating “the very deliberative space that democratic theorists have been calling for” (2002:116). Enthusiasm, in contrast, arises from our habitual “disposition system” and does not necessarily encourage deliberation, although it may encourage participation (Marcus, 2002:Ch. 5). Loathing may also motivate action while dampening deliberation, but it does so for darker reasons (Marcus, 2002:Ch. 7).

Marcus and Jennifer Wolak extend this research by claiming that citizens who react to policy proposals with anger “resist middle-ground remedies and are less likely to support a compromise” (Wolak and Marcus, 2007:183), neither of which improve deliberation. This research indicates that anxiety, enthusiasm, loathing, and anger all have significant effects on deliberation, but it focuses on diffuse deliberation in the broader society, not interactive deliberation. In contrast, other studies have examined citizen interactions, but they have only measured the general role of emotions in deliberation, specifically the presence of emotions in juries (Hickerson and Gastil, 2008), positive and negative emotions in online forums (Sobkowicz and Sobkowicz, 2012), and “biographical affect” expressed by participants in a deliberative patient forum (Komporozos-Athansiou and Thompson, 2015). These studies reach interesting conclusions, but they concentrate primarily on the presence or valence—positive or negative—of emotions; they tell us little about the discrete emotions Marcus and his colleagues identified.

One study of discrete emotions in interactive deliberations is a small-scale experiment by Colleen McClain (2009), although participants engaged in only limited deliberation and did so online. One-hundred undergraduates, after reading news coverage of a proposal on human embryonic stem cell research, participated in an online exchange with a programmed “interlocutor.” McClain used a $2 \times 2$ experimental design with prescribed comments from other “users” to vary chat synchronicity (synchronous vs. asynchronous) and feedback (supportive vs. challenging), and investigated the effects of these treatments and participants’ self-reported emotions on information seeking and intentions to participate in future politics. Factor analysis revealed three additive indices of emotional response: anger (angry, irritated, and outraged), enthusiasm (enthusiastic, excited, and hopeful), and anxiety (worried, afraid, anxious and stressed) (McClain, 2009:57–58). After controlling for gender and awareness of the issue, she found that higher enthusiasm significantly increased subjects’ stated intention to participate in the future (McClain, 2009:61–62), while neither anger nor anxiety had significant effects (2009:62–63). For information seeking, her initial analysis found that only enthusiasm had a significant, positive effect, although anxiety approached significance. A second regression that included only anxiety and anger showed anxiety to
have a significant, positive effect (McClain, 2009:62). She concludes that multicollinearity may be a problem, and given the results of the model with only anger and anxiety, the affective intelligence hypothesis that anxiety leads to more information seeking “is partially, and very cautiously, supported” (McClain, 2009:62). We must interpret McClain’s results with caution because this was a laboratory experiment involving 100 undergraduates who participated for “approximately 45 minutes” (2009:56) with prescribed responses, and it occurred online, which might have significant effects on participants’ emotions. Within these limitations, however, the study provides preliminary evidence to support some parts of the affective intelligence theory: enthusiasm increases participation, while anxiety increases information seeking. In contrast, however, enthusiasm also spurred information seeking, while anger did not have any significant effects. We can thus conclude that the evidence is mixed, although it does appear that enthusiasm, anxiety, and anger are all important.

One recently published study has examined discrete emotions in face-to-face deliberation. Saam qualitatively analyzed a snowball sample of 150 interviewees from a variety of face-to-face, extended deliberative forums, but the discrete emotions she examined were different from Marcus et al. “hope, disappointment, and shame on the side of the participants” (2018:764). Her work also differed from much of the previous research because it focused on the emotions generated by the deliberative process itself, rather than the emotions that participants have about political objects that they bring to and sometimes express during deliberation. Saam’s analysis focuses on the emotions and “emotion work” in deliberation, and she hypothesizes inductively based upon her data that: (1) disappointment and shame promote exit rather than deliberation (2018:767), (2) higher-status individuals have the emotional capital to do the emotional work necessary to overcome this tendency, and thus, disappointment and shame reinforce social inequalities in deliberation (2018:768–69), but (3) hope induces participation rather than exit, and “strengthens the voice of all hopeful individuals irrespective of their emotional capital” (2018:770). While this impressive work does not address the relationship between the emotions people feel about political objects and deliberation, and it emerged after we had conducted our study, it serves as an important reminder that participants can feel emotions about various factors related to the very process of deliberation itself. Unlike Saam’s study, however, we examine similar questions drawing on a more complete sample of all participants from several mini-publics throughout the deliberative process.

In order to fill a gap in this previous research, our goal was to examine discrete emotions in all the participants in a group of face-to-face mini-publics that take place over several days. Since there are few theoretical or empirical bases to hypothesize about the range of discrete emotions that might occur in interactive deliberation, our first research question was: What discrete emotions do participants report experiencing during mini-public deliberation? Second, given the “black box” nature of mini-public deliberation in which scholars often have pre- and postdeliberation measures, but very little understanding of how things change within deliberation, we wanted to ask: How do participants’ reported emotions vary during mini-public deliberation? Having identified the emotions and their patterns across time, we next aimed at connecting these to the deliberation itself by querying: How do expressed emotions affect participants’ perceptions of deliberative quality? Finally, we investigated our fourth question: What work do expressed emotions do in deliberation in terms of either helping or hindering deliberation? Since previous research indicates that anger is a likely detriment to quality deliberation, we focus on this particular emotion. To answer

1Saam’s article was published after we had already collected and analyzed our data; she points to her 2015 book for further descriptions of her research, but since none of us, unfortunately, reads German fluently, we are unable to do a complete assessment of her work.
these questions, we used what we believe is a unique set of quantitative and qualitative data that provide the first broad look at discrete emotions in a nearly complete sample of participants in face-to-face mini-public deliberation.

