

National Institute for Civil Discourse Research Brief No. 11: Deliberative Practice and its Impact on Individuals and Society¹

Key Issues:

What types of deliberative practices are in use today?

How do researchers measure the quality of deliberation?

What is the impact of deliberation on individuals?

What factors contribute to whether a deliberation is productive for healthy democracy?

How have deliberative practices been incorporated into policymaking and democratic governance?

Overview

Deliberative democratic practice is on the rise worldwide as policymakers seek to avoid gridlock, develop public support and backing for tough decisions and address problems that require individual and small group action or large scale behavioral change.² Elements of deliberative practice have been used in a wide range of online and in-person environments.³ Different types of deliberation include: citizens juries,⁴ deliberative polling,⁵ citizens initiative reviews,⁶ consensus conferences,⁷ and study circles.⁸ Examples of deliberative practices include large-scale “21st Century Town Meetings” organized by *AmericaSpeaks*, the Oregon Citizens Initiative Review, Britain’s *Granada 500*, and the Municipal Health Councils in Brazil.⁹ Across the various types, deliberations may or may not be designed to include mechanisms linking them to policy-making and governance.

Measures of the quality and impact of deliberative practice lag far behind their implementation. Researchers have used a variety of measures, making assessment of deliberation something of a “moving target.”¹⁰ Additionally, impact studies have not always been sufficiently well designed to ensure confidence in the results, and some studies have shown inconsistent findings.¹¹ However, the overall weight of the evidence suggests that there are positive associations between deliberative experience and political interest,¹² political knowledge¹³ and key measures of civic engagement and political participation.¹⁴ Further, as researchers and practitioners have understood that the impact of deliberation is conditional on *characteristics, goals and institutional context* of the practice, they have begun measuring these elements of deliberation and specifying the conditions under which various positive impacts are likely to hold.¹⁵

After discussing major types of deliberative processes, and the variability in measurement, this brief summarizes key research findings about the characteristics and impact of deliberation.

Argument and Findings

Types of Deliberation

Among the wide variety of deliberative practices in use today, five types are: deliberative polling, citizens’ juries, citizens’ initiative reviews, 21st Century town hall meetings and study circles. Each of these is explored here. As will be seen, **the types vary along multiple dimensions including recruitment methods, the scale of the deliberation, innovative use of technology, and whether or not the deliberation is linked directly to electoral processes or policy making**

Deliberative Polling

Deliberative democracy scholar James Fishkin invented the concept of “deliberative polling” in 1988.¹⁶ Describing the process, he wrote:

A random, representative sample is first polled on the targeted issues. After this baseline poll, members of the sample are invited to gather at a single place for a weekend in order to discuss the issues. Carefully balanced briefing materials are sent to the participants and are also made publicly available. The participants engage in dialogue with competing experts and political leaders based on questions they develop in small group discussions with trained moderators. Parts of the weekend events are broadcast on television, either live or in taped and edited form. After the deliberations, the sample is again asked the original questions. The resulting changes in opinion represent the conclusions the public would reach, if people had the opportunity to become more informed and more engaged by the issues.¹⁷

In their review of literature, scholars Michael X. Delli Carpini, Fay Lomax Cook and Lawrence R. Jacobs note that “[d]eliberative polls combine aspects of the internal validity provided by experimental design, the external validity provided by actual deliberation about real world issues and the generalizability provided by surveys.”¹⁸ Nonetheless, critics of deliberative polling express concern about the generalizability of the results given self-selection by participants. They also are concerned about the limited practicality of the design as “a means of increasing meaningful deliberation among the larger population,” and about whether reported opinion change and increases in knowledge will endure.¹⁹

The adaptation of deliberative polling to online platforms helps meet the concern about extension to large populations. It also helps meet the concern about self-selection for face-to-face deliberation that is constrained by work and family responsibilities.²⁰ Yet, while conducting deliberation online clearly diminishes costs, saves (travel) time, and enables more widespread participation, it is also true that online access is not distributed equally across the population.²¹

Further, many argue that if online discussion is not preceded by face-to-face engagement it may not facilitate mutual trust among participants or their ability to “take the role of the other.” These are key goals of deliberative practice in that they help participants move beyond narrow self-interest towards reason that reflects a broader, community view.²² At the same time, there have been encouraging findings from initial studies comparing online and face-to-face deliberation undertaken on foreign policy issues and during the 2000 American Presidential cycle. These studies suggest that deliberations enhance voting, civic participation and social trust while also increasing confidence in political institutions.²³ As a cautionary note, while online deliberations did sometimes increase awareness of reasons behind diverse viewpoints, they *also* sometimes led to more polarized opinions.²⁴

Citizens Juries

A staple of U.S. criminal and civil justice processes, juries engage in small group, face-to-face deliberations that must result in collective decisions under varying decision rules—one of which is often, but not always, unanimity among participants. The concept of a Citizens Jury—as it pertains to group deliberation more generally—was invented by political scientist Ned Crosby, with the first such jury conducted in 1974.²⁵ The Crosby-founded Jefferson Center describes the Citizens Jury process as follows:

[A] randomly selected and demographically representative panel of citizens meets for four or five days to carefully examine an issue of public significance. The jury of citizens, usually consisting of 18-24 individuals, serves as a microcosm for the public. Jurors are paid a stipend for their time. They hear from a variety of expert witnesses and are able to deliberate together on the issue. On the final day of their moderated hearings, the members of the Citizens Jury present their recommendations to decision-makers and the public. Citizens Jury projects can be enhanced through extensive communication with the public, including a dynamic web presence and significant media contacts.²⁶

Unlike deliberative polling (whether online or in-person), citizens juries are a deliberative methodology likely to be directly linked to decision-making. Further, where deliberative pollsters focus especially on individual-level opinion change from pre-deliberation to post-deliberation polling, citizens juries must produce group policy recommendations.

In 2002, political psychologist Tali Mendelberg reviewed what had been learned about deliberation from small group research including experiments using mock juries.²⁷ In 2007, she and political scientist Christopher Karpowitz described a “group-based approach” to deliberation, focusing on the impact that variable group compositions can have on deliberative processes and their outcomes, including specific interactions between decision rules and group composition features such as gender and race.²⁸ The authors found, for example, that “unanimity sets group norms, norms that vary by gender composition and that affect the satisfaction experienced by both men and women with the group discussion...participants in *unanimous* groups with more women were more satisfied with their discussions than those in other conditions, holding a variety of other variables constant. This satisfaction is not a result of individual gender because it is experienced by both men and women in the groups. Unanimity does not polarize *individuals* according to gender. Rather it polarizes *groups* according to gender.”²⁹

Citizens’ Initiative Reviews

Like citizens juries, citizens’ initiative reviews are directly linked to decision-makers or decision-making. The Oregon Citizens Initiative Review (CIR) is the paradigmatic example of a citizens initiative review. This form of deliberative practice brings principles and processes from citizens juries to proposed referenda or initiatives that voters then approve or disapprove during scheduled electoral opportunities.³⁰

In 2009, the Oregon legislature enacted the Citizens Initiative Review, first as a pilot project to evaluate how well it would work, then after a positive evaluation, as part of its standard initiative voting process. A non-profit organization, Healthy Democracy Oregon, implemented the CIR³¹ which has since been run two times, first in 2010 as a pilot study and then again in 2012. In both 2010 and 2012, representative citizen panels reviewed the pros and cons of two separate initiatives. The process began with the establishment of a citizen panel which:

...consisted of a random sample of 24 registered Oregon voters demographically stratified to match the Oregon electorate in terms of sex, age, ethnicity, education, geography and party affiliation. For five days, citizen panelists assisted by a pair of experienced moderators...reviewed a single ballot measure to develop insights and analysis for...[s]tatements [that would be compiled in a]... Voters Pamphlet. On the first day, panelists received training in deliberation...For the next three days panelists listened to evidence from the initiative proponents and opponents as well as from background witnesses. Moderators led the panelists in large and small group conversations that allowed them to distill the information they heard. Panelists used these conversations, along with votes conducted using computerized voting devices, to identify lingering questions about the initiative and its impact, as well as the most important things voters needed to know about it. At the end of the week, panelists condensed the information and arguments they had developed to write their Citizens Statement. [The statement]... included Key Findings (information related to the initiative that a majority of the panel found both relevant and accurate) and Statements in Favor and in Opposition, written by panelists who ultimately found themselves for and against respectively...[The] one-page Citizen Statements...went into the official Oregon State Voters’ Pamphlet that the Secretary of State mailed to every registered voter. Since Oregon is a vote-by-mail state, these statements provided timely non-partisan information that voters would have at hand while completing their general election ballots.³²

