

6-4-2016

Assessing Deliberative Pedagogy: Using a Learning Outcomes Rubric to Assess Tradeoffs and Tensions

Sara A. M. Drury

Wabash College, drurys@wabash.edu

Derek Andre

Wabash College


Seton Goddard

Wabash College

Jeremy Wentzel

Wabash College

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

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Rhetoric Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Drury, Sara A. M.; Andre, Derek; Goddard, Seton; and Wentzel, Jeremy (2016) "Assessing Deliberative Pedagogy: Using a Learning Outcomes Rubric to Assess Tradeoffs and Tensions," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 12 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol12/iss1/art5>

This Article 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.

Assessing Deliberative Pedagogy: Using a Learning Outcomes Rubric to Assess Tradeoffs and Tensions

Abstract

Teaching deliberative decision-making is a method of encouraging students to think critically, engage public problems, and engage in both public speaking and public listening. College instructors have begun to use deliberation as a pedagogical tool, yet further research is needed to understand the learning outcomes of deliberative pedagogy. We argue that the deliberative principle of “understanding tradeoffs and tensions” is a key learning outcome of deliberative pedagogy, and demonstrate an avenue for evaluating it through a learning outcomes rubric, and through critical-interpretative methods of rhetorical criticism. In our analysis, we demonstrate that students with prior training in deliberation achieve higher levels of understanding tradeoffs and tensions through their rhetorical behaviors of embodying a deliberative perspective, expressing inclusivity, and working through public problems.

Keywords

deliberation, deliberative pedagogy, higher education, rhetoric, rhetorical criticism, tradeoffs, tensions

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the editors of *Journal of Public Deliberation* and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback on earlier drafts. Additionally, they wish to express sincere gratitude to the Kettering Foundation for their support of this project, especially for Maxine Thomas’ leadership of the Deliberative Pedagogy Research Exchange where this paper was workshopped and presented. Leila Brammer and Joni Doherty were incredibly gracious co-authors of the Deliberative Pedagogy Learning Outcomes (DPLO) Rubric, and gave their feedback on earlier versions of this essay. Wabash College also supported teaching and research associated with this project, and Jeffrey P. Mehlretter Drury and Preston Bost who provided assistance with elements of the project. Finally, the authors thank three additional members of the original Wabash College spring 2013 project team who aided the development and execution of the pilot study: Grant Klembara, Nathan Manning, and Garrett Wilson.

In 2012, the American Association of Colleges and Universities released *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*, a landmark report addressing the troubling state of lowered civic health and awareness in the United States. With dismay, the report noted the downward trends in civic education and learning: for example, less than half the states require high school civics courses, and among 14,000 college students surveyed in 2006-2007, the average score on a sixty-question civic literacy exam was just over 50% (National Task Force, 2012, pp. 6-7). To halt, and perhaps even reverse these trends, the report charged colleges and universities “to cultivate in each of its graduates an open and curious mind, critical acumen, public voice, ethical and moral judgment, and the commitment to act collectively in public to achieve shared purposes” (p. 10). In addition to creating a framework for 21st century civic learning, the report also highlighted key pedagogical practices designed to invigorate civic health on campuses and in communities across the nation. One such suggested practice was “deliberation and bridge building across differences” (p. 4).

Public deliberation, or the careful addressing of public problems through a process of critical reasoning, listening, speaking, and decision-making, is recognized as an important tool for higher education because it facilitates the consideration of diverse ideas, provides students with a framework for critical thinking, and ultimately prompts citizens to engage in choosing actions and approaches to addressing public problems. While many activities in the field of deliberation have focused on public events and consultation projects to encourage more participatory decision-making, scholars such as Scully (2014) have stressed that “building a strong civic infrastructure is highly dependent on our ability to embed democratic values, practices, and institutions more deeply within our local communities” (p. 1). Part of the process of embedding democracy must include instructing citizens in this new type of deliberative politics, centered around participation and deliberation across tradition political divides (Boyte, 2014; Hess & Gatti, 2012). The teaching of the theories, skills, and practices of democratic deliberation in higher education is a critical and necessary component of building twenty-first century civic learning and democratic engagement—though one that has been overlooked and understudied, particularly in comparison to “service learning” and “civic engagement” practices on college campuses (Hogan, 2010; Shaffer, 2014).

Deliberation prioritizes discussion around a public problem, encouraging participants to understand that the problem has no perfect solution without drawbacks (tradeoffs) and that often participants are choosing between multiple favorable solutions with competing values (tensions). The process of *understanding tradeoffs and tensions* is important in deliberation because it suggests the embodiment of a participatory and deliberative approach to public

problems, one that recognizes no problem has a perfect solution, and often solutions are in tensions with different values held by stakeholders. It is, therefore, a key learning outcome of deliberative pedagogy—the process of teaching how to name, frame, address, and determine actions to wicked problems through collective, participatory, and communicative means (Longo, 2013).

