WHERE IS DEMOCRACY HEADED?

RESEARCH AND PRACTICE ON PUBLIC DELIBERATION

A Report of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

ABOUT THIS REPORT 3

PART ONE: THE RESEARCHER AND PRACTITIONER (R&P) NETWORK 5

Origins and Purposes **5**

Activities of the R&P Network **7**

The Deliberative Democracy Handbook **7**

Researcher & Practitioner I (2003) **7**

The Journal of Public Deliberation 10

The "Norms of Deliberation" project 12

"Advocates' Views of Deliberation" project 13

"Map of the Field" project 14

"Measurement Toolbox" project 15

The "Deliberation Advisory Group" (DAG) 16

The North-South Learning Event **17**

Researcher & Practitioner II (2005) **19**

"Evaluation Framework" project 20

"Alternative Spaces" project 21

"E-rulemaking" project 23

"Map of the Field" project 27

Researcher & Practitioner III (2007) **27**

PART TWO: MAJOR FINDINGS 31

Premises **31**

1. A body of knowledge from experience 31
2. A plurality of methods, which need to be compared 31
3. Positive impacts 32

The Current State of the Field **32**

4. The use of deliberative methods, while not enormously common, is clearly growing 32
5. We have learned a great deal about the question of 'representation'—how much is enough, and how to achieve it—but it remains a contentious issue 33

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6. Given a group of citizens with unequal status, information, education, and communication skills, we can achieve reasonable levels of equality 34
7. There is an increasing supply of research 35
8. Useful bridges have been built between academics and practitioners, but further attention is needed 35
9. The cultural and political context is difficult but provides opportunities 37
10. There is increasing interest in alternative forms of communication, such as storytelling, in relation to deliberation 38
11. We have learned a great deal about how to "embed" deliberation in the life of communities 38
12. Certain types of issues seem more ripe for deliberation than others 39

Ideas for Moving Forward **39**

13. Acknowledge that people vary in their predisposition to deliberation 39
14. Provide hard-nosed evaluations that will be proof-points for practitioners (if the result are positive) or impetus to change 39
15. Move away from analyzing differences among methods 40
16. Turn the focus to institutionalization 40
17. Consider the links between deliberation and other democratic practices, such as advocacy and movement-building 40
18. Learn from the Global South 41
19. Consider the problem of scale 41
20. Give deeper attention to online methods 41

APPENDIX I: 2003 R&P PARTICIPANTS 42

APPENDIX II: 2005 R&P PARTICIPANTS 43

APPENDIX III: 2007 R&P PARTICIPANTS 44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During four years of work—meetings, conversations at a distance, collaborative projects, and publications—an international network of researchers and practitioners has strengthened our knowledge of public deliberation. Members of this network have investigated a growing body of practical experience with deliberation that employs diverse methods and tools.

The use of deliberative methods, while still not enormously common, is clearly growing. Often, these methods have been found to have positive effects on the participants and on public policy. One of the most serious challenges remains attracting truly representative samples of people to deliberate. However, when citizens with unequal status, information, education, and communication skills come together, they can achieve reasonable levels of equality.

Today's cultural and political context is difficult for deliberation. We live at a time of polarization and often nasty politics. This difficult context, however, also offers opportunities to expand deliberation as an antidote to aspects of politics that many citizens and leaders strongly dislike.

An increasing supply of research is now derived from practical experiences in public deliberation. Useful bridges have been built between academics and practitioners, although further attention is needed. The research is increasingly open to alternative forms of communication: not just the giving of reasons, but also the sharing of personal experiences, planning for action, and artistic expressions like storytelling, music, and performance, in relation to deliberation.

We have learned a great deal about how to "embed" deliberation in the life of communities. However, certain types of issues seem more ripe for deliberation than others; and people vary in their predisposition to deliberation.

As next steps, the field must provide hard-nosed evaluations that will be proof-points for practitioners (if the results are positive) or provide an impetus to change our methods. There is some support for moving away from analyzing the differences among methods and instead focusing on how to institutionalize deliberation, expand its scale, and connect it to other democratic practices, such as advocacy and movement-building. Two critical sources of innovation are the Global South and the Internet.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

This is a collaborative document about public deliberation. It was created in a way appropriate to its subject matter. It does not have named authors because it emerged from interviews, face-to-face discussions, and a mode of collaboration called a "wiki" (in which many people edit one document online). We do not have a precise count of the contributors, some of whom were anonymous, but the number certainly exceeds 35. The whole process was organized by the Deliberative Democracy Consortium (DDC) and supported by the Charles Kettering Foundation, which is a DDC member.

The purpose of this report is to derive lessons from more than four years of discussions and research projects. In 2003, the DDC convened leading researchers and practitioners at a meeting on public deliberation. The goal of the meeting was to improve collaboration between the two communities and to advance the field of public deliberation by building knowledge. At this meeting and two subsequent face-to-face conferences (2005 and 2007), researchers and practitioners formed a network and undertook several key activities: to identify important unanswered questions about public deliberation, to rank these questions in importance, to develop joint projects that would contribute answers, and to report back on their research findings.

In 2007, the DDC asked Peter Levine (Tufts University) and Lars Hasselbad Torres (America*Speaks*) to draft a report about this work, focusing on how the DDC's Researcher and Practitioner (R&P) Network had carried out its activities and how to strengthen the network in the future.

Levine and Torres conducted 15 interviews with fellow members of the network, read pertinent DDC files, and reviewed the publications that had been sponsored or funded by the DDC. They created a document based largely on verbatim quotes from their colleagues. This document was then thoroughly revised by members of the DDC using a wiki and face-to-face discussions in October 2007. The present publication is the final result of this process.

The first part tells the story of the DDC's R&P Network, describing events and products in basically chronological order. This part will mainly be of interest to readers who want to know what the R&P Network is and what it has accomplished. The second part draws together major findings that are relevant to general debates about deliberation and democracy.

PART ONE

THE RESEARCHER AND PRACTITIONER (R&P) NETWORK

Origins and Purposes

The Deliberative Democracy Consortium (DDC) was founded in 2002 at a conference of scholars and practitioners that America*Speaks* convened at Airlie House in Virginia. The title of the meeting was "Taking Democracy to Scale." The kind of democracy that the participants favored was a deliberative one: a form of politics in which fair and informed discussion among lay citizens plays a vital role.

In public deliberation, groups of citizens discuss important public matters and learn from one another, inform themselves and sometimes alter their own knowledge and opinions, and enhance their social networks. Sometimes they collectively produce decisions, recommendations, plans or blueprints, or questions to direct at leaders.

Although deliberation also occurs in formal settings, such as legislatures and courts, public deliberation means processes or events that are open to ordinary citizens, who are understood as representative members of their community. Public deliberation can be a society-wide process, as (for example) when Americans wrestle with issues of race in their families, communities, schools, workplaces, and media. However, the DDC is committed to concrete processes in which specific groups of citizens discuss particular issues over a finite period, using a nameable format or method. Until recent decades, such processes required face-to-face meetings, but electronic forums can now be used.

Concrete examples of public deliberation are at least as old as the assemblies of ancient Greece and have a deep heritage in the United States. The DDC, however, emerged from concrete experiments that have developed, grown, and strengthened since the 1960s in the USA and abroad, usually organized by nonprofit organizations, but sometimes by governments or firms.

Methods and processes have proliferated; there are clearly more forms of public deliberation today than there were a generation ago. This proliferation reflects a wide range of contexts, purposes, and opportunities. For example, E-thePeople has been able to host large-scale public discussions because the Internet is an open platform with huge reach. Participatory Budgeting

became an important aspect of local government in Brazil when a political party (the Partido dos Trabalhadores or Workers' Party) found itself unable to govern effectively in the face of entrenched corruption and hostile local interests; it experimented with deliberative public meetings as an alternative.

Deliberative processes are important in numerous communities, but they do not yet play a regular, significant role at the national or international level—nor have the various deliberative processes yet coalesced into an effective movement that can increase the scale, institutionalization, and impact of public deliberation. That is the role conceived for the Deliberative Democracy Consortium.

The Airlie House meeting convened practitioners who organize or moderate deliberations along with government officials and foundation leaders who promote public participation. The meeting also drew scholars who study deliberation. The scholars represented a range of academic fields, including political science, communication, law, computer science, and philosophy. In most cases, deliberation was one of *several* democratic practices that interested the scholars professionally.

Conference participants acknowledged that a "nascent movement" to promote more deliberative democratic practices was afoot—across the United States and around the world. To support this movement, participants identified two potential paths. The first was to create a new organization that would champion practices and policies to advance deliberative democracy. The second path was to cultivate a national and international interdisciplinary network that would seek, opportunistically, to define and promote joint messages and projects that would augment the visibility and impact of the field on contemporary democratic affairs.

Among the pressing goals identified at the Airlie House conference were: to strengthen the research on public deliberation and to enhance the connections between researchers and practitioners. Such collaboration would give the scholars more opportunities for concrete, empirical research. As Peter Muhlberger (Texas Tech University) said in his interview for this report, "Practitioners are exceedingly helpful in getting the research done. If I run my own deliberation project, it's anyone's guess whether I've put everything together in a way that a practitioner would say was good." Likewise, John Dedrick (Kettering Foundation) explained that Kettering is a research institution, but it helped to build the National Issues Forums in order to have practical examples to study. In turn, when research results from collaborations with practitioners, it can have stronger and better impact on practice, on public opinion, and on relevant policy and law.

Soon after it was formed at Airlie House, the DDC created a task force on research and practice, co-chaired by Archon Fung (Harvard University) and Peter Levine (Tufts University), as one of its core standing committees. This Knowledge Building Task Force, representing the DDC, began to build a Researcher and Practitioner (R&P) Network, composed of active DDC members and others. The R&P Network then conducted the activities described below.

Activities of the R&P Network

The Deliberative Democracy Handbook

JOHN GASTIL AND PETER LEVINE

At Airlie House in 2002, participants envisioned a book that would describe as many as possible of the well-established processes and methods for public deliberation. Each chapter (to be written, whenever possible, by a team of scholars and practitioners) would describe a different method. The chapters would follow a common outline, to produce an easily navigable reference book and to permit convenient comparisons among methods. There would also be overview chapters on the history and purposes of public deliberation and the future of the field.

Peter Levine and John Gastil (University of Washington) emerged as the editors of this volume. They recruited 42 authors—in addition to themselves—who wrote chapters on 16 different processes or methods of public deliberation, plus the overview chapters. The book was published in 2005 by Jossey-Bass as *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century*.

