


10-25-2013

Teaching, Practicing, and Performing Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom

Hayley J. Cole

University of Missouri - Columbia, hayley.cole@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd>

 Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cole, Hayley J. (2013) "Teaching, Practicing, and Performing Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 2 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art10>

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by Public Deliberation. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Public Deliberation by an authorized editor of Public Deliberation.

Teaching, Practicing, and Performing Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom

Abstract

Inspired by the Citizens Initiative Review Process in Oregon, *Healthy Democracy*, and the *Living Voters Guide*, this paper proposes that undergraduate educators should teach, practice, and perform deliberative democracy in the classroom. This paper will identify deliberation as a tool for resolving difficulties in current democratic practices and propose a specific classroom activity to teach deliberative skills. The sample undergraduate activity involves student research, local political leaders coming to speak and answer questions, and in-class deliberations. Using survey data collected from the students/ participants, it was found that the activity had positive learning outcomes for students. Students reported feeling more knowledgeable and informed about the democratic process the ballot measure on which students deliberated (Missouri's Proposition E from the 2012 election). Results also suggest that this activity allowed for students to learn about and gain confidence in argumentation, advocacy, deliberation, and democracy.

Keywords

Deliberation, Deliberative Democracy, Deliberative Argument, Direct Democracy, Pedagogy

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Healthy Democracy and The Oregon CIR for their continuing work and inspiration.

Introduction

As a scholar and educator in the area of argument and advocacy, I have found that people tend to view argument through an adversarial lens, rather than through a more cooperative and deliberative one (Kroll, 2005; Tannen, 1999). Adversarial argumentation tends to be more hostile and silencing than deliberative engagement, and this negatively influences the practice and performance of democracy. I propose that educators incorporate deliberative practices in the classroom to foster communication skills that strengthen informed and reasoned decision making, as well as skills that may practically influence our democratic processes. Developing deliberative skills should be a goal for undergraduate instructors to increase deliberation inside and outside the classroom because these skills are necessary for a healthy democracy.

According to Kroll (2005) the practice of a form of deliberation known as deliberative argument is a “thoughtful, fair-minded examination of possible solutions” (p. 39). Deliberative argument can be practiced through the

dynamics of group discussions, especially conversations among people who are making a good-faith effort to arrive at the best decision. If we look at the structure of productive problem-solving discussions, we see that often multiple proposals are advanced and then discussed before any decision is reached (Kroll, 2005, p. 39).

In the first section of this paper, I will explore the need to incorporate deliberative decision making into the classroom. Next, I will present an example of deliberative decision making in the undergraduate classroom at a midwestern university. Finally, I will review the results found from implementing deliberation in the undergraduate college classroom, as well as future directions for pedagogy and research.

Deliberation as a Tool for Resolving Difficulties in Current Democratic Practices

We have a crisis of democracy in America today. According to Tannen (1999) our adversarial argument culture has become toxic, a “pervasive warlike atmosphere that makes us approach public dialogue, and just about anything we need to accomplish, as if it were a fight” (p. 3). Approaching democracy and decision making through an adversarial lens limits the prospects for deliberation, and it can dissuade people from participating in democracy. Thus, deliberative democracy is more advantageous than purely adversarial democracy (Mansbridge, 1983). For example, according to Levinson (2002) deliberative democracy

fosters cooperation and mutual understanding rather than winning and losing (as adversarial democracy seems to); it purports to give all citizens a “voice” rather than just the most powerful or the most numerous (as tends to occur in majoritarian democracy); and it encourages citizens to make decisions based on “public reasons” that can be supported through deliberation rather than on individual prejudices that thrive in the privacy of the voting booth (p. 262).

Direct democracy and ballot initiatives are unique sites for exploring the potential of deliberation and deliberative democracy because voters often have relatively little information about initiatives, compared to the vast amount of information made available during candidate elections. Matsusaka (2004) posits that “the initiative process embodies the simple idea that ordinary citizens should have the right to propose and pass laws without the consent of their elected representatives” (p. 1). According to Matsusaka (2004) initiatives trouble thoughtful observers who “question whether voters are sufficiently informed to decide complicated policy issues, and whether the initiative ultimately promotes democracy or works to the advantage of rich special interests who use it to hijack the policy process” (p. 2). Research has shown that initiatives tend to promote the interests of the majority and that citizens are capable of making competent decisions about ballot measures (Bowler & Donovan, 2000; Matsusaka, 2004). That said, the same studies suggest that well-educated and less-educated voters may reason about issues differently, and most end up relying on information shortcuts and cues to make their voting decisions.

In addition to gathering evidence that suggests voters are capable of making decisions about ballot measures, Griffin (2011) and others have found that deliberation develops reasoned decision making. According to Gastil (2000),

deliberation requires both citizens and representatives to present reasons and justifications for their views and to consider alternative views. When successful, deliberation can confer legitimacy upon even majoritarian policy decisions, so long as those decisions take conflicting views into account. Even if it does not produce a solution acceptable to all, it may at least preserve mutual respect among the parties to an unresolved debate (p. 24).

The approach of bringing “together conflicting views to seek out points of agreement” (Gastil, 2000, p. 142) is quite different from the adversarial culture described by Tannen (1999).

Arguing that there are benefits for voters who have access to the results of deliberation on issues that appear on ballots, Gastil (2000, p. 139) has proposed that deliberation be incorporated into the process of direct democracy. Accordingly, Gastil (2000) posits that deliberation serves democracy by enabling citizens to grapple with complexity and to clarify the implications of values for public policy choices (pp. 23-24). Additionally, the qualities of democratic citizens include “the ability to make a reasoned argument, written or oral, as well as the abilities to cooperate with others, to appreciate their perspectives and experiences and to tolerate other points of view. Talk is obviously fundamental to active citizenship” (Enslin et al., 2001, p. 116). It should also be noted that “participants in democratic deliberation also have a responsibility to avoid manipulative discourse, provide other participants with any relevant knowledge they possess, and consider carefully what others say” (Gastil, 2000, p. 22). Therefore, deliberation should allow for everyone’s voice to be heard and understood.

Generally, “to deliberate means to weigh carefully both the consequences of various options for actions and the views of others” (Mathews, 1999, p. 111). Deliberation allows for the careful examination of a problem through a process of inclusive and respectful consideration of diverse points of view, and for the arrival at a reasoned solution (Gastil & Black, 2007, p. 2). According to Griffin (2011), “the only obstacle that citizens might face on their journey towards becoming deliberative citizens is the lack of opportunity to participate in these free environments” (p. 14). Thus, academics and those working outside of the academy should develop more opportunities for citizens to participate in deliberative practices and processes.