Citizen Statements provided vote totals for and against each initiative, but the meat of the Statement was in the findings and arguments pro and con.³³

The CIR, as implemented in Oregon, has been institutionalized into the state's electoral process, giving it real potential to influence voting and policy outcomes. However, outcome data on the two CIRs present a somewhat mixed picture. In 2010, Oregon voters *accepted* the initiative that the Citizen Panel had rejected by a very large margin (21-3); Oregon voters *rejected* the initiative that the Citizen Panel had accepted by a very small margin (13-11).³⁴ While these results would seem to imply that the panels did not significantly influence voters, evaluation researchers concluded that the Citizen Statements did, in fact, have a discernible influence.³⁵ For example, in the case of the lopsided panel vote against the initiative, evidence suggested that Oregon voters passed the initiative by a lesser margin than they would have in the absence of the Citizen Statement. Voters who reported having read the statements indicated that they—and especially the critical analyses of the initiatives—were helpful.³⁶

The Oregon CIR encompasses key general principles—including random and representative sampling and hearing from experts and/or opponents and supporters—that are also involved in deliberative polling. However, like face-to-face deliberative polls and citizens juries, CIR panels are also quite small relative to the populations they intend to represent, and may suffer from self-selection bias.

AmericaSpeaks and the 21st Century Town Meeting ®³⁷

In terms of sheer scale, the 21st Century Town Meeting® developed by the non-profit and non-partisan organization *AmericaSpeaks*, can operate at the opposite end of the spectrum from the citizens' jury. Founded in 1995 by Carolyn Lukensmeyer—who now is the Executive Director of the National Institute for Civil Discourse—*AmericaSpeaks* developed its signature Town Meeting methodology in 1997, describing the 21st Century Town Meeting as “a dynamic forum that combines small group, face-to-face dialogue with technology to engage citizens in discussions on planning, resource allocation, and policy formulation.”

At this point, *AmericaSpeaks* has facilitated deliberation around such topics as “fiscal budget policy, disaster recovery, education, adults with autism, childhood obesity and health care.” Its initial project, Americans to Discuss Social Security, involved 45,000 participants. For a national conversation on Our Budget and Our Economy, *AmericaSpeaks* linked 3,500 people at 19 different sites by webcast and satellite for a day-long deliberation. Since 1995, 165,000 people have participated in *AmericaSpeaks*-facilitated deliberations.

Forbes Magazine called the distinctive methodology of the 21st Century Town Meeting® “[an] effective technique of using technology to tap the collective thoughts of a large group.” Indeed, technology is a central part of the deliberative processes facilitated by *AmericaSpeaks*. No matter the size of the deliberating body, “as themes emerge from the discussion,” [they are] “reported back to the group on large screens and voted on using keypads.” The largest meeting conducted “required 1,000 laptops and 12,000 keypads.”

Beyond its use of the latest technology and the sheer scale on which it operates, *AmericaSpeaks* has committed to bring its 21st Century Town Meeting® “around the world through Global Voices, its international arm.” The central purpose of its work both nationally and internationally is provision of infrastructure to link citizens' voices to policy-making. The organization has conducted deliberations in all 50 states in the United States.

Another hallmark of the organization's methodology is the importance placed on partnering with *other* organizations to build *collective institutional capacity*. Indeed, on its website, *AmericaSpeaks* lists “developing partnerships” as the first of five basic principles that make it distinctive and implement its vision of national infrastructure.

- Developing partnerships with other organizations to create coordinating institutions
- Increasing elected officials' knowledge of and commitment to public discussions
- Recruiting and training a national network of volunteer facilitators
- Developing public outreach processes to ensure diverse and representative participation
- Developing appropriate technologies and approaches to facilitate effective dialogue

Although *AmericaSpeaks* does sometimes use representative sampling techniques, it also mobilizes its community partnerships to ensure that its deliberations involve a diversity of viewpoints, span many different constituencies and engage hard-to-reach populations. It works with its partners to ensure that participants are provided with “accessible materials that frame the issues involved and provide a baseline of data upon which participants may begin their discussions. This framing process may involve identifying a series of ‘tough choices’ that must be made by the public to address the area’s challenges.” The organization’s trained facilitators help “to ensure high quality dialogue” with the object of “foster[ing] consensus among participants and identify[ing] shared priorities.”

Unlike deliberative polling but like the CIR, the 21st Century Town Meeting® aims to “link to action.” Unlike deliberative polling, *AmericaSpeaks* wants to influence not just community members but also policy elites.

AmericaSpeaks designs our citizen engagement initiatives to create the conditions needed to produce meaningful action and change. The *AmericaSpeaks* team will craft the scale, composition and design of the citizen engagement strategy to build credibility with policy makers, the media, key stakeholders and the public as a whole

Since its founding, *AmericaSpeaks* has done a great deal to demonstrate the feasibility of running large scale participatory deliberations around difficult and sometimes very technical policy issues. The organization also has shown that it *is* possible to get substantial citizen consensus around key elements of potential policy reforms. Even so, however, neither *AmericaSpeaks* nor any other organization promoting citizen deliberation can guarantee that elected officials and policy elites will move toward policy solutions and proposals agreed to by deliberating citizens.

Study Circles

At the other end of the scale from the very large deliberations facilitated by *AmericaSpeaks*, study circles are small deliberative forums that meet over time to address local community issues.³⁸ Study circles may be organized around any issue by any small group of people with a common interest or concern. Unlike other types of deliberative forums, study circles do not always try to represent a diversity of community constituencies. They may—or may not—have a designated leader or facilitator, and the type of outside materials drawn on is up to the group. Sometimes, however, study groups are sponsored by the community or government officials with the express purpose of helping to resolve ongoing community issues.³⁹

For example, Portsmouth, New Hampshire has been the site of numerous study circles connected to community issues.

In 1999, study circles addressed bullying and school safety, with deliberative results used to generate new school policies that were associated with a decline in bullying.⁴⁰

In 2000, study circles provided a forum in which citizens voiced their opinions and heard other perspectives on school redistricting—the subject of bitter public argument. These deliberations produced ten recommendations for a redistricting plan that garnered high levels of community acceptance.⁴¹

In 2002 the school district, local chapter of the NAACP and the police department sponsored study circles pertaining to racial issues, including allegations of racial profiling and harassment of young black men by the police. Involving school leaders, police officers, community members and high school students, these deliberations failed to result in policy change but they did improve communication between the police and the community.⁴²

From 2002 to 2004 the Portsmouth City Planning Board relied on study circles to generate input for the city's master plan. The Board asked the circles to define quality of life and recommend methods for sustaining it. In a second phase, study circles deliberated to identify issues affecting quality of life in Portsmouth and provide recommendations to the Planning Board based on their deliberations. The Board revised its master plan based on this citizen feedback, and in a final third phase, the Board asked study circle participants to “discuss findings, set priorities, address final comments to the city, and explore ways to partner with the city to influence and enable change.”⁴³

Swedish democracy frequently relies on local study groups to enhance citizen knowledge and engage citizens in the political process. However—and notwithstanding the specific history of community-sponsored study groups in Portsmouth—a study conducted on Swedish study circles found that the circles enhanced knowledge but typically did not promote new policies or social change. Ordinarily there was no institutionalized vehicle linking the study circle with political *action*.⁴⁴

Measuring the Quality of Deliberation

Researchers and practitioners concur about the importance of shared standards and measures for deliberation that are rooted in deliberative theory.⁴⁵ **Benchmarks currently used to assess the quality of deliberative practice include measures of participants' personal and political efficacy; changes in attitudes about social and/or political responsibility; changes in social trust and empathy; and changes in rates of long-term civic and political involvement.**⁴⁶

While benchmarks like these are linked to deliberative democratic theory⁴⁷ and could have important implications at a societal level, they tend to be focused more on individual impact. In addition, some researchers argue that the quantitative nature of such benchmarks fails to capture many key benefits of deliberation, such as the construction of shared meanings and the mutual understanding that can emerge from community discussion.⁴⁸

Finally, many of the traditional benchmarks assess quality by measuring the outcomes or impact of a deliberation. While essential, these outcome benchmarks do not capture the characteristics of the deliberative process itself. **It is, researchers believe, equally essential to unpack the “black box”⁴⁹ and determine which characteristics of deliberative practices increase their effectiveness.** For example: how does variability in the characteristics of deliberation shape variability in its outputs and impacts? Can we assess the degree to which deliberation approaches an ideal—typical or authentic process as outlined in deliberative theory?⁵⁰ Does coming closer to the ideal increase the positive impact of deliberation on individuals and on society?

