


10-25-2013

The People's Lobby: A Model for Online Activist Deliberation

Jeffrey C. Swift

North Carolina State University, jswift8@gmail.com

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

 Part of the [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#), [Rhetoric Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Swift, Jeffrey C. (2013) "The People's Lobby: A Model for Online Activist Deliberation," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 2 , Article 13.

Available at: <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art13>

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.

The People's Lobby: A Model for Online Activist Deliberation

Abstract

This article presents a model for a “People’s Lobby,” a digital process of deliberation and activism that allows citizens to have their voices heard on important political issues. The model described in this proposal attempts to achieve deliberation for its own sake, but also for the sake of an activist intervention geared toward immediate response—a process commonly called lobbying. In other words, this is a model that combines the fairness and inclusivity of deliberation with the prodding tension of organized activist lobbying. The People’s Lobby might not completely counteract the effects of more conventional corporate lobbying and other mass-organizational pressures, but if it increases the impact of citizens’ reflective and deliberative voices even marginally, it will be well worth the effort.

Keywords

deliberation, activism, lobbying, digital deliberation, new media

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank the issue editors and anonymous reviewers for their invaluable feedback.

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to
the great task remaining before us . . . that government
of the people, by the people, for the people,
shall not perish from the earth.

—Abraham Lincoln

The creation of tension [is] a part of the work of the nonviolent resister.

—Martin Luther King, Jr.

Introduction

Lincoln's ideal of a people-centered democratic government has become a useful measure of success at achieving a functioning democracy. Since his Gettysburg Address, however, corporations have become legally recognized in the United States as people and money has become recognized as speech, mirroring trends in other liberal democracies of corporations gaining outsized political influence. This trend threatens to stifle the very deliberation that could help temper its more controversial effects.

In this article, I present a model for a "People's Lobby," a digital process of deliberation and activism that allows "We the People" to have voices heard on important political issues. No tool or procedure will be a permanent answer to the enduring questions facing the project of deliberative democracy, but a combination of new media tools and carefully designed deliberative processes can help citizens create the tension necessary to retake control of an important part of the political process. In writing this proposal, I was inspired by the recent success of Oregon's Citizens' Initiative Review (Healthy Democracy Oregon, 2009) to empower deliberative bodies to inform and influence the larger population.¹ The People's Lobby is not focused on reviewing initiatives, however. Based on a combination of Gastil's (1993, 2000; Gastil & Richards, 2013) deliberative "Citizens' Assembly," which proposes legislation, and the "Policy Jury," which advises legislators on existing legislation, the Lobby uses key affordances in digital media to facilitate citizen input directly to legislators.

1 The Citizens' Initiative Review is the focus of an increasing body of literature. For example, see Knobloch et al. (2012, 2013); Archer (2012); Binder et al. (2011); Gastil (2011a, 2011b); Gastil and Knobloch (2010); Gastil et al. (2011, 2012); Gastil and Richards (2013); Ingham (2013); Knobloch and Raabe (2011); Moses and Farley (2011); Richards (2012); Wright (2010).

Problem Identification

Many liberal democracies across the world are being confronted with money's influence in the political process (Peev, 2002; Rowbottom, 2010; Ip, 2007). For example, the 2010 U.S. Supreme Court decision known as "Citizens United" has prompted a great deal of worry—and loss of public trust—over the influence of money in the American electoral process. This worry is well founded in light of increasing influence of wealthy PACs, SuperPACs, and other shadowy "nonprofits" dedicated to tilting the political playing field in the favor of the wealthy. This trend, combined with business-friendly lobbying powerhouses such as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC),² represents an opportunity for deliberative democracy to be proven as a viable alternative.

This troubling trend of those with more resources drowning out everyday citizens' voices is somewhat counterintuitively paralleled by an increase in the accessibility of free publishing tools that enable anyone with an Internet connection to share their opinions with the world. As Hindman (2009), Morozov (2011), and Pariser (2011) have argued, however, the Internet is not a democratizing force. Far from achieving the democratic reforms many hoped for, the Internet has reestablished the control of the media and opinion elites (Hindman), empowered oppressive regimes (Morozov), and created a culture where big businesses track every piece of online data and algorithmically construct silos of agreement that hide opposing viewpoints and stifle deliberation (Pariser).

