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**Table A1**: *Binary logistic regression predicting citizens’ assembly decision acceptance*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | B | SE |
| Ethno-national moderation (1-3 scale, high=moderate) | .81\* | .33 |
| Unlikely to vote | -.31 | .62 |
| Trust both communities | -.41 | .47 |
|  |  |  |
| Women | .07 | .47 |
| Age | .01 | .01 |
| Protestant | - | - |
| Catholic | -.50 | .49 |
| Other religion | .65 | 1.16 |
| AB social grade | - | - |
| C1 social grade | -.81 | .71 |
| C2 social grade | .34 | .78 |
| DE social grade | -.60 | .67 |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | -.45 | 1.21 |
| -2 Log likelihood | 124.28 |  |
| Nagelkerke *R2* | .16 |  |
| *χ*2 (d.f.) | 14.02 (10) |  |

Note 1: \*=p<.05. The dependent variable is decision acceptance (accept/not accept). N = 122.

Note 2: In this particular analysis we are limited to investigating approximately half of the individuals in the citizens’ assembly experimental condition. This is due to the fact that the data was collected in two waves and one particular variable – ‘trust both communities’ – is available for only one of the waves. All other analyses in this paper use the full N.

**Table A2:** *Moderating effects of ethno-nationalism (strength of self-identified ideology) on decision acceptance across different modes of decision-making*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | | 3 | |
|  | **Decision Acceptance** | | | | |
| (Ref: Citizens’ Assembly) |  | |  | |  |
| Party Talks (British Govt) | 1.010 (.096) | | 1.030 (.101 | | 1.218 (.197) |
| Party Talks (Intl Diplomat) | 1.261  (.196) | | 1.186 (.205) | | 1.922 (.417) |
| Election | .998 (.048) | | 1.012 (.050) | | 1.140 (.096) |
| Direct Rule | .962 (.063) | | .966 (.066) | | .942 (.132) |
| Referendum | **1.375 (.055)\*\*\*** | | **1.410 (.056)\*\*\*** | | **1.738 (.111)\*\*\*** |
| Ethno-national moderation | - | | **4.077 (.138)\*\*\*** | | **6.188 (.330)\*\*\*** |
| Ethno-national moderation x Party Talks (British Govt) | - | | - | | .638 (.462) |
| Ethno-national moderation x  Party Talks (Intl Diplomat) | - | | - | | .526 (.480) |
| Ethno-national moderation x  Election | - | | - | | .519 (.450) |
| Ethno-national moderation x  Direct Rule | - | | - | | 1.125 (.463) |
| Ethno-national moderation x  Referendum | - | | - | | **.210 (.641)\*\*** |
| Constant | **2.980 (.134)\*\*\*** | | 1.008 (.175) | | .738 (.285) |
| *N* | 1734 | | 1708 | | 1708 |
| Log Likelihood | 1740.50 | | 1614.14 | | 1603.81 |
| Nagelkerke *R*2 | .06 | | .14 | | .15 |
| *χ*2 (d.f.) | 62.72 (5)\*\*\* | | 161.17 (6)\*\*\* | | 171.50 (11)\*\*\* |
| Entries are odds ratios from logistic regressions; standard errors are reported in parentheses. The dependent variable is decision acceptance (accept/not accept). “Ethno-national moderation” refers to the intensity of the respondent’s self-identified ethno-national identity (1 = moderate unionist/nationalist, or neither; 0 = strongly unionist/nationalist). Odds ratios greater than 1 indicate a positive association; odds ratios less than 1 indicate a negative association. *\*p* < .10; \*\**p* < .05; \*\*\**p* < .01 | | | | | |