Researchers are now developing process measures that will enable us to answer some of these questions. For example, political scientist Jürg Steiner and his colleagues developed and have applied a Discourse Quality Index (DQI) to measure the quality of political discourse in policymaking bodies and discussion groups.⁵¹ Based on laborious content coding, the initial index measured seven different aspects of the quality of deliberative processes. These included:

- A speaker's ability to participate freely in a debate;
- The degree to which speakers justify demands logically;
- Whether the content of justifications offered appeals to group interests or the common good;
- Levels of expressed respect for the groups being helped by a particular policy;
- Levels of expressed respect for the demands of other speakers;
- Levels of expressed respect for counter-arguments that have been, or could be, offered by other speakers; and
- The degree to which speakers try to reach some compromise or build some sort of consensus about a particular policy intervention.⁵²

In his 2012 book, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy*, Steiner details recent extensions to the Discourse Quality Index.⁵³ **The expanded DQI now measures 13 separate aspects of deliberation, including three measures of respect that might be included in the concept of “deliberative civility:”**⁵⁴ the use of “foul language” to attack persons or arguments; the use of respectful language toward other participants or their arguments; and respectful listening—this last considers whether participants ignore or engage the arguments of other participants, the extent they engage them, and whether they engage them in undistorted or distorted form. Further, five aspects of “justification” now are measured, including: the level of justification; the extent of references to costs and benefits for the participant's own group, for other groups, and for the common good; and whether the justification refers to abstract principles. Also measured are these features of group interaction: whether participants tell stories related or unrelated to their arguments; whether there are changes of position and if/how these connect to arguments that were made during the deliberation; whether people interrupt each other; how long speakers talk; and whether speakers indicate verbally or behaviorally that they feel constrained by others.

The Discourse Quality Index is a major stride in measuring the quality of deliberative practice. However, because applying the DQI in ways that achieve validity and reliability is a labor- and time-intensive process (requiring multiple coders who have received substantial systematic training), there are trade-offs to consider between the desired measurement quality and the cost and efficiency of the evaluation.

Another measurement framework recently put forward by communication researchers Katherine R. Knobloch, John Gastil, Justin Reedy and Katherine Kramer Walsh is a theory-linked approach for evaluating both the characteristics and proximate output of deliberations.⁵⁵ According to these scholars, the “quality of any deliberative event” can be judged on “six tangible elements: the context of the event, the project design and set up, its structural design, the discussion itself, subjective experiences of the participants and the output or product created.”⁵⁶

With respect to context, the authors note that while adversarial processes provide “accessible positions in a debate,” they tend not to produce consensus.⁵⁷ With regard to project design and set up, the authors emphasize the importance of topic selection, framing, and decision options as influencing the facts and values that emerge from discussion. Attention to structural design includes analysis of “the actual presentation of information, values and solutions, the structure of the agenda, logistics and facilitation protocols.”⁵⁸ Regarding the impact of the discussion itself, the authors indicate that “special

attention goes to those moments in which individuals make ‘claims,’ but other important features include questions, narratives, reflective talk and turn-taking dynamics.”⁵⁹ Knobloch *et al* assess the subjective experience of participants through interviews, questionnaires and surveys. And, they find that a deliberation’s outputs “indicate the quality of the decision and may include markers of the information values and tradeoffs considered by the participants. Whether the output mentions or provides space for opposing or minority opinions may also testify to the democratic character of the deliberation.”⁶⁰

Knobloch *et al* make **an important distinction between the “internal process quality” of a deliberation and the wider, or external, impact of the products produced.** They point out that while measures of external impact provide evidence about “the perceived legitimacy and potency of deliberative projects,” they are not part of assessing the internal quality of deliberative processes.⁶¹

Finally, attentive to the cost and efficiency of evaluation, Knobloch *et al* include both easy-to-code indicators in their framework, as well as evaluative criteria that require more time and labor-intensive content coding.⁶² There is considerable overlap between key dimensions of the DQI and the discursive dimensions that Knobloch *et al* sought to evaluate with respect to the 2010 Oregon CIR.⁶³

Regardless of the tool or framework that is used, evaluations of deliberations serve multiple purposes. They provide empirical evidence linking deliberative practices with deliberative theories, and they allow forum organizers to “reap the benefits of constructive criticism” and improve deliberative processes to meet the needs of different political actors.⁶⁴

Understanding the Effects of Deliberation

Despite variability in how deliberative forums are organized and how their quality is measured, research suggests that deliberation may have positive effects on a number of outcomes important for individuals and the health of a democratic society. **Much research has examined the impact of deliberation on political knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, and civic and political engagement.**

Effects on Political Knowledge

With respect to gains in political knowledge, studies of specific deliberations have produced mostly positive findings. For example:

- A 2010 study found that that 85% of participants in an AmericaSpeaks-run 19 site, 3000 person deliberative forum titled Our Budget, Our Economy, *perceived* that after the forum they were “more informed about the challenges and options for cutting the federal budget deficit.”⁶⁵
- A 2009 study used a pre-test/post-test comparison group design to examine whether political knowledge about social security issues discussed at a deliberative forum in Phoenix, Arizona increased as a function of participating in the forum. Researchers contrasted the change in knowledge of forum participants from before to after the forum with two comparison groups before and after the forum – people invited to attend who did not attend and a random sample of adults residing in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Not only did the perceived knowledge of participants increase significantly; interviewer ratings of participants’ knowledge and participants’ scores on a series of factual questions assessing their knowledge also increased significantly. There were no significant knowledge changes for the comparison groups.⁶⁶
- A 2009 review of findings from deliberative polls held in Great Britain in 1994 and the United States in 2003 showed that participants in the deliberative polling process experienced significant

increases in both issue-specific political knowledge and knowledge concerning party positions on different political issues.⁶⁷

- 2005 study using pre- and post-forum data from the National Issues Convention (NIC), found that participants experienced information gains on eight of eleven items when compared to nonparticipants and to a random sample of individuals who were not contacted to participate in the NIC forums. Specifically, participants were more likely to know: 1) the position of different political parties on a liberal-conservative dimension; 2) roughly what the unemployment rate was in the United States during the time of the study; 3) whether the U.S. had sent ground troops to Bosnia, Somalia, Rwanda, and Iraq in the past decade; and 4) whether the U.S. government spent more money on national defense, the space program, foreign aid, or agricultural subsidies.⁶⁸
- A 1999 study analyzing data from semi-structured interviews conducted with participants in the 1997 U.S. Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy reported that nine of the 14 participants learned "a lot" or "some" about telecommunications from participating in the panel. Two of the respondents were able to use what they had learned to ask deeper questions about the impact of technology on privacy rights and on society as a whole. All of the participants interviewed reported being more interested in telecommunication issues and following these issues on their own after participating in the panel.⁶⁹
- A 1997 report on citizen participation in a series of deliberations about the role of money in politics showed that participants became more knowledgeable about this issue.⁷⁰

In addition to these positive results, there are a smaller number of studies with negative findings. For example:

- A 1995 British study using data on 173 of the 500 participants in the Granada 500 deliberative forums and a subsample of 253 voters from a random sample of 1,000 individuals from the same constituency as the Granada 500 participants, found that when participants were compared to non-participants, deliberation *decreased* participants' expressed political knowledge.⁷¹

It is hard to know what to make of the Granada 500 results. Researchers Denver, Hands and Jones found that the 173 participants did not represent well the full demographic spectrum of the more general survey sample, and that there was substantial attrition of Granada 500 participants over time. As a result, they concluded that it was unwise to give the findings much weight.⁷² However, these findings do suggest that in order to secure positive effects on participants, deliberative practices may need to more closely attend to logistical problems that can lead to high attrition.