More opportunities for deliberation may also increase one’s political efficacy since deliberation allows for thoughtful examination of problems. McKinney and Chattopadhyay (2007) posit that political information efficacy is the confidence that citizens express in the political knowledge they possess (p. 1170). Similarly Craig et al. (1990) assert that internal efficacy refers “to beliefs about one’s own competence to understand and to participate effectively in politics” (p. 290). Suggesting that deliberation is a means to resolve difficulties and inadequacies in our current democratic practices, this review of the literature may be used as a guide for those who wish to consider innovative ways of opening up spaces for deliberation, especially in the classroom.

Proposing Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom

I recently taught an undergraduate course titled “Argument and Advocacy,” for which I created an activity titled “Deliberative Democracy Activity.” The assignment summary read:

This semester we will use deliberative argumentation to better understand Proposition E (Prop. E) [a measure on the 2012 General Election Ballot in the U.S. state of Missouri]. We will create a “citizens’ statement” informing voters about Proposition E, its strengths, and its weaknesses, and we will advocate a particular stance on the issue. We will collect and analyze evidence and data, we will hear from student experts (that’s YOU), we will hear from professional experts, we will deliberate as a class and in smaller groups, and we will use deliberative argumentation (as a class) to create a “citizens’ statement” giving our opinions about what Prop. E is and how people should vote on it. We will work to get this “citizens’ statement” out to the general public through a media outlet. (See Appendix I for the full activity assignment sheet.)

This activity was modeled after the Citizens’ Initiative Review Process in Oregon, which was largely sponsored by the nonprofit organization Healthy Democracy.¹ According to Healthy Democracy, “the Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) is an innovative way of publicly evaluating ballot measures so that voters have easy access to clear, useful, and trustworthy information at election time” (Citizens Initiative Review, 2012, p .2). The literature on the CIR is noteworthy as scholars have suggested and shown many potential benefits of the CIR, including its ability to influence attitudes (Gastil, 2011; Gastil et al., 2011; Knobloch et al., 2013), and improve democratic processes (Binder et al., 2011; Gastil, 2011; Gastil et al., 2012; Gastil & Richards, 2013; Knobloch & Raabe, 2011; Moses & Farley, 2011; Wright, 2010). The CIR citizens’ panel includes randomly selected voters—demographically representative of the statewide population—who hear arguments for and against a measure, as well as expert testimony, in order to deliberate and produce a citizens’ statement made available to voters at election time (Citizens’ Initiative Review, 2012, p. 4). Findings from the most recent 2012 CIR evaluation report indicate that the CIR was successful in that it was a deliberative process, the CIR citizens’ statements were factually accurate and helpful for voters, and those who were exposed to the CIR statement showed substantial knowledge gains (Knobloch et al., 2012).

¹ See <http://www.healthydemocracy.org>.

Another source that wasn't used for this particular activity, but which can be used as a model in the future for similar pedagogical and academic exercises is called the *Living Voters Guide* (LVG).² According to Elliot (2012), the LVG is similar to the official guides that voters receive in the mail for each election, but its online users are able to “submit their pros and cons and take a position on the issue” (para. 5). The LVG is a model for online deliberation (Freelon et al., 2012) and introduces “a kind of interactivity, making the process less about deciding between two extreme arguments and more about an extended discussion between what LVG likes to call ‘virtual neighbors’” (Elliot, 2012, para. 3).

Using the CIR and the LVG as models, I propose that academics implement activities in the classroom that strive to develop and practice argumentation and deliberation skills. These skills are particularly important for democracy (Camicia, 2010; Gastil, 2006), and past research supports fostering democracy, critical thinking, deliberation, and argumentation in education (Carcasson et al., 2010; Diaz & Gilchrist, 2010; Goodin & Stein, 2008; Harriger, 2010; Parker, 2011, 2012; Thomas, 2010). Using the CIR as a model, the “Deliberative Democracy Activity” had as its major goals to help students practice deliberation, deliberative argumentation, and democracy in the classroom.

Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom: Details and Explanations

Deliberating over ballot measures can be done in the classroom, even in a state that does not have a statewide initiative process. As Matsusaka (2004) points out, even in non-initiative states there are still measures that people vote on, such as local bond measures and charter amendments. Alternatively, one could incorporate deliberation about congressional policy into a classroom activity. Thus, there are many measures and policies available to deliberate on in the classroom. The particular activity for my undergraduate class focused on Proposition E (Prop. E), a measure on the 2012 General Election Ballot in Missouri.³ (See Appendix I for the broad activity assignment sheet.)

The objectives for bringing deliberative democracy into the undergraduate classroom were to train students in deliberation and develop students' skills that foster deliberation, democracy, healthy citizenship, argumentation, and advocacy. It is important to note that I introduced the concepts of deliberation (Kroll, 2005; Merkle, 1996), deliberative democracy (Citizens' Initiative Review, 2012; Kashani & Stern, 2011), and the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review (Citizens'

² Living Voters Guide, <https://wash.livingvotersguide.org/>.

³ Proposition E—Senate Bill No. 464, <http://www.senate.mo.gov/12info/pdf-bill/tat/SB464.pdf>.

Initiative Review, 2012; Gastil & Knobloch, 2010) before entering into this unit in order to expose students to core materials related to the unit. Students did not “practice deliberation” before we engaged the unit, however. Instead, after students had been introduced to the concepts noted above and to the unit details, we then began the unit and used each deliberation session as an opportunity to practice and perform deliberation. This classroom example is similar to the CIR in that both students and CIR panelists were introduced to deliberation at the beginning of their processes. The classroom example is markedly different from the CIR, however, in that CIR panelists practice deliberation during the first day of the CIR (Gastil & Knobloch, 2010, p. 22), whereas the students, although trained in deliberation literature and theory, did not practice deliberation before the start of the unit. Educators who adopt this proposal for classroom deliberation should consider having students practice deliberating before entering into the activity.

For the first component of the activity, each student was responsible for researching Prop. E or something related to Prop. E, and presenting his or her research to the class. (For the evaluation sheet, see Appendix II.) This component of the larger activity involved practicing research skills, critical thinking, and oral communication skills. Those presenting their information to the class worked to understand and present the evidence as a rhetorical artifact: They shared the source of the artifact, the messages and the text(s), as well as what the information meant for audiences/readers and citizens. Additionally, students were to process and retain the information presented, ask questions and engage in critical thinking, practice deliberating, and use the information presented to gain a better understanding of Prop. E. Overall, this component of the activity, in addition to offering practice in argumentation skills, allowed members of the class to research and listen to others present their own research on Prop. E, and thereby gain knowledge about Prop. E.