Data and Methods

Citizens’ initiative reviews (CIRs) involve panels of 18 to 24 randomly selected citizens deliberating four or five consecutive days about ballot initiatives (see ⟨http://sites.psu.edu/citizensinitiativereview/about/⟩). Typically, on the first two days, participants receive information, listen to and question experts and advocates on both sides of the issue, and engage in face-to-face deliberation overseen by moderators in both plenary sessions and smaller breakout groups. In the remaining days, panelists then work in groups to produce a Citizens’ Statement containing arguments for and against the initiative that is distributed to voters in advance of the election. This structure, which spurs competition between the two sides, but also facilitates collaboration among panelists, creates interesting dialogical opportunities for the productive expression of both reasons for or against the initiative and emotions provoked by it (see Johnson, Black, and Knobloch, 2017).

Our data come from CIRs held in Arizona, Massachusetts, and Oregon in August of 2016, all involving stratified random samples of registered voters deliberating over four days. In Arizona, 22 participants examined Proposition 205, which proposed ‘legalizing the possession and consumption of marijuana by persons who are 21 years of age or older’ (Gastil, Reedy, et al., 2016). In Oregon, 20 participants scrutinized Measure 97, which would have removed the cap on the corporate gross sales tax and tax all sales in excess of $25 million at 2.5 percent (Gastil et al., 2017). In Massachusetts, 20 participants studied the Massachusetts Marijuana Legalization Initiative, which proposed to “legalize marijuana but regulate it in ways similar to alcoholic beverages” (Gastil, Knobloch, et al., 2016). Our research design allowed us to examine both quantitative and qualitative data in order to allow us to best answer our research questions.

At the conclusion of each day, all 62 participants completed a survey. Given the limited space available on the survey because of the numerous questions the research team wanted to investigate, we chose to use single items for each emotion rather than taking McClain’s index approach (2009). We measured respondents’ self-reported emotions by asking: “During today’s CIR sessions, which of these emotional reactions did you experience, if any? Circle all that apply.” We recognize there are many emotions that might be part of the deliberative process, and in future research, we hope to include a wide range of these, but given space limitations on the survey, we chose six specific emotions based upon the previous theoretical and empirical research that was available at the time we designed the survey. Given the centrality of the work of Marcus and his colleagues on emotions and deliberation, we asked about anger, anxiety, and enthusiasm. Various theorists have also claimed that empathy plays an important role in deliberation (see, e.g., Fleckenstein, 2007; Grönlund, Herne, and Setälä, 2017), but as one of us has argued, we agree that empathy is not itself an emotion (see Morrell, 2010). As an alternative concept related to empathy that is an emotion, we included sympathy among the possible responses. Finally, in order to capture positive and

2CIRs are tightly designed, and they are implemented very consistently across sites. Unlike other types of deliberative forums that vary in activities depending on the context, CIRs follow a fairly rigid agenda in each location. With this in mind, and with all of our CIRs occurring in the same month and year, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that the participants had similar experiences in terms of the deliberative event design and to aggregate data from them.
negative valence emotions similar to previous research (e.g., Sobkowicz and Sobkowicz, 2012), we included happiness and sadness as choices.

Teams of nonparticipant observers—three each in Arizona and Massachusetts and four in Oregon—also collected qualitative data by taking detailed notes on a computer about the process and participants’ reactions and behaviors using a common template corresponding to procedural segments of the CIR. Although not as detailed as a fully developed set of ethnographic field notes (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 2011), observer notes can provide rich accounts of group dynamics (Black et al., 2010; Knobloch et al., 2013) and capture details of the participants’ comments and dialogue throughout the process. Observers also included notes about their emerging interpretations, which aided our conceptual analysis. Thus, for our study, observer notes have advantages over transcripts, which often provide much text without enough context.\(^3\)

**Results of our Quantitative Analysis**

**Expressions of Emotion**

We begin our analysis by reporting the percentage of respondents across all three CIRs who reported feeling each of the six emotions we tested for each day, ordered from most to least frequent overall (see Figure 1). While we recognize that mini-publics can often have frustratingly difficult variations across cases, we chose to aggregate the data from all three mini-publics in order to overcome issues of small sample size that are endemic to much of this type of research. This allows us to be more confident that any effects that we find are not due to the idiosyncrasies of a particular mini-public, and although it is also a conservative approach that might lead to more Type II errors, and thus miss effects that are present, we think it is the most appropriate given our small sample sizes.\(^4\) In order to

\(^3\)We recognize that the research methods we employed may have had an effect on the deliberation itself, but we strongly believe that the data we were able to collect outweigh the risks of these effects.

\(^4\)To further ensure this approach was valid, however, we computed Goodman and Kruskal’s lambda for contingency tables of the three CIRs by each emotion on each day. The only comparison that was significant at
compare the differences among the six emotions reported for each of the four days, and across the four days for each of the emotions, since we have paired dichotomous nominal data, McNemar’s test is the most appropriate. The resulting analysis examined 96 different pairs of emotions.

Enthusiasm was consistently the emotion participants most frequently reported feeling across the CIR, with a range of 67.7 percent (Day 2) to 75.8 percent (Day 1); there were no significant differences across the four days on the level of enthusiasm. Participants were, however, statistically significantly more likely to report feeling enthusiasm than all other emotions on all four days ($p < 0.001$ for all comparisons except for the Day 2 comparison with anxiety, where $p < 0.01$), with one exception: on the final day, the difference between enthusiasm (69.4 percent) and happiness (66.1 percent) was not statistically significant ($p = 0.85$). Not only was it the most common emotion, the substantive gap between enthusiasm and the second most common emotion ranged from 29 percent (anxiety on Day 2) to 45.2 percent (anxiety Day 1). Thus, we conclude that enthusiasm was the dominant emotion participants reported feeling throughout the CIR.