In addition to the deliberation-specific research highlighted above, **two reviews of the literature (in 2004 and 2012) suggest that overall—and notwithstanding some negative findings—deliberation tends to produce gains in political knowledge.**⁷³ The 2012 review further suggested that, on balance, deliberation will produce significant gains in participants' political knowledge *even in situations in which the issue discussed is not particularly salient to participants.*⁷⁴

In short, the totality of the literature examining the effects of deliberation on political knowledge shows that these processes *do* produce citizens who are more knowledgeable about the political issues being discussed in the forum as well as about the political landscape more generally. However, deliberation's effectiveness as a strategy for political education may be contingent on various other factors including the institutional context, structural design of the deliberation, and the pre-deliberation baseline knowledge or political sophistication that participants possess. More research is needed that

codes for both the characteristics of the deliberation *and* the baseline characteristics of participants, and then systematically examines whether and how such factors influence change in participants' political knowledge relative to matched sets of non-participants.

Effects on Political Opinions, Attitudes and Beliefs

Deliberative democrats emphasize that deliberation participants' openness to new facts and alternative views is a necessary condition for the development of consensus positions. Many hope that reasoned argument can promote this consensus and compromise.⁷⁵ **So it is important to investigate whether, and the conditions under which, citizen deliberation either enhances ideological disagreement or promotes consensus.** This information is especially critical in light of research on cultural cognition and "moral foundations" that shows some portion of the U.S. population to be entrenched in opposing moral "camps," and that those in these camps filter all facts and reasoned arguments through conflicting and deeply held world views.⁷⁶

Researchers and practitioners suggest that deliberation can alter individual attitudes in one or more of the following ways:

- By engaging in deliberation, individuals are able to more clearly conceptualize and articulate their own preferences in ways that move them past the uncritical adoption of particular political positions.⁷⁷
- Deliberation may push participants to recast their preferences in terms of the public good because selfish arguments will tend to be viewed as less legitimate when norms established for deliberation emphasize the public good.⁷⁸
- Deliberation may alter an individual's opinion by shifting the beliefs underlying that opinion. However, change to a single underlying belief may be insufficient to change the targeted opinion. If the deliberation can challenge and/or alter an individual's beliefs across a sufficient number of related dimensions, the targeted opinion is also likely to change.⁷⁹

Though the precise mechanisms by which influence occurs are not always clear, research has shown that **deliberation does influence the attitudes and opinions of participants.** For example:

- A 2009 review of nine different deliberative polls conducted in the United States, Australia and Great Britain reported large, statistically significant changes in individual attitudes on 72% of the 58 indices measured before and after the deliberative process. The author of the review also noted that the magnitude of change depended on the salience of the issue being discussed. If the issue is particularly salient to participants, he explained, attitude change may be much less pronounced because they already will have spent considerable time pondering the issue in their daily lives. Familiar issues thus are more resilient to the deliberative process.⁸⁰
- A 2005 study based on data from the National Issues Convention found that when compared to those who had not participated in the deliberative forums, deliberation participants experienced significantly higher rates of opinion change on 24 of the 47 opinion items measured by their survey.⁸¹
- A 1999 analysis of data gathered a few weeks prior to, and a few weeks after, deliberative forums in six northern New York counties suggested that participants experienced attitude shifts following the deliberative process. They tended to adopt a more pragmatic view about the northern New York County food system *after* they engaged in deliberation.⁸²

- A 1999 study using data from the National Issue Forums to compare pre-forum and post-forum views about free speech, foreign policy, energy policies, strategies to encourage economic growth, crime policies, healthcare and the restructuring of the U.S. political system found that across these seven areas, post-deliberation views were, on average, more ideologically consistent (i.e., people were less likely to hold conflicting views) and more certain.⁸³

However:

- The 1995 British study of the Granada 500 deliberative forums referenced above found that deliberation resulted in higher levels of ideological *inconsistency* in forum participants' opinions and party preferences when compared to non-participants.⁸⁴ The study also found increased prevalence of participants without opinion preferences, relative to non-participants.⁸⁵

Despite the anomalous 1995 findings, a **2012 literature review suggests that those who engage in deliberation generally emerge from the process with more consistent attitudes and more resistance to persuasive efforts from elites. They are also more likely to have experienced an attitude change in some direction.**⁸⁶

A Further Note about Group Interaction

Regarding deliberation's general impact on both political knowledge as well as attitudes and beliefs, scholar Heather Pincock noted that **extant evidence suggests that deliberation produces higher levels of "single-peakedness,"** that is, **agreement among individual preferences in a way that preserves majority rule.**⁸⁷

While relatively few participants in diverse deliberative groups are likely to be *so* entrenched in their moral foundations that they are unable to be influenced in some way, the evidence on "single-peakedness" calls to mind the findings of political psychologist Tali Mendelberg that "discussion tends to amplify the strength of a majority opinion...if the group starts out inclined toward one alternative it emerges from the discussion with a strengthened commitment to that alternative."⁸⁸ As Mendelberg further points out:

This robust finding has been explained most often by two very different mechanisms, one social the other informational. One offers pessimistic implications for deliberative theory, the other hope. The pessimistic social mechanism is normative influence. Group polarization may be driven by social comparison, the attempt to present oneself to others in a positive light...normative pressure shifts individuals in the direction of the group's norm, whatever that may be. The majority preference or perspective has more weight simply because it is the most popular [implying] that the most influential side in a conflict may not be the one with the best arguments [but] the side that is most influential socially...

[Alternatively], [g]roups move in the direction suggested by the most novel and valid arguments, whatever that direction may be...The majority is simply more likely to offer novel arguments. If the balance of novel and valid arguments were skewed toward the minority, the group would move in its direction instead. In its emphasis on rational argumentation and its attempt to rule out any social motivation, this theory of persuasive arguments harmonizes quite well with deliberative theory.

The evidence suggests that each model—the social and the informational—captures an important part of the reality of group interaction.⁸⁹

Future research should focus on understanding what characteristics of deliberative context, design (including recruitment and training), structures and processes encourage informational mechanisms of influence to dominate over social mechanisms of influence. Deliberative practices, such as those used in the Oregon CIR, that allow for opposing viewpoints (pro and con, majority and minority) to be expressed in Citizen Statements along with key facts deemed relevant and important by a super-majority of participants, may also be desirable in encouraging informational mechanisms of influence within deliberative bodies and with respect to influencing voters at large.⁹⁰

Effects on Civic and Political Engagement

With respect to the impact of deliberation on civic and political participation, research suggests that deliberation generally tends to increase the health of democratic society.