Another component of the activity involved having political representatives come to our class and present information about Prop. E, as well as their arguments for or against Prop. E. (See Appendix IV.) Overall, these presentation sessions included time for the speakers to present their arguments and positions to the class, as well as question-and-answer sessions. Additionally, the students engaged in deliberative argumentation sessions as a class, as well as in smaller groups. Finally, it is important to note that students were responsible for completing worksheets for each speaker, which involved taking notes on presentations, identifying the speaker’s major arguments and writing down any questions they had for the speaker. (See Appendix III for the worksheet.)

After all student and political representative presentations had been made, the class then engaged in in-depth deliberation sessions and came together to develop and create a general statement about Prop. E in order to inform voters

about the measure. During these sessions I acted as the moderator, aiming to facilitate deliberation within the groups. It is also noteworthy that students exercised agency by facilitating deliberation among themselves. To educators I offer a side note of caution: Deliberating in larger groups can be painful, difficult, and frustrating; it takes time. Indeed, all of the deliberation sessions held during this activity were time consuming; the time-intensive nature of deliberation should be considered when creating a schedule to accommodate such activities in the classroom.

As noted above, deliberation aims to allow all voices to be heard, should be critical and also respectful of others, and is designed to reach a solution. As a moderator, I took these responsibilities seriously and I encourage all moderators of deliberation to do the same. From these deliberations the class was able to create a general statement about Prop. E for Missouri citizens. (See Appendix IV.)

After the class as a whole had deliberated and arrived at a general statement about Prop. E, the class then divided into two groups, one of supporters of the measure and one of the measure's opponents. Each group deliberated to identify the best arguments supporting its stance toward the measure and wrote a position-statement setting out those arguments. As a facilitator and monitor I worked to uphold the integrity of deliberative democracy and did not force students into making quick decisions.⁴ Instead, the many deliberation sessions allowed for students to critically come to decisions without coercion. In fact, during this final deliberative session one student did not come to a decision quickly and instead participated in both groups until she decided which position she agreed with more. Throughout these deliberations students asked questions, provided evidence and reasoning, challenged one another respectfully, and worked together to create statements for and against Prop. E in order for citizens to better understand the measure. (See Appendix IV.)

After writing the general statement and the statements in favor of and against the measure, we created a final report. This final report was, like the rest of the activity, modeled after the CIR. As such, it included an executive summary, a general statement about Prop. E, arguments in favor of and against Prop. E, a list of the political representatives who had visited the class, and a brief summary of demographic data provided by the students in a follow-up survey. (See the final report in Appendix IV.) This final report was sent to news outlets in Missouri and posted online on several platforms, including Twitter. Although the final report did not receive attention from mainstream news, it was retweeted and posted on online news outlets.

⁴ For additional resources on facilitating group communication and deliberations see Frey (2006a, 2006b); O'Doherty et al.(2012); and Sunwolf and Frey (2005).

Studying Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom

To assess the effects of the classroom deliberation, I created a survey, modeled after a 2010 survey used by researchers studying the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review (Gastil & Knobloch, 2010), and after receiving IRB approval I invited all students from the course to complete the survey for extra credit. (See the survey in Appendix V.) A total of eighteen out of twenty-one students completed the survey for extra credit. The survey aimed to capture general information about the students as well as information regarding how the students felt about the deliberative democracy process.

It is important to note some limitations to this study. First, no pre-survey was conducted. In future classroom deliberations I suggest that a pre-survey be conducted as well as periodic surveying throughout the activity. Second, the results are not generalizable to a larger population due to the lack of a representative sample and controls, and the fact that only eighteen students completed the survey. Unlike the CIR, students in this classroom deliberation were not randomly selected and were not representative of the voting population. For example, all eighteen students who completed the survey were within the 18-34 age range.

Table 1

Political Feelings

Do you feel you are a...	Response %	Response <i>n</i>
Strong Democrat	5.6	1
Democrat	22.2	4
Middle of the Road Democrat	22.2	4
Strong Republican	0.0	0
Republican	11.1	2
Middle of the Road Republican	22.2	4
Strong Non-partisan, Independent, &/or Other	5.6	1
Non-partisan, Independent, &/or Other	11.1	2
Middle of the Road Non-partisan, Independent, & or Other	0.0	0

Note. *N* = 18. See text for details.

In terms of demographic characteristics, most respondents were male (55.6%, *n* = 10; female: 44%, *n* = 8), White (77.8%, *n* = 14), and registered to vote (94.4%, *n* = 17). Eleven percent of respondents (*n* = 2) were Black or African American, and the same percentage were Hispanic or Latino (11.1%, *n* = 2).

Additionally, as Table 1 shows, the political leanings of the students were fairly evenly spread across political leanings. Overall, even though the students weren't randomly selected and were all in the same age range, they differed from each other in some important respects, such as race and political leanings.

Overall, students responded favorably to the deliberative process. Students were asked to share their thoughts about the process of deliberation, as well as whether they thought there were any advantages and or disadvantages to using deliberation to reach a goal. One student answered, "I think deliberation gave me a good opportunity to understand both sides of the argument." Another student responded, "I think it is a more effective way to test your own beliefs and get multiple viewpoints on an issue," and another stated, "I think the advantage to using deliberation was that you had 20+ different mindsets contributing to the discussion and ultimate goal of the citizens statement." Finally, another student noted that deliberation "allows group members to bring up individual concerns over a specific topic that can be considered among all members before making a decision."

Some students also noted that deliberation is hardly a quick and easy process. One said, "I think it is very difficult and time consuming but yields good results." Another student responded that "deliberation is good because it examines all perspectives, and sides of the issue, but on the other hand, it made my patience wear thin because of the time it took to accomplish menial (in my opinion) tasks."

Students were also asked very generally at the end of the survey whether they had any additional comments about the deliberative democracy process that they wanted the instructor, future staff, or the research team to hear. Overall, students responded favorably to the process. For example, one student responded that "this was a fantastic activity that really opened my eyes to the construction/deliberation process of the bills presented on the ballot. Having interactions with the speakers was a tremendous help." Another stated that "I thought it was a great unique way to get our class involved while we were learning about the process. I am a person who learns better in the field of actually seeing and doing the work so it was very beneficial for me!"