Although the *Handbook* proceeded on a separate track from the rest of the R&P process, it received a boost from the 2004 R&P conference (described in the next section), which was a critical opportunity for recruiting authors and forming teams to write chapters. All proceeds from the sale of the book benefit the DDC, and the DDC has constructed and hosted a website that accompanies the print edition.

Researcher & Practitioner I (2003)

With generous support from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the DDC convened the first R&P Network for a meeting in Bethesda, Md., on October 22–24, 2003. Participants—listed in Appendix I—included researchers and practitioners; Americans and people from other countries; and people (both scholars and practitioners) who work in both online and face-to-face settings. Participants were identified on the basis of their contribution to the field as scholars and/or practitioners, many of whom had developed their own approaches or "methods" of public deliberation.

It is important to note that the line between scholars and practitioners was not sharp at the meeting or in other R&P events and projects. Practical organizations in the field of public deliberation seek to address unanswered questions and may publish or otherwise disseminate their findings. Meanwhile, many people who study public deliberation from positions in colleges and universities also organize deliberations or work closely with practitioners, in part because they need concrete processes to study. Only a few of the 16 people interviewed for this report placed themselves squarely in one camp or the other. David Kahane (University of Alberta) joked that he is "73 percent practitioner." That was a light way of putting the point that Lyn Carson (University of Sydney) made more seriously: "It's an ongoing and chronic condition,

this dual identity." Several of the interviewees suggested that researchers might see them as practitioners, while practitioners might see them as researchers.

Different norms, agendas, incentives, and challenges prevail in universities, government agencies, foundations, and nonprofit organizations. People who work in these various settings do not automatically understand one another's situations and can sometimes be mistrustful or work at cross purposes. We believe that the 2003 R&P Meeting strengthened connections between academics and practitioners and built the foundation for collaboration because:

- The number of people who represented each category was roughly equal;
- Both researchers and practitioners helped to shape the meeting's agenda and invitation list;
- Many individuals in the room had "dual identities" or had crossed the line from academia to practice, or vice-versa, in their own careers;
- We took the time at the meeting to exchange candid explanations of the pressures that we are under and our agendas;
- The meeting was expertly facilitated to give equal attention to the distinct voice and needs of each community; and
- The whole group had a concrete task to accomplish together.

In contrast to many academic meetings, participants were not asked to write, present, or comment upon prepared papers. Instead, participants engaged one another through a series of professionally designed and facilitated conversations to do the hard, collective work of identifying and honing the questions that concern us all. We learned that effective collaboration among scholars and practitioners requires deliberate and careful efforts to increase mutual understanding and trust.

Jane Mansbridge (Harvard University) said—in paraphrase—that the 2003 gathering "was the best meeting of researchers and practitioners I have ever attended. I have been invited to any number of these before. These efforts run from dismal failure to pretty good, except for the first R&P meeting, which was really good. The reason was that the practitioners were more or less in charge. The practitioners' questions were driving it. The personal accounts of what had led people into the field were very useful. … The usual mixture of deference and anger toward academics was either absent or found constructive channels."

Almost all the other recollections were equally positive. Janette Hartz-Karp (now at Murdoch University; then in Australian state government) did recall that she had been "incredibly intimidated" at first. "It felt like being an outsider meant being a third-class citizen; being a practitioner felt second-class; and that academics had the corner. But by the second meeting I didn't have that same sense." Reflecting on the first two R&P meetings, she said, "They saved my life, really." She no longer felt that she "was working in vacuum."

Participants at a National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation meeting

The main outcome of the meeting was a set of small research grants, funded from a pool of money provided to the DDC by the Hewlett Foundation. The process for awarding these grants was collaborative and deliberative. The first stage was to share and discuss the critical issues arising from participants' work and to identify important unanswered questions facing the field. Small-group discussions allowed participants to present breakthroughs in their work. As Francesca Polletta (Columbia University) and others recalled, the style and format of these discussions were more familiar to practitioners than to academics though skilled facilitation enabled everyone to feel a high level of comfort and to engage the process, content, and one another.

Several themes emerged from the meeting:

1. **Diversity:** Organizers of public deliberation should—and to a large extent often do—attract traditionally disenfranchised groups to participate.
2. **Institutionalization:** Governments can be enablers of democracy at the community level, providing citizens with voice and responsibility. However, there is a need for new governance mechanisms at every level of jurisdiction. At the global level, no structure exists to link those mechanisms.
3. **New technologies:** The Internet offers universal connectivity but raises questions of anonymity and identity.
4. **Public capacity:** Complex issues are amenable to citizen deliberation. There is growing recognition of the public's capacity to engage in deliberation. Governance benefits from the input of diverse people with various forms of knowledge (not just technical expertise).
5. **Critical inquiry:** researchers and practitioners are willing to collaborate. A growing number of academics are working on process. Links between the government and practitioners, however, are weak.

Participants also recognized several useful outcomes to deliberative methods, including: better policies, more engaged citizenry, greater opportunity for learning (about one another, policies) and increased opportunities for personal transformations.

During the second day of the meeting, participants identified the fundamental differences between the world of research and practice and began to move towards bridging the needs between both. Specifically, participants focused on their various understandings of their own fundamental purposes, the audiences to whom each participant felt responsible, and their varying definition of legitimate knowledge (which might range from reflection on experience to data from randomized field experiments).

Ultimately, the participants were able to agree on a list of eight research questions that were both practical (subject to being addressed in a finite amount of time with limited resources) and valuable to academics and practitioners. These priorities were:

- Understanding how the design and structure of deliberative processes affect quality and outcomes.
- Determining under what conditions deliberation impacts public policy.
- Identifying and measuring outcomes of deliberation other than policy outcomes.
- Developing measures of the quality of deliberation.
- Probing the relationship between deliberation and advocacy.
- Strengthening the movement for deliberative democracy by learning from other social movements.
- Learning whether the public has a potential or actual interest in, or appetite for, deliberation.
- Learning how deliberation can be organized on larger scales (multilevel deliberations) and institutionalized.
- Developing a clearer picture of the range and scope of deliberative practices as they occur throughout the world.

Teams worked to hone the critical needs into research projects that were presented during the meeting. The draft proposals were further developed after the meeting using a wiki for Internet-based collaboration among teams, and final submissions were submitted to the DDC Steering Committee's Knowledge-building Task Group in January 2004. The five research projects approved for funding were announced by the DDC Steering Committee the following month.

The Journal of Public Deliberation

TED BECKER (AUBURN UNIVERSITY)

The proposal to create a *Journal of Public Deliberation* (*JPD*) was one of the ideas that was developed and then chosen for funding during the R&P meeting in 2004. It was different from the other proposals because it involved creating a permanent new institution, not conducting a specific research project.

Ted Becker (Auburn University) had previously received commitments from academic researchers and practitioners to serve on *JPD*'s two separate Boards of Editors. The *JPD* had two major goals: (1) to become the peer-reviewed journal of choice for academics from many disciplines who were researching and writing about deliberative democracy and (2) to create a non-academic website where important news about the global deliberative democracy movement could be presented to the general public and practitioners in the field in an engaging way.

During 2004 and through the first part of 2005, Becker used the money to hire a webmaster (a part-time graduate assistant at Auburn University) and to obtain a license to become a "free access" online journal with Berkeley Electronic Press for its academic side. BePress provides sophisticated software that automates many of the routine activities required to publish a scholarly journal, although it certainly leaves much work to be done by the editor. The result is a product that is free of charge and accessible all over the world to anyone with an Internet connection and the ability to read PDF documents. This approach to journal-publishing is consistent with the ideals of "open access."

Becker solicited a number of articles and book reviews for the first installment, Volume I, which was launched in May 2005. Since then, annual editions have been published, usually with about 12 items (articles, notes, etc.) in each. The number of items doubled in 2007, causing Becker to plan to release Volume IV about six months earlier than usual, in December 2007.

The Boards of Editors: From the start, it was easy to get some of the most distinguished academics in the field to agree to serve as peer reviewers and policy makers for *JPD*. The Board started off with about 15 members and now has 22. Their fields include political science, sociology, journalism, law, psychology, and communications.

The Board works as a collaborative group. Becker says that the peer reviews are almost always conducted in a timely and extremely professional manner. The rejection rate is relatively low for high-quality peer-reviewed journals; Becker estimates it in the neighborhood of 60 percent. He argues, however, that the excellence of a peer-reviewed journal should not be measured by how many articles are rejected, but by how well the board of editors works with those who submit articles to turn them into publishable products. "In this we excel. … I receive a great deal of feedback from the submitters about how tough and rigorous and helpful the Board is."

Becker is much less satisfied with the level of support among practitioners. "I do just about everything except for a few people who send me some really good information directly and actually write for *JPD*… and through some information I get from a few of the email newsletters."

Audience: Volume III had about 3,000 downloads. This number rose to 3,600 in Volume II (2006). Becker predicts a total of more than 5,000 downloads for 2007.

The "Norms of Deliberation" project

JANE MANSBRIDGE, JANETTE HARTZ-KARP, MATTHEW AMENGUAL (MIT), AND JOHN GASTIL

The goal of this project was to clarify the norms of good deliberation, based on the insights of practitioners. Thus the project was completely inductive. Instead of deducing good practice from theory, the investigators tried to induce it by identifying and naming the norms implicit in practitioners' judgments.

This project led to an article in the *Journal of Public Deliberation*: "Norms of Deliberation: An Inductive Study," by Jane Mansbridge, Janette Hartz-Karp, Matthew Amengual (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), and John Gastil. Hartz-Karp—who has moved from government to academia—described this project as her "first real venture into the academic world."

As the authors explain, "To identify the norms implied in contemporary deliberative practice, we collected tapes of ten small group deliberations on public issues from six organizations in the United States (anonymous for reasons of privacy). The organizations provided the tapes on the basis that the tapes would be analyzed for an inductive study of deliberative norms. We asked more than one coder to code each tape." The coders were professional facilitators of deliberation. They were asked to identify "good" and "problematic" moments in the tapes, but they were not given definitions of "good" or "problematic." The idea was to derive their implicit or working definitions from their coding decisions.