A 2003 study compared 1000 randomly selected respondents—some of whom had attended a meeting to discuss issues of public concern in the last year—with an oversample of 500 individuals *all* of whom had attended a formal or informal meeting to discuss a local, national or international issue of public concern in the past year. Researchers identified the oversample by using screening questions within a much larger random sample. Results from the combined survey of 1500 respondents show that only 10% of those who had ever attended a civic forum reported that they “participated often” during the meetings they attended. In contrast, 39% of the 756 “deliberation specialists” who had attended a civic forum in the last year (500 from the oversample and 256 from the original 1000 person sample) reported that they “participated often.”⁹¹

Of these deliberation specialists, 65% stated that at the last meeting they attended, a facilitator helped convince meeting participants to take some action to address the issue.⁹² The same 2003 study showed that about a third of “deliberation specialists” reported that, as a direct result of their participation in a deliberative forum, they engaged in some charitable, civic or political action to address the issue discussed at the forum and indicated that deciding on a concrete action to take was an especially important goal of these forums.⁹³

However, it is unknown what percentage of “deliberation specialists” would have engaged in charitable, civic or political action *in the absence of their deliberative experience*. Further, their reasons for additional civic activity may be the same as those that impelled them to acquire deliberative experience in the first place, rather than being a result of the deliberation. Still, this 2003 study does suggest that **deliberation is not “just talk.” Rather, it seems to give rise to civic or political action.** Further evidence for this conclusion includes the following:

- A 2012 review of the impact of deliberation notes that multiple empirical studies support the claim that that deliberation strengthens the interest in politics of those who deliberate.⁹⁴ The same 2012 review notes that multiple empirical studies suggest that that deliberation promotes participation in community service, community organization and community problem solving.⁹⁵
- A 2009 review of research on deliberative polls demonstrated that participation in this activity resulted in citizens being more willing to make sacrifices for the common good. Further, research from eight Texas-based deliberative polling projects on sustainable energy showed that participants were later more willing to pay more on their monthly utility bills to provide wind power to the whole community and provide funds for local conservation efforts. Similarly, findings from a New Haven deliberative poll showed that participants were more likely to support new development projects benefitting fifteen towns in the metropolitan region and also to share the revenues from these projects with one another.⁹⁶

- The same 2009 review also found that participation in a deliberative poll conducted in Austin, Texas resulted in participants reporting significant increases, ten months later, in how often they talked about politics and in whether they had voted, worked in an election campaign, contacted a government official, and/or contributed money to a political party.
- A study of court and voting records from a geographically and demographically diverse sample of eight U.S. counties and parishes found that among those selected for jury service, experiencing jury deliberation in a criminal trial (compared to being an empanelled juror who did *not* deliberate) significantly increased voter turnout rates among *those who had voted infrequently* in the past.⁹⁷
- A 1999 study analyzing data from a nationally representative survey conducted in 1996 demonstrated that respondents who had engaged in more conversations about the national government, local government, economy, and foreign affairs were more likely to report participating in formal political activities such as voting, working for a political campaign, attending campaign meetings, and contacting elective officials.⁹⁸ This same study showed that conversation about specific political issues was also significantly linked to extra-institutional behaviors such as participating in demonstrations, writing letters to the media, and calling in to talk shows.⁹⁹
- Results from a deliberative poll conducted in 1997 in Britain indicate that 96% of individuals who participated in the deliberative poll reported voting in the general election.¹⁰⁰

In contrast, some studies have produced negative findings. For example:

- Some studies of the impact of informal political talk find that such political discussion may depress some types of civic engagement.¹⁰¹
- Some survey research suggests that exposure to opposing viewpoints in informal discussion may *decrease* political participation rates.¹⁰²

In sum, **there is much evidence to suggest that deliberative experience enhances civic and political engagement.** However, as with research on other presumed impacts of deliberation, **future studies should take care to specify the context for, and characteristics of, specific deliberative forums and practices. In this way, the field can better map the *types of deliberative experience* that produce—or do not produce—the desired effects, and to what degree.**¹⁰³ In particular, further empirical research that compares participants in deliberations with otherwise matched non-participants would be desirable, as would be research that specifically examines the degree to which the apparent effects of deliberation can be accounted for by selection into deliberative experiences.

Fostering Productive Deliberation

What factors contribute to making deliberation maximally productive for healthy democracy? Some, or all, of the positive impacts theorists associate with deliberation may be dependent on the process meeting certain key conditions for “ideal- typical” or “authentic” deliberation. These conditions include inclusiveness, equal participation, mutual respect and reason-giving.¹⁰⁴ This section focuses on the first two.

Inclusiveness

Empirical research suggests that inclusiveness (i.e., full representation of opposing viewpoints allowing for cross-cutting conversations) may produce higher levels of tolerance for opposing political views. In fact, representation of opposing viewpoints is critical because homogeneity of discussion partners has been found to increase political extremism or simply reinforce pre-discussion views. For example:

- A 2006 study including a range of data on network ties and political conversations from a national survey found that people who participated in cross-cutting conversations in their workplace were more tolerant of other political viewpoints.¹⁰⁵
- A 2009 report on multi-wave panel data produced using a quota sample of U.S. citizens found that participants in political discussions with homogeneous conversation partners (i.e., friends and people who agreed with the respondent) were more likely to exhibit extreme attitudes about a related subject seven to eight months later.¹⁰⁶
- A 2010 study randomly assigned participants to an ideologically homogenous liberal group, an ideologically homogenous conservative group, a moderate group or a group combining elements of the other three positions. Participation in the ideologically homogenous conservative group produced greater extremism than participation in the other three.¹⁰⁷
- A 2009 analysis of 1,386 respondents from a nationally representative survey found that when online forums were highly politicized—as was the case with some religious/ethnic forums and political chat rooms—the participants were more homogeneous.¹⁰⁸ Results from a series of hierarchical linear models conducted across these groups and the individuals in them, found that participation in professional leisure group forums produced substantially *higher levels of disagreement* than political/civic online chat rooms and message boards. One interpretation of the data is that individuals in the political/civic groups were more likely to engage in conversations with like-minded people and therefore to have their political perspectives reinforced instead of challenged.
- A 2003 experimental study showed that those assigned to participate in cross-cutting discussions (conversations held among individuals with different political views) were *less* susceptible to elite framing effects than were their peers assigned to a homogenous discussion group or those who did not engage in discussion at all.¹⁰⁹

In a further refinement of these findings, studies have shown that when people *self-select* into various types of deliberative opportunities, it may be relevant whether they perceive themselves to hold majority or minority opinions. A 1999 analysis of a nationally representative sample of 1,029 adults found that, holding constant age, sex, race, education, political interest, and general and issue-specific media consumption, those who perceived their opinion to be consistent with the majority opinion in their locale were more willing to engage in argument with those who held opposing points of view.¹¹⁰

Equal Participation

The findings highlighted above reinforce the assertion by deliberation theorists and practitioners that **random sampling and full representation of community demographics and political diversity are critical.**¹¹¹ Although random, or stratified random sampling can be time-consuming and costly (especially when done in multiple stages to create relatively small deliberative groups intended to represent far larger populations), practitioners and researchers assert that it is the only way to generate a representative “microcosm” of the population and ensure that a wide range of viewpoints are introduced into deliberations.¹¹² Further, **random probability sampling ensures that all persons have an equal probability of being included in the deliberation, thus meeting the “equal opportunity to**

participate” condition for ideal-typical or authentic deliberation.¹¹³ Stratifying the population according to key demographics and/or political views prior to applying random sampling within each stratum can ensure that all constituencies have a probability of inclusion proportionate to their size. Alternatively, stratified sampling can oversample particular constituencies to ensure that they retain some representation when sample size (i.e., the size of the final deliberative group) becomes quite small.

Despite the importance of equality in participation, outside of deliberative processes that are *designed* to include diverse political viewpoints, opportunities for encountering views different from one’s own, and engaging in cross-cutting political discussion are neither equally nor randomly distributed. For example:

- A 2009 analysis of data from a nationally representative survey found that online forums focused on topics *other* than politics were more likely to lead to cross-cutting conversations than were those forums focused on politics.¹¹⁴
- The previously discussed 2006 study that used data on network ties and political conversations found that cross-cutting conversations were more likely to occur in the workplace than they were in neighborhood associations, family groups and voluntary organizations. Workplaces tend to bring together people who have different political views, whereas neighborhood associations, families and voluntary organizations often (but certainly not always) may be more homogeneous.¹¹⁵

As illustrated here, the principles of equal participation and inclusiveness are important for supporting the cross-cutting conversations that promote tolerance and social learning. **However, production of these democratic goods also requires that individuals have, and exercise, a capacity for understanding an issue from other viewpoints.** As scholar Robert E. Goodin argued, successful deliberation depends on the capacity to understand arguments made by all other persons and groups, and also the capacity to adopt others’ perspectives.¹¹⁶

Linking Citizen Deliberation to Policy-Making and Governance

While not all deliberative processes are explicitly linked to community policy-making and governance, many theorists and practitioners alike embrace deliberation in part because they presume it will improve governance.¹¹⁷ As has been shown, *AmericaSpeaks* embraces such an action model and Portsmouth, New Hampshire was able to use study circles to influence local policy making.¹¹⁸ One much studied example of institutionalizing deliberation as part of policy making and governance comes from Brazil.