This activity also helped students learn about arguments, argumentation, and advocacy. When asked whether they found this activity helpful in this regard, every one said "yes." This activity also increased the students' understanding of and knowledge about Prop. E, as well as their own political efficacy and confidence in participating in the democratic process. Table 2 shows that the majority of students ($n = 16$) reported that they understood Prop. E better and felt more knowledgeable about the measure after deliberating and participating in the activity. Table 3 also shows that the majority of students felt more informed about the democratic process and more confident in their ability to vote.

Table 2

Learning through Deliberation

Survey Question: On a scale of one to five, with one being definitely NO and five being definitely YES, please answer the following questions:

	Do you feel more knowledgeable about Prop. E after the process?	Did deliberating about Prop. E help you to understand Prop. E?	After deliberating over Prop E, do you feel more knowledgeable about Prop. E?
1 Def. No	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
2	5.6% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
3	5.6% (1)	11.1% (2)	11.1% (2)
4	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
5 Def. Yes	88.9% (16)	88.9% (16)	88.9% (16)

Note. N = 18. Table lists percentage of respondents. Number of respondents appears in parentheses. See text for details.

Table 3

Political Efficacy

Survey Question: On a scale of one to five, with one being definitely NO and five being definitely YES, please answer the following questions:

	Do you feel more confident in your ability to vote in the upcoming election?	Do you feel more informed about the democratic process after having participated in this activity?	Are you likely to vote in the upcoming election after having participated in this process?
1 Def No.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)
2	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
3	0.0% (0)	16.7% (3)	5.6% (1)
4	44.4% (8)	44.4% (8)	22.2% (4)
5 Def. Yes	55.6% (10)	38.9% (7)	66.7% (12)

Note. N = 18. Table lists percentage of respondents. Number of respondents appears in parentheses. See text for details.

Conclusion

Overall, the survey results suggest that incorporating deliberation in the classroom is beneficial for the learning potential of students. Additionally, the survey results suggest that this activity as a whole allowed students to learn about and gain confidence in the areas of argumentation, advocacy, deliberation, and democracy. I encourage educators not only to implement practical activities such as the deliberative democracy activity, as well as different interpretive versions of this activity, but also to continue to research how such activities impact the students. As previously mentioned my attempt to better understand my students' experience is limited due to the use of a post-survey only; educators using this classroom deliberation approach in the future should implement more rigorous testing. Additionally, I encourage educators to continue to research, practice, and report on their experiences acting as moderators and facilitators of deliberative classroom activities. Finally, the CIR sponsored by Healthy Democracy and the *Living Voters Guide* are great models for designing practical deliberation activities and evaluating the effects of such activities through surveys of participants, and should serve as references for future educators and scholars interested in implementing or studying classroom deliberation.

Appendix I.

Deliberative Democracy Activity

*“The shared goal of finding the best answer
or
making the best or most justified decision in any given situation”*

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY & BALLOT LANGUAGE

This semester we will use deliberative argumentation to better understand Proposition E. We will create a “citizens statement” informing voters about proposition E, its strengths, its weaknesses, and we will advocate a particular stance on the issue. We will collect and analyze evidence and data, we will hear from student experts (that’s YOU), we will hear from professional experts, we will deliberate as a class and in smaller groups, and we will use deliberative argumentation (as a class) to create a “citizens statement” giving our informed opinions about what Prop E is and how people should vote on it. We will work to get this “citizens statement” out to the general public through a media outlet.

Note: We will use google docs throughout this activity to archive speaker related information, evidence, data, notes, deliberation notes, and much more in order to assist us with creating a citizens statement.

“Official Ballot Title

Proposition E

[\[full text\]](#) 

[Proposed by the 96th General Assembly (Second Regular Session) SB 464]

Official Ballot Title:

Shall Missouri law be amended to deny individuals, families, and small businesses the ability to access affordable health care plans through a state-based health benefit exchange unless authorized by statute, initiative or referendum or through an exchange operated by the federal government as required by the federal health care act?

No direct costs or savings for state and local governmental entities are expected from this proposal. Indirect costs or savings related to enforcement actions, missed federal funding, avoided implementation costs, and other issues are unknown.

Fair Ballot Language:

A “**yes**” vote will amend Missouri law to deny individuals, families, and small businesses the ability to access affordable health care plans through a state-based health benefit exchange unless authorized by statute, initiative or referendum or through an exchange operated by the federal government as required by the federal health care act. A “**no**” vote will not change the current Missouri law regarding access to affordable health care plans through a state-based health benefit exchange.

If passed, this measure will have no impact on taxes.”

<http://www.sos.mo.gov/elections/2012ballot/>

EXPERT PRESENTATIONS (50 points)

Each student will be required to give a 3-5 min “expert presentation”. During this presentation, the expert is to provide the class with a NEW (NOT redundant) piece of research related to our understanding of Proposition E. You are to explain the evidence you have found, such as: summarize the research generally, provide its credibility as a source & its strength as a piece of research relating to Prop E, how it relates to Proposition E and what it will mean for its passage or rejection on election day, and what (if any) arguments are present within the evidence. Additionally, you will compile your reference information to a google doc spreadsheet available to the class. You will also be responsible for bringing up this evidence during deliberations as needed. Audio visual aids are required. Be prepared to answer questions after your presentation (time permitting).

Evaluation Criteria

Did the speaker:

- Provide the class with a new piece of evidence related to understanding Prop E?
 - Summarize the evidence?
 - Explain the arguments within the evidence?
 - Explain its credibility & strength as a piece of research?
 - Explain the links between the evidence and Prop E?
 - Use audio visual aids to show us the evidence & explain it?
 - Speak extemporaneously, use appropriate nonverbal & verbal delivery skills, and speak within 3-5 min?
-

Deliberation Activity 100 points. Points will be determined by student participation and performance in the activity as a whole, including in class work, related take home assignments, and behavior during guest and expert speakers.

GUEST SPEAKERS

We will, on occasion, have guest speakers come in to explain their take on Proposition E, along with their arguments for or against the measure. During these times it is imperative that we have excellent listening and audience skills. You will be expected to take notes, to ask questions, and to consider the evidence and arguments they bring to the table during our deliberations. DO NOT EVER leave the class, or use any technology (unless special permission is given) during their presentations.

DELIBERATION

The class will deliberate as a whole, and in groups many times throughout the semester. At times, leaders will need to emerge or be assigned by the class in order to help facilitate deliberation. At times having a computer and online access

in class will be helpful. Full participation is REQUIRED from each student during deliberations.