With this in mind, it is imperative that we heed the call of Pfister and Godana (2012) "for the careful and informed creation of 'deliberation technology.'" They stipulate, however, that deliberation technologies will be more than the "hardware of communication" but will instead involve thoughtful innovation of digital media models that facilitate deliberation (Pfister & Godana, 2012, p. 2). This sort of concerted effort is imperative if we hope to take advantage of the largely untapped potential of these new communication technologies to enable digital deliberation and empower democratic reforms.

Proposal Details

The People's Lobby (PL) model of online deliberative activism consists of three main phases: selection, deliberation, and accountability. But before setting out this model, it is important to address an apparent contradiction in the title of this proposal. As Levine and Nierras (2007) point out, deliberation is often viewed as a process quite unrelated to activism. While deliberation is aimed at consensus

2 For more on the efficacy of the lobbying organization known as ALEC (American Legislative Exchange Council), see Beckett (2011).

and fairness, activism is more strategic and aimed at accomplishing predetermined goals (Levine & Nierras, 2007, p. 1). This project does not attempt to renegotiate these differences, only to include aspects of both deliberation and activism for maximum practical effect on policy and legislation. Levine and Nierras (2007) found that many activists were interested in deliberation not as an end unto itself, but rather as a means to help achieve particular “urgent goals” (p. 3). The model established in this proposal attempts to achieve deliberation for its own sake, but also for the sake of an activist intervention geared toward immediate response: lobbying. In other words, this is a model that combines the fairness and inclusivity of deliberation with the prodding tension of activist lobbying.

Though this combination might seem counterintuitive (how can activists be fair and open to opposing viewpoints?), this model accepts Garsten's (2006) assertion that productive dialogue about public issues is best carried out by interested and even partisan citizens. In this sense, the ideal PL process would be one in which all participants enter with a desired outcome and then modify that desire through research, well-facilitated deliberations, and meaningful interactions. The details of how this model aims to achieve this combination will be more fully explained below.

The PL process officially begins as citizens collaboratively select relevant issues to weigh in on. The second phase continues the process in an online moderated deliberation. After the deliberations, the model begins transitioning into activism with a presentation to the public of the results of the deliberations. The final, and most activist-oriented, step involves holding politicians accountable to the published results.

Each section below presents a basic framework that is broad enough to be adapted to various countries or districts around the world. In this way, this model will follow Pfister and Godana's (2012) requirement that deliberative technology be not a one-size-fits-all set of rules, but rather a flexible framework that can be adapted by moderators and participants for particular situations (p. 1). This model is specifically tailored for use at the intermediate level between local and national governments (e.g., U.S. states, Canadian provinces, etc.), but can be adapted for counties, cities, towns, or even neighborhoods. Ideally, the People's Lobby model will be repeated on a regular basis in a given state, compounding its effectiveness by increasing visibility, participation, and buy-in from the general population.

Phase 1: Selection

The PL will take place between legislative sessions, soon enough after the previous session to give the process enough time to be completed before the beginning of the next. In addition, participants will be made aware that once an issue has been the subject of a PL process, it cannot be taken up again for at least

two full legislative cycles. This safeguard will ensure that competing proposals will not be active at the same time, and will decrease the ability of outside interests to quickly overturn PL legislation before it can take effect.

In order to ensure that the PL process is transparent and people-driven, the selection phase begins with citizens' collaboratively deciding on the issues to be considered by the People's Lobby. Residents of the state will be presented with an online platform for requesting that specific issues be covered.³ This platform will be shared via social media and will be advertised in public buildings with free Internet access (e.g., public libraries and schools). Logging into the platform will require residents to disclose their demographic and geographic information to enable tracking by organizers to ensure that a sufficiently diverse sample participates. If a particular demographic group is underrepresented in this phase, the organizers will increase outreach appropriately until demographic parity is achieved. The platform will ask for participants to submit the issues they find most pressing, and then prompt them to rate other submissions.⁴ The entire list of issues will then become the pool from which that PL's topic will be selected.