In 1988 the Brazilian government decentralized policymaking and established mechanisms for citizens to participate in developing, administering and monitoring social policies.¹¹⁹ Participatory budgeting allows citizens to set priorities for government investment in infrastructure and social services. Management councils allow citizens, service providers, and government officials to define public policy and oversee its implementation. Sao Paulo’s local health councils (LHCs) have garnered deliberative democracy scholars’ attention because these councils guarantee to organizations from civil society one-half of the 32 seats on the councils. The councils’ horizontal structures ensure that all members can participate in face-to-face discussions with other councilors, bringing their views and preferences into debates. Councils debate health policies and programs, problems with service delivery, citizen participation, and public health implications of water and security issues. They even have veto powers over the health secretariat.¹²⁰

Clearly not all attempts to incorporate deliberation into existing political processes are successful in shaping public policy. For example, a 1999 analysis of semi-structured interviews with participants and

organizers of the 1997 Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy found that the findings of the panel did *not* affect telecommunication funding or regulation policy.¹²¹

Researchers explained failure in part by the “thinness” of formal ties between forum organizers and policymakers. Political turnover also limited forum organizers' access to politicians. Deliberations also failed to influence the agenda, vocabularies, or framing of telecommunication policy.¹²² Limited media coverage limited the communication of panel findings to nonparticipants. Still the deliberative forum demonstrated to elites and experts that citizens could make reasoned judgments when they were fully informed concerning an issue.

Although the evidence from San Paolo gives reason for optimism, it also sounds a cautionary note. Research on the Sao Paulo local health councils suggests that the formal inclusion of citizen input in policy making did *not* ensure:

- that citizen representatives were either able or willing to attend the meetings of the council (which scheduled on weekdays in the afternoon);
- that the suggestions of citizen representatives were seen as legitimate or relevant to representatives from other sectors; and
- that citizen representative were able to develop and propose their own alternative policy proposals.

Taken together, each of these factors limited the influence of citizen representatives on the San Paolo Local Health Councils, putting them in a weak bargaining position relative to the government.¹²³

In sum, **research on deliberation that is linked to formal policy-making reinforces the message that the nature of deliberative practice, and the conditions under which it occurs, are critical factors.** Rosemary Rowe and Michael Shepherd found it necessary, but not sufficient, that formal linkages between deliberation and policy decision-making be incorporated into deliberative design. They also noted that informal ties among deliberative forum organizers, politicians and policy-makers may be helpful. Finally, they indicate that the ideologies and views of how politics should be done that are held by those who occupy formal political roles also will influence whether and how much citizen deliberation can shape policy making and governance.¹²⁴

Overall, as this brief has shown, there has been a burgeoning of deliberative democratic experimentation. Some best practices have been established, such as the use of random sampling and an emphasis in recruitment strategies and process design on diversity, inclusiveness and engaging with opposing viewpoints. To move the field forward, **systematic research evaluations with frameworks linked to deliberative democratic theories and with adequate quantitative and qualitative measures that assess the characteristics, outputs and impacts of deliberative processes, are essential.**

As future deliberative practices—and attendant evaluation research—close gaps in our current state of knowledge, we can maximize deliberative processes that are of high quality and have demonstrable influence on policy-making and governance. Additional challenges will include cultivating confidence and responsiveness among politicians and government officials, and balancing financial resources and time with normative ideals. In short, while we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good, neither should we make costly or unproductive mistakes that well-designed experimentation and evaluative research could help us to avoid.

¹ J. Taylor Danielson, Department of Sociology and Robin Stryker, National Institute for Civil Discourse and Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, prepared this brief (October 3, 2013).

² Matt Leighninger, "Mapping Deliberative Civic Engagement: Pictures from a (R)Evolution," In *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, edited by Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, G. Michael Weiksner and Matt Leighninger, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 19-32. For a review of the theory and feasibility of deliberative democracy, including discussion of the relationship between deliberation and civility, see Robin Stryker and J. Taylor Danielson, "Democracy and Civil Discourse," *National Institute for Civil Discourse Research Brief No. 10*, University of Arizona, September 7, 2013.

http://nicd.arizona.edu/research_briefs

³ Patricia A Bonner, Robert Carlitz, Rosemary Gunn, Laurie E. Maak, and Charles A. Ratliff, "Bringing the Public and Government Together Through On-Line Dialogues," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 141-153; Lincoln Dahlberg, "The Internet and Democratic Discourse: Exploring the Prospects of Online Deliberative Forums Extending the Public Sphere," *Information, Communication, & Society* 4(4), 2001, pp. 615-653; Todd Davies and Reid Chandler, "Online Deliberation Design: Choices, Criteria, and Evidence," In *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, edited by Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, Michael Weiksner, and Matt Leighninger, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 615-633; Davy Janssen and Raphael Kies, "Online Forums and Deliberative Democracy," *Acta Politica* 40, 2005, pp. 317-335; Michael G. Weiksner, "e-thePeople.org: Large-Scale, Ongoing Deliberation," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 213-227.

⁴ Ned Crosby and Doug Nethercut, "Citizens Juries: Creating a Trustworthy Voice of the People," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 111-119.

⁵ James Fishkin and Cynthia Farrar, "Deliberative Polling*: From Experiment to Community Resource," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 68-79; James S. Fishkin and Robert C. Luskin, "The Quest for Deliberative Democracy," *The Good Society* 9(1), 1999, pp. 4-9; Robert C. Luskin and James S. Fishkin, "Deliberative Polling, Public Opinion, and Democracy," Paper presented at the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, 1998.

⁶ Norman Daniels, "Is the Oregon Rationing Plan Fair?" *JAMA, The Journal of the American Medical Association* 265(1), 1991, pp. 2232-2235; Ryan Smith, "Deliberative Democracy and Oregon Health Care Reform: The Role of Representative Deliberation," presented at the Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting, 2009.

⁷ Carolyn M. Hendriks, "Consensus Conferences and Planning Cells: Lay Citizen Deliberations," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, 2005, pp. 80-110.

⁸ Patrick L. Scully and Martha L. McCoy, "Study Circles: Local Deliberation as the Cornerstone of Deliberative Democracy," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 199-212.

⁹ Gregory Barrett, Miriam Wyman, and P. Coelho Vera Schattan, "Assessing Policy Impacts of Deliberative Civic Engagement," In *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, edited by Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, Michael Weiksner and Matt Leighninger, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 181-203; P. Coelho Vera Schattan, Barbara Pozzoni, and Mariana Cifuentes Montoya, "Participation and Public Policies in Brazil," In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 174-184; Katherine R. Knobloch, John Gastil, Justin Reedy and Katherine Kramer Walsh, "Did They Deliberate? Applying an Evaluative Model of Democratic Deliberation to the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review," *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 41, 2013, pp. 105-125 Carolyn Lukensmeyer, founder of *AmericaSpeaks*, is now Executive Director of the National Institute for Civil Discourse.

¹⁰ Diana C. Mutz, "Is Deliberative Democracy a Falsifiable Theory?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, 2008, pp. 521-538. For a related critique, see Dennis F. Thompson, "Deliberative Democratic Theory and Empirical Political Science," *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, 2008, pp. 497-520.

¹¹ See this brief's section titled "Understanding the Effects of Deliberation," *infra* and citations therein.

¹² Heather Pincock, "Does Deliberation Make Better Citizens?" In *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, edited by Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, G. Michael Weiksner and Matt Leighninger, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 135-162.

¹³ See notes 63-74 *infra*.

¹⁴ See notes 91-104, *infra*.

¹⁵ See e.g., Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Marcus Spörndli and M. R. Steenburgen, *Deliberative Politics in Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004; Knobloch et al 2013 *supra* n. 9; Heather Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12.