Among the many important results of this study are the following:

- Facilitators are concerned about the general "atmosphere" of a deliberative session; they prize a positive and serious, but not overly formal, mood. They want discussions to be fun and engaging, but "on task." These criteria differ from the norms assumed in much theoretical literature about deliberation, wherein "good" deliberation is marked by the offering of certain kinds of reasons.
- Facilitators want groups to make progress, to stay on task. Their criterion for success is the ability to solve problems in a group.
- Facilitators are looking for common ground—opportunities to move forward as a group—rather than commitment to a common good.
- Facilitators value "free flow," which means the kind of uninhibited, generally positive and enthusiastic conversation that generates good practical ideas.
- Facilitators do not distinguish emotion from reason, but rather identify some emotions as productive and valuable, and others as harmful to the atmosphere and progress of the discussion. The authors write:

  We may conclude that the facilitators coding these deliberations welcomed the expression of emotion—even "passion"—when it provided insight, engaged the participants, or even

brought "focus" back to the proceedings. They found emotion unproductive when it made participants feel "defensive or angry" and when it kept them from "consider[ing] others' views" or explaining the reasons behind their position. The coders positively valued emotions that elicited new ideas and perspectives for consideration and negatively valued emotions that in various ways seemed to close down communication.

Many of these points are inconsistent with mainstream political theory. That does not prove that the facilitators are right, but there is clearly a need for more dialog between theory and practice.

"Advocates' Views of Deliberation" project

PETER LEVINE AND ROSE MARIE NIERRAS

Deliberation implies some degree of open-endedness about outcomes. Organizers of a deliberation always have purposes and goals of their own, but they try to create processes in which the participants may reach their own unpredictable and uncontrolled conclusions. There are other forms of authentically democratic political practice in which advocates try to *persuade* people to adopt their own points of view.

The similarities and contrasts between deliberation and advocacy are important to explore. First, if proponents of deliberation can persuade advocates that an open-ended approach is valuable, the field of deliberation will gain powerful allies. (Advocates greatly outnumber practitioners of deliberation.) Second, proponents of deliberation may improve their practice by taking seriously the criticisms of deliberation that advocates offer. And third, it may turn out that there are times and situations when advocacy is more valuable that deliberation, or vice-versa.

To explore this relationship, Rose Marie Nierras (then of the LogoLink, University of Sussex) and Peter Levine facilitated discussions involving 60 advocates and deliberation-proponents from 14 countries. They took advantage of four meetings sponsored by the DDC and/or LogoLink in the United States, Britain, and Brazil. Nierras and Levine published their results as "Activists' Views of Deliberation" in the *Journal of Public Deliberation*, Volume III.

This article summarizes numerous criticisms of the deliberative style of politics, offered by advocates. Those criticisms are important for deliberation-practitioners to consider. Levine and Nierras end with three reflections:

- Deliberation should not be understood as a stand-alone process that is always preferable to other modes of political action. Instead, it plays an important role within broader political efforts that may also include advocacy and/or direct public work.
- One of the prominent arguments against deliberation is that deliberative styles of communication are too narrow or are culturally biased. Outsiders to deliberation assume that to deliberate requires rationality or reasonableness, and excludes emotion. However, as revealed in

Nierras' and Levine's interviews and the "Norms of Deliberation" project (see above), actual organizers and facilitators of deliberation do not make these distinctions. They value positive emotions and welcome many styles of communication, including storytelling.

- If we presume that an advocate holds correct political views, then deliberation is unnecessary. But this assumption is a risky one. A very strong argument for deliberation is that it provides opportunities to learn and to test assumptions.

Participants at a National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation meeting

"Map of the Field" project

LYN CARSON, LARS TORRES, JAN ELLIOTT, JOHN GAVENTA

A widely recognized gap in the field of deliberative democracy is the lack of a synthesis of the purposes and design of various methods for deliberation that are employed around the world, and the policy environments in which they occur. The "mapping" of the field was intended to produce a typology of methods, taxonomy for organizing information, and a single document that would bring methods together in an accessible format.

The group sought to answer three broad questions:

1. How is deliberative democracy being manifested globally? In particular, what are the different deliberative, inclusive methods being employed in different countries?
2. What are the gaps in terms of geography (where are we not finding information)? Put differently, where does information and practice seem to be most dense globally?

3. What are the ways people talk about deliberation in various settings, and what can that tell us about our assumptions and (contested) language we use?

To answer these questions, the Mapping group established a methodology that included two principal activities:

1. A brief literature review (existing "inventories" and mapping activities) to gather language and a sense of where we could collect some novel data.
2. A multi-mode electronic survey instrument that could be completed by or on behalf of, people in different countries.

The collaborative aspects of this project meant that researchers-practitioners from four countries (USA, Canada, Australia, and the UK) offered various ideas, many of them drawn from our own experiences conducting more limited mapping exercises, for carrying out research.

As of December, 2007, the group has a world "map." Case studies are being implanted on that electronic map by a research assistant so that, with a keystroke, one will be able to view deliberative democracy throughout the world in its many manifestations.

"Measurement Toolbox" project

PETER MUHLBERGER (NOW AT TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY) AND JED MILLER

The purpose of this project was to identify and compare means for measuring and recording the deliberative quality of public dialogue and the consequences of such deliberation for individuals. This project built on the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation's (NCDD) Evaluation Tool Project, as well as preliminary empirical work to define and operationalize deliberation. Jed Miller made several important introductions to practitioner organizations but then changed jobs and had to drop the project.

The survey questions that Muhlberger developed and carefully assessed are available online at geocities.com/pmuhl78/DDCReport.pdf. This document also provides a theoretical rationale and much practical advice about how to measure the quality of deliberation. Mulhberger writes:

> Measures were developed and tested at multiple deliberation sites, including the Virtual Agora Project, a large National Science Foundation grant project in Pittsburgh, PA; a nationally representative deliberation of young adults held by the Canadian Policy Research Network; deliberation among local communities in Connecticut held by Public Agenda and Connecticut Community Conversations; and a large deliberation among community members in Memphis, Tennessee held by America*Speaks* and Shaping America's Youth. Results from these projects help validate a toolbox of measures that show great promise as indicators of the positive consequences of democratic deliberation.

The results of this project are exciting; many of the measures show positive change from before to after the deliberation, thus demonstrating deliberation's positive impact and providing an assessment tool for practitioners. In his interview, Mulhberger says, "My concern is that people are not using the measures, although I'm not 100 percent sure whether they are or are not." He invites recommendations about how to get the measures used more widely. "What we're looking for," he says, "is feedback."

The first stage of Muhlberger's project—the pilot survey of Virtual Agora participants—also generated an article for the *Journal of Public Deliberation*, Volume II.

The "Deliberation Advisory Group" (DAG)

One of the common concerns discussed at the R&P meetings was the fact that it is very difficult for the layperson to navigate all the resources, organizations, and research available in the field. The leaders who usually initiate deliberation projects—elected officials, school administrators, community organizers, federal agency personnel, civic activists—have difficulty finding the information that is most appropriate to their situation. DDC members began to work on what they called a "Deliberation Advisory Group," some kind of switching station that would direct people to the right resources.

Over time, this idea evolved into the Democracy Helpline, an on-line (and eventually, by-phone) resource that will enable a broader array of people to make use of democratic strategies and principles. The beta version of the Helpline can now be viewed at helpline.deliberative-democracy.net. Users encounter diagnostic questions that help them think through the specifics of their citizen involvement projects. Using the answers to these diagnostic questions, the site then offers a set of publications, organizations, and program examples that matched their needs and interests.

In the future, the Democracy Helpline will also have a more traditional side: a telephone number that connects callers with a knowledgeable resource person, the Helpline Manager. The Helpline Manager will use the same kinds of diagnostic questions to probe the interests and needs of the caller. This initial conversation, coupled with continued use of the online database, might be enough to meet the needs of some callers. For those with more complicated questions, the Helpline Manager will summarize the situation in a report to the DDC's director and an expert panel of practitioners, who will evaluate the request and respond within a set number of days.

Most efforts to mobilize citizens for dialogue and deliberation on public issues have been initiated by local leaders, including public officials, community organizers, educators, planners, human rights commissioners, and nonprofit directors. The Helpline is useful to them, but it may achieve its greatest impact by assisting a second set of truly grassroots leaders, such as youth leaders, neighborhood association presidents, block captains, agency employees, and other active citizens. The Helpline is a valuable resource for established professionals in larger cities, but it represents an unprecedented opportunity for new leaders in urban neighborhoods and small towns.

Some examples of how the Helpline works:

- A neighborhood organizer who wants to know how to mobilize residents around crime and trash pickup concerns is presented with "how-to" ideas and stories of what happened when neighborhoods in Yonkers, New York, and Delray Beach, Florida addressed these issues.
- A high school student interested in working with her peers on intergroup tension finds about the way that youth leaders initiated school-based projects in Silver Spring, Md., and launched a community-wide effort in Kuna, Idaho.
- A city planner who indicates a desire to work with residents in low-income neighborhoods is presented with case studies like the Neighbors Building Neighborhoods process in Rochester, N.Y., and the Strong Neighborhoods Initiative in San Jose, Calif.
- A parent who wants to help other parents work more constructively with the school their children attend learns about examples from school districts in Kansas City, Kan. and Inglewood, Calif.
- A federal official who shows an interest in involving citizens in complex science-based policy questions is given examples like the Danish Technology Boards, the engagement efforts of the Centers for Disease Control on pandemic influenza, and the work of the National Nanotechnology Initiative.

The North-South Learning Event

The majority of DDC members work in the United States, and several others are based in Canada, Australia, or Western Europe. However, the DDC is well aware that many of the leading practical experiments in public participation now occur in the Global South, in such countries as Brazil, India, South Africa, and Uganda. Whereas "public deliberation" is the key phrase for the DDC, often the projects in the Global South are conducted under the headings of "participation," "decentralization," or "social accountability." Yet there are profound similarities—as well as some significant differences—between the experiments underway in the US and those in the South.

To explore these similarities and differences and to promote mutual learning, the DDC formed a partnership with LogoLink, an international network committed to public participation and based, at the time, at the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex, England. At the time, LogoLink had regional affiliates in Brazil, Bolivia, India, the Philippines, East Africa, and South Africa and was making efforts to secure partners in China and other regions.

Over two-and-a-half days in Washington, DC (June 9–11, 2004) Members of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium and members of the LogoLink network met to discuss their work and to explore opportunities for future collaboration. Although this meeting was sponsored by the whole DDC, not its Knowledge Building Task Force, the meeting advanced the DDC's work on research and practice.

The meeting began with a field trip to Neighborhood Services, which is an outgrowth of the Citizen Summit—an annual event organized by America*Speaks* for the Mayor of Washington, DC, in which citizens identify priorities for DC's budget. The mission of Neighborhood Services is to rebuild citizen trust in government by ensuring citizens a voice in setting city and neighborhood priorities, and delivering high quality services in every neighborhood through multi-agency collaboration. Observing a deliberative exercise in a very poor urban neighborhood in the U.S. helped to break down stereotypes about the global North and South and built a sense of community. This sense deepened as participants shared aspects of their personal missions, commitments, and biographies, which turned out to have many similarities.

