"Gender Inequality in Deliberation: Unpacking the Black Box of Interaction" Online Appendix

Table of Contents

A Supplementary Tables and Figures

Notes on additional results, summarized:

1. As noted in the paper, minority women under majority rule receive positive affirmations at less than half the rate enjoyed by men in their group (Figure 2). Here we note that the results are similar when we subtract women's from men's average instead of taking the ratio of women's to men's. In addition, the women/men ratio of the negatively interrupted proportion of the person's speaking turns does not change in a statistically discernible way (results not shown). Neither does the gender ratio of the interrupting proportion of the issuer's speaking turns, for either positive or negative interruptions (results not shown).
2. If we collapse mixed and enclave groups in Figure 4, Panel A, a similar pattern holds. The negative balance of interruptions received is influential for women and men ($B = -1.18$, $SE = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$ among women, versus $B = -0.64$, $SE = 0.32$, $p < 0.05$ for men). However, when we control for participants' proportion of talk time instead of speaking turns, the effect of the person's negative balance of interruptions received is very similar for women though smaller ($B = -0.682$, $SE = 0.245$, $p < 0.01$). The effect for men disappears ($B = -0.226$, $SE = 0.265$).

Table A1: Experimental Conditions and Sample Size

	# Unanimous Groups	# Majority Groups	Total # Groups	# of Individuals
0 Females	8	7	15	75
1 Female	10	9	19	95
2 Females	6	7	13	65
3 Females	9	7	16	80
4 Females	8	8	16	80
5 Females	7	8	15	75
Total # of Groups	48	46	94	
# of Individuals	240	230		470

Table A2: Negative Proportion of Negative or Positive Interruptions Received, for Men and for Women, Mixed Groups

	(1) Women	(2) Men
Majority Rule	0.30	-0.05
	(0.18)	(0.11)
Number of Women	-0.03	-0.03
	(0.04)	(0.03)
Majority Rule x Number of Women	-0.11*	0.03
	(0.06)	(0.05)
Number of Speaking Turns	0.00***	0.00***
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Egalitarianism	-0.10	-0.19
	(0.17)	(0.17)
Number of Egalitarians	0.08***	-0.04
	(0.02)	(0.04)
Constant	0.18	0.37***
	(0.15)	(0.10)
Observations	128	141
R-squared	0.19	0.09
Control for Experimental Location	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10

Table A3: Elaborated Proportion of Positive or Negative Interruptions, Mixed-Gender Groups Only

	Negative		Positive	
	(1) Women by Men and Women	(2) Men by Men and Women	(3) Women by Men and Women	(4) Men by Men and Women
Majority Rule	-0.205	0.017	0.156	0.007
	(0.224)	(0.115)	(0.226)	(0.124)
Number of Women	-0.046	0.008	0.023	-0.078**
	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.048)	(0.030)
Majority Rule x Number of Women	0.086	-0.032	-0.060	-0.015
	(0.065)	(0.053)	(0.066)	(0.052)
Egalitarianism	0.418	0.349*	-0.082	0.041
	(0.301)	(0.177)	(0.269)	(0.173)
Number of Egalitarians	-0.019	0.005	-0.068*	0.014
	(0.030)	(0.040)	(0.034)	(0.038)
Constant	0.746***	0.665***	0.526***	0.584***
	(0.195)	(0.110)	(0.179)	(0.111)
Observations	92	104	118	129
R-squared	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.07
Control for Experimental Location	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Individual-level analysis. Cluster robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10, two-tailed test.

Table A4: Formal Test of Mediation

	Others' Ratings of Speaker's Influence	Self-Rating of Speaker's Influence
Average Causal Mediation Effect	0.29 [0.02 – 0.67]	0.08 [0.01 – 0.15]
Direct Effect	-0.08 [-1.26 – 1.11]	-0.22 [-0.42 – -0.03]
Total Effect	0.21 [-0.81 – 1.19]	-0.15 [-0.30 – -0.01]

90% confidence intervals in brackets below estimates. Estimates based on 1,000 simulations. Models include main effects for group gender composition and for decision rule as well as controls for total # of comments, egalitarianism, and experimental location. These are only partial estimates, as Imai et al. (2010) have not yet extended their method to include the interaction + main effect when the model includes an interaction between experimental conditions.

Table A5: Panel A: Effect of Proportion of Turns Receiving Positive Interruptions and Confidence on Talk Time, Mixed Groups

	(1) Women	(2) Men
Confidence	0.042*	-0.012
	(0.021)	(0.024)
Proportion Speaking Turns w/ Positive Interruption	1.176*	0.667
	(0.630)	(0.679)
Confidence x Prop. Turns w/ Positive Interruption	-0.270	0.436
	(0.813)	(0.810)
Outlier Control	-0.134**	--
	(0.064)	--
Speaking Turns	0.002***	0.002***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	0.055**	0.098***
	(0.021)	(0.019)
Observations	157	163
R-squared	0.40	0.31
Control for Experimental Location	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10

Table A5: Panel B: Effect of Confidence and Proportion of Turns Receiving Positive Interruptions on Influence Votes, Mixed Groups

	(1) Women	(2) Men
Confidence	0.701*	0.140
	(0.401)	(0.297)
Proportion Speaking Turns w/ Positive Interruption	26.088**	16.297**
	(10.930)	(6.648)
Confidence x Prop. Turns w/ Positive Interruption	-20.119	-7.317
	(13.951)	(8.523)
Outlier Control	-18.219***	--
	(1.433)	--
Speaking Turns	0.016***	0.011***
	(0.004)	(0.002)
Constant	-2.012***	-0.772***
	(0.508)	(0.222)
Alpha	0.833	0.208
	(0.355)	(0.145)
Observations	157	163
Control for Experimental Location	Yes	Yes

Coefficients from a negative binomial model; Robust standard errors in parentheses
Models in Panels A and B include a control for an outlier that receives well over 2 SD more positive interruptions than anyone else in the sample; patterns of are similar if the outlier control is removed.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10

Table A6: Effect of Confidence and Proportion of Turns Receiving Positive Interruptions on Self-efficacy, Mixed Groups

	(1) Women	(2) Men
Confidence	0.096*	0.018
	(0.051)	(0.039)
Proportion Speaking Turns w/ Positive Interruption	4.799***	0.283
	(1.330)	(1.256)
Confidence x Prop. Turns w/ Positive Interruption	-3.360*	0.499
	(1.933)	(1.637)
Outlier Control	-0.333***	--
	(0.120)	--
Constant	0.550***	0.685***
	(0.037)	(0.031)
Observations	157	163
R-squared	0.11	0.01
Control for Experimental Location	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in parentheses

Models include a control for an outlier that receives well over 2 SD more positive interruptions than anyone else in the sample; patterns are similar if the outlier control is removed.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10