This safeguard will not completely prevent well-organized or well-financed factions from attempting to manipulate the process (e.g., by packing this stage of the PL with their supporters to steer issue selection), but will dilute their influence by leaving the final topic selection up to a deliberative body whose transparency in every stage of the process will earn and keep public trust. While some might worry that the possibility of a deliberation populated by passionately opinionated participants raises too big a risk, Garsten (2006) has made the case that successful deliberations can and must be based on interested persuasion rather than on the neutralization of previously held opinions (p. 189). In this sense, having participants hand-picked by relevant interest groups could actually improve the quality of the deliberations rather than overshadow the process entirely.

PL participants will be drawn from the body of people who submit/vote in the topic-selection phase. Following the direction of Gastil (1993; Gastil & Richards, 2013, p. 268) regarding the size and sampling appropriate for a selected group tasked with drafting legislation, a group of fifty individuals will be selected from this body of participants through random sample (governed by demographic

3 For an already existing example of the technology described here, see Google Moderator (<http://moderator.appspot.com>).

4 The process will include a "merge issues" option that participants can control and that PL organizers can instigate if need be. For example, "gun control," "ban handguns," and "more gun free zones" would all be merged into one issue for deliberation. There will be as little moderation in this stage as possible, allowing individuals free reign to select exactly the issues that most concern them. If duplicate issues remain on the list during the deliberative issue selection phase, participants will have the freedom to merge issues at that point.

quotas, as decided upon by local organizers).⁵ This means that the initial process of advertising and gathering participants must reach every demographic, as any demographic with no representation in the initial submission/voting process will be excluded from any potential deliberations. The organizers will be transparent about this process in the final report.

An honest assessment will admit that perfect representativeness will be unlikely. Therefore, in keeping with the transparency necessary to win public trust, the demographic makeup of the PL will be frankly addressed in the final report. Even if the first round of PL participants is not as demographically diverse as desired, each future PL iteration will use and expand upon the same body of participants (excluding previous participants for at least one year to reduce the potential for abuse or manipulation of the system) in order to produce a cumulative effect of increasing diversity and the potential for the entire state population to be represented.⁶ Because each PL selection process will draw from an increasingly large body of participants, as outreach and advertising will be designed to draw more participants each time, each pool will be perceived as fresh and fair to all who wish to participate.⁷

After the fifty participants have been selected, they will be presented with the five issues selected by the larger population. They will then decide, through the initial round of online deliberation, which issue to deliberate upon as a body.

Phase 2: Deliberation

To keep the PL process moving quickly, while also providing the PL organizers time to prepare the research and expert testimonies, the PL will begin no sooner than two weeks after the issue has been selected. The PL participants will then have two weeks to research and discuss the issue at hand. Discussion will take

5 The process of random sampling from a group of self-selected individuals is similar to the process adopted by California's recent redistricting commission (Pierce & Larson, 2011; Reyes, 2008; Mac Donald, 2012), which, after an unrepresentative start, has ended up being quite successful due to targeted outreach (Lagos, 2010).

6 For example, if 1,000 citizens submit ideas for a particular state's first People's Lobby, the participants in the deliberative phase will be drawn from those 1,000 individuals. The state's second People's Lobby will start with and expand upon those 1,000 accounts. Each iteration will broaden the base of participation and encourage more individuals to be involved.

7 PL participants will be compensated based on local average weekly income (as determined by local PL organizers). This cost and others associated with the process need to be covered, but the People's Lobby will not be funded from the legislators it aims to influence—an activist entity will lose credibility if it gets its funding from the target of its activism. Instead, it will be funded entirely by private philanthropy and individual donations, but will give funders no influence whatsoever in the PL process. This follows the example of the Citizens' Initiative Review, which similarly relies on private funding (Gastil & Richards, 2013, p. 271).

place entirely online⁸ and under the direction of a facilitator who is trained to moderate this type of asynchronous deliberation, encouraging participation, familiarizing participants with the technology, and establishing deadlines with the group. The facilitator will introduce the initial set of research and expert testimonies compiled by PL organizers (carefully and transparently so as to reduce procedural bias or undue influence from any faction) from relevant stakeholders, think tanks, and universities. If participants find and use additional research resources, they will be asked to supply links to those resources so that the entire group can engage with the additional resources. Aside from a mandatory initial training with the facilitator, the deliberation will be entirely asynchronous, allowing individuals with difficult work or family schedules to still participate.