To effectively integrate deliberation into the civic activities of higher education, we need to prioritize the development of methods to demonstrate not only how deliberation works in public, but avenues for assessing the process of students learning how to deliberate. This essay proposes using a rubric-based evaluation system to identify and assess a learning outcome of deliberation using rhetorical features present in deliberative discourse. To better understand the deliberative learning outcome of understanding tradeoffs and tensions, we look at two sets of deliberative transcripts based on students' exposure to a basic public speaking course with a module on deliberation. Using critical-interpretative rhetorical methods, our analysis demonstrates that previous exposure to deliberation instruction in the public speaking course produced a higher quality of understanding tradeoffs and tensions in a future deliberative setting. Furthermore, we find that higher levels of understanding tradeoffs and tensions are indicated through the consistent presence of certain rhetorical features, including a deliberative perspective, inclusivity, and robust “working through” of diverse perspectives, a process that prompts the “choicework” present in deliberative civic engagement.

To begin, we first review scholarship on deliberation as practiced in education, and then turn to previous literature on assessing deliberation in public and classroom settings. We detail our method for studying the learning outcomes of deliberative pedagogy, specifically addressing the importance of understanding tradeoffs and tensions in pedagogical settings, then proceed to our analysis and findings. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of implications and future opportunities for research.

Deliberation in Educational Contexts

The terms “deliberation” and “deliberative democracy” are still relatively new to political and communication scholarship, having been coined in the 1980s and brought into regular scholarly use in the 1990s (Hansen, 2012). Definitions of deliberation vary based on discipline and practice, but a good definition can be found in Chambers (2003): “deliberation is debate and discussion aimed at producing reasonable, well-informed opinions in which participants are willing to

revise preferences in light of discussion, new information, and claims made by fellow participants” (p. 309). Deliberation brings community members together to discuss pressing public problems, forging connections and, determining actions that will begin to address the issue (Carcasson & Sprain, 2016).

Deliberation is a prioritized practice of twenty-first century citizenship because it represents an incredible potential for the revitalization of American democratic talk, practices, and problem solving. It has tremendous power to “facilitate engagement across differences in complex and diverse societies,” fostering trust amongst community members and reflecting the creative potentials of democracy (Asen, 2013, p. 3). Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini (2009) surveyed a “veritable warehouse of data” on public deliberation, and ultimately argued that deliberation has the potential to benefit American politics. It is not, they warned, an idealistic “salvation of democracy,” but rather “presents opportunities for the future expansion and rejuvenation of democracy.” Indeed, the authors acknowledge that one of the struggles of deliberation is that it takes “time, effort, and skill,” requiring a sort of “entry fee” of citizens (pp. 153-154).

These challenges—the time, effort, and skill required for successful deliberation—have led to many scholars and practitioners calling for the teaching of deliberation to citizens of all ages to improve civic capacity. The pedagogical process of teaching students to deliberate reflects Longo’s (2013) term “deliberative pedagogy,” or the process that “integrates deliberative decision-making with teaching and learning” (p. 2), as well as Murphy’s (2004) conception of “deliberative civic education,” or “instruction that utilizes varying forms of classroom deliberation and deliberative exercises to enhance the democratic skills of citizenship and to increase understanding of democratic practice” (p. 74). Many scholars have emphasized the potentials for teaching and practicing deliberation in the collegiate classroom as a way of encouraging the development of civic skills, attitudes, and capacities (Carcasson, Black, & Sink, 2010; Dedrick, Grattan, & Dienstfrey, 2008; Harringer, 2010; Hogan, 2010; Longo, 2013; Sheeler, Weiss, & D’Souza, 2015; Stitzlein, 2010; Thomas & Hartley, 2010). Others have stressed how deliberation may foster participatory management styles (Greitens & Strachan, 2014), as well as how deliberation facilitates communication skills and problem-based learning in the classroom (Drury, 2015; Maurer, 2015). Classroom exercises reflecting this orientation encourage students to consider their civic responsibilities around challenging public problems, with the aim of developing capacity for engaging in public life (Eberly, 2002; Hess & Gatti, 2010).

Yet just as with public deliberation, introducing deliberation into higher education remains a difficult task. Classroom deliberations are a time-intensive, labor-

intensive, small-classroom-size activity that does not always line up neatly with the economic and political realities of higher education today (Dedrick et al., 2008; Drury, 2015). If deliberation is to succeed in the current higher education climate of assessment and standards, practitioners must determine methods of demonstrating deliberation's value to encourage more frequent adoption. This leads to the question of how we might research the question of whether learning deliberative theories and practices impacts future capacity for deliberation, understanding deliberative pedagogy's impacts on students.

Assessing Deliberative Pedagogy

There are many challenges in studying group deliberation, such as interdependence of data, small group size, and difficulties in interpreting discursive outcomes across varied settings. A comprehensive resource on the scholarship of analyzing and measuring group deliberation can be found in a book chapter by Black, Burkhalter, Gastil, and Stromer-Galley (2011). They explain that since there is not a "consistent definition of small group public deliberation," researchers have "drawn on diverse literature to create research designs aimed at empirically capturing aspects of deliberation" (p. 324). Assessment in public deliberations have utilized a variety of methods to answer different research questions about deliberation's quality and effectiveness (Weiksner et al., 2010), including, for example, quantitative political communication and civic engagement measures (Adams, 2015; Gastil & Xenos, 2010); inductive and analytical methods (Hartz-Karp, 2007; Knobloch et al., 2013; Mansbridge et al., 2006; Ryfe, 2006); discourse analysis (Tracy, 2005, 2010); and content analysis (Stromer-Galley, 2007).