Archon Fung (Harvard and the DDC) and John Gaventa (University of Sussex and LogoLink) provided conceptual and historical backgrounds, respectively, for deliberative democracy and citizen participation.

Gaventa explained that United Nations documents have long described "participation" as citizen control over decisions that affect citizens. This perspective was taken up by donor agencies in the 1980s who sought the input of beneficiaries or stakeholders. In the early 1990s, participation began to mean involvement by citizens as a right. The reasons were the global democratization movement and efforts by the UN and World Bank to mainstream participation.

Fung described "deliberation" as a process to decide what we want and how to get it. The central value is that people ought to give reasons for what they want. Contrary to some criticisms, this norm still leaves room for self-interest. This process is contrasted to how political decisions are made today. Fung gave three reasons for deliberation:

- Like participation, deliberation is a (potential) way to *constrain political power* for the sake of justice. The process disciplines power by making the powerful offer reasons for what they want to do.
- Deliberation generates more information for elected officials, if the distinction between elites and the public is maintained.
- Deliberation makes the people who deliberate wiser or, better informed. Participants learn and change their opinions by hearing perspectives that they did not already know about.

Fung also offered three reasons why people might be against deliberation:

- Who speaks, who shows up, what counts and what is discarded are heavily determined by inequalities in power and resources people bring to the table.
- What gets discussed is also determined by power. As an example, the government controls the agenda in many cases.
- The question of hegemony: deliberation could reinforce an already narrow set of ideas.

The R&P Project on "Advocacy and Deliberation" (described above) took a step forward as Nierras and Levine conducted group discussions of the connections between advocacy and deliberation and privately interviewed some of the participants. In the group discussions, participants observed that social movements do not always involve deliberative methods. The link between social causes and deliberation was also found to be weak at times because many citizens in representative democracies assume that only elected officials and senior bureaucrats are capable of having influence, and therefore less likely to deliberate. Many agreed that social causes usually include democratic principles. A discussion ensued concerning the difference between representative democracy and deliberative democracy.

The Mapping project also took a step forward as Gaventa and Torres used the meeting as an opportunity to get feedback on their survey and methods.

After deliberations in small groups and the plenary, participants selected a set of high priority areas for further research and discussion:

- Problems of inclusion and inequality
- The lack of middle-level institutions, between small grassroots gatherings and massive bureaucracies
- The preconditions for deliberation
- The cost of organizing deliberations

Participants also identified some practical next steps, including further meetings (some of which occurred on schedule in other countries). Finally, there was a moderated discussion of online deliberation in the Global North and Global South.

Researcher & Practitioner II (2005)

The second R&P Meeting was held June 16–18, 2005 in Washington, DC. The goals were to share and explore the outcomes of research projects funded by DDC in 2003; to continue to develop a research agenda for the field that would reflect and integrate the needs of practitioners and researchers; to make new collaborative research grants; to explore possibilities for one large research project for which DDC could seek funding; to continue to develop mutual understanding between researchers and practitioners. Please see Appendix II for the list of participants.

The gathering provided opportunities for researchers and practitioners to strengthen the connections established at the first meeting two years earlier and to discuss possibilities for collaborative research. Recollections captured by our interviews were mostly positive. Lyn Carson said of the 2005 meeting, "I absolutely loved it. It's been significant to me. We're far away [in Australia] and there's not that much going on (apart from John Dryzek). Not many colleagues that I can 'play with.' For me, it was as if I'd been asked to a party that I'd been wanting to be invited to for a long time." David Kahane considered it

"mind-blowingly well constructed as a meeting." Archon Fung thought that the 2005 meeting was weaker than the 2003 meeting. "The questions seemed less focused and less promising for scholarship."

Presentations were made on the five research projects funded in 2003. (Ted Becker, the project leader for *JPD*, was unable to attend, so participants were referred to the first volume of the *Journal*).

Seventeen new project ideas were developed. They fell under several general headings:

- Institutionalization/embedding (What does it mean for DD to be institutionalized or embedded in public life?)
- Tools (Projects that explore deliberative tools, combinations and their appropriateness for different purposes and different contexts.)
- Impacts/outcomes (Understanding impacts and outcomes of DD processes and their relevance in public life)
- Large-scale deliberations on particular topics

As a result of a deliberative process and voting, the following specific projects were chosen to be funded:

"Evaluation Framework" project

MIRIAM WYMAN (PRACTICUM LIMITED, TORONTO) AND VERA SCHATTAN P. COELHO (BRAZILIAN CENTER OF ANALYSIS AND PLANNING)

The proposal was "to review (selected) relevant literature to get a sense of the kind of evaluation that is being carried out or considered with respect to participatory processes; to examine particular processes (in Vera's case, the work of local health councils; in Miriam's case, discussions related to pandemic influenza); to examine the nature of citizen's contributions to policy deliberations (quantity and quality, whether people are proposing genuinely new ideas); and to begin to articulate a number of "indicators" that might be useful as we continue to study participatory processes."

Wyman and Coelho report: In the literature about social participation there are countless testimonials to the many principles, procedures and results associated with participatory processes. In our work on two participatory processes—with municipal health councils in Brazil and with a series of deliberative dialogues related to pandemic flu planning in Canada—we have tried to elaborate a small set of indicators aimed at quantifying some procedural dimensions of participation—in this case state-sponsored forms, in that they relate to the decisions or policy making activities of public bodies. Three different dimensions were identified: a) inclusiveness, which is related to the greater or lesser heterogeneity of participants and their networks; b) deliberativeness, which is related to how deliberation, negotiation and confrontation are combined; and c) connectivity, which relates to the degree of coordination with other political bodies. These seem to be central elements of participatory processes which can be examined in

different socio-economic and political contexts. We put forward a model to demonstrate ways in which these indicators can be empirically and systematically defined, elaborated and measured.

The report is organized in four sections: a brief review of the literature; procedural dimensions used in the proposed model; a description of the two case studies; and, finally, some thoughts on the utility of these indicators with a view to assessing how they relate to one another as well as to different outcomes. We are finding that it is, indeed, useful to identify and systematize this kind of information. And, this work has been helpful in identifying the many other things which need to be considered in identifying impacts and outcomes of deliberative processes.

Participants at a National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation meeting

"Alternative Spaces" project

VERA SCHATTAN COELHO, DAVID KAHANE, BETTINA VON LIERES (DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTER ON CITIZENSHIP, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO) ROSE MARIE NIERRAS (LOGOLINK), AND NICOLE SPENCER (INTER-AMERICAN DIALOGUE)

Kahane and von Lieres report that this project was structured around four cases:

- The case from Indonesia examines a district-wide deliberative forum that brought together more than 700 participants from marginalized groups to identify common development concerns in the Jepara district. The forum was organized by a coalition of nine NGOs working with marginalized communities in the area. Rose Marie Nierras draws attention to the complexities of using deliberation as a tool for social change in political contexts with weak civil societies, deeply entrenched local patronage politics, and low levels of citizen engagement.
- The South African case looks at emerging forms of 'publicness' and engagement amongst marginalized individuals living with HIV/AIDS. It examines the role of development orga-

nizations such as Medecins sans Frontières (MSF) in facilitating new spaces for dialogue around HIV/AIDS treatment in highly localized and private spaces. Bettina von Lieres argues that these new spaces represent important moments in the emergence of new forms of public identity amongst highly stigmatized patients with HIV/AIDS.

- The Canadian case considers the deliberative styles and strategies of developmentally disabled adults in Edmonton, Alberta, as they have defined the terms of their self-organization (within the groups 'Voices for the Future' and 'The Self-Advocacy Federation of Alberta'), and as they have negotiated structures by which provincial bureaucracies consult them on issues of policy and service delivery. David Kahane and Nicola Fairbrother suggest that this case sheds new light on the interfusion of dialogue and deliberation; on the evanescence of the gains of enclave deliberation when this particular marginalized group enters heterogeneous deliberation; on questions of deliberative competence and authority; and on the potential pleasures of public dialogue.
- The Brazilian case considers the mobilization of black (quilombo) communities in the Vale do Ribeira region, around their disadvantage as an economically disenfranchised and geographically minority group, and also in opposition to dam-building projects in their area. Vera Schattan Coelho explores tensions between the strengthening of collective identities (through identity politics and demands for cultural rights), and the propensity of representatives of quilombos to engage deliberatively when it comes to regional planning around dams and economic development. She suggests that notwithstanding the complex pros and cons of dam development, representatives of black communities are not inclined to negotiate or to influence policies through a give and take, and that this cannot be explained simply by the limitation of the forum (the Committee of River Basin of the Ribeira River). So we learn something about tensions between identity and deliberation—between the cultural empowerment of the quilombolas, and their propensity to participate in deliberative democratic (as distinct from agonistic) decision making outside of their own communities.

In what follows they identify and discuss eight key issues and themes emerging from their research:

1. We argue that rather than seeking mechanisms to more effectively include the marginalized in existing deliberative exercises ("seeing marginalization through the lens of deliberative democracy"), researchers and practitioners need to take the more controversial step of evaluating deliberative democracy as a tool for undermining unjust hierarchies ("seeing deliberative democracy through the lens of marginalization").
2. We point to gaps that often exist, especially in the global south, between modes of citizen engagement (such as participation in democratic deliberation) and clientilistic political strategies and structures, such that deliberative democrats need to be attentive to the risk of bringing marginalized groups into dialogue with the wrong partners.

3. We suggest that while enclave deliberation often is key to the mobilization of marginalized groups, it can have complex and ambivalent effects: identity politics may have contra-deliberative effects, for example, or gains in individual and collective confidence achieved within enclaves can be evanescent when members of marginalized groups enter heterogeneous deliberations.
4. We note that allies and brokers play key roles in all four of our cases, which introduces new complexities to theories and practices of including the marginalized in democratic deliberation, and to accounts of deliberative representation.
5. We consider how the deliberative cultures and practices we observed in the marginalized groups we study may demand difficult changes to mainstream deliberative practices and norms—for example, by breaking down distinctions between dialogue and deliberation in some contexts, or by downgrading the goals of deliberative efficiency and speed in others.
6. We observe how, in the cases we studied, deliberation cross-fertilizes with or even merges with other forms of political struggle by the marginalized; this raises questions about whether deliberative democrats should overtly embrace hybrid forms of collective action (of which deliberation is only one part), and about how deliberative democrats might anticipate and facilitate movements in and out of deliberative spaces by marginalized groups.
7. We urge deliberative democrats to accept that marginalized groups may have good reasons to refuse deliberation, in some contexts, in favor of other modes of struggle. We conclude this synthesis of our cases by framing a broad challenge to deliberative democratic theorists and practitioners: to more carefully articulate the accounts of social change that underlie our commitments to deliberative democracy, so that we can more adequately justify our advocacy for deliberation as a vehicle of political equality and social justice.