Deliberative Argumentation BASICS (material below from external sources)

- Consider building consensus about the best way to address a problem about which people are undecided or have differing viewpoints.
- If we look at the structure of productive problem-solving discussions, we see that often multiple proposals are advanced and then discussed before any decision is reached. This **thoughtful, fair-minded examination of possible solutions lies at the heart of deliberative argument.**
- Core idea: Arguments can incorporate some features of cooperative, problem-solving discussions in which people focus “on the **shared goal of finding the best answer or making the best or most justified decision in any given situation,**”
- It isn’t so simple as imagining oneself as a participant at the discussion table, because that way of understanding deliberation would lead you to produce a “contribution” to the discussion, one that would surely look very much like a traditional claim-plus-reasons argument.
 - Instead, the **challenge is to replicate the dynamics of thoughtful discussion, where participants express their views, question others, and refine their opinions in the interactive process of arriving at a decision.**

Optional/Extra Resources

Gastil, J. & Knobloch, K. (2010). *Evaluation report to the Oregon state legislature on the 2010 Oregon Citizens’ Initiative Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/OregonLegislativeReportCIR.pdf>

Kashani, N. H., & Stern, R. M. (2011) Making California’s initiative process more deliberative. *California Western Law Review*, 47.

Kroll, B. M. (2005) Arguing differently. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 5(1).

Merkle, D. M. (1996). The National Issue Convention Deliberative Poll. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60(4). Pp. 588-619.

Appendix II.

NAME: _____

EXPERT PRESENTATIONS (50 points)

Each student is required to give a 3-5 min “expert presentation”. During this presentation, the expert is to provide the class with a NEW (NOT redundant) piece of research related to our understanding of Proposition E. You are to explain the evidence you have found, such as: summarize the research generally, provide its credibility as a source & its strength as a piece of research relating to Prop E, how it relates to Proposition E and what it will mean for its passage or rejection on election day, and what (if any) arguments are present within the evidence. Additionally, you will compile your reference information to a Google doc spreadsheet available to the class. You will also be responsible for bringing up this evidence during deliberations as needed. Audio visual aids are required. Be prepared to answer questions after your presentation (time permitting).

Evaluation Criteria

Did the speaker:

-
- Provide the class with a new piece of evidence related to understanding Prop E?
 - Summarize the evidence?
 - Explain the arguments within the evidence?
 - Explain its credibility & strength as a piece of research?
 - Explain the links between the evidence and Prop E?
 - Use audio visual aids to show us the evidence & explain it?
 - Speak extemporaneously, use appropriate nonverbal & verbal delivery skills, and speak within 3-5 min?
 - Complete the “expert presentation” spreadsheet? [google docs spreadsheet]
-

Notes:

Total points _____/50

Appendix III.

NAME: _____

Speaker: _____

Major Claim:

Evidence/data to back up claim:

Warrant/Reasoning (link connecting data to claim):

Summarize 1 of the major arguments made by the speaker (include the claim, the data & reasoning) in no more than 2 sentences.

Questions for the speaker:

Notes:

Appendix IV.

Missouri Ballot Measure: Proposition E General Election November, 2012 -Final Report-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From August through October, 2012, 21 citizens conducted deliberations on Proposition E for the November, 2012 election in Missouri. For the review of Proposition E, a panel of 21 citizens from the fall 2012 course Argumentation and Advocacy at the University of Missouri-Columbia (Instructed by Hayley Cole) convened to engage in a comprehensive examination of Proposition E, titled:

“Shall Missouri Law be amended to prohibit the Governor or any state agency, from establishing or operating state-based health insurance exchanges unless authorized by a vote of the people or by the legislature? No direct costs or savings for state and local governmental entities are expected from this proposal. Indirect costs or savings related to enforcement actions, missed federal funding, avoided implementation costs, and other issues are unknown.”

During the comprehensive examination of Proposition E, proponents and opponents of Proposition E presented their arguments to the panel and each had question and answer sessions after their presentation, the panelists conducted research on Proposition E and presented their findings, and the panelists deliberated over the merits of the ballot measure. At the end of the process, the panelists developed a Citizens’ Statement containing their conclusions about the ballot measure. The statement provides voters with an informed analysis of the ballot measure that has been crafted by a panel of their peers.

The panel and the comprehensive examination of the ballot measure was modeled after the Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) process in Oregon. The CIR is an innovative way of publicly evaluating ballot measures so voters have easy access to clear, useful, and trustworthy information at election time. The Oregon CIR Commission was established by an act of the Oregon Legislature in 2011. For additional information about the CIR process, the Oregon Citizens’ Initiative review Commission, or the convener of the CIRs, Health Democracy, please see the following websites: Oregon CIR Commission: www.Oregon.gov/CIRC ; Health Democracy & Background of the CIR: www.healthydemocracy.org

SHARED GENERAL STATEMENT: 21 out of 21 citizens agreed on this statement

What is Proposition E?

Proposition E is a legislative ballot initiative that determines the process by which Missouri's health care exchange is established. A health care exchange is an online database for individuals and small businesses listing private health insurance in a format that allows easy comparison between coverage options and prices. If Prop E passes, then only the legislature or a citizen ballot initiative would have the ability to establish a state based exchange. If Prop E does not pass, then the governor has the ability to establish a state based exchange by executive order without the approval of the legislature.

The Affordable Healthcare Act stipulates that plans for state based exchanges must be submitted by November 16, 2012. Members of both political parties expect that if Prop E is passed (and the decision is left to the legislature or citizen's ballot initiative) there will not be a state based exchange. In that case, the federal government will assume the responsibility of an exchange's establishment.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP E STATEMENT:
Citizens' Statement of In Favor of Voting YES on Prop E
Position taken by 9 of 21 citizens**

We support the passage of Proposition E for several listed reasons. Beforehand, we find it important to reiterate that regardless of the outcome of this proposition, a health care exchange will be provided to Missouri citizens. If the state decides not to establish the exchange the Federal Government is prepared to set one up.

- The passage of the proposition upholds the checks and balances of power between the executive and legislative branches as mandated by the constitution. Meaning, the decisions regarding a healthcare exchange must be approved by the legislature instead of allowing the governor to make the decisions on his own.

- The passage of the proposition maintains the regulation and approval of all state spending by the House Appropriations Committee.