Assessing deliberative learning outcomes provides an opportunity to build on the previous research in assessing deliberation through the incorporation of methods that assess the rhetorical content of the deliberative process. Much of the assessment of deliberation has tended to focus on the participant experience rather than the arguments made and the process of coming to a decision (Adams, 2014; Black, 2012). One avenue for classroom assessment could be student self-reporting measures to understand some aspects of deliberation's impacts; however, when determining whether deliberation is an effective tool for increasing the quality of deliberation in students about a range of issues, another avenue is assessing what is said in deliberations. More recently, rhetorical scholars have begun to utilize critical-interpretive methods to analyze the qualities and features of deliberation (Asen, 2015; Asen et al., 2011; Asen et al., 2013; Lawrence & Bates, 2014; Lefebvre & Carlin, 2001; Steffensmeier & Schenck-

Hamlin, 2008). This suggests an opening for utilizing such rhetorical methods to determine the quality of discourse around key principles of deliberative practice.

As part of assessing teaching students deliberative methodologies and practices, Drury, Brammer, and Doherty (2013) developed a Deliberative Pedagogy Learning Outcome (DPLO) rubric to assess deliberative pedagogy as part of their work with the Kettering Foundation’s Deliberative Pedagogy Research Exchange. This rubric details seven learning outcomes for deliberative pedagogy: collaboration, reason-giving, synthesis of ideas and information, understanding of tradeoffs and tensions, reflection, awareness of relationships, and empathy (Drury, Brammer, & Doherty, in press). Each learning outcome has four assessment levels: an entry level that depicts a fundamental lack of the principle, two intermediary benchmark levels, and a capstone level. Rather than the replacement of one benchmark with the criteria of the next, each subsequent level suggests the cumulative addition of skills, critical thinking, and practices: a participant who reaches the capstone level would also demonstrate the practices of two previous benchmark levels. The rubric levels for the learning outcome “Understanding Tradeoffs and Tensions” can be found in Table A.

Table A – DPLO Rubric, Understanding Tradeoffs and Tensions

| | Entry level | Benchmark 1 | Benchmark 2 | Capstone |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Understanding Tradeoffs and Tensions | Unable or unwilling to recognize the tradeoffs or tensions in a position. | Recognizes that there are tradeoffs and tensions in public decisions but may minimize those associated with one’s own position. | Identifies various things that are valued for a given issue; weighs tradeoffs and tensions for different groups in the community. | Prioritizes values in tension by articulating the tradeoffs and benefits of choices, and identifying preferred choices for the community. |

The development of civic activities in pedagogy—such as deliberation—are typically designed to encourage students to build lifelong civic skills and the capacity for civic action (Colby et al., 2003; Longo, 2013; Musil, 2015; Shaffer, 2014). Understanding tradeoffs and tensions in public problem solving builds new ways of thinking about public problems and new capacities for civic action in several ways. First, this principle recognizes that a deliberative perspective on public problems is founded on the idea that there is no one, perfect ideal solution—every solution to a wicked, public problem has benefits and drawbacks

(Carcasson & Sprain, 2016; Rittel & Webber, 1973). This is a substantial change in thinking about public issues, as the recognition that even the “best” solution has tradeoffs may be a new way of thinking—it certainly is one infrequently displayed in our current political culture, which seems to reward absolute positions and an unwillingness to change one’s mind.

Second, understanding tradeoffs and tensions is critical for being able to achieve the choicework that makes deliberation different from other small group discussion. Unlike discussion and dialogue, which are exchanges of ideas between different perspectives, deliberation involves “facing up to difficult tradeoffs” through deep consideration of alternatives and ultimately making choices (Mathews, 2014, p. 77). Tradeoffs of decisions are typically represented in the framing issue guides of the National Issues Forum, which emphasize the “choice work” of weighing benefits, costs, tradeoffs, and risks of each choice. This perspective is in contrast to a debate approach to public policy, which seeks to “win” the round by refuting tradeoffs and risks of the preferred position.

Third, understanding tradeoffs and tensions is often an obstacle to successful deliberation, as it is understood by many scholars to be challenging to achieve in public settings (Adams, 2015; Levasseur & Carlin, 2001). Focusing on whether prior instruction in deliberation increases the communication process of working through tradeoffs and tensions seems particularly relevant to making the case for deliberative pedagogy. If taught successfully, understanding tradeoffs and tensions may encourage students towards a lifelong consideration of public problems from a more deliberative perspective, whether they engage in public deliberation or are formulating opinions on issues independently.

Methodology

All research in this pilot study was approved by the Wabash College Institutional Review Board.¹ Student participants were recruited for the focus groups through emails on all-student listservs and class emails to target groups of students who had and had not taken public speaking. The participants in this study (N=18) represented freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors from a four-year, private non-sectarian liberal arts college for men.

¹ This study was approved by the Wabash College IRB on March 18, 2013. The approval number is #1330201.