¹⁶ James Fishkin, *Deliberative Polling: Executive Summary*, Center for Deliberative Democracy, Stanford University, <http://cdd.stanford.edu/polls/docs/summary/>, last accessed September 15, 2013.

¹⁷ *Ibid*.

¹⁸ Michael X. Delli Carpini, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs, "Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature," *Annual Review of Political Science* 7, 2004, pp. 315-244.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 334.

²⁰ E.g., Shanto Iyengar, Robert C. Luskin, and James S. Fishkin. "Facilitating Informed Public Opinion: Evidence from Face-to-Face and On-Line Deliberative Polls," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.

²¹ Delli Carpini et al, 2004, *supra* n. 18; See also Robin Stryker and Heidi Reynolds-Stenson, "New Media Usage and Civic Engagement, Part 2," *National Institute for Civil Discourse Research Brief No. 3*, University of Arizona, July 29, 2011, http://nicd.arizona.edu/research_briefs; Bonner, Carlitz, Gunn, Maak, and Ratliff 2005, *supra* n. 3; Davies & Chandler 2012, *supra* n. 3; Janssen and Kies 2005, *supra* n. 3.

²² See Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2.

²³ Delli Carpini et al 2004, *supra* n. 18, discussing Iyengar et al 2003, *supra* n. 20; Vincent Price and Joseph N. Cappella, "Online Deliberation and Its Influence: The Electronic Dialogue Project in Campaign 2000," *IT & Society* 1, 2002, pp.303-328; Vincent Price, Lilath Nir and Joseph N. Cappella, "Does Disagreement Contribute to More Deliberative Opinions? *Political Communication* 19, 2002, pp. 95-112; Vincent Price, Danna Goldthwaithe, Joseph Cappella and Anca Romantan, "Online Discussion, Civic Engagement and Social Trust," Working Paper, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2003; Joseph N. Cappella, Vincent Price and Lilath Nir, "Argument Repertoire as a Reliable and Valid Measure of Opinion Quality: Electronic Dialogue in Campaign 2000," *Political Communication* 19, 2002, pp. 73-93.

²⁴ Delli Carpini et al 2004, *supra* n. 18 p. 335. See also Robin Stryker and Heidi Reynolds-Stenson, *National Institute for Civil Discourse Briefs Nos. 1-3*, discussing the characteristics and impact of online discourse, http://nicd.arizona.edu/research_briefs

²⁵ Audrey Wall, "The Citizens Jury Process," July 1, 2011, <http://knowledgecenter.csg.org/kc/content/citizens-jury-process>.

²⁶ <http://jefferson-center.org/what-we-do/citizen-juries/>

²⁷ Tali Mendelberg, "The Deliberative Citizen: Theory and Evidence," *Political Decision Making, Deliberation and Participation* 6, 2002, pp. 151-191. For key findings, see Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2.

²⁸ Christopher Karpowitz and Tali Mendelberg, "Groups and Deliberation," *Swiss Political Science Review* 13(4), 2007, pp. 645-662. See also Tali Mendelberg and John Oleske, "Race and Public Deliberation," *Political Communication* 17, 2000, pp. 169-191.

²⁹ Karpowitz and Mendelberg 2007, *supra* n. 28, p. 652, first italicized emphasis ours, second and third italicized emphases in the original.

³⁰ Knobloch et al, 2013, *supra* n. 9. See also Katherine R. Knobloch, John Gastil, Robert Richards and Tracy Feller, *Evaluation Report on the Oregon Citizens Initiative Reviews for the Oregon CIR Commission*, 2012, <http://www.la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/ReportToCIRCommission2012.pdf>

³¹ Knobloch et al 2013, *supra* n. 9.

³² *Ibid*, pp. 109-110.

³³ *Ibid*.

³⁴ *Ibid*.

³⁵ John Gastil and Katherine Knobloch, *Evaluation Report to the Oregon State Legislature on the Oregon Citizens Initiative Review*, Unpublished Report, University of Washington, Seattle, WA., 2010, [http://www/la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/Oregon Legislative ReportCIR.pdf](http://www/la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/Oregon%20Legislative%20ReportCIR.pdf)

³⁶ Knobloch et al, 2013, *supra* n. 9, pp. 109-110.

³⁷ This subsection is based on information provided on the AmericaSpeaks website, <http://americaspeaks.org/about/>, last accessed October 25, 2013. Quotation marks are used for all quoted material except the five bullet-pointed principles. This bullet-pointed material too, however, is directly quoted from the AmericaSpeaks website.

³⁸ Scully and McCoy 2005, *supra* n. 8

³⁹ *Ibid*.

-
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 201, *supra* n. 8.
- ⁴⁴ Staffan Larsson, “Seven Aspects of Democracy as Related to Study Circles,” *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20 (3), 2001, pp. 199-217.
- ⁴⁵ Steiner et al 2004, *supra* n. 15; Knobloch et al 2013, *supra* n. 9; John Gastil, Katie Knobloch, and Meghan Kelly, “Evaluating Deliberative Public Events and Projects,” In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, G. Michael Weiksner and Matt Leighninger, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 205-230.
- ⁴⁶ Mark Button and David Michael Ryfe, “What Can We Learn from the Practice of Deliberative Democracy?” In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- ⁴⁷ See Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2.
- ⁴⁸ Carole J. Schwinn, John T. Kesler, and David R. Schwinn, “Learning Democracy Centers: Where the Public Works,” In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, Jossey-Bass, 2005, pp. 228-236. See also Lynn M. Sanders, “Poll Envy: An Assessment of Deliberative Polling,” *The Good Society* 9(1), 1999, pp. 1-14.
- ⁴⁹ Mutz 2008, *supra* n. 10; Sanders 1999, *supra* n. 48.
- ⁵⁰ For the concept of an ideal-typical or authentic deliberation, see Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2.
- ⁵¹ Steiner et al 2004, *supra* n. 15; Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy: Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- ⁵² Steiner et al, 2004 *supra* n. 15, pp. 43-73.
- ⁵³ Steiner 2012, *supra* n. 51, pp. 268-71.
- ⁵⁴ This concept is discussed in Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2
- ⁵⁵ Knobloch et al 2013, *supra* n. 9.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*
- ⁶³ Criteria used by these authors in their summary assessment of the 2010 Oregon Citizens’ Initiative Review panels are four aspects of “promot[ing] analytic rigor,” (“learning basic issue information, examining underlying values, considering a range of alternatives and weighing pros/cons of measures”); four aspects of “facilitate[ing] a democratic process,” (“equality of opportunity to participate, comprehension of information, consideration of different views and mutual respect”); and two aspects of “produc[ing] a well-reasoned statement,” (“informed decision making and non-coercive process.”) In their recent reporting on how the 2010 Oregon CIR panels fared when evaluated according to these criteria, the authors assigned grades (from A to B-) to represent their summary assessment. They provided just a few illustrative examples to suggest why evaluators gave the grades that they did (*Ibid.*, p. 8).
- ⁶⁴ Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, G. Michael Weiksner and Matt Leighninger, editors, *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 206; Knobloch et al 2013, *supra* n. 9.
- ⁶⁵ Kevin Esterling, Archon Fung and Taeku Lee, *The Difference that Deliberation Makes: Evaluating the “Out Budget, Our Economy” Public Deliberation*, Preliminary Report, December 1, 2010, p. 43.
- ⁶⁶ Lawrence R. Jacobs, Fay Lomax Cook and Michael X Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- ⁶⁷ James S. Fishkin, *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 140.
- ⁶⁸ Luskin and Fishkin 1998, *supra* n. 5.
- ⁶⁹ David H. Guston, “Evaluating the First U.S. Consensus Conference: The Impact of the Citizens’ Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy,” *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 24(4), 1999, pp. 451-482.