- There is a significant risk of tax penalties to small businesses if a state based exchange is established.
- A federal exchange allows less interference from private interest groups within the state.
- The federal government is on schedule to have a federal exchange up and running within the year. If Missouri uses the federal exchange instead of trying to establish their own, citizens won't have to wait for the state to design one from scratch. While the basic framework for this federal exchange will be provided, there won't be a universal set of "essential health benefits"; we as a state will decide our own benefits.
- If Missouri is unhappy with the federal exchange provided the federal government Missouri can choose to create a state based exchange at any point in the future
- Some have argued that voting no on Prop E would result in the expansion of Medicaid even though establishing a state exchange is not linked to Medicaid expansion. Conservative lawmakers in Missouri would likely decline to expand Medicaid regardless of who is funding the exchange. Despite receiving \$8.4 billion dollars from the federal government to initially fund an expansion, after the year 2019 the burden on the state of Missouri would increase to \$431 million dollars and \$100 million dollars every year after that.

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO PROP E STATEMENT:
Citizens Statement in favor of Voting NO on Prop E
Position taken by 12 of 21 citizens**

When a healthcare exchange is established, it should be established by the state because:

- A state based exchange will most likely be tailored to the needs of Missouri. It will be more specialized to the residents as compared to a Federal exchange.
- The federal government will provide additional funding to the state of Missouri to create a state based exchange.
- Along with a state-based exchange will come an expansion of Medicaid, which will grow to include 300,000 previously uncovered Missourians. The State

of Missouri will also receive \$8.4 billion through 2019 towards this expansion.

- Without this expansion of Medicaid, several hospitals with high percentages of uninsured patients, as well as multiple rural hospitals, will be in danger of shutting down.

- The Federal Government is not prepared to set up health care exchanges in all states; therefore, giving this power to the Governor will allow the health care exchange to be established more efficiently. The sooner the exchange is implemented, the sooner those without insurance will be covered.

- Voting NO will support state sovereignty more than voting YES, because it allows the power to remain within the State.

- There are advantages for small businesses under a state-based exchange. Certain small businesses* will be exempt from penalties that otherwise will be imposed for not covering their workers. Additionally, tax credits will be offered to help cover their workers. The state health insurance exchanges will also allow small businesses to buy coverage there, thus improving access for their employees.

- It has been argued that the passage of the proposition maintains the regulation and approval of all state spending by the House Appropriations Committee. However, from 2010-2011, 15 different State Departments received an excess of \$49 billion in non-appropriated Federal funds; this shows that there are numerous instances in which the State received funding from the Federal Government to be used at the discretion of the Governor.

*Businesses with fewer than 50 employees are exempt from penalties that otherwise will be imposed for not covering their workers. Small businesses with fewer than 25 workers and average wages of less than \$50,000 get tax credits to help cover their workers.

PRESENTERS TO CITIZENS INITIATIVE REVIEW OF PROPOSITION **E**

Advocates in Favor of the Measure:

- Chris Dunn, Chief of Staff for Republican Senator Rob Schaaf, representing the 34th Senatorial District

- Scott Rupp, Republican member of the Missouri State Senate, representing district 2.

Advocates in Opposition to the Measure:

- Stephen Webber, Democratic member of the Missouri House of Representatives, representing the 23rd district (Up for re-election in the newly drawn 46th district)

- Mary Still, Democratic member of the Missouri House of representatives, representing the 25th district (Running for Senate in District 19).

- Chris Kelly, Democratic member of the Missouri House of representatives, representing the 24th district (Up for re-election in the newly drawn 45th district)

- Homer Page, Chairperson of the Boone County Democratic Central Committee

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Characteristic	Population Percentage	Number of Panelists
Gender		
Female	43.8%	7
Male	56.3%	9
Voting History		
Voted in 2 or more of last 4 election	18.8%	3
Ethnicity/Race		
White	81.3%	13
Black or African American	12.5%	2
Hispanic or Latino	6.3%	1
Party Registration		
Democrat	26.7%	4
Republican	33.3%	5
Non-Partisan, Independent &/or Other (Skipped Question)	40%	6 1
Age		
18-34	100%	16
35-59	0%	0
60+	0%	0
Religion		
Christian	31.3%	5
Catholic	25%	4
Jewish	6.3%	1
Agnostic	18.8%	3
Do not practice religion	18.8%	3

*These numbers represent the results from the 16 out of 21 panelists who completed the survey.

Information on CIR Prop E Final Report can be found at : <http://goo.gl/66cPX> & <http://pci.missouri.edu/>

Appendix V

Deliberative Democracy **Survey/ Instrument**

1. What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
2. Have you voted in 2 or more of the last 4 elections?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
3. Have you voted in less than 2 of the last 4 elections?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
4. Are you White, Black or African-American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, or Other?
 - a. White
 - b. Black or African American
 - c. American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - d. Asian
 - e. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - f. Hispanic or Latino
 - g. Other
5. Are you registered to vote?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
6. If you are registered to vote, what party are you registered as?
 - a. Democrat
 - b. Republican
 - c. Non- Partisan, Independent & Other
7. If you are NOT registered to vote what political party do you feel you identify with most?
 - a. Democrat
 - b. Republican
 - c. Non-Partisan, Independent & Other
8. Do you feel you are a
 - a. Strong democrat

- b. Democrat
 - c. Middle of the road democrat
 - d. Strong republican
 - e. Republican
 - f. Middle of the road republican
 - g. Strong Non-Partisan, Independent & Other
 - h. Non- Partisan, Independent & Other
 - i. Middle of the road Non Partisan, Independent & Other
9. What is your age?
- a. 18-34
 - b. 35-59
 - c. 60+
10. What is the highest level of education you have received?
- a. High School or Less
 - b. Some College
 - c. Bachelor's Degree
 - d. Graduate degree
11. What is your religion?
- a. Christian
 - b. Buddhist
 - c. Catholic
 - d. Jewish
 - e. Hindu
 - f. Agnostic
 - g. Atheist
 - h. Other
 - i. Do not practice religion
12. Looking back over the course of this process, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the deliberative democracy activity as a whole?
- a. Very low satisfaction
 - b. Low
 - c. Neutral
 - d. High
 - e. Very High Satisfaction
13. Did the moderator (instructor) demonstrate a preference for one side or the other overall?
- a. Favored proponents
 - b. Neutral
 - c. Favored opponents

14. Was the moderator (instructor) fair? On a scale of one to five, with one showing favoritism towards those who SUPPORT the initiative and five showing favoritism toward those who OPPOSE the initiative, did the monitor demonstrate an OVERALL preference for one side or the other during the ENTIRE activity?