To assess the deliberative principle of understanding tradeoffs and tensions, we created a focus group deliberation that engaged two categories of students—(1) undergraduate students who had taken a public speaking course with a module on deliberation, and (2) undergraduate students who did not have formal instruction in deliberation. The goal was to determine if previous instruction in deliberation increased the quality of deliberation in future settings. For the first group, previous instruction occurred through an entry-level public speaking course focuses on learning outcomes around public speaking, critical thinking, and democratic citizenship. Assignments in the course included an informative speech identifying a productive or unproductive piece of public discourse, a group deliberation speech, an advocacy speech, and a speech of rhetorical analysis of public discourse (Abbott, McDorman, Timmerman, & Lamberton, 2015).²

The group deliberation speech is of particular interest to assessing deliberative pedagogy. In groups of four to five, students examined and presented the “tough choices” inherent in public controversies and led their classmates through a discussion of that issue. Similar to the National Issues Forum style of deliberation, the assignment asked students to frame a public issue through a group speech with four (or five) sections: a framing of the problem and three (or four) approaches to solving that problem. Students in the class also gained experience facilitating the public issue, as they led their peers through a deliberation after the framing speech. The deliberation module introduced students to the concepts of deliberative framing, “wicked problems” of public concern, and the idea that any “solution” to a wicked problem has benefits, tradeoffs, and tensions between values (Mathews, 2008; Rittel & Webber, 1973).

Research Question and Design

Our primary research question focused on a comparison of the deliberative capacity of these two categories of students: *Will students who have past experience with deliberation instruction better articulate an understanding of tradeoffs and tensions in future deliberations than those without such instruction?* To answer this research question, we designed and implemented a focus-group based study to record and analyze deliberative conversations for evidence of understanding tradeoffs and tensions.

While individual demographic data was not collected about the participants due to the small size of the pilot study as well as the small size of educational site for the study, institutional data on political behaviors of the study body as a whole are

² This study used a draft version of the *Public Speaking and Democratic Participation* textbook (Abbott, McDorman, Timmerman, & Lamberton, 2015).

available. This institutional data was collected as part of the Higher Education Research Exchange’s CIRP Freshman Survey from 2009-2012. According to this survey, male students at this college were more conservative than their male counterparts at other private, nonsectarian, four year institutions, with an average of 36% of students at the institution in question reporting their political views as conservative or far right, compared to 21.3% of students at all private, nonsectarian 4-year colleges in the study (see Table B and Table C).³ This is relevant due to the content of the deliberation, which was about the national debt, an issue that features a strong ideological divide between liberals and conservatives.

Table B

CIRP Institutional Data on Entering Male Freshmen at the Pilot Study Institution

Question: How would you characterize your political views?

| Year | Far left | Liberal | Middle-of-the-road | Conservative | Far right |
|------|----------|---------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| 2009 | 2.2% | 24.2% | 37.7% | 31.8% | 4.0% |
| 2010 | 2.6% | 17.7% | 41.6% | 35.5% | 2.6% |
| 2011 | 1.1% | 19.4% | 45.3% | 32.0% | 2.2% |
| 2012 | 1.2% | 17.7% | 44.9% | 31.3% | 4.9% |

Table C

CIRP Institutional Data on Entering Male Freshmen at All Private Nonsectarian 4-Year

Question: How would you characterize your political views?

| Year | Far left | Liberal | Middle-of-the-road | Conservative | Far right |
|------|----------|---------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| 2009 | 4.0% | 30.2% | 46.0% | 17.7% | 2.2% |
| 2010 | 4.2% | 29.3% | 45.4% | 18.7% | 2.4% |
| 2011 | 3.6% | 27.1% | 46.7% | 20.4% | 2.2% |
| 2012 | 3.9% | 25.8% | 48.6% | 19.4% | 2.2% |

³ The data presented in the two CIRP charts represents male students only, since the pilot study involved only male students.

Once recruited, students were divided into five focus groups based on their prior instruction in deliberation, with focus groups at two different timeslots on the same day. The five focus groups included three with exposure to deliberation in the public speaking course (Groups A, B, and C) and two with no previous exposure to deliberation in their coursework (Groups D and E). Although five focus groups are listed here, only three participants arrived for Group C. Because three people would have been a very small deliberation group to study, Group C was eliminated from the study. This resulted in N=18, spread across the four groups. Each participant was compensated with a \$25 gift card and dinner on the evening of the focus groups.

The focus group timeslots began with a 20-minute introduction by the research team. The research team explained that the focus group was about finding out student views and problem-solving skills on the topic of the national debt. Information about the primary purpose of the research was withheld from the students so as not to taint their conversations towards more productive deliberations. The groups used the National Issues Forum issue guide *A Nation in Debt: How Can We Pay the Bills?* as the topic and framing for all deliberations (Wharton & McAfee, 2011). The research team selected this topic because it is a topic that is usually divided into the two political ideologies of liberal and conservative, and thus deliberating three approaches represents a significant change from politics as usual. Participants were given copies of this guide, and time to read the material. After the 20-minute introduction to the material, students were dismissed into focus groups based on their deliberation experience.

Each focus group deliberation took approximately 60 minutes, and was lead by a moderator and a notetaker. The moderator began the conversation, but because we were interested in how students would deliberate without significant leadership from a moderator, the moderator only occasionally asked follow-up questions or added to the deliberation, embodying the role of a passive moderator and guiding the conversation with minimal prompts to the group (Dillard, 2013). The notetaker annotated the deliberation and was responsible for the audio recordings. After the 60-minute deliberation, each group had a short (approximately 10 minute) debriefing session to first ask participants to reflect on the process and then inform them of the purpose of the study, namely studying deliberative learning outcomes.