"E-rulemaking" project

STEVE BALLA (GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY), GAIL BINGHAM (RESOLVE), BOB CARLITZ, ROSEMARY GUNN (INFORMATION RENAISSANCE), PETER MUHLBERGER, AND ALAN TOMKINS

For every law passed by the United States Congress, executive branch agencies write some 25 regulations. There must be an opportunity for public comment before an agency enacts a regulation. However, the existing process creates the following problems:

1. It favors organized lobbying groups that can hire experts. Those experts become part of the same "community of practice" or the same "stakeholder group" as the regulators. They have similar training and networks; they know the ropes; and over the course of their careers, they work for the same employers. As a result, they get very cozy. Some "public interest" groups, such as the major environmental organizations, have fought their way into the circle.

But other interests, such as the homeless and even average taxpayers, are not effectively organized to lobby scores of separate rulemaking bodies.

2. A system of administrative rulemaking encourages Congress to pass vague laws that fail to resolve tensions and tradeoffs. Congress delegates those hard issues to rulemakers, who have relatively low profiles and are insulated from public accountability. For instance, various statutes since the Federal Communications Act of 1934 have directed the Federal Communications Commission to issue broadcast licenses in such a way as to serve the "public interest, convenience, and necessity." Likewise, Congress has delegated the right to "determine just and reasonable rates" to the Federal Power Commission; and the authority to "prevent an unfair or inequitable distribution of voting power among security holders" to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Congress has not even attempted to define "just rates," the "public interest," or "unfair voting power." When regulators make costly or unpleasant decisions in the course of implementing vague statutes, legislators win political points by blaming them.
3. Rulemakers obtain no legitimacy from being elected, but they do have expertise in science, law, or economics. Thus they have a natural tendency to make moral decisions appear to be technical ones. If appointed administrators ever presumed to set "reasonable rates" for power, or picked broadcast companies because of the quality of their programming, their decisions would appear overly "political." Therefore, rulemakers typically address such questions as if they were technical matters of efficiency, even though these issues are fundamentally moral.
4. As a result of a system in which multiple agencies make separate decisions on supposedly technical grounds, federal policy is unnecessarily complex. The great and increasing complexity of policy is a barrier to democratic participation.

Whereas Congress can only consider a major area of policy once every few years, administrative agencies can reconsider them constantly. The result is a mass of always shifting rules. But, as Madison wrote (Federalist 62), "mutable policy ... poisons the blessings of liberty itself." Government by the people can hardly be said to exist, he said, "if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow."

1. Administrative rulemaking leads to piecemeal, incoherent policy, as multiple agencies make decisions basically in isolation.
2. Administrative rulemaking undermines the Constitutional order itself. Locke proposed that "the legislative cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands. For it being but a delegated power from the people, they, who have it, cannot pass it over to others." (Second Treatise of Civil Government, chapter 11, sec. 141.) This precept was made explicit in the

Constitution, which assigns "all legislative powers" to Congress. In reality, however, most binding rules are made by administrative agencies.

A partial remedy would be to turn the process by which people file "comments" on proposed regulations into something approaching public deliberation. All pending regulations could be easily searchable on a single web page; people could comment and read one another's comments; and a public dialog would occur. Accumulated public knowledge could complement and counter expertise.

All proposed regulations are now being presented on one site—regulations.gov—built by the Office of Management and the Budget. However, in a formal comment, Information Renaissance criticized the emerging website on numerous crucial grounds. There was no opportunity to create conversational "threads"—each comment just stood alone. There were no links to important background materials. The page didn't use open standards so that others could build software compatible with it. The search engines weren't effective. The process for designing the site was itself closed—it wasn't even easy to find out what contractor was responsible for it. And there was no easy means to get automatic updates of new regulations.

The great advantage of an online forum is the potential for citizens to benefit from other citizens' work. For example, someone should be able to summarize a complicated regulation in a way that brings out its bad consequences, and then others should be able to refine, criticize, endorse, or disseminate that summary. The current structure does not support such work at all.

The goals of the DDC-funded project were to:

- Explore the possibilities for enhanced public participation and deliberative discourse in rulemaking and other public comment processes.
- Establish a broad online collaborative community on rulemaking, including researchers and practitioners both inside and outside government.
- Develop proposals to one or more programs of the National Science Foundation (or other suitable funding agencies).
- Take advantage of opportunities to partner in at least one pilot project, if possible, that supports a researcher/practitioner partnership to apply and evaluate what has been learned to date about electronic rulemaking.
- Maintain the collaborative community to get feedback on the process, increase commitment to use of results, gain help in dissemination and seed usage across agencies.

The white paper was intended to cover:

- the extent of deliberation in rulemaking (including stages before notice and comment) as it is currently practiced
- the potential for increasing deliberation in rulemaking

- approaches that show potential for increasing deliberation
- the relevance of these findings for other public comment processes
- possibilities for researcher-practitioner collaboration, including collaboration with agencies
- identification of questions for research

Both researchers and practitioners were to be involved in the identification of important variables and research questions that would be summed up in the white paper as a framework for a research agenda; the material would be put to use as input to grant proposal(s), to be written by participating researchers and practitioners.

Gail Bingham helped the group substantially and provided a site for meetings in Washington, but due to work pressures did not take an active part during the last several months. Among researchers, very unfortunately Peter Muhlberger had to resign from the project early on due to a job change.

Participants at a National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation meeting

The team reports: We were overly ambitious, not anticipating adequately the difficulties of working as a team. The variety of viewpoints that participants brought to the project created an environment in which discussions were lively and wide-ranging. But it has been difficult to align the group's disparate research interests into one coherent program. And, as the white paper will make clear, the manner in which the government has implemented its system for online rulemaking has fallen so far short of expectations for usability and flexibility that even after several years of operation the system is woefully inadequate for facilitating any significant expansion of citizen participation in the rulemaking process. This raises the bar considerably for any research effort in this direction, since it would be necessary for the researchers to supply the many elements missing from the government system—even after an expenditure of some $50 million. While it would not cost even a fraction of this amount to remedy the failings of the government system, it would still be necessary to include a major development effort to create an adequate platform for citizen deliberation in rulemaking, and we don't see either the government or private foundations stepping up to address this need. A collaboration with a corporate sponsor might work, but until that happens we expect research to continue in small-scale efforts such as those undertaken by some of the individuals in this project.

"Map of the Field" project

LYN CARSON, JAN ELLIOTT, JOHN GAVENTA, LARS HASSELBLAD TORRES

This was a renewal of a 2003 grant; see above for the report.

Researcher & Practitioner III (2007)

The third Researcher & Practitioner conference was held in Bethesda, Md., on November 29–30, 2007. It began with sessions that followed the pattern established at the first two R&P gatherings, albeit compressed into a shorter period. All participants were researchers and practitioners with interest in public deliberation; many had attended the previous meetings of the network. They discussed what we have learned so far and set priorities for future grants and other collective activities. The present document was discussed and edited.

This compressed meeting was followed by a gathering that combined members of the R&P network with representatives of important national and international nonprofit groups that work on various aspects of democracy (not limited to deliberation). Essentially, the R&P Network sought to consolidate its findings and then interact with a broader community—for mutual benefit. Please see Appendix III for the full list of participants.

At the narrower meeting of researchers and practitioners, some of the key areas of discussion included:

- how public policy can support or hinder deliberation
- how deliberation can deal with issues of diversity (e.g., of culture and class) and of marginalization
- how the field of deliberation can gain greater capacity and become embedded in communities and institutions
- the impacts and benefits of deliberation, and how they can be measured
- how to expand the network itself

Many of the significant results are summarized in Part II of this report.

As in previous meetings, the group also began to develop small proposals for funding by the DDC, starting by selecting broad areas of highest interest. The DDC ultimately chose to fund the following projects:

"Updating the Legal Framework for Democratic Governance: Addressing Current Challenges and Exploring New Possibilities" – *Lisa Blomgren Bingham, Joe Goldman, Peter Levine, and Bob Carlitz*

"A Local Official's Primer on Public Deliberation" – *Terry Amsler, Martha McCoy, and Sandy Heierbacher*

"Deliberative Democracy and Climate Change" – *David Kahane, Ted Becker, Michael Briand, Maya Enista, Janette Hartz-Karp, Mary Pat MacKinnon, Peter Muhlberger, Rose Marie Nierras, Leanne Nurse, Tomas Ohlin, Joseph Peters, Florence Raes, Gloria Rubio-Cortés, Stuart White, and Miriam Wyman.*

"Public Dialogue Compendium" – *Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, and Michael Weiksner*

The meeting of the R&P Network plus the broader "democracy" community yielded the following questions (among others):

- Most of the local, state, and federal laws on citizen participation are now 30 years old. How can we update the legal framework for democratic governance so that it supports, rather than hinders, the best practices being used today?
- Does the new wave of video-related technologies hold promise for melding online and face-to-face forms of participation? What tools are out there, and what new opportunities exist?
- Attempts to involve citizens more intensively and democratically seem to have all kinds of consequences for public institutions (city departments, state and federal agencies, and so on). In some cases, middle managers and rank-and-file public employees block these efforts, and in some situations they embrace them. What accounts for the differences in attitude from one situation to the next? What kinds of cultural and structural changes are taking place within institutions as a result of (or in order to support) these kinds of projects?
- Most membership associations have lists of core principles and codes of conduct. How might these statements be rewritten or redefined to reflect the changes in how association members are now relating to the public?
- What do K-12 teachers need in order to teach democratic skills more effectively?
- What is the role of media in connecting "mini-publics" (people who get involved in a particular project or decision) with the larger public? Is some kind of media role essential to the success of these efforts?
- How can one calculate the cost-effectiveness of deliberative work? (Can we develop some kind of formula to help leaders decide, on a case-by-case basis, when the benefits outweigh the costs?)
- The academics who are arguing about the effects of deliberation (does it produce polarization? does it make people less politically active?) don't seem to agree on the definition of the term. Can we come to a basic understanding of what this work entails, and therefore make the debate more helpful to practitioners?
- Thirty years ago, a "first wave" of neighborhood council systems emerged in places like Dayton, Portland, and Saint Paul. How are those structures being updated for the 21st Century? What have the newer experiments in neighborhood governance learned from the successes and shortcomings of earlier efforts?