While the participants and facilitators will have the ultimate say on this procedural decision, the schedule will break down into two broad sections:

Week 1: initial training, topic selection, research

Week 2: policy proposal, supplementary research, final document

At the end of the allotted time the PL participants will produce a final document (via collaborative online document-creation software such as Google Drive) that represents their policy recommendation on the issue. The document will contain a piece of plain language⁹ model legislation agreed upon by a two-thirds majority of participants. Based on the size of the random sample and the finality of a piece of model legislation (see Gastil 2000; Gastil & Richards 2013, p. 268), this high supermajority threshold will provide yet another safeguard against the system's being gamed by special interests, and will demonstrate to the public a piece of legislation supported by a wide cross-section of their peers. The final document will be published online immediately after the deliberations have concluded. This publication begins the activist portion of the People's Lobby deliberative activism process, by making public a citizen-endorsed proposal that legislators ignore only at their own electoral peril.

Phase 3: Accountability

8 As an example of what the digital tool used in these deliberations might look like, see the free and open-access tool at Loomio.org, <https://www.loomio.org/>.

9 Plain language will be used for two reasons: 1) a random sampling of citizens cannot be expected to be fluent with the legal language of legislation, and 2) to ensure that legislators are held accountable to a standard understood by the general population. As needed, based on the issue being discussed, PL organizers could arrange for legal counsel to work with the participants to translate the plain-language text into language appropriate for official legislation.

This phase of the PL will focus entirely on the activist goal of getting the legislation passed. After the PL group for a particular issue is disbanded, but before the associated legislature begins its next session, participant names, deliberation transcripts, and related research will be posted online in full. This level of transparency will help build a level of trust in the PL process that will encourage future participation and increase the potency of the final results of each subsequent PL. Participants will be encouraged to talk about their experience with the media, and will be supplied with fact sheets about the PL process (including demographic breakdown, participant statistics, etc.).

PL organizers, facilitators, and participants will track the state's elected officials to see the extent to which they follow the PL's recommendations. A simple online "score card," similar to that proposed by Gastil (2000), will present the extent to which each officeholder's actions are in line with past PL decisions. During the subsequent election season, the organizers will ask challengers how they stand on the issue(s) the PL has weighed in on and then publicize the answers along with the incumbent's score card. This will pressure both incumbents and challengers at least to respond to the PL's recommendations or model legislation.

The PL participants and organizers will begin the lobbying process by holding a press conference in the lobby of the legislative hall (thereby drawing attention to the origin of the word "lobbyist"). At this press event, participants will present legislators with a copy of their model legislation and formally request it be passed as soon as possible. Participants and organizers will also encourage the public to pressure the legislators via phone calls, emails, petitions, etc. This two-pronged lobbying effort—involving both directly lobbying officials and encouraging the public to lobby as well—has the potential to create the tension needed to ensure the legislators are sufficiently convinced to enact the PL's proposals.

Why the People's Lobby Can Be Successful

Gastil (2000) set out four characteristics of deliberation that is able to give the public a meaningful voice: such deliberation must be representative, deliberative, articulate, and influential (p. 111). This section will briefly address each of these characteristics and demonstrate the efficacy of the PL model in terms of these criteria.

Representative

Because the participants in each PL will be organized by stratified random sample, this model will meet Gastil's (2000) criterion of bringing a wide range of subgroups into the discussion and incorporating them into an inclusive voice (pp. 91-92). As described above, initial PLs might not be as representative as later ones. Each successful PL, however, will have potential to increase the visibility and participation of the next. Since the database of participants in the initial topic-selection process will carry over for each subsequent PL, that database will become increasingly representative.