1	2	3	4	5
Moderator		Moderators seemed		Moderator
seemed to				
Seemed to prefer		to prefer NEITHER side		prefer
those in OPPOSITION				
Those in SUPPORT				

15. Did you have sufficient OPPORTUNITY to express your views during the process?

- a. No
- b. Unsure
- c. Yes

16. On a scale of one to five, with one being not at all important and five being extremely important, how important a role did YOU play overall in this activity?

1	2	3	4	5
Not important		Moderately		Extremely
Important				
At all		Important		

17. On a scale of one to five, with one being definitely NO and five being definitely YES, would you say you had sufficient OPPORTUNITY to EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS overall?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

18. On a scale from never to almost always: Please respond to the following questions:

When other participants or advocates expressed views different from your own overall, how often did you consider carefully what they had to say?

Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Almost
Always				

How often did you have TROUBLE understanding or following the discussions generally?

Never Rarely Occasionally Often Almost
Always

How often do you feel that other participants treated you with respect overall?

Never Rarely Occasionally Often Almost
Always

How often did you feel pressure to agree with something that you weren't sure about?

Never Rarely Occasionally Often Almost
Always

19. On a scale from one to five, with one being NOT satisfied at all and five being VERY satisfied please respond to the following questions:

How satisfied were you with the SHARED AGREEMENT STATEMENT?

1	2	3	4	5
NOT at all		SOMEWHAT		VERY
Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied

How satisfied were you with the ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR statement?

1	2	3	4	5
NOT at all		SOMEWHAT		VERY
Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied

How satisfied were you with the ARGUMENTS in OPPOSITION statement?

1	2	3	4	5
NOT at all		SOMEWHAT		VERY
Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied

20. Please answer either YES or NO to the following questions:
Did you find this activity to be overall helpful to learning about arguments and argumentation?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Did you find this activity to be overall helpful to learning about advocacy?

- a. Yes
- b. No

21. On a satisfaction scale from very LOW to very HIGH please answer the following questions:

Looking back over this activity, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the activity to learn about deliberation?

Very Low Low Neutral High Very High

Looking back over this activity, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the activity to learn about arguments and argumentation?

Very Low Low Neutral High Very High

Looking back over this activity, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the activity to learn about advocacy?

Very Low Low Neutral High Very High

Looking back over this activity, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the activity to learn about democracy?

Very Low Low Neutral High Very High

Looking back over this activity, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the activity and the deliberative democracy process?

Very Low Low Neutral High Very High

22. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability

Some participants have had conversations about the ballot measure outside of class. How much influence did those informal talks have on your views during the activity and process?

I DID NOT Participate In such discussions	I participated but was NOT influenced	Those conversations influence me a little bit	Those Conversations Influenced me A GREAT
---	---------------------------------------	---	---

DEAL

Some participants have had conversations with each other about the ballot measure. How much influence did those informal talks have on your views during the activity and process?

I DID NOT Participate In such discussions	I participated but was NOT influenced	Those conversations influence me a little bit	Those Conversations Influenced me A GREAT
---	--	---	--

DEAL

23. On a scale from STRONGLY OPPOSED to STRONGLY SUPPORTED please answer the following questions:

Before you participated in this activity, what was your position on this measure?

Strongly Opposed	Somewhat Opposed	Not sure/ undecided	Somewhat supported	Strongly supported
---------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

At the end of this activity, what is your position now on the measure?

Strongly Opposed	Somewhat Opposed	Not sure/ undecided	Somewhat supported	Strongly supported
---------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

24. Do you support having an institutionalized Citizens Initiative Review process in Missouri?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Possibly

25. Do you support an institutionalized Citizens Initiative Review in Missouri?

Strongly Opposed	Somewhat Opposed	Not sure/ undecided	Somewhat supported	Strongly supported
---------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

26. On a scale of one to five, with one being definitely NO and five being definitely YES, please answer the following questions:

Do you feel more knowledgeable about Proposition E after the process?

1 Definitely NO	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Definitely YES
--------------------	---	-------------	---	---------------------

Are you likely to vote in the upcoming election after having participated in this process?

1 Definitely NO	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Definitely YES
--------------------	---	-------------	---	---------------------

Do you feel more confident in democracy after having participated in this process?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

Do you feel more confident in your ability to vote in the upcoming election?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

Do you feel more informed about the democratic process after having participated in this activity?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

Do you feel more confident that you will vote in future elections after having participated in this activity?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

Did deliberating about Proposition E help you to understand Proposition E?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

After deliberating over Proposition E, do you feel more knowledgeable about Proposition E?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NO		Unsure		Definitely YES

27. A goal for this activity was to learn enough about Proposition E to reach an informed decision. On a scale of one to five, with one being definitely NOT and five being definitely YES, do you believe that you learned enough from this activity to make an informed decision about Proposition E?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely NOT	Probably NOT	Unsure	Probably YES	Definitely YES

28. After having deliberated on an issue do you have any thoughts about the process of deliberation? Do you think there are any advantages or

disadvantages to using deliberation to reach a goal? Please provide a few comments.

29. Some people leave processes like this feeling the same as when they came. Others leave feeling like their sense of citizenship has changed. How about you? Do you think that this process has changed you, and if so, please provide a few comments about how your sense of citizenship has changed.
30. Some panelists entered this process with no prior experience with this issue, while others had some relevant prior experience with this issue. How about you? Do you have any previous personal experience with this issue?
Yes, I do. No, I do not.
31. If you answered yes and feel comfortable sharing your experience, please provide a brief description of your own relation to this issue. Remember that all the answers you provide in this evaluation are strictly anonymous.
32. If approved by the state legislature, Citizen Initiative Review processes may be held in the future for upcoming initiatives. What part of the activity/ process would you recommend that the project staff change?
33. Thinking back over the course of the activity, please provide any additional comments about the deliberative democracy process that you would like your instructor, future staff or the research team to hear.
34. Thank you for participating in this survey. To receive your extra credit please enter your pawprint.