The second most commonly reported emotion was happiness (36.3 percent of all surveys), but this was primarily because of the final days of the CIR. There was a jump in reported happiness from 19.4 percent on Day 2 to 33.9 percent on Day 3 ($p < 0.05$), but the largest substantive differences were between the 66.1 percent of subjects who reported feeling happiness on Day 4 and the 25.8 percent on Day 1, 19.4 percent on Day 2, and 33.9 percent on Day 3 (all significant at the $p < 0.001$ level). Substantively, these differences of 40.3, 46.7, and 26.2 percent, respectively, are the three largest in our entire sample. Happiness was also statistically significantly different on Day 4 from anxiety, sympathy, anger, and sadness, all at the $p < 0.001$ level. In contrast, for the remaining days, happiness was significantly different only from sadness on Days 1 ($p < 0.01$), 2 ($p < 0.05$), and 3 ($p < 0.01$), and anger on Day 1 ($p < 0.05$). Happiness, therefore, while somewhat present throughout the CIR, was most prominent at the end of the deliberative process.

Participants reported feeling anxiety the third most often, with a range from 24.2 percent (Day 4) to 38.7 percent (Day 2). Although there appears to be a pattern of rise and fall in anxiety across the CIR, the only statistically significant difference was between Days 2 and 4 ($p < 0.05$), with a 14.5 percent substantive difference. Compared with the other emotions, anxiety was significantly different from anger ($p < 0.05$) and sadness ($p < 0.01$) on Day 1; from happiness ($p < 0.05$), sympathy ($p < 0.05$), anger ($p < 0.01$), and sadness ($p < 0.001$) on Day 2; from sadness ($p < 0.01$) on Day 3; and, as reported above, from enthusiasm and happiness on Day 4. Although this pattern is not as strong as the others already reported, it does suggest that anxiety peaked early and reached its zenith on the final day.

Two of the three emotions subjects reported feeling least often, cumulatively, were sympathy (22.6 percent) and sadness (9.3 percent). While sympathy appeared to have dropped from Day 1 to Day 2, and sadness to have increased from the early days to the final one, these differences were not statistically significant. Comparing sympathy and sadness to the other emotions, other than the differences we have already discussed, it was only significantly different from anger ($p < 0.01$) and sadness ($p < 0.001$) on Day 1, and sadness was significantly different from anger on Day 3 ($p < 0.01$). These results indicate that while sympathy was felt by a number of participants, it did not appear

the $p < 0.05$ level was for anxiety on Day 1, with 50 percent of participants reporting feeling it in Massachusetts, 30 percent in Oregon, and 14 percent in Arizona, and its substantive significance was small (0.12). Given this, we feel confident that our approach is apt.
to fluctuate significantly during the CIR process; sadness, however, was a relatively rare emotion throughout it.

Since anger is so important in previous research, however, we were especially interested in the patterns of participants reporting feeling this emotion. While it was only the fifth most reported emotion cumulatively (16.9 percent), it reached a peak of 29.0 percent on Day 3, which was statistically significantly different from the 17.7 percent on Day 1 ($p < 0.01$) and 17.1 percent on Day 2 ($p < 0.05$). Although it dropped in half from 29.0 percent on Day 3 to 14.5 percent on Day 4 (14.5 percent), the difference was not quite statistically significant ($p = 0.06$). Thus, we can conclude that while anger was never one of the dominant emotions during the CIR, it did rise to a peak during Day 3, and lingered among a handful of participants in the final day.

These results provide evidence that most participants embraced the CIR process. Over two-thirds reported feeling enthusiasm across all four days, with only happiness on the final day approaching the same level. The gaps between enthusiasm and the other emotions are not only statistically significant, they are substantively large as well. This is not surprising. After all, participants had agreed to spend four days deliberating about an issue of public concern facing their state, and thus, they had already made a commitment to the CIR. Nonetheless, the organizers drew them from a stratified random sample of the greater population; there was no guarantee that any initial enthusiasm would continue throughout the process, or that they would describe themselves as happy on the final day. This happiness may have arisen for all kinds of reasons, ranging from satisfaction with the process, to a sense of accomplishment, to relief at the end of a difficult four-day deliberation. In conjunction with the findings about enthusiasm, however, we feel confident that these findings reflect positively on the CIR process.

This does not mean that our findings indicate that the process was perfect. Although anxiety was present somewhat throughout the process, the data indicate that it likely peaked on Day 2. It makes sense that anxiety would be greatest early in the CIR as participants are trying to understand the process, the issues involved, and their fellow citizens. Bearing in mind the work of scholars we cited above, anxiety might actually contribute to better deliberation. While sympathy might also contribute to deliberation, and may have contributed positively to these CIRs, we cannot make any claims in this regard given our data.

Likely one of the greatest threats to deliberation, however, is anger. While it was cumulatively only the fifth most common response on the surveys, we do see a pattern. On Day 1, anger was much lower than all the emotions other than sadness. By Day 2, we see a small drop in happiness and sympathy, and a very slight rise in anger; these changes are enough such that only enthusiasm and anxiety are significantly higher than anger on this day. Anger peaks, however, on Day 3, such that there the only significantly higher emotion is enthusiasm. The change in anger from Days 1 and 2 to Day 3 is also significant. After this peak, anger drops again and is only significantly different from enthusiasm and happiness, which are much higher. Although this drop does not quite reach statistical significance at the $p < 0.05$ level, it approaches it ($p = 0.064$). We conclude that anger in the CIR process reached its highest levels in Day 3, although it was no more common on this day than anxiety or happiness; yet, it is this rise in anger that could hinder deliberation the most of all the emotions we studied. To determine whether this might have been true, we turn to an examination of the effects of emotion on deliberative quality.
Emotions and Deliberative Quality