Deliberative

Each PL will focus initially on facilitating effective deliberation, which Gastil (2000) refers to as "a period of informed discussion and reflection oriented toward discerning a clear and mutually acceptable policy direction" (p. 92). By enabling citizens to narrow down a list of topics, and then allowing PL participants to select topics to deliberate on, the process of producing mutually acceptable policy starts right at the inception of each PL. As the trained facilitator guides the online discussion and provides relevant research and expert opinions, that discussion will become more informed and thus more deliberative, allowing the participants to engage with each other more substantively.

Articulate

The final product of each PL will be either a set of opinions supported by a majority or a minority of participants, or a detailed piece of model legislation. Each opinion or piece of legislation will be specific, concrete, and directly related to a pressing current issue, thus meeting the third requirement for a deliberative process that creates accurate public voice (Gastil, 2000, p. 92). Whereas some deliberations might ultimately create a final product that has little bearing on public policy, the PL process is built specifically with legislative ends in mind. Just as a lobbyist for a large corporation is ultimately focused on getting legislation passed, the PL will be single-minded in its efforts to provide the People with a lobbying force to counteract paid lobbyist armies.

Influential

The tension created by the active lobbying and activism of the third phase of the PL is aimed at creating an influential public voice. As Gastil (2000) argues, "Only when voice affects actual policy decisions does it serve the public interests that sparked it and reinforce the civic habits and institutions that gave rise to it" (p. 92).

This level of influence will hopefully reinforce the PL and encourage citizens to participate in future efforts to lobby their government. The extent to which the PL can be influential remains to be seen, but the potential is there for significant influence on state legislators and other elected officials. The increase in influence over policy stemming from the PL's activism phase would potentially end up outweighing the risks to the PL's legitimacy arising from combining advocacy and deliberation.

Metrics of Quality and Efficacy For Researchers

Assessment of the People's Lobby is one of the most important aspects of this proposal; well-conducted evaluation will allow organizers and researchers to understand how and why the PL works and to improve upon the PL's procedures (Nabatchi et al., 2012). Among the various metrics available I have selected three main areas of inquiry, based on Gastil's (2000) characteristics of successful deliberation. One advantage of the PL's taking place online is that some of the variables described below can be more easily measured using archived online evidence than using evidence obtained from face-to-face deliberations. The three areas of inquiry are as follows:

1. *Articulate and Influential*. Does the People's Lobby increase the impact of the People's voice on specific issues and "actual policy decisions"?
 - A. Do elected officials care about PL proposals? How do they respond?
 - B. Do people feel empowered after participating in PL processes or seeing PL successes?
 - C. Are citizens interacting with the PL documents, grading sheets, or pieces of model legislation that are posted online after each PL?

The first effect can be measured by monitoring outside reactions to PL proposals. Is legislation sponsored and passed? Does each PL attract more participation than the last (indicating an increasing feeling of empowerment among the general public)? Do electoral campaigns mention or debate PL proposals? As these metrics are measured, the PL technologies can be adapted and improved to ensure that future engagements will be more successful.

2. *Representative and Deliberative (part 1)*. Is the online format successfully creating a diverse deliberative space built to sustain "informed discussion and reflection" aimed at finding a "mutually acceptable policy direction" (Gastil, 2000, p. 92)?
 - A. Are participants drawn from a demographically diverse and representative body, or does something need to change in order for the process to be more representative?

- B. Is the facilitator properly prepared to moderate an online deliberation?
- C. Is the research presented sufficiently thorough and fair to all sides?

While the impact of the PL process can only be measured by looking outside the PL itself, the next two questions require looking into the workings of the process and examining both the qualitative and quantitative data available in the digital format. The quality of the deliberative space can be ascertained by examining such quantitative factors as the length of time each participant spends deliberating, the number of participants, and the diversity of participants, as well as such qualitative factors as the nature of participants' interactions, the degree to which consensus and fairness were achieved, and attributes of participants' relationships.

- 3. *Deliberative (part 2)*. Are the tools initially adopted for a PL deliberation adequate for "informed discussion and reflection," or is more innovation required to improve upon the deliberative technologies?
 - A. Is the learning curve too great for participants to quickly become involved in the process?
 - B. Is participation easy and intuitive, or does the technology discourage participation/deliberation?
 - C. Do the tools assist in sustaining the deliberations for both weeks?