References

- Binder, M., Boudreau, C., & Kousser, T. (2011). Shortcuts to deliberation? How cues reshape the role of information in direct democracy voting. *California Western Law Review*, 48, 97-128.
- Bowler, S., & Donovan, T. (2000). *Demanding choices: Opinion, voting, and direct democracy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Camicia, S. P. (2010). Deliberation of controversial public school curriculum: Developing process and outcomes that increase legitimacy and social justice. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(2), Article 7. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss2/art7>
- Carcasson, M., Black, L. W., & Sink, E. S. (2010). Democracy: Current contributions and future possibilities. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), Article 8. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss1/art8>
- Citizens' Initiative Review (CIR). (2012, November 14). *Citizens' Initiative Review Commission report*. Retrieved from <http://www.leg.state.or.us/committees/exhib2web/2011interim/JEB/JEBSGG/12102012mtg/32%20CIRC.pdf>
- Craig, S. C., Niemi, R. G., & Silver, G. E. (1990). Political efficacy and trust: A report on the NES pilot study items. *Political Behavior*, 12, 289-314.
- Diaz, A., & Gilchrist, S. H. (2010). Dialogue on campus: An overview of promising practices. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), Article 9. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss1/art9>
- Elliott. (2012, October 9). The living voters guide: Democracy online. *Evergreenapps*. Retrieved from <http://www.evergreenapps.org/the-living-voters-guide-democracy-online/>
- Enslin, P., Pendlebury, S., & Tjiattas, M. (2001). Deliberative democracy, diversity and the challenges of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 35, 115-130.
- Freelon, D. G., Kriplean, T., Morgan, J., Bennett, W. L., & Borning, A. (2012).

Facilitating diverse political engagement with the living voters guide.
Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 9, 279-297.
doi:10.1080/19331681.2012.665755

- Frey, L. R. (Ed.). (2006a). *Facilitating group communication in context: Innovations and applications with natural groups: Vol. 1. Facilitating group creation, conflict, and communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- (Ed.) (2006b). *Facilitating group communication in context: Innovations and applications with natural groups: Vol. 2. Facilitating group task and team communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Gastil, J. (2000). *By popular demand: Revitalizing representative democracy through deliberative elections*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (2006). How balanced discussion shapes knowledge, public perceptions, and attitudes: A case study of deliberation on the Los Alamos National Laboratory. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 2(1), Article 4. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol2/iss1/art4>
- (2011). Investigating the electoral impact and deliberation of the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review. 2010 National Science Foundation Political Science Program Awards. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44, 437-439. doi:10.1017/S1049096510002362
- , & Black, L. W. (2007). Public deliberation as the organizing principle of political communication research. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 4(1), Article 3. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol4/iss1/art3>
- , & Knobloch, K. (2010). *Evaluation report to the Oregon state legislature on the 2010 Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review*. Seattle: University of Washington. Retrieved from <http://www.la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/OregonLegislativeReportCIR.pdf>

- , ———, Reedy, J., Henkels, M., & Walsh, K. C. (2011, November). *Hearing a public voice in micro-level deliberation and macro-level politics: Assessing the impact of the Citizens' Initiative Review on the Oregon electorate*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- , ———, & Richards, R. (2012, May). *Vicarious deliberation: How the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review influences deliberation in mass elections*. Paper presented at the fifteenth biennial conference of the Rhetoric Society of America, Philadelphia, PA.
- , & Richards, R. (2013). Making direct democracy deliberative through random assemblies. *Politics & Society*, 41, 253-281.
doi:10.1177/0032329213483109
- Goodin, H. J., & Stein, D. (2008). The use of deliberative discussion to enhance the critical thinking abilities of nursing students. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 5(1), Article 5. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol5/iss1/art5>
- Griffin, M. (2011). Developing deliberative minds- Piaget, Vygotsky and the deliberative democratic citizen. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 7(1), Article 2 . Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol7/iss1/art2>
- Harriger, K. J. (2010). Political science and the work of democracy. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), Article 7. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss1/art7>
- Kashani, N. H., & Stern, R. M. (2011). Making California's initiative process more deliberative. *California Western Law Review*, 47, 311-328.
- Knobloch, K. R., Gastil, J., Reedy, J., & Walsh, K. C. (2013). Did they deliberate? Applying an evaluative model of democratic deliberation to the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 41, 105-125.
doi:10.1080/00909882.2012.760746

- , ———, Richards, R., & Feller, T. (2012). *Evaluation report on the 2012 Citizens' Initiative Reviews for the Oregon CIR Commission*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved from <http://www.la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/ReportToCIRCommission2012.pdf>
- , & Raabe, R. (2011, November). *Exploring the effects of deliberative participation through panelist self-reports*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Kroll, B. M. (2005). Arguing differently. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 5, 37-60.
- Levinson, M. (2002). Dilemmas of deliberative civic education. *Philosophy of Education*, 2002, 262-270. Retrieved from <http://ojs.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/pes/article/view/1825/535>
- Mansbridge, J. J. (1983). *Beyond adversary democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Matsusaka, J. G. (2004). *For the many or the few: The initiative, public policy and American democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mathews, D. (1999). *Politics for people: Finding a responsible public voice* (2nd ed.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- McKinney, M. S., & Chattopadhyay, S. (2007). Political engagement through debates: Young citizens' reactions to the 2004 Presidential debates. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50, 1169-1182. doi:10.1177/0002764207300050
- Merkle, D. M. (1996). The National Issues Convention Deliberative Poll. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60, 588-619.
- Moses, M. A., & Farley, A. N. (2011). Are ballot initiatives a good way to make education policy? The case of affirmative action. *Educational Studies*, 47, 260-279. doi:10.1080/00131946.2011.573607
- O'Doherty, K., Gauvin, F., Grogan, C., & Friedman, W. (2012). Implementing a public deliberative forum. *Hastings Center Report*, 42(2), 20-23. doi: 10.1002/hast.28

- Parker, W. C. (2011). Feel free to change your mind: A response essay to “The potential for deliberative democratic civic education.” *Democracy & Education*, 19(2), Article 9. Retrieved from <http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol19/iss2/9>
- Parker, W. C. (2012). Democracy, diversity, and schooling. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of diversity in education* (pp. 613-620). New York: Sage.
- Richards, R. (2012, June 6). Oregon Citizens Initiative Review 2010 Measure 74. *Participedia*. Retrieved from <http://participedia.net/en/cases/oregon-citizens-initiative-review-2010-measure-74>
- Sunwolf, & Frey, L. R. (2005). Facilitating group communication. In S. A. Wheelan (Ed.), *The handbook of group research and practice* (pp. 485-509). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tannen, D. (1999). *The argument culture: Stopping America's war of words*. New York: Ballantine Publishing Group.
- Thomas, N. L. (Ed.). (2010). Why it is imperative to strengthen American democracy through study, dialogue and change in higher education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), Article 10. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss1/art10>
- Waghid, Y. (2005). Action as an educational virtue: Toward a different understanding of democratic citizenship education. *Educational Theory*, 55, 323-342.
- Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning real utopias*. London: Verso.