The discussion (in breakout groups and plenary sessions) was very rich and complex. Here we focus on three of the numerous discussions to give a flavor of the event.

Polarization: Many participants had confronted polarized publics and saw polarization as a major issue. They found that organizing a deliberation when people are already polarized is particularly difficult. Deliberation may not reduce polarization, but it may change the nature of the discourse and make it more civil and more respectful

Some participants felt that it was important to bring protagonists and antagonists together to try and agree on a frame for the deliberation. If they can do this, they may become the steering team for the process. If they can't, then it may be that it's better not to do a deliberative process at all.

Measurement and evaluation: Participants agreed that it is important to prove that deliberation works in order for such processes to gain wider acceptance and use. Evaluation and measurement can help in this effort by providing legitimacy. We need to show the "profitability" of deliberative democracy processes. Profitability means savings in cost and time, as well as non-monetary benefits.

There is a need to focus on the argument that deliberation produces "better" decisions, and that these decisions are sustainable over the long term. Sustainability is a significant issue when dealing with the promulgation of agency rules and regulations. Although deliberative democracy presumes the option of ongoing dialogue and the ability to alter decisions after a period of time, this is generally not an option with agency rules. An administrative rule must be "right the first time." If a rule is legally challenged, then power leaves the agency and goes to the courts.

The group identified two broad categories of outcomes: intrinsic benefits and instrumental benefits. Intrinsic benefits refer to the potential of deliberative democracy to improve the civic skills of participants. Instrumental benefits refer to the potential of deliberative democracy to improve the quality of decisions and governance in general. The group recognized that these potential benefits must be evaluated within the context and design of the specific deliberative process being used.

The "dark side" of deliberative democracy: Participants identified serious disadvantages or risks to deliberation. It can be harmful to marginalized groups. It can lack a strategy for social change. It can simply fail; and we may overlook or downplay failure as we try to "drum up business" for deliberative techniques.

PART TWO: MAJOR FINDINGS

PREMISES

Several premises seemed evident to members of the R&P Network in 2002 and were supported by early discussions, the Handbook, and articles in the *JPD*:

1. A body of knowledge from experience

There have been relatively few highly rigorous and independent evaluations of public deliberation. (Peter Muhlberger's DDC-funded "toolkit" project represents an important contribution, with pre-and post-test surveys, although no control groups.) Despite the relative lack of evaluation data, there is a body of knowledge and experience that is worth capturing, at least as a basis for future research. The existing knowledge contains relevant lessons for social and political theorists and for students of democratic government and political reform. Knowledge derived from actual public deliberations is in some respects more valuable than knowledge derived from: (a) formal, laboratory-type experiments with deliberation, (b) analysis of deliberation in official bodies, such as legislatures and juries; and (c) research on large-scale processes, such as social movements and mass communications.

2. A plurality of methods, which need to be compared

There are many credible methods for convening and conducting public deliberations. Methods vary along several dimensions, e.g., how participants are recruited, what materials are provided, how the discussions are moderated and structured, how various small groups of citizens relate to one another, what technologies are used, and what products (if any) the participants generate. The field of public deliberation thus provides a menu or a toolkit, not a single "gold standard." This may mean that the choice of methods is dependent on context, or it may mean, as Michael Briand noted, that there is actually "an underlying disagreement about the *purpose* (the point or need) of public deliberation, and hence an underlying disagreement about its *meaning*." Miriam Wyman argued that certain essential criteria underpin all deliberations worthy of that name.

These criteria may include access to good information, freedom of expression within the discussion, and a connection between the deliberation and some kind of policy.

There are emerging standards and principles for civic engagement and deliberative democracy (such as the Brisbane Declaration and the Equator Principles). Standards cannot select one specific model over all the others; there is no one single "best practice" for public deliberation. Nevertheless, it is worth identifying common best practices and comparing and categorizing the extant methods so that practitioners (i.e., citizens, policymakers, and funders) can make reasonable decisions about which practices to use in any given context. The main purpose of the comparisons is to support practical advice.

3. Positive impacts

Among the general findings from public deliberation are that participants tend to find their work satisfying and rewarding, and experts tend to be impressed—and often surprised—by the quality of public discussions and products. Public deliberation is more widespread than is sometimes assumed. Moderating discussions is difficult and requires education and experience; however, skillful moderating can mitigate problems, such as inequality among deliberators, that are much discussed in the scholarly literature on deliberation. Becker said, "beyond any doubt whatsoever ... citizens are interested, samples can be gathered, they'll talk, have agency, and come up with sound ideas" that are outside the box and are public-spirited.

There is a long list of cases in which deliberation had produced tangible action by institutions and/or communities. The conditions that promote action include: a credible process, the presence of decision-makers during deliberation, and the achievement of consensus.

We need to know more about the effects of deliberation on the "triple bottom line" (economic, social, and environmental). A cost/benefit estimate would include data on the financial costs of organizing deliberations, and also a measure of the cost of NOT using deliberation. We also need to know the effects on culture and governance.

The Current State of the Field

Individuals interviewed for this report in 2007 provided rich, detailed, and very diverse perspectives. It is impossible to report all their ideas without generating an enormous list. These, however, are some of the key clusters of ideas that emerged from the interviews.

4. The use of deliberative methods, while not enormously common, is clearly growing

One impetus is the support of some elected and appointed government officials (although pressure from citizens also surely helps). Lyn Carson cited an inventory of 78 cases in Australia, many of which could be traced to Janette Hartz-Karp's leadership in the state government of Western Australia. Roger Bernier

of the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has been able to develop a major, government-sponsored deliberation on how to respond to pandemic flu. Archon Fung notes the "uptake of political elites," such as Prime Minister Gordon Brown in the United Kingdom and the health care deliberations in California. Heidi Gantwerk, whose firm is often retained by governments to conduct deliberative processes, said that she was excited about the deep engagement of some officials in planning deliberations. "Sometimes leaders will sit with us for four to six hours helping to shape the questions, which changes the way they receive the results. Some leaders are realizing that they cannot make progress without really engaging the public." Gantwerk emphasized that when elected officials are engaged in planning a deliberation, the odds increase that the results will have a tangible impact on policy.

However, several interviewees were worried that the popularity of deliberative methods might tempt governments or other organizations to implement inauthentic, biased, or manipulated processes that would undermine the movement. Mansbridge said she knew of no bad examples so far, but Kahane pointed to consultative processes in Alberta that were "shallow appropriations of deliberative principles." (Some of this was cynical, he thought, and some was well-intentioned.) Leighninger and Becker also criticized uses of deliberation for mere "consultation," especially in the United Kingdom and Canada.

Four elements seem to increase an environment conducive to sustained deliberation: (1) supportive leaders who have political power; (2) experts and advocates for deliberative processes; (3) articulated, organized public demand; and (4) legal support or mandates.

5. We have learned a great deal about the question of 'representation'—how much is enough, and how to achieve it—but it remains a contentious issue

Lyn Carson said she generally trusted deliberation, but not the methods for selecting participants, which can be biased or manipulated. Several interviewees noted that the use of random selection is spreading, for instance in Australia. Carson confessed to being "slightly obsessed with random selection, a key to the robustness of the process. It moves [deliberation] along the continuum, succeeds where many other approaches do not succeed." Miriam Wyman, however, wrote that she was "not a fan of random selection, especially since I've been involved in a couple of large processes that demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt how not random the random selection actually was." She also felt that the barrier to making deliberations representative was not a lack of understanding or knowledge, but inadequate commitment.

John Dedrick said that methods for recruiting genuinely diverse and representative groups are improving; he cited the recent deliberations on healthcare in California convened by America*Speaks* and recent Bay Area dialogs on housing. Carolyn Lukensmeyer welcomed experiments in drawing random samples of hard-to-reach populations—for example, a recent experiment in reaching young people through cell phones. She said that America*Speaks* will use random selection, if necessary, to demonstrate the legitimacy of a process to an external audience. However, random selection has the disadvantage that it must

Peter Mulhberger at a deliberative session

operate "under the radar screen" and therefore blunt one's ability to create excitement before an event. Careful comparisons of random selection to alternatives would be useful. There is a also room for combinations of randomness and recruitment; for example, in some contexts, Janette Hartz-Karp draws one third of the deliberators through random selection, one third through invitations to stakeholders, and one third by advertisements.

It is not always appropriate or desirable to use random recruitment. Much depends on the context, scale and purpose of the deliberation. In large scale processes it is desirable to use different types of recruitment that include targeted outreach to marginalized groups and individuals, and purposive methods.

There are important questions here of how we think about marginalization: for example, David Kahane suggests that group identities and group caucusing can empower members of marginalized groups within deliberations, whereas others believe that good deliberation requires that we step away from group memberships, or that participants function as "unaffiliated citizens."

6. Given a group of citizens with unequal status, information, education, and communication skills, we can achieve reasonable levels of equality

The factors that contribute to equity include trained moderators, properly framed materials, appropriate venues, and well planned discussion groups.

Many practitioners believe that good facilitation and design can help to address the problem of inequality that has been emphasized in the literature on public discussion (e.g., by Lyn Sanders). Jenny Mansbridge says, for example, that "Once people are in the room, we have the moderating skills to give space to members of different groups. Our [R&P funded] study found that this worked well. There may be one or two loudmouths, but by and large, there is quite a bit of deference to the ordinary citizens. If the moderator says, 'Let's hear from so-and-so who hasn't spoken yet,' by and large that will happen." Many practitioners share Mansbridge's belief that good facilitation and design can mitigate the problem of inequality that has been emphasized in the literature on public discussion (e.g., by Lyn Sanders).

Some problems of inclusion are best addressed, not by skillful moderation, but by organizing separate discussions for the marginalized (such as young people).

Different cultural groups respond to different strategies of inclusion. In some cases, what is most important is to offer tangible assistance, such as food, day care, or financial incentives. Who issues an invitation to deliberate can make a difference in the effectiveness of recruitment and the breadth of participation. Sometimes, invitations work best when they come from friends.

7. There is an increasing supply of research

"Deliberation" has been a topic of scholarly inquiry for centuries, and its prominence increased during the 1970s when theorists such as John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas asserted the moral importance of exchanging reasons (in contrast to merely negotiating interests). However, many scholars remained uninterested in concrete, practical examples of public deliberation. These are too messy and idiosyncratic to work like laboratory experiments of human communication and interaction. At the same time, they are often too small and too dependent on favorable political circumstances—such as friendly government officials or supportive foundations—to impress scholars who want to understand how power works.

However, an increasing number of scholars are now interested in concrete, practical experiments with deliberation. They come to this interest from various backgrounds, but Peter Muhlberger described himself and several of his colleagues when he said, "we have a sense that deliberation is one of the few hopes of turning around politics—a very idealistic notion. We are to some extent horrified when we see how deliberation actually works out. So then the question is how could this be done better."