The Rhetorical Criticism of Deliberative Discourse

As researchers in rhetorical studies, we sought to assess our deliberation through humanistic, critical-interpretative methods of analyzing discourse. This method stems from the theories and practice of rhetorical criticism more so than

qualitative discourse analysis, and so represents an applied research method of rhetorical criticism (Condit & Bates, 2009). It follows in the work of Asen et al. (2011; 2013) who used rhetorical, critical-interpretative methods to analyze the reasoning present in school board deliberations, addressing differences in interpretation through discussion and judgment amongst the research team. Asen et al. (2013) acknowledged that their approach “differs from the procedure prescribed in quantitative coding schemes,” but that this sort of analysis can “resonate” with the process of deliberative discussion and with scholars working together to resolving tensions or conflicts in interpretation to ultimately understand the significance of deliberative discourse (p. 40).

In working through the deliberations, our research team relied both on the audio recordings and transcriptions of those recordings. Each focus group produced an audio transcript of the conversation, which was turned into text through either a transcription service or by a team member transcribing the audio; a member of the research team then checked the audio recording against the text transcript for any errors. While the research team primarily relied on the textual transcripts in their analysis, the audio transcript was useful for further illuminating tone and meaning within the deliberations.

Analysis of Deliberation Transcripts

In our analysis of how the groups engaged in an *understanding of tradeoffs and tensions* during deliberation, we discovered several important rhetorical differences between groups with deliberation experience (Groups A and B) and groups lacking previous course instruction in deliberation (Groups D and E). First, from the beginning stages of the conversation, the groups with deliberation experience tended to frame the problem from a “deliberative perspective,” which set a foundation for a more robust consideration of tradeoffs and tensions later in the deliberation. Second, the groups with deliberation experience were able to discuss the problem with inclusivity while still recognizing the different values present in the problem, as well as the tension between those values. Thus, when one member of a group tried to advocate for a particular perspective, other members of the group engaged that member by re-articulating the values of multiple groups in society. Advocacy became a *part* of the deliberation, rather than transforming the deliberation into a debate between two sides. Finally, the groups with deliberation experience were able to more robustly engage the “working through” aspect of deliberation, whereas the groups without deliberation experience encountered obstructions when trying to weigh different actions to address the problem.

Engaging with a Deliberative Perspective

The two sets of focus groups seemed to approach the conversation under different mindsets, or perspectives. In all groups, participants were asked to give a “personal stake” to the prompt of how they relate to the national debt problem. Groups with deliberation experience quickly moved from personal connections to the problem into consideration of broad, public approaches to the national debt problem, whereas groups without deliberation experience stayed largely self-reflective. We define the former process as approaching the conversation through a “deliberative perspective.” A deliberative perspective towards politics is a mindset experienced in conversation; a deliberative perspective is something that one *does* in the early stages of beginning the deliberation that prepares participants for a more significant consideration of tradeoffs and tensions later in the conversation. This deliberative perspective is similar to how Asen (2013) has defined deliberative trust as a rhetorical act within the deliberative process. A deliberative perspective reflects a willingness to engage in public problem solving, and considering the self in relation to others (Carcasson & Sprain, 2010; Matthews, 1999; Nabatchi, 2012), and embraces citizen agency, or the power of citizens to consider, deliberate, and decide the solutions to the problems facing their community (Burkhalter, Gastil, & Kelshaw, 2002). Thus, a deliberative perspective *prepares* participants to engage in understanding tradeoffs and tensions because it enlarges the problem from self-interest to multiple interests.

Both of the groups with deliberation experience moved towards a deliberative perspective, whereas the groups without experience stayed within their own self-interested perspective. After expressing some initial personal views about the problem, Group A, the first group with experience, began to consider the broader implications of the national debt problem for all citizens:

Participant: “What are people’s priorities? What do you think our country’s priorities are? Because, that’s what politicians are going to need first.”

Participant: “Well the thing is—I think people want both...”

After acknowledging the multiplicity of stakes and one participant stating that the national debt was a broad “social problem,” Group A moved towards thinking through how to engage in problem-solving work to address the issue. Their sentiments are embodied in this summary of the opening section by one participant:

Participant: I guess to kind of try to move forward—like you said—we need to try in areas... essentially we're going to have to boil it down to increasing revenue and sacrificing some of the things we want or expect from the government.

Group A's conversation continued to revolve around the broader stakes, rather than just their own perspectives as college students.

In Group B, participants began by expressing their personal connection to the national debt issue, and then moved on to a deliberative perspective that encouraged broader consideration. For example, in the opening comments, one person mentioned that the national debt would impact them because they were "planning on going into politics," another stated "I'm going to end up suffering from it," and others stated it would impact them because of employment concerns—all very self-focused considerations of the problem. After sharing these perspectives, Group B was prompted by the moderator to give "initial impressions of the three options laid out in the issue guide," representing a more active facilitation technique than Group A. Following, Group B quickly moved from self-interest to a broader deliberative understanding that the national debt problem would take multiple perspectives and actions to address:

Participant: I think all three are actually doable at the same time and can actually solve the issue. It just doesn't appear that way on paper. You actually have to think about how things work out...

