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*Table A1.*Representation of types of commenters in the sample

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Group*** | ***N* *(% of total sample)*** |
| Feminists | 21 (13.29%) |
| Feminist organization staffers | 19 (12.03%) |
| Form letters from constituents | 2 (1.27%) |
| Charter schools | 23 (14.56%) |
| Educators | 36 (22.78%) |
| Parents | 31 (19.62%) |
| Students | 57 (36.08%) |
| Policy makers | 11 (6.96%) |
| **Total** | **170** |

**Full Description of Coding Procedures**

The full coding procedure proceeded in three steps. First, I identified all of the relevant text and I excluded irrelevant text, which including headings, greetings, and addresses. Second, I reviewed all of the comments and I labeled each complete argument in them. As I labeled these arguments, I wrote memos to capture the main ideas related to each label. I considered a piece of text to be a “complete argument” when it fully expressed and justified the author’s view. Some authors completed this task more succinctly than others so “complete thoughts” ranged from a single sentence to a full paragraph. This round of coding produced 81 labeled arguments. Third, I reviewed all 81 of the labeled arguments, my memos about the labels, and the original text related the labels to group similar labels together into thematically-related arguments. For example, I combined nine labels about how the proposed rule related to existing laws and the Constitution into one argument called “Legal and Constitutional Issues.” This second round of coding produced 15 thematically-related arguments.

**Full Description of Interview Recruitment Procedures**

I invited one former Education Department official (and six others who I identified using materials published in the *Federal Register* and a snowball sampling approach) to participate in the study by mailing and/or emailing them letters on university letterhead that indicated the Institutional Review Board approved the study and any identifying information provided in the study would be kept strictly confidential. Four of these potential participants were currently employed at the Education Department and the former official I interviewed suggested their resistance to participate was likely due to the fact that it would be “awkward” for them to participate while they were still employed at the Education Department.