Having established the patterns in self-reported emotional expression among participants in the CIR, we then examined the relationships among these emotions and participants’ evaluations of the deliberation utilizing three questions from the daily surveys:

**Would you say you had sufficient OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS today?**

[OPPORTUNITY]
- Definitely No
- Probably No
- Unsure
- Probably Yes
- Definitely Yes

**How often did you feel that other participants treated you with RESPECT today?**

[RESPECT]
- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Often
- Almost Always

**When experts or other CIR participants expressed views different from your own today, how often did you CONSIDER CAREFULLY what they had to say?**

[CONSIDER OTHER VIEWS]
- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Often
- Almost Always

The first and second items measure participants’ perceptions of whether the process and their fellow participants allowed them to contribute to the deliberation, while the third measures their self-reported willingness to listen to others. Since we had a dichotomous variable for emotions (felt/not felt) and ordinal variables for the evaluations, Somers’ D was the most appropriate to use in our analysis (Newson, 2002:51–52); we assumed that having opportunities to speak and being treated with respect would affect the reported emotions of participants, while the emotions would affect whether participants were more likely to listen to others. We hypothesize that these relationships would be positive for the positive emotions (enthusiasm, happiness, and sympathy) and negative for the negative emotions (anger, anxiety, and sadness), with one exception. Following the findings of Marcus et al. that anxiety induces deliberation, we hypothesize that anxiety would have a positive relationship with CONSIDER OTHER VIEWS.

With six emotions and three evaluations across four days, we performed 72 comparisons, of which only nine even approach statistical significance ($p < 0.10$). Three of these involve sadness, with it having a marginally significant, moderately negative relationship with OPPORTUNITY on Day 1 ($d = −0.23, p = 0.09$); a marginally significant, weakly positive relationship with RESPECT on Day 2 ($d = 0.08, p = 0.06$); and a moderately significant, positive relationship with CONSIDER OTHERS ($d = 0.48, p = 0.03$) that same day. In all three cases, however, only four participants reported feeling sadness each day, so we have no confidence in these findings. In four of the six remaining analyses, from 9 to 42 participants indicated feeling the emotion, but given their statistical weaknesses, we conclude that these findings are only suggestive. Those that indicate our hypotheses might be correct include enthusiasm having a marginally significant, moderately positive relationship with OPPORTUNITY on Day 2 ($d = 0.18, p = 0.09$), anger having a marginally significant, moderately negative relationship with RESPECT ($d = −0.22, p = 0.08$) on Day 4, and happiness having a marginally significant, moderately positive relationship with CONSIDER OTHERS ($d = 0.22, p = 0.08$) on the same day. The one suggestive finding that countered our hypotheses was that happiness had a marginally significant, moderately negative relationship with OPPORTUNITY ($d = −0.16, p = 0.07$) on Day 1. Given that the data are only suggestive, we decided to leave to future research to examine what might explain this and the previous findings.

The remaining two findings, however, demonstrate both statistical and substantive significance, with happiness having a highly significant, positive relationship ($d = 0.45, p <
TABLE 1
Final Day Anger and Happiness and Opportunity to Express Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would You Say You Had Sufficient Opportunity to Express Your Views Today?</th>
<th>Definitely No</th>
<th>Probably No</th>
<th>Probably Yes</th>
<th>Definitely Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt anger on the final day</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt happiness on the final day</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.001), and anger having a statistically significant, moderately negative relationship ($d = -0.22, p = 0.04$), with OPPORTUNITY.

Looking closely at the distributions (see Table 1), it is clear that these results arise because participants who reported in the final survey that they definitely had opportunities to speak were much more likely to report feeling happiness, while they were much less likely to report feeling anger, both of which conform to our hypotheses. It is important to recognize that only six respondents (less than 10 percent) reported probably or definitely not having sufficient opportunities to express their views on the final day, and although they reported feeling happiness less often, they reported feeling anger at the exact same rate. Thus, we posit that the differences we are finding are primarily due to the differences we see among those who reported they definitely had an opportunity to express themselves. Despite these hypotheses-confirming findings, there are several reasons why we remain cautious in interpreting them. Beyond the small size of our sample, and the possibly unique nature of the CIR, we have to acknowledge that these findings only occurred on the final day, and the only finding for another day that connects two of these variables—happiness on Day 1—has the opposite sign. Yet acknowledging this caution, we believe it is possible that the final day may be a unique moment where the culmination of the CIR results in certain emotions that have specific relationships with evaluations of the final day’s deliberation.

Our analysis, in sum, demonstrates very few significant relationships among self-reported emotions and participants’ evaluations of the deliberation. There did not seem to be a positive relationship between anxiety and a greater commitment to consider others’ views, or a negative relationship between anger and the same commitment. We have a few suggestive findings that future research may explore, but our two significant findings indicate that perceptions of definitely having an opportunity to express their views on the final day increased the likelihood that participants reported feeling happiness and decreased the likelihood that they reported feeling anger. Our earlier analysis also indicated a pattern in the participants’ reported feelings of anger across the four days of the CIR. Given that previous research indicates that anger might provide an impediment to good deliberation (see, e.g., Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen, 2000), we were especially interested in investigating these findings. While anger did not overwhelm the more positive emotions, it had the potential to do so, which makes it important to explore using qualitative data that can reveal deeper insights on its role in the CIR.
Qualitative Analysis Through Two Frames

Following standard processes of coding qualitative data (Saldaña, 2015), we examined the nonparticipant observer notes in three cycles. The first cycle focused on a preliminary reading in which we identified broad patterns in the emotional dynamics common to the three CIRs. We also started to tease out two possible interpretive frames from the group and deliberation research—the Life Cycle and the Deliberative Procedures Frames—for these dynamics. The second cycle focused on identifying expressions and observations of emotions and on categorizing these in terms of either one of the two frames. Finally, the third cycle focused on more deeply understanding the interplay between these two frames and exploring how they helped describe the work emotions do in deliberative mini-publics.