Participant: Yeah, I didn't see [the approaches] as mutually exclusive, um, it seemed that that's the idea here but, I mean, I feel like we can agree to make sacrifices now, strengthen our checks and balances, and invest in growth if we can allot the money that way.

Participant: Yeah, I mean, I guess I thought they all three seemed like good ideas but as far as one that you could actually convince people to go along with, uh, reinvesting in growth first was the one that, I mean, I would say is probably going to appeal to a lot more people than the suffering now.

This understanding seemed to open up their consideration of the national debt issue to recognize broader public concerns, with one participant then stating, "It's a real thing that affects everybody." In moving from the personal to more public concerns, Group B participants came to a deliberative perspective early in the conversation that better prepared the conversation for understanding tradeoffs and tensions.

A deliberative perspective acknowledges public problems are felt differently by different groups, and there are different preferred values as the public considers potential solutions to those problems. This undergirds participants for future engagement in the weighing of values and tradeoffs between different ideas. In the opening phases of the conversation, both groups with deliberation experience seemed to gravitate towards a perspective of working through different approaches that each had benefits and drawbacks. In this way, the “personal stakes” of deliberation encouraged participants to consider the national debt issue as having multiple perspectives and multiple possible avenues for action.

In contrast, the two groups without deliberation experience began with statements of personal belief, but then struggled to create deep connections between their positions, the public, and the issue. In Group D, some participants expressed their sentiment that the national debt did not directly impact them: “I’m not sure we’re affected,” said one; another replied “I don’t feel the weight of the debt;” and a third affirmed that they did “not personally feel the national debt.” Others suggested that the impact would be in the future:

Participant: I think I feel the affect of the national debt particularly in two ways. First, my family, who’s—I have older parents. So they’re starting to feel the affects of not being able to get Social Security benefits... [My dad] has to work harder than he’d expect. ... so the second way I’m affected is also through tuition.

Similar to the participant above suggesting that the debt impacted him because it hurt his family, in Group E, a participant shared that the debt would hurt him because “my family would be more or less dealing with like health care cost and whatnot.” Participants in Groups D and E who framed the national debt as a significant issue tended to do so because of the personal, rather than public, impacts.

This difference in deliberative mindset could be accounted for in a variety of ways. One possibility is that those with prior experience in deliberation instruction may have recognize the National Issues Forum-style framing of an issue, prompting them to consider it from a public perspective as they did in their previous course experiences. Additionally, the facilitator in Group B prompted participants to consider the “issue,” which suggests more of a public framing, rather than respond or react with their opinions. Those with experience in deliberation might have learned about how public problems impact citizens personally and the broader public, and therefore been encouraged to think about wicked problems from a public perspective.

Regardless, the rhetorical substance of the opening exchanges varied significantly between the two categories of students. Participants with prior deliberation experience were more likely to see the national debt issue as a problem because of public *and* personal reasons, rather than just discuss the problem from a self-interested perspective. This recognition of the wicked problem containing multiple interests and values hit Benchmark Level One of the DPLO rubric. The analysis here suggests that students with prior deliberation experience articulated a willingness to begin the working through of tradeoffs and tensions in public problems from the beginning stages of the conversation.

Inclusivity

A critical part of understanding tradeoffs and tensions is first the recognition that wicked problems have multiple perspectives, and then engaging in discussing and weighing values in tension in a productive manner. Whether this is achieved at a high or low level, inherent in understanding tradeoffs and tensions is the rhetorical move to discuss problems *inclusively*, rather than through an adversarial means. Carcasson (2009) suggested that one of the goals of deliberation is to counter the tendencies of U.S. citizens to engage in adversarial politics, defined by win-loss rather than moving forward. Rhetorical inclusivity in deliberation creates a foundation of diverse perspectives and values that remains present despite participants who may see themselves as advocates for a particular perspective. A rhetorically inclusive advocate recognizes their position not against, but rather in tension with other positions, acknowledging their preference may require sacrifice from others.

In Group A, the participants expressed inclusive understandings of the problem, self-correcting their assumptions about those with different viewpoints as they went throughout the deliberation. In the early stages of the deliberation, a few group members made comments disparaging other viewpoints, suggesting that part of the problems of economic development were that “people don’t wanna work [sic]” and “people just want to live the life of luxury without putting any of the work in.” However, these comments were countered by other participants in Group A who suggested that there were multiple perspectives: one person advocating for viewing the national debt issue from “the lens of the American person,” encouraging his fellow participants to consider the point of view of others on the problem who might have different backgrounds. The tone of the deliberation was respectful towards views, even as participants began to recognize that some groups would have to make tradeoffs to begin addressing the problem.

Additionally, this inclusivity led Group A to bring together the expertise present in the guide with the lived experiences of citizens. One member, for example,

suggested that while something might be economically viable, it might not be the will of the people: “that’s from an economist’s point of view. But ... in political science, I am told that it’s a government for the people.” Here, this student used a humoristic device (by referencing course experiences in college) to suggest that people’s experiences have value in determining government policies. Such a perspective demonstrates that there are *different groups in the community* with different knowledge bases and expertise—meeting Level Two on the DPLO rubric—and that these must be weighed against one another when choosing in deliberation.