As a result of work by Muhlberger, Fung, Gastil, and others around the world, there is now an unprecedented supply of research relevant to practice. Leighninger noted that it's much more common today than it was six or seven years ago for scholars to study concrete examples of organized public deliberation. Lyn Carson said, "There's actually too much going on, too much information to absorb. The R&P face-to-face meetings are helpful for sorting through it all. We've lost the scholar who had the time to think, read, and write."

8. Useful bridges have been built between academics and practitioners, but further attention is needed

The interviewees provided very different evaluations of how practitioners and scholars relate in the field of deliberation. Mansbridge said, "The relationship is healthier and more generative than in almost any other field I can think of"; but Becker said, "I would say it's almost non-existent."

Other views filled the spectrum between these two. David Kahane said, "Well designed conversations between researchers and practitioners can lead to breakthroughs, but these conversations are rare. At least as common are situations where researchers talk at or past practitioners. The problem lies in the academic culture in North America. It requires deliberate efforts to overcome that problem."

Lyn Carson said that some scholars are "studying 'deliberation' in artificial contexts and making judgments about deliberation that just aren't true. Some areas of research produce results that are implausible because of practical experience." (In response to this comment, Michael Briand defended the value of controlled experiments, arguing that as long as they are transparent and replicable, they can build a body of reliable evidence.) In any case, Carson mostly saw "interesting synergies" between research and practice.

Carolyn Lukensmeyer said, "In cancer research, the questions are the same for researchers and practitioners." That is not the case in deliberation, although "the relationship is positive and building." She argued that it would be valuable for academics to discuss and develop an overall research agenda for the field.

Michael Briand argued that deeper analysis of the various kinds of theory and practice might be helpful. "Sharpening … the theory-practice distinction might ultimately 'soften' the 'conflict' between theorists and practitioners over what counts as 'theory' and over the issue of what our priorities should be and where we should direct our energies."

Peter Muhlberger said, "On the practitioner side, there's a feeling of expertness about deliberation, but that expertness is not tied to the theoretical infrastructure. On the researcher side, there's a need to come down from the theoretical heights and investigate things that might matter to practitioners. I [as a scholar] start with very unrealistic expectations about what people do in deliberations. It's important for me to come down to concrete behavior." Francesca Polletta, similarly, said that research used to be dominated by the normative claims of political theorists but is now becoming more empirical and connected to practice. She said that she shared the enthusiasm of practitioners but worried that they were not being critical enough; the "spectacle of deliberation" could overcome real participatory democracy. We need to look critically at whether that does happen, why it happens, what it looks like when it happens, and how to prevent it from happening. Pat Scully observed that sometimes the most valuable research for practitioners come from "evaluations" of projects that are directly connected to projects in the field.

John Dedrick argued that lessons from practical work have influenced "mid-level theory"—i.e., scholarly writing about public deliberation—but not fundamental theories of politics or democracy. He believes that research (itself informed by practice) has influenced Study Circles, National Issues Forum, and America*Speaks*, for example. Larger theoretical frames and democratic theory (e.g. Gutmann and Thomson) influence some practitioners, but Dedrick called that connection "very, very loose."

For theorists who think about more abstract and general issues, as Dedrick, Fung, and others noted, the issue is deliberation versus other ways of making decisions. Fung said, "Researchers view practice opportunistically, as opportunities to develop a point or make a point," often about how deliberation compares to other forms of politics. "This is happening more," he said: more dissertations are being written about deliberative processes, and more senior academics are taking deliberative practice seriously. But practitioners are more concerned about dealing with issues that arise *within* deliberations, such as the variety

of speaking styles and how to treat them fairly. Iris Marion Young, Lynn Sanders, and others have pushed the field to think about these practical issues.

The DDC is not alone in trying to build bridges between research and practice in our field. The National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), and the Canadian Community for Dialogue and Deliberation (C2D2) also have made forays into this area.

Mary Pat MacKinnon (University of Ottawa) said that "in Canada, we also need to build bridges among scholars to build understanding and knowledge about public deliberation—in addition to bridge building among researchers and practitioners." She cited the work of Mark Warren (University of British Columbia) "as a political theorist whose work is about trying to connect larger theoretical frames and theory to empirical research and practice."

Effective collaboration among scholars and practitioners requires deliberate and careful efforts to increase mutual understanding and trust. It does not occur naturally, because the norms and incentives are quite different in academia, in nonprofit organizations, and in government. A particular challenge is keeping the dialog going between face-to-face meetings.

There is some evidence that the R&P meetings strengthened useful networks. For instance, Hartz-Karp said that the meetings led her to specific collaborations with Miriam Wyman, John Gastil, and Ned Crosby, caused her to join the design team for an NCDD conference, helped to bring Ted Becker to Australia, and involved her as a chapter co-author in the *Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. On the other hand, it's clear that some people who attended one or two meetings had little other interaction with peers.

At the 2008 meeting, David Kahane called for "safe spaces for practitioners to talk in more detail about the issues that keep them up at night, their needs." He argued: "We have not dug deep enough to reach the areas in which we disagree." Participants called for "disaggregating the notion of a practitioner" to make sure that we include types of actors who have not been included in our meetings to date.

9. The cultural and political context is difficult but provides opportunities

Deliberation contradicts deep and powerful assumptions and patterns of interaction in contemporary mass societies. For example, the political context seems increasingly polarized and nasty in many countries lately. Dedrick cited the general "argument culture" that prevails today. Lyn Carson said, "We're working in a political landscape where the job description of politicians is to destroy each other." Becker noted that technology is being used for activism, which is "crowding out deliberative initiatives" online. He proposed research to measure the deliberativeness of our culture and the interventions that we could be taking to make the culture more deliberative. Immigration sometimes fractures communities and makes it harder for groups to work together.

The relatively hostile context makes life difficult. It offers few models for deliberation. However, it may also increase public demand for better forms of politics. Heidi Gantwerk argued that the American "public is frustrated with gridlock and polarity," and some political leaders understand that it pays to promote deliberation. If demand for deliberation rises, the public can capitalize on helpful trends such as the burgeoning deliberative democracy movement itself, the development of alternative media, and the rise in youth volunteering. Miriam Wyman commented, "there tend to be corners, even in very difficult contexts, where deliberation is flourishing (sometimes in small ways and sometimes in not so small ways) precisely because the context is so difficult."

Understanding deliberation in social and cultural context would require more attention to work by scholars like Diana Mutz (who finds a tradeoff between participatory and deliberative democracy) and Nina Eliasoph, who finds that people deliberate more in private than in public contexts, because they don't have scripts or models for public deliberation.

10. There is increasing interest in alternative forms of communication, such as storytelling, in relation to deliberation

The DDC-funded projects on "Norms of Deliberation" and "Advocates' Views of Deliberation" both confirmed what members of the R&P Network have also argued in other forums: deliberation is not limited to dispassionate exchange of reasons. Facilitators and other practitioners of deliberation value emotion and storytelling, the sharing of personal experiences, and moments of recognition, not just arguments and evidence. Emotion and narrative arise in standard deliberative processes, but David Kahane also cited "suggestive experiments at the edges of the D&D community" such as circle processes, learning journeys, meditation, deep democracy methods, and the "art of hosting" as promoted by organizations like the Shambhala Institute for Authentic Leadership. He said, "The more holistic processes help to investigate the possibility that we don't know ourselves or our interests very well, and that rational deliberation will not help us, for example, understand whole systems." Bettina von Lieres described her current work on conversations between AIDS patients and their own doctors. These discussions transform the patients' capacity, but cannot be described narrowly as deliberation.

11. We have learned a great deal about how to "embed" deliberation in the life of communities

Institutionalization seems to require three preconditions: some support from political leaders, a group of residents who are experienced with organizing and facilitating deliberations ("process experts"), and organized public demand for deliberative engagement. During the November 2007 meeting, two separate groups of participants identified this same list of preconditions for embedding deliberation. One of the groups described a virtuous cycle in which deliberation produces concrete, practical benefits for the community, and therefore citizens and officials organize new deliberations.

12. Certain types of issues seem more ripe for deliberation than others

Local issues are often most suitable for deliberation. It is best when deliberation occurs early in the policy process, not after key decisions have already been made. Often, it is helpful to start with small, manageable issues to demonstrate that deliberation works.

Ideas for Moving Forward

The following proposals for our future agenda are drawn from interviews but do not reflect consensus; they are meant to stimulate discussion.

13. Acknowledge that people vary in their predisposition to deliberation

People vary in terms of how favorably inclined they are toward deliberation. Survey data from the US indicate that those inclined toward deliberation are also (in general) more inclined toward other forms of politics, from voting to protest.

We need to know: What are the implications of attracting into deliberations only those people who have an attitudinal disposition toward deliberation? How does deliberation change when people participate who are not favorable to it? What are the effects on individuals of putting the willing and unwilling together—do individuals change? What are the people like who are not predisposed toward deliberation (demographically, ideologically, behaviorally).

14. Provide hard-nosed evaluations that will be proof-points for practitioners (if the result are positive) or impetus to change

Pat Scully (Study Circles) was one of several interviewees who noted that practitioners want evidence they can use to show their own effectiveness or to improve their impact. Leighninger said, "Among the practitioners, especially the larger nonprofits, there is an understandable desire for research to pay attention to and to validate their projects." Academic researchers are not necessarily motivated to conduct that kind of evaluation, since they want to pursue broader research questions. However, it is possible to conduct a program evaluation that also addresses broader questions, thereby serving both the scholar's and the practitioners' interests.

At the third Researcher & Practitioner meeting, a subgroup of scholars, practitioners, and nonprofit leaders reached some conclusions about evaluation. To evaluate, they said, we must know about the purposes of our practice: what are we trying to achieve? The desired outcomes of deliberation will vary by player, place, process, and problem. We also need to think about how evaluations will be useful for all stake-

holders, including funders, communities, and providers, as these groups will likely have different interests. For example, funders may want to know if the process achieved its goals and produced the desired results. Providers may want to better understand what about the process worked and did not work. Communities may want to know whether the process resulted in increased capacity.