The Life-Cycle Frame (see Wheelan, 2005) emphasizes that groups who work together over time experience phases of development (Tuckman and Jensen, 1977; Wheelan, Davidson, and Tilin, 2003) marked by shifts in the group members’ orientation to each other and the task, including different types of emotions (Saldaña, 2015; Sanders, 1997; Sobkowicz and Sobkowicz, 2012; Thompson and Hoggett, 2001; Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman and Jensen, 1977). Newly formed groups emphasize “inclusion and dependency” (Wheelan, 2005) as members learn what behaviors are acceptable. The second phase is described as “counter-dependency and conflict” as group members struggle for power, authority, and status; in this phase, emotions such as frustration and anger are common. The third phase involves the development of trust, and negotiation of roles and goals. The fourth phase involves a more focused attention on accomplishing the groups’ tasks. Groups with a finite ending time, such as the CIR panels, experience a fifth phase associated with adjournment. As the group’s time together comes to a close, members may engage in conflict if the tasks are not clearly accomplished, and they feel increased time pressure. However, this phase also includes expressions of positive emotion and discussion of separation (Wheelan, 2005). Although emotions have not been the primary focus of the group development literature, this body of work suggests that life-cycle phases have emotional dimensions that are likely to emerge regardless of the particulars of the group.

The Deliberative Procedures Frame postulates that there are particular design features that mediate emotional trends and that these design features serve to focus potentially destructive emotions into a more productive direction. The CIR is designed as a multi-day program that requires panelists to collectively deliberate in order to complete fairly difficult coordinated tasks such as analyzing information, prioritizing claims, coming to agreement on facts, and creating a statement to represent their views before the end of the program. As CIR participants represent a wide range of education levels, professional experiences, and demographic characteristics, it is likely that they have different expectations about how to complete tasks as a group within a specified time that are relevant to their emotional experience. Group research shows that group members’ perspectives on time matters a great deal for their performance of tasks (Arrow et al., 2004) and that deadline pressure or group members’ differing construals of time can create coordination problems for groups (Ballard and Seibold, 2000). Such coordination problems can be frustrating for group members, and are related to design elements such as the time allotment for different activities within the CIR. Previous work on the CIR has argued that the deliberative design of the mini-public helped participants mediate both emotion and reason (Johnson, Black, and Knobloch, 2017). Our current project extends that investigation by examining emotional trends more deeply and across cases, paying particular attention to the function of life-cycle dynamics and deliberative procedures with respect to expressions of anger.
Analyzing the qualitative materials through both frames enables us to see an interplay between life-cycle dynamics and deliberative procedures in the early stages of the CIR process. Much of Day 1 was about orienting the panelists to the task and overall purpose of the CIR. The communication from organizers and panelists at this time is consistent with a life-cycle approach, which argues that early formation of the group requires members to learn the goals of the group and what behaviors are expected. CIR procedures for Day 1 attend to that need by offering activities that help group members successfully accomplish the needs of the first phase of group development. In all three CIRs, the first half of Day 1 involved a spokesperson from the host organization welcoming panelists and introducing them to the process. Moderators introduced themselves and provided an outline of the process. They then led panelists through an icebreaker exercise. Common to all of the CIRs, the moderators provided many instructions concerning the process itself and the process of deliberation. Many of these instructions took the form of basic procedural rules. For example, panelists were not to speak about the initiative outside the room and were not to speak about the initiative with anyone who was not another panelist or moderator. Other instructions were less procedural and more aspirational, focusing instead on the dispositional stance participants were encouraged to take when engaging in collective deliberation. Participants should be open to other views; they should listen and learn.

In terms of group dynamics among the panelists, observers noted early signs of social bonding in all three CIRs, which is typical of life-cycle dynamics. They also noted signs of panelists taking the process seriously. Most panelists appeared to be very interested and engaged in the process. In the second half of Day 1, moderators ran a simulation exercise in which panelists practiced deliberating and practiced identifying strong and reliable evidence. Observer notes indicate that most panelists actively engaged in this process. Toward the end of the day, moderators reviewed the initiatives, and advocates made their initial presentations. Some panelists asked questions at the end of the day concerning how to conduct independent research overnight. Observers noted that panelists remain engaged despite the lengthy day. The engagement and enthusiasm expressed by participants at the end of Day 1 are consistent with a life-cycle explanation that the group was successful at its inclusion and dependency phase.

The first part of Day 2 began with moderators encouraging panelists to “stay in a learning mode.” Moderators reminded panelists of their task for the day, which was to gather information. Some panelists shared the independent research they conducted overnight. The first set of group exercises focused on panelists identifying and developing questions for the advocates or experts. Observers began to note, with reference to the small group exercise to develop questions, expressions of minor irritation related to the CIR procedures. We present examples of these expressions of irritation in Table 2.

The timing of this dynamic is typical of the life-cycle approach, implying that the group was entering its counter-dependency and conflict phase. However, as we see in Table 2, panelists’ specific concerns focused on aspects of the CIR design, which is clear through a procedural frame (i.e., the order of tasks, reliance on dot process, and use of “we”). Yet, on the whole, observers noted very few negative emotional expressions. They noted good interactions and engagement among panelists; all of the participants seemed to be taking the process seriously and engaging with each other. Despite noting minor irritation, observers made note of a “good group vibe” during the first half of Day 2.