Group B, on the other hand, demonstrated how inclusivity could mitigate the impacts of a dominant advocate within a deliberation, enabling the consideration of tradeoffs and tensions within group advocacy. Group B had one dominant participant who consistently articulated clear personal views and values about the national debt. A dominant participant could become a significant hamper to encountering and understanding tradeoffs, because strong advocacy without acknowledging the other side could move a group away from seeing the problem as having multiple conflicting values. This participant tended to make statements that re-framed other participants’ comments in a pro-con debate organization, rather than exploring alternatives, tradeoffs, and benefits across multiple perspectives. One of the stark examples of this is when he stated: “It sucks for certain people for a little bit of time but, you know ... everyone’s going to have to make sacrifices. It’s what we’re going to have to do.” The emphasis on “have to” suggests a closing of deliberation, rather than an opening. This participant then went on to advocate for “way lower government spending,” but with the understanding that the government could best ensure economic productivity in the future through better, prioritized spending on education. While this participant, and subsequently, the group as a whole, did not reach the highest levels of understanding tradeoffs and tensions, the participant did still *recognize* the existence of multiple values in tension.

Rather than dismissing these opposing values, the dominant participant in Group B used the weighing of tensions to advance—and in some cases, restate with the intent to persuade—his own positions that lower spending would pay down the debt and compel a reconsideration of essential social programs. Other group members chimed in, countering when he became overly combative to remind him of values of opposing groups. In this way, Group B consistently maintained the lower Level One Benchmark of understanding tradeoffs and tensions: “Recognizes that there are tradeoffs and tensions in public decisions but may minimize those associated with one’s own position.” The group was inclusive in that their discussion of the problem included multiple perspectives without demonizing any one faction, but occasionally minimized the relevance of

opposing ideas and did not really engaged in a robust *weighing* of different values and perspectives.

This trend ended up being reflected in Group B's statements at the end of their deliberation. Several participants articulated that their opinions had not substantially changed, but that they had learned a great deal more and developed their own positions. For example, one participant shared that his opinions were now "either better developed, more concrete, more supported, I guess, from doing this." Another participant explained that although he appreciated the "fiscally efficient" perspective of one of the group members, he wanted to focus more on something that could be "realistically able to be implemented," suggesting a weighing of the tension between ideal and politically effective policy. Finally, the group as a whole affirmed the deliberative process, lamenting that "open and honest conversation[s], like we've had here tonight," could produce more creative and long-lasting solutions. They left wanting to become more engaged, with one participant relating it to his desire to teach civic engagement to high school students in the future and another relating it to his upcoming internship in government. Even this lower level of understanding tradeoffs and tensions still created reflections in the group that there were many different ideas and values necessary for determining a way forward on the wicked problem of the national debt.

In contrast, groups without deliberation experience did not express inclusivity in their statements. As will be described in greater detail below, the two groups kept to a fairly shallow characterization of different interests. Like the dominant participant in Group B, Group D also had several participants who expressed fiscally conservative views such as advocating for a flat tax or lower taxes. However, unlike in Group B, where others contextualized or countered the dominant participant's viewpoint with other views, in Group D, positions and values were stated without being brought into context with one another. For example, in one exchange, participants in Group D discussed their preference for a balance budget:

Participant: We should also maybe put into that balanced budget amendment to mandate Congress to have a budget every two years, instead of having the continual irresolution that we've had for the last six, I believe.

...

Participant: Why don't we try?

...

Participant: There'd be riots.

As demonstrated above, Group D’s discussion of many issues began with an idea, suggested a course of action, and then quickly eliminated that action because someone would oppose it. Rather than seeing citizens as concerned about the same problem and seeking a solution—reflecting an inclusive rhetoric—Group D’s deliberation frequently framed outcomes in an oppositional and sensational manner, such as the “riots” mentioned above or later suggesting that we just need to “get rid of the damn penny” to “save a good amount of money,” which then led to someone else repeating “End the Fed” twice in the exchanges. While Group D acknowledged different positions, they did not discuss those positions as *related* to one another as tradeoffs or tensions between conflicting values; therefore, they represented the entry level of the understanding tradeoffs and tensions rubric because of their lack of inclusivity for multiple perspectives on the problem of the national debt.

Working Through to Understanding

When contextualized for the deliberative understanding tradeoffs and tensions, a thorough “working through” process suggests encompasses several aspects of the Level Two Benchmark and Capstone Level of the DPLO: identifying values, weighing alternatives for different groups in tension, and ultimately being able to prioritize values by articulating the tradeoffs necessary to move forward. Working through, as Mathews (1999) writes, is “what we do when making choices: we have to get past our initial reactions enough and reach a point where we are in enough control to make sound decisions about our future” (p. 228). The example of the advocate-turned-deliberator in Group B, above, represents how inclusive rhetorical behaviors enables participants to contextualize their initial views and reactions within a broader landscape, versus a more adversarial positioning in Group D. Working through deliberation reflects an inclusive understanding of problems, encouraging participants to reconsider the initial views of themselves and others, undertaking the hard work of re-examining the public problem and its potential solutions from a variety of perspectives (Yankelovich, 1991).