- ⁷⁰ Michael X. Delli Carpini, *The Impact of the "Money + Politics" Citizen Assemblies on Assembly Participants*, Report to Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1997.
- ⁷¹ David Denver, Gordon Hands, and Bill Jones, "Fishkin and the Deliberative Opinion Poll: Lessons from a Study of the *Granada 500* Television Program," *Political Communication* 12, 1995, pp. 147-156.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 150-151
- ⁷³ Delli Carpini, Cook, and Jacobs 2004, *supra* n. 18; Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12.
- ⁷⁴ Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12.
- ⁷⁵ See Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2 and citations therein.
- ⁷⁶ Jonathan Haidt, *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*, New York, NY, Vintage, 2012; Dan Kahan, Donald Braman and James Grimmelmann, "Modeling Cultural Cognition," *Social Justice Research* 18(3), 2005; Dan Kahan, Donald Braman, John Gastil, Paul Slovic and C.K. Mertz, "Culture and Identity-Protective Cognition: Explaining the White Male Effect in Risk Perception," *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 4(3), 2007, pp.: 465-505; Dan Kahan, Donald Braman and Hank Jenkins-Smith, "Cultural Cognition of Scientific Consensus," *Journal of Risk Research* 14(2), 2011, pp.147-174; Dan Kahan, "Cultural Cognition as a Conception of the Cultural Theory of Risk," In *Handbook of Risk Theory: Epistemology, Decision Theory, Ethics, and Social Implications of Risk*, edited by S. Roesner, R. Hillerbrand, P. Sandin and M. Peterson, Springer, 2012.
- ⁷⁷ Pincock 2012 *supra* n. 12; Fishkin and Luskin 1999, *supra* n. 5; John Gastil and James P. Dillard, "Increasing Political Sophistication Through Public Deliberation," *Political Communication* 16, 1999, pp. 3-23.
- ⁷⁸ Pincock 2012 *supra* n. 12.
- ⁷⁹ Gerry Mackie, "Does Deliberation Change Minds?" *Politics, Philosophy, and Economics* 5(3), 2006, pp. 279-303.
- ⁸⁰ This explanation for why attitude change is conditional on issue salience is consistent with the underlying logic of deliberative rationality. The more important a particular issue or decision, the more likely a person is to move from reacting automatically to engaging conscious, reasoned reaction. Once the latter has taken place, the more resistance there may be to further change. See Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking Fast and Slow*, New York, NY, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Reprint edition, 2013.
- ⁸¹ Luskin and Fishkin, 1998, *supra* n. 5.
- ⁸² David Pelletier, Vivica Kraak, Christine McCullum, Ulla Uusitalo, and Robert Rich, "The Shaping of Collective Values through Deliberative Democracy: An Empirical Study from New York's North Country," *Policy Sciences* 32(2), 1999, pp. 103-131.
- ⁸³ Gastil and Dillard 1999, *supra* n. 77.
- ⁸⁴ Denver, Hands, and Jones 1995, *supra* n. 71.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁶ Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12.
- ⁸⁷ Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12.
- ⁸⁸ Mendelberg 2002, *supra* n. 27, p. 158-159. See also Joohan Kim, Robert O. Wyatt, and Elihu Katz, "News, Talk, Opinion, Participation: The Part Played By Conversation in Deliberative Democracy," *Political Communication* 16, 1999, pp. 361-385 (pointing out that the feeling of belonging to a majority encourages political talk).
- ⁸⁹ Mendelberg 2002, *supra* n. 27, pp. 159-160
- ⁹⁰ See also this brief's section titled, "Fostering Productive Deliberation," *infra.*
- ⁹¹ Michael X. Delli Carpini, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs, "Talking Together: Discursive Capital and Civic Deliberation in America," Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, 2003.
- ⁹² *Ibid.*
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁴ Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁶ Fishkin 2009, *supra* n. 67, p. 142.
- ⁹⁷ John Gastil, E. Pierre Deese, Philip J. Weiser and Jordan Meade, "Jury Service and Electoral Participation: A Test of the Participation Hypothesis," *Journal of Politics* 70 (2), 2008, pp.1-16, also showing that a national study of court and voting records demonstrated that deliberating as part of a criminal jury significantly increased voter turnout rates among those who had not voted frequently in the past.
- ⁹⁸ Kim, Wyatt, and Katz 1999, *supra* n. 88.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

-
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 143. Because the underlying propensity to vote may have driven both the participation in deliberative polling and the subsequent voting, we cannot infer that participation caused the voting.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰² Diana C. Mutz, *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative Versus Participatory Democracy*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- ¹⁰³ See Pincock 2012, *supra* n. 12; Knobloch et al 2013, *supra* n. 9.
- ¹⁰⁴ Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2, http://nicd.arizona.edu/research_briefs
- ¹⁰⁵ Diana C. Mutz and Jeffrey J. Mondak, "The Workplace as a Context for Cross-Cutting Political Discourse," *The Journal of Politics* 68(1), 2006, pp.140-155. This study was based on a national survey funded by the Spencer Foundation, the United States component of the 1992 Cross National Election Project, the 2000 National Election Study (NES), the 1985 and 1987 General Social Surveys (GSS) and a 1984 study of South Bend, Indiana.
- ¹⁰⁶ Andrew R. Binder, Kajsa E. Dalrymple, Dominique Brossard, and Dietram A. Scheufele, "The Soul of a Polarized Democracy: Testing Theoretical Linkages between Talk and Attitude Extremity During the 2004 Presidential Election," *Communication Research* 36(3), 2009, pp. 314-240.
- ¹⁰⁷ Benjamin Warner, "Segmenting the Electorate: The Effects of Exposure to Political Extremism Online," *Communication Studies* 61(4), 2010, pp. 430-444. Homogeneity alone was not sufficient to produce the effect; participating in a homogenous *liberal* group did *not* produce more extremism.
- ¹⁰⁸ Magdalena E. Wojcieszak and Diana C. Mutz, "Online Groups and Political Discourse: Do Online Discussion Spaces Facilitate Political Disagreement?" *Journal of Communication* 59, 2009, pp.40-56.
- ¹⁰⁹ James N. Druckman and Kjersten R. Nelson, "Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Influence," *American Journal of Political Science* 47, 2003, pp. 729-745.
- ¹¹⁰ Kim, Wyatt, and Katz 1999, *supra* n. 88. This analysis also showed that the more often a person engaged in issue-specific conversations related to the issue being discussed, the higher the likelihood that person would be willing to engage in an argument about this issue.
- ¹¹¹ Fishkin and Farrar 2005, *supra* n. 5.
- ¹¹² Fishkin and Luskin 1999, *supra* n. 5; James S. Fishkin and Robert C. Luskin, "Making Deliberative Democracy Work: A Reply to Elkin, Lustig, and Sanders," *The Good Society* 9(1), 1999, pp. 22-29; Luskin and Fishkin 1998, *supra* n. 5; Fishkin and Farrar 2005, *supra* n. 5.
- ¹¹³ Fishkin and Farrar, *supra* n. 5; Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2, discussing what constitutes ideal-typical or authentic deliberation.
- ¹¹⁴ Wojcieszak and Mutz 2009, *supra* n. 108.
- ¹¹⁵ Mutz and Mondak 2006, *supra* n. 105.
- ¹¹⁶ Robert E. Goodin, "Democratic Deliberation Within," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 29(1), 2000, pp.81-109. See also Stryker and Danielson 2013 *supra* n. 2 for additional citations to similar arguments. This is especially important in societies that are fractured along ethnic or racial lines, where goals of deliberation can shift quickly from establishing consensus among participants about what is needed to foster the common good to fostering intergroup contact and mitigating existing intercultural conflicts.
- ¹¹⁷ See Stryker and Danielson 2013, *supra* n. 2.
- ¹¹⁸ See Subsection titled "AmericaSpeaks and the 21st Century Town Meeting@," *supra* pp. 4-5.
- ¹¹⁹ Barrett, Wyman, and Coelho 2012 *supra* n. 9; Coelho, Pozzoni, and Montoya 2005, *supra* n. 9.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹²¹ Guston 1999, *supra* n. 69.
- ¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 474.
- ¹²³ Barrett, Wyman, and Coelho 2012 *supra* n. 9; Coelho, Pozzoni, and Montoya 2005, *supra* n. 9.
- ¹²⁴ Rosemary Rowe and Michael Shepherd, "Public Participation in the New NHS: No Closer to Citizen Control?" *Social Policy & Administration* 36(3), 2002, pp. 275-290.