In the second half of Day 2, observers documented a change in group dynamics again with few explicit expressions of negative emotions. Again, we see interplay between
life-cycle dynamics and procedures. Despite the minor irritations expressed earlier in the
day, we see in the latter part group bonding, with panelists interacting well during the
plenary and small group sessions, and during breaks. The afternoon of Day 2 focused on
presentations by the advocates (AZ) or experts (MA and OR), both those in favor of the
initiative and those against it. Panelists all seemed appreciative of advocates and experts,
posed to them good questions, and appeared to engage in good deliberation. Observers
noted that deliberative leaders started to emerge. They also noted that panelists were start-
ing to form and express opinions in development of new claims and concepts. Groups
representing different sides started to emerge. Another theme in the notes is that panelists
were starting to look tired, and a few were “checking out,” but that they continued to
take the process seriously. Generally, observers reported there was good deliberation in the
plenary sessions and small groups. For example:

The group is being pretty copacetic. Folks are clearly showing their colors—pro and anti-
govt expansion—but are remaining very respectful of one another. There’s no talking over
each other; people are taking turns. . . . The process ISN’T RUSHED. Things are running
pretty smoothly. So far, at least, the CIR seems to be working. (Observer #1, OR)

That participants are “showing their colors” in terms of their positions on the issue, but
doing so in a way that is “respectful,” is consistent with life-cycle dynamics. This frame
highlights group members moving between the second and third phrases of development,
where they try to develop trust and negotiate their individual roles within the group.
However, through the procedures frame, we see that successful communication is attributed
to an unrushed process that “seems to be working” (Observer #1, OR).

Mounting Anger and Frustration

Day 3 marked further developments in the group dynamics, with panelists becoming
more expressive of their views and forming clearer subgroups. The procedure for the first
half of Day 3 required panelists to work to identify new claims, sort through these claims
for reliability, and vote on claims (in MA and OR; not in AZ). They then broke into
pro and con groups to start drafting out the statements. These tasks were analytic and
somewhat challenging, requiring panelists to use what they learned from the past two days
to evaluate information and judge the quality of the claims.

The upward spike in anger on Day 3 (Figure 1) is evident in observer notes (Table 3),
which demonstrated that personal opinions were developing, tensions were surfacing, and

---

**TABLE 2**

Expressions of Minor Irritation (All Names Are Pseudonyms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>“Why are we doing this now, and not when they read the text of the measure, or something. Huh?” She seems put out by the order in which things are happening . . . “why we didn’t get a chance to ask questions before?” (Observer #1, AZ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>expressed concern about the dot process to Natalie. Worried that it might overshadow the diversity of concerns or cause people to vote for something they might not have otherwise voted for because it doesn’t have the dot (Observer #2, MA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>says that she is triggered with use of “we” . . .; Jenny wants to use “we” to refer to the whole group, but this makes Linda uncomfortable. Jenny says that this “we” is necessary for the conversation since they are working together as a group (Observer #2, OR).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3

Spike in Frustration and Anger (All Names Are Pseudonyms)

Gets PRETTY heated here, Edith is agitated. Ben steps in with a comment that gets a lot of yeahs . . . That’s great, that helps defuse the situation a little bit. . . . OK now they get into the “proximity to schools” claim, and some people get a little wound up. Ruth ALMOST loses the room here as people are arguing about K12 schools or just any schools, or something—BUT she steps in and reins in the crowd a bit and refocuses everyone into the small groups (Observer #1, AZ).

This group has a lot of strong personalities. Malik and Kelly are going at it a little bit. Kelly is trying to put it in plain language (for a senior citizen). Malik is saying it will “address” the opioid crisis, and Kelly wants to make sure it doesn’t sound like it’s solving the crisis. They don’t want to report out even though all the other groups are done. Kelly doesn’t want to move on. Kelly seems pissed. Malik is trying to calm her down. Nora is also trying to calm everyone down. I think she’s just got a hot temperament. Alan is shaking his head. I think he’s frustrated with the time crunch (Observer #1, MA).

Matt: “I think it’s going to be that we don’t ever give them enough money; I don’t have a lot of faith in this panel” . . . “we’ve got to throw as much sh*t into this as we can, cause we’re the minority guy; if it fits in it does, if not it doesn’t.” Matt is getting frustrated (Observer #2, OR).

TABLE 4

Frustration, Anger, and the CIR Procedures (All Names Are Pseudonyms)

All new claims are starting out as questions. Individuals want more information it seems. But the process disallows more information. . . . Folks still seem to not understand the process and their expectations. Seems to be the same folks who don’t quite understand their exact expectations (Observer #2, AZ).

Mindy [moderator] was visibly frustrated. She should have handed the microphone to Nicole to interact with panelists rather than pushing forward when irritated. The process needs to be protected, but when a panelist is confused there needs to be something in place to help them understand what is going on (Observer #2, MA).

Matt, Ethan, and Doug—comments about not having faith in the process, about their preferences, and about their political leanings as well; seems like all of the other groups were a lot more neutral and open and taking their role as panelists seriously (Observer #2, OR).

emotions were starting to be expressed more explicitly. There were some disagreements among panelists, including some hot tempers and heated exchanges, concerning the substance of the claims. Observers noted that it was getting “messy.” They also noted several expressions of anger and frustration.