15. Move away from analyzing differences among methods

Early discussions within the DDC emphasized the value of taxonomies and comparisons of methods. (See point 2, above). But several interviewees in 2007 argued for a change of focus. Pat Scully said, "Comparing and contrasting different methodologies of deliberation is less important than how this whole approach fits into other strategies. We can get too inward-looking and precious, not worried about the broader context." Becker characterized the field as "balkanized—everybody wants to save the world in their own way." Janette Hartz-Karp was struck by financial competition among models and methods in the United States. Gantwerk doubted that nuances and distinctions among methodologies are important; we need to create an overall "market" for deliberative practices. Leighninger said that it might be a mistake to ask which process works best for which situation. Dedrick lamented the competition for funds among nonprofits that use different methods. Lukensmeyer also said that the way the field is funded discourages cooperation and encourages practitioners to magnify their differences. Fung argued that the question a few years ago was how to do deliberation right. Now it is more about how to institutionalize deliberation and connect it to power. (The DDC-funded projects in 2003 and 2005 to some extent reflect this shift.)

Two interviewees (Lukensmeyer and Becker) argued that much could be gained from one national project that used many methods. Lukensmeyer saw such a project as an opportunity for learning: "methods would be stretched."

16. Turn the focus to institutionalization

Institutionalizing deliberation means building it into laws, policies, formal procedures, or prevailing norms. One aspect of research on institutionalization would be learning how various legal frameworks should be revised to benefit deliberation. (For instance, Leighninger mentioned notice-and-comment rules and requirements for public meetings.) The DDC-funded E-Rulemaking project is a step in this direction. Fung argued that to institutionalize deliberation, we need to make the case to citizens that the results of a deliberative process are legitimate. Gantwerk said that we need to be able to tell foundations and other funders that policies actually changed as a result of deliberation.

17. Consider the links between deliberation and other democratic practices, such as advocacy and movement-building

Pat Scully said, "Deliberation is a political strategy; a means, not an end. What's interesting is how delib-

eration intersects with other forms of politics, which gets more complex the higher the level of government." Study Circles is currently working with the Northwest Areas Foundation in a project that ties deliberation to "visioning," leadership-development, and actual poverty-reduction work in small, poor communities. Archon Fung noted that Participatory Budgeting (as used in Brazilian cities) is only partly deliberative. Thus PB is marginal in the field of public deliberation even though it has great potential for increasing citizen participation. The DDC-funded project on "Advocates' Views of Deliberation" addresses some of these connections and cites other relevant literature.

18. Learn from the Global South

Interviewees were generally enthusiastic about broader international participation, and several emphasized that the most exciting, and most thoroughly institutionalized, examples of public deliberation occur in countries such as Brazil, not in Europe or North America. Von Lieres said that the "Northern debate is all about design. ... the Northern debate seems that it's a one-size-fits all—that you can take a deliberative form and then enact it." In the South, it's evidently more important to consider the context: whether the government recognizes citizens' rights, how forms of authority can undermine participation and deliberation, and how people understand their roles as citizens. These issues may actually be more important in the Global North than the literature on deliberation recognizes.

19. Consider the problem of scale

The DDC was founded at a conference whose premise was that deliberation flourishes at the local level but needs to be institutionalized at the national and international scale. Gantwerk argued that this was still the key problem, and Carolyn Lukensmeyer said, "For the first time since I've been in this field, there is an opportunity in the United States for potentially embedding something at the national level. This comes out of the abuse of power for the last seven years."

On the other hand, many of us value local and decentralized politics and resist the demand to increase scale.

20. Give deeper attention to online methods

Since the Airlie House meeting in 2002, the DDC has deliberately included practitioners and proponents of online deliberation. However, the bulk of research has been devoted to face-to-face processes, and several interviewees wondered if there might still be a bias against technology. Polletta said, "I really think online is really important. We operate with this idea that face to face is the ideal form. All the research seems to suggest that you should generate your theories of deliberation based on what happens in face to face deliberation. Online is seen as a 'peculiar' form." However, face-to-face methods are more expensive and in some respects harder to implement.

APPENDIX I: 2003 R&P PARTICIPANTS

- Terry Amsler, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Ted Becker, Auburn University
- Pat Benn, Citizen Juries
- Gail Bingham, Resolve
- Cole Campbell, Kettering Foundation
- Ned Crosby, Citizen Juries
- Lyn Carson, University of Sydney
- Jan Elliott, Public Policy Forum (Canada)
- Cynthia Farrar, Yale University
- John Forester, Cornell University
- Archon Fung, Harvard
- Heidi Gantwerk, ViewPoint Learning
- John Gaventa, Institute for Development Studies/Logolink
- John Gastil, University of Washington
- Joe Goldman, America*Speaks*
- Tonya Gonzalez, DDC
- Sandy Heierbacher, National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation
- Carolyn Hendriks, Australian National University
- Betty Knighton, West Virginia Center for Civic Life
- Steven Kull, Program in International Policy Attitudes
- Melissa Harris Lacewell, Princeton University
- Janette Hartz Karp, practitioner (Australia)
- Peter Levine, Tufts University
- Carolyn Lukensmeyer, America*Speaks*
- Bob Luskin, Center for Deliberative Democracy
- Jane Mansbridge, Harvard University
- Martha McCoy, Study Circles
- Mary Pat McKinnon, Canadian Policy Research Network
- Peter Muhlberger, Carnegie Mellon University
- Rose Marie Nierras, Logolink
- Tomas Ohlin, Linkoping University

- Leanne Nurse, United States Environmental Protection Agency
- Francesca Polletta, Columbia University
- Alan Tomkins, University of Nebraska
- Hank Topper, United States Environmental Protection Agency
- Lars Torres, AmericaSpeaks
- Katherine Cramer Walsh, University of Wisconsin
- Michael Weiksner, e-thePeople
- Marc Weiss, Web Lab
- Stuart White, University of Technology, Australia
- Gwen Wright, National League of Cities

APPENDIX II: 2005 R&P PARTICIPANTS

- Steven Balla, George Washington University
- Roger Bernier, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- Gail Bingham, Resolve
- Bob Carlitz, Information Renaissance
- Vera Schattan Ruas Pereira Coelho, Citizenship and Development Group, Brazilian Center of Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP)
- Ned Crosby, Citizen Juries
- Lyn Carson, University of Sydney
- Jan Elliott, Public Policy Forum (Canada)
- Archon Fung, Harvard
- Tonya Gonzalez, DDC
- Janette Hartz-Karp, practitioner (Australia)
- Carolyn Hendriks, Australian National University
- David Kahane, University of Alberta
- Sarah Landry, United States Department of Health and Human Services
- Peter Levine, Tufts University
- Carolyn Lukensmeyer, America*Speaks*
- Jane Mansbridge, Harvard University

- Mary Pat McKinnon, Canadian Policy Research Network
- Peter Muhlberger, Carnegie Mellon University
- Rose Marie Nierras, Logolink
- Tomas Ohlin, Linkoping University
- Leanne Nurse, United States Environmental Protection Agency
- Francesca Polletta, Columbia University, Alan Tomkins, University of Nebraska
- Patrick Scully, Study Circles Resource Center
- Frances J. Seymour, Center for International Forestry Research
- Lars Torres, America*Speaks*
- Bettina Von Lieres, Development Research Center on Citizenship, Toronto
- Michael Weiksner, e-the-People
- Stuart White, University of Technology, Australia
- Miriam Wyman, Practicum Limited

APPENDIX III: 2007 R&P PARTICIPANTS

- Denden Alicias, Institute for Popular Democracy
- Terry Amsler, Institute for Local Government
- Bill Barnes, National League of Cities
- Ted Becker, Journal of Public Deliberation and Auburn University
- Lisa Blomgren Bingham, Indiana University
- Pat Bonner, Environmental Protection Agency
- Michael Briand, International Journal of Public Participation
- John Bryson, University of Minnesota
- Martin Carcasson, Center for Public Deliberation, Colorado State University
- Bob Carlitz, Information Renaissance
- Lyn Carson, University of Sydney
- Laura Chasin, Public Conversations Project
- Vera Schattan Coelho, Citizenship and Development Group, Brazilian Center of Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP)
- Barbara Crosby, University of Minnesota

- John Dedrick, Kettering Foundation
- William DiMascio, Pennsylvania Prison Society
- Maya Enista, Mobilize.org
- Tim Erickson, E-Democracy.org
- Will Friedman, Public Agenda
- Archon Fung, Harvard University
- John Gastil, Unversity of Washington
- Cindy Gibson, Cynthesis Consulting and CitizenPost
- Lois Giess, Rochester (NY) City Council
- Joe Goldman, AmericaSpeaks
- John Gøtze, Slash Democracy
- Cheryl Graeve, League of Women Voters of the USA
- Rosemary Gunn, Information Renaissance
- Janette Hartz-Karp, JHK Quality Consultants
- Peter Hawley, formerly of the American Planning Association
- Sandy Heierbacher, National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation
- Chris Hoene, National League of Cities
- Mary Jacksteit, Public Conversations Project
- Alison Kadlec, Public Agenda
- David Kahane, University of Alberta
- Christina Kelleher, Sustained Dialogue Campus Network
- Gail Leftwich Kitch, By the People
- John Landesman, Montgomery County Public Schools
- Matt Leighninger, Deliberative Democracy Consortium
- Peter Levine, Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)
- Mary Pat MacKinnon, University of Ottawa
- Bruce Mallory, University of New Hampshire
- Martha McCoy, Study Circles Resource Center/Everyday Democracy
- Peter Muhlberger, Texas Tech University
- Tina Nabatchi, Syracuse University

- Rose Nierras, Plan International UK
- Leanne Nurse, Environmental Protection Agency
- Tomas Ohlin, eDemocracy and Linköping University
- Joe Peters, Ascentum
- Florence Raes, LogoLink
- Stefania Ravazzi, University of Turin
- Deldi Reyes, Environmental Protection Agency
- Neil Richardson, Serve DC, City of Washington, DC
- Gloria Rubio-Cortés, National Civic League
- Bill Schechter, Collaboration DC
- Mary Schmidt, University of Idaho Extension Service
- Pat Scully, Study Circles Resource Center/Everyday Democracy
- Michael Smith, Case Foundation
- Jim Snider, iSolon.org
- John Stephens, UNC-Chapel Hill
- Nancy Tate, League of Women Voters of the USA
- Nancy Thomas, The Democracy Imperative
- Hank Topper, Environmental Protection Agency
- Chris Wagner, Sustained Dialogue Campus Network
- Julie Segal Walters, AmericaSpeaks
- Michael Weiksner, e-thepeople.org and Stanford University
- Stuart White, University of Technology, Australia
- Michael Wood, United Way of America
- Miriam Wyman, Practicum Limited

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY CONSORTIUM

1050 SEVENTEENTH STREET NW, SUITE 315

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

MATT LEIGHNINGER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

905-972-0550 / MATTL@DELIBERATIVE-DEMOCRACY.NET