Finally, the effectiveness of the digital tools can be assessed by looking at the aggregated user data on the various digital tools employed. Metrics such as the amount of time spent on the site, the number of links clicked per visit, the number (and quality) of interactions, and the number of direct engagements with other participants can help answer the third research question and contribute to the further development of deliberative technologies.

Conclusion

A government perfectly of the people, by the people, and for the people will always be an unattainable ideal. Nevertheless, models of public deliberation such as the People's Lobby can be implemented, assessed, and revised with the aim of empowering We the People to have a stronger say in every point of the legislative process. Whether or not corporations are people or our friends, they certainly have well-funded lobbyists fighting for their causes in statehouses across the country. The People's Lobby might not completely counteract the effects of corporate lobbying on public policy, but if it increases the impact of citizens' voices even marginally it will be well worth the effort.

References

Archer, L. (2012, June). *Evaluating experts: Understanding citizen assessments of*

technical discourse. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Great Plains Society for the Study of Argumentation, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

- Beckett, L. (2011, August 1). Our step-by-step guide to understanding ALEC's influence on your state laws. *ProPublica*. Retrieved from <http://www.propublica.org/article/our-step-by-step-guide-to-understanding-alecs-influence-on-your-state-laws>
- 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.
- Garsten, B. (2006). *Saving persuasion: A defense of rhetoric and judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gastil, J. (1993). *Democracy in small groups: Participation, decision making, and communication*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society.
- . (2000). *By popular demand: Revitalizing representative democracy through deliberative elections*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . (2011a, January 31). *Connecting small group deliberation with electoral politics: An assessment of the 2010 Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review*. Paper presented at the Annenberg Research Seminar, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- . (2011b). 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(1), 151–154. doi:10.1017/S1049096510002362
- , & 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). *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 97th Annual Conference of the National

Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

———, ———, & Richards, R. (2012). *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

Healthy Democracy Oregon. (2009). Citizens' Initiative Review. *Healthy Democracy Oregon*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.healthydemocracyoregon.org/citizens-initiative-review>

Hindman, M. (2009). *The myth of digital democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ingham, S. (2013). Disagreement and epistemic arguments for democracy. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 12, 136-155.
doi:10.1177/1470594X12460642

Ip, P.-K. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and crony capitalism in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79: 166–177.

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*, 21, 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: 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 97th Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Lagos, M. (2010, January 25). Critics say redistricting panel needs diversity. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from

<http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Critics-say-redistricting-panel-needs-diversity-3201695.php>

- Levine, P., & Nierras, R. M. (2007). Activists' views of deliberation. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 3(1), Article 4. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol3/iss1/art4>
- Mac Donald, K. (2012). Adventures in redistricting: A look at the California Redistricting Commission. *Election Law Journal*, 11, 472–489. doi:10.1089/elj.2012.1148.
- Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Moses, M. S., & 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.
- Nabatchi, T., Gastil, J., Weiksner, G. M., & Leighninger, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. New York: Penguin.
- Peev, E. (2002). Ownership and control structures in transition to 'crony' capitalism: The case of Bulgaria. *Eastern European Economics*, 40(5), 73–91.
- Pfister, D. S., & Godana, G. D. (2012). Deliberation technology. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8(1), Article 10. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss1/art10>
- Pierce, O., & Larson, J. (2011, December 2011). How Democrats fooled California's Redistricting Commission. *ProPublica*. Retrieved from <https://www.propublica.org/article/how-democrats-fooled-californias-redistricting-commission>.
- Reyes, K. (2008). Redistricting or rethinking? Why proportional representation may be a better solution than California's independent redistricting commission. *Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal*, 20, 655-694.

Richards, R. (2012, November). *Legal narrative in the citizens' panel: Identifying theories to explain storytelling in a small group deliberation about ballot initiatives*. Paper presented at the 98th Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.

Rowbottom, J. (2010). *Democracy distorted: Wealth, influence and democratic politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, E. O. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London: Verso.