These comments from observers indicate that panelists expressed frustration and anger in the morning of Day 3. Some observers attributed the expression of anger to the panelists’ personal characteristics, noting, for example, that group participants have “strong personalities” or that someone has a “hot temperament.” However, other observers note that the emotional dynamics are group-oriented. The formation of subgroups or coalitions is common in the second and third phases of group development according to life-cycle views. Yet, at this point in the CIR panelists’ work together, they should be moving toward the fourth phase of accomplishing tasks and performing collaborative work. This seems to be a difficult transition for the group, which could be brought about by frustration and anger with respect to the procedure. The observer notes provide support to this interpretation (Table 4).
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TABLE 5
Interaction and Collaboration (All Names Are Pseudonyms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Observer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is going pretty well, I think. The revised wordings of all of these</td>
<td>Observer #1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things are much better than I was anticipating. ... We are way behind</td>
<td>AZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule, though. Nearly an hour behind, I think (Observer #1, AZ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are running super late, but the participants are still really</td>
<td>Observer #1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanting to talk about the issue. Haven’t actually heard the</td>
<td>MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants complain (Observer #1, MA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All panelists are carefully reading and taking notes; virtually everyone</td>
<td>Observer #2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has pen out as they go through; they are all ranking their key findings;</td>
<td>OR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone is engaged; fascinating that everyone is taking this so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seriously; no one is speeding through them; everyone is taking time to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read and consider carefully; no one is talking or looking at someone else;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone is focused on ranking the key findings; seems like an intense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process (Observer #2, OR).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of these descriptions, observers noted that panelists are critical of—even angry or frustrated with—the process. They express concern with aspects of the task and with the word counts of the statements and the exact phrasing of them. Panelists express lots of frustration about the process, but they remain respectful of each other. It appears that the CIR procedures frame helps us understand the emotional dynamics of this day. While a life-cycle approach would account for some aspects of coalition forming, role negotiation, and task orientation, the specific procedures seem to cause frustration and anger, but they also play a critical role in mediating these potentially negative emotions so that their role serves not to derail deliberations but to focus them on accomplishing the task of developing their assessment of the ballot initiatives.

Indeed, during the second half of Day 3, tensions did not seem to carry over. Observers described the second half of Day 3 in largely positive terms, despite recognizing that the CIR was behind schedule. This change in mood is best explained through a procedures frame. The mood likely lightened in part because the session immediately following lunch required the panelists to engage in their work differently. Rather than actively participating in a large plenary session or intensely working in small groups, they had time to listen and reflect in the afternoon, which included a final presentation by advocates. This procedural design minimized the interaction between panelists and required them to listen, reflect, and ask questions. It gave them time to process information and deepen their understanding of the issues, and importantly, time to resolve their anger and frustration. After this session, panelists were asked to self-select into two groups—one pro and one con group—and to move to statement drafting, which enabled them to channel their more fully formed positions into the drafting process and to do so with like-minded individuals. Drafting the statements required their interaction, which given the time pressure could have been tense and conflictual, but the procedural design of having like-minded individuals work together, after a period of reflection and cooling off, facilitated deliberative collaboration. Observers of all three CIRs noted this change in mood, examples of which are provided in Table 5.

**Saliency of Procedures**

During the first half of Day 4, observers noted that anger concerning the procedures resurfaced. In particular, panelists appeared to experience the pressure of time to complete their statements; they appeared to become irritated with each other. This anger over the
feeling of time pressure is common for groups who have a finite ending time and is consistent with the life-cycle explanation. Observers also noted that panelists were frustrated that they could not edit claims that were finalized earlier in the process. This source of frustration is related to the CIR procedures. Thus, again, we see evidence of both of these frames in the beginning of Day 4. For instance, Observer #3 from the Oregon team writes:

Overall, this segment was very rushed, the process wasn’t clear, Willow esp, but most of them wanted to dig deeper, but couldn’t b/c of time constraints and rules about not being able to make substantial changes. The group dynamic was intriguing, with the time pressure, people were on the edge and at one point Naomi shut down Willow, which was surprising considering that they seem to be good friends between Day 1–3 (Observer #3, OR).

However, once again we see a mood change after lunch. The end of Day 4 involved a concluding activity to wrap up the event. Many who study mini-publics do not give much analytic weight to the closing statements, but we think that, in a study of emotions and deliberation, they are important to examine. In part, the closing statements of all three 2016 CIRs are consistent with the Life-Cycle Frame for the “adjourning” phase that concludes with positive emotion and talk about separation of the group and the future. Yet, in these final statements we see strong evidence that the deliberative procedures helped shape panelists’ emotional experiences and the way they talked about the meaningfulness of their participation. In the closing procedure, panelists sat in a circle and took turns saying what they were taking away from the process. Their comments were overwhelmingly positive, and many panelists reflected on how their group had successfully accomplished the difficult deliberative tasks. Unlike other mini-publics, in CIRs, both the pro and the con sides get to produce a statement that is published in the voters’ pamphlet and sent out to all eligible voters. This is in contrast to other mini-publics, where participants either do not produce anything substantial as a group (e.g., deliberative polls), and are thus not able to publicly articulate their reasons for or against a proposal, or they have to vote on one set of recommendations (e.g., Citizens’ Assemblies), and are therefore effectively silenced in terms of expressing dissenting preferences. The deliberative procedures of the CIR are more inclusive in this sense. Indeed, the findings of our qualitative analysis tie back into those of our quantitative analysis, indicating that having an opportunity to express their views increased the likelihood that participants reported feeling happiness and decreased the likelihood that they reported feeling anger.

Another standout theme that comes into focus through the Deliberative Procedures Frame is the way that panelists consistently situated their description of their own emotional experience in a larger democratic context. Table 6 highlights examples of how panelists compare their own emotional experience to the work of legislators and other public officials. They express pride in their hard work but also disappointment, even frustration, that they, as volunteers, as laypersons, and as regular citizens, are able to deliberate collectively while their elected officials cannot.

These statements, and many others like them, indicate that CIR panelists see connections between their experiences with the CIR and the work of both representative and deliberative democracy. Panelists appear to recognize the emotional challenges associated with the work, and the difficulty of the tasks they were given. But in the end, they are not only satisfied with their own experience, but they also recognize that the current political system is deficient and view the CIR as a model for other deliberative bodies. From our analysis of the observer notes, it appears that, if participants as political novices can withstand the stresses and frustrations associated with political deliberation, they expect their elected
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TABLE 6

Emotions and Disappointment with Public Officials (All Names Are Pseudonyms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Amazing how a diverse group can come together and disagree and still encourage one another and give support to one another (Observer #3, AZ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>I don’t understand that if we can sit here as a group with a problem and get along, why can’t they (politicians) do the same. Kate: well said, Natalie. Echoes other comments. Really appreciates the way . . . people here had a difference of opinion . . . respectful and honorable way that everybody behaved really touched her, thanks everyone. Right now in our country, there is a lot of hostility and anger—we can do with a lot more cooperation and peace (Observer #3, MA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>“I don’t want to be a negative nellie, but I just can’t help it.” “We’re here because other people [legislators?] don’t do their job.” “We can work together in four days . . . and we have representatives who we elect, and they can’t agree . . . or come to a conclusion on hardly anything” (Observer #1, OR).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

officials to do the same. While the Life-Cycle Frame enables us to understand the broad emotional patterns and dynamics of the CIR, it is the procedures frame that provides us with even greater nuance into understanding the expression of emotions by panelists—including their enthusiasm and happiness, but especially their frustration and anger—and the role of these emotions in deepening and advancing collective deliberation.

Conclusion

The findings from our quantitative analysis of the participant surveys in the 2016 CIRs provide good evidence that citizens felt enthusiasm throughout the process, an increasing level of happiness as the process proceeded, an early level of anxiety that peaked on the second day, a moderate but consistent level of sympathy on all four days, a moderate peak of anger on the third day, and very low levels of sadness during the deliberation. This unique, day-to-day evidence demonstrates that the emotions participants experience during mini-publics are likely to vary significantly across the entire process, and it is probable that the middle of that process presents the greatest threat to the success of mini-public deliberation. Additionally, while there was no guarantee that any initial enthusiasm would continue throughout the process, that it did so is evidence that should satisfy the organizers of the CIR. Interestingly, these various emotions and their patterns appear to have had little effect on participants’ perceptions of the deliberation itself, with one exception: those who indicated that they had an opportunity to express their views on the final day were more likely to describe feeling happiness and less likely to describe feeling anger at the end of the CIR.

In our qualitative analysis, we focused on the emotion of anger since it is potentially the most disruptive of deliberative processes. Our analysis reveals a complex interplay between life-cycle dynamics and deliberative procedures in the expression and mediation of anger. However, there are times when procedures appear to play a dominant role in the emotional experience of participants. While a life-cycle approach could account for some aspects of coalition formation, role negotiation, and task orientation, the specific procedures seem to shape how panelists experience and express anger and frustration. This is particularly true during difficult task segments in which participants are confused about the process or feel constrained by inflexible rules. The procedures also seem to account for how, in the end, the CIR tempers the possibly disruptive emotion of anger and helps participants connect
their experience in the CIR to larger democratic ideals. In this way, the CIR procedural design allows for a successful deliberation.

Emotional dynamics in the context of group deliberation are inevitable, and they have the potential to derail deliberation. What we have shown, however, is that the relationships among emotions and deliberation are complex; not only do participants feel emotions about political issues, they also feel emotions about the very democratic processes themselves. The data we analyzed lead us to conclude that the procedures of democratic deliberation themselves are highly salient in mediating the emotional dynamics within face-to-face mini-public deliberation. What stands out is the way that panelists consistently situated their description of their own emotional experience in a larger democratic framework. Framing the process as a mini-public makes a big difference in how people experience the emotional dimension of adjudging. At the end of the process, most panelists, especially those who felt they had a say in the deliberation, expressed happiness and appeared content with their accomplishments, but many also expressed frustration with elected public officials and their inability to collectively deliberate. Our analysis brings to the fore how deliberative procedures themselves generate emotional responses, but also how those procedures can channel these responses such that they play an important role in productive deliberation.

Despite decades of research into deliberative democracy, the role of emotions in deliberation, especially in mini-publics, remains an area in need of exploration. We are well aware of the limitations of our study and the importance of further quantitative and qualitative analysis. We analyzed a relatively small sample of participants from three similarly structured mini-publics that examined two topics. Studies using larger samples might lead to alternative findings or find effects that we could not detect. Perhaps more important, given our conclusion that the CIR procedures likely had significant effects on the emotional experiences of participants, these effects might be altered under different structures, such as those in which participants have more decision-making authority (e.g., some instances of participatory budgeting), are able to search for integrative solutions (e.g., some Citizens’ Juries and the National Issues Forum), or do not reach group decisions at all (e.g., most instances of Deliberative Polling®). Mini-publics that are shorter, occur online, involve a larger number of participants, or have a different model of facilitation might also generate distinctive results.

Notwithstanding these limitations, we contend that the CIRs are sufficiently representative of mini-public deliberation that our results are likely to generalize to other mini-publics. They involve a stratified random sample of citizens who receive information and arguments about an issue and engage in a structured, face-to-face deliberation on the issue. Even acknowledging the limitations of our study, there are three strengths to our argument: (1) that emotions vary across time is something that should apply across different deliberative structures, (2) scholars studying emotions in deliberation must recognize that participants can have emotional reactions to deliberative procedures themselves, not just the subject of discussion, and (3) researchers could adapt the deliberative procedures model to identify how differences in procedures create distinct effects on participants’ emotions. Thus, while future research could delve further into these and other questions we were unable to answer—for example, Do the same individuals report feeling certain emotions throughout a mini-public?—the unique nature of our data, and the different types of analysis we were able to conduct makes us confident that we have provided some significant insights into the role of discrete emotions in the context of face-to-face mini-public deliberation.
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