As the deliberation progressed, Group A became more efficient at questioning assumptions of politically divided groups, identifying the values present and underscoring how moving forward required tradeoffs. For example, one participant articulated a very clear vision of tradeoffs in relation to public goods:

Participant: But again, I think that comes down to—we’re going to have to compromise—you know Republicans are going to have to understand we’re going to need programs. Democrats are going to have to understand we can’t have every program, and vice-versa.

This participant demonstrated that to craft an effective solution to a wicked problem such as the national debt, there would need to be re-prioritization, reconsideration, and sacrifice amongst both political parties. To move forward, as the above suggests, a viable solution required some aspect of tradeoffs from both political parties.

Later in the deliberation, a participant from Group A suggested the struggle between immediate results and long-term solutions:

Participant: Ok, so what are people's priorities? Do they want another week of the good life, or do they want to invest and have like you know, a **** five years and a good fifteen years? What do you think the social perspective on this is? ... do they want people to have a better life the next day, or a better life in the next ten years after five years of hardship?

This participant demonstrates weighing tradeoffs and tensions in a very concise, inclusive, and effective manner. While not reaching the upper level benchmark of prioritizing values, the participant certainly understands the struggle for different groups and perspectives.

Group B moved from summarizing the benefits and tradeoffs in the issue guide to articulating the tough choices that would need to be made to adequately address the national debt problem. Participants weighed the real risks of some of the approach options, such as "reducing the corporate tax rate" would likely result in corporations holding "on to the money that they would ... accrue instead of paying taxes on it." In this example, the person explained that the risk, or tension, with lowering the corporate tax rate is that companies may not reinvest the money they don't pay taxes with. The participant seemed to express understanding of the complexity of economics and laid out the possible tradeoffs and tensions. Similarly, another member of Group B discussed the difficulty of cutting social programs, because some people's lives would "get a lot tougher," but he feels that "we have to do it" for the good of future generations. Here, the individual is acknowledging the tradeoff of eliminating what might be important support for a population, in favor of what he saw as a better long-term result. Group B's conversation did not exhibit the higher levels of understanding tradeoffs and tensions, but the participants did work to try and articulate the "tough choices" present in decision-making. At one point, the group generally agreed with one person's statement that "we cannot have our cake and eat it too."

Struggles to Engage Tradeoffs and Tensions

The two focus groups without deliberation experience began with strong statements of personal belief, but the conversation quickly became less interconnected and insightful. Variance in deliberation groups obviously reflects aspects of the individuals in the group (personality, political affiliation, willingness to communicate in a small group setting), but it is significant that both groups struggled to continue their conversation in ways that reflect known challenges of deliberating wicked problems: seeking a “magic bullet” or ideal solution to the problem (Carcasson & Sprain, 2016, p. 48) or “paralysis by analysis,” where talking about the issues has chilling impacts for future engagement because participants cannot work through a way forward and instead continue to analyze the issues (Carcasson, 2013, p. 11).

Group D did not engage the tensions of any of the three options, and instead tended to search for an ideal solution—one that would be without a flaw. Early on in the deliberation, participants in Group D focused on the positive aspects of each option, rather than taking the tradeoffs and benefits together as part of the tensions of public problem solving. For example, a participant explained that the group was talking about all three options because “there’s things in each option that are good to talk about.” However, the group saw any drawbacks from the framing guide as problematic, rather than working through an understanding that no problem has a perfect solution, there are always tradeoffs and risks.

As a result of the framing emphasizing the flaws of each solution, Group D expressed their frustration with the framing guide’s lack of what they viewed as adequate options towards solving the problem. The group considered a variety of actions that could alleviate the national debt, including reducing military spending, implementing a balanced budget amendment, changing minimum wage, reducing entitlements, raising taxes, adding a national sales tax, cutting foreign aid, and more. However, nearly every case, one or two group members would propose the action to address the national debt, the group would then point out flaws or problems, and move onto something else. As one participant summarized during a discussion of cutting federal programs, “There’s no rules here on how we have to fix this problem. I mean, it’s just whatever works, right? Whatever’s efficient.” Still, “efficiency” was not defined, and the broader sentiment of “whatever works” described the group’s rhetorical freewheeling throughout the conversation, jumping from topic to topic without engaging deeply.

After rejecting many possibilities because they were not ideal, the group then switched to wishful thinking, suggesting that balancing the budget and cutting costs would be the best way forward. As they began to talk about how to do that,

the group descended into talking over one another, still throwing out idea after idea and not really discussing the implications of any specific plan. When asked by the moderator about their process, the group agreed that they had not come to a decision or decided a solution on the issue.

Furthermore, Group D participants dismissed many government programs as inappropriate or unsustainable, adding to their lack of adequately weighing tradeoffs and tensions. For example, one participant stated:

Participant: What makes Social Security in its current state totally insolvent is because for approximately every dollar that goes in, three comes out. That's just insane that we think that that's sustainable.... Because nobody is proposing to get a real, serious solution of how to fix Social Security.

The implication of his remarks was that there could not be a serious solution other than eliminating these programs entirely, because there might be drawbacks to the approach.

Attempts to consider the tradeoffs were quickly countered. For example, one member of Group D did bring up the struggle between multiple positions, suggesting tradeoffs were a part of the process, but other group members countered him. Later, a group member noted that there are always “tradeoffs” in policy-making, and then another group member responded by cutting off that group member and saying, “Not tradeoffs,” suggesting that a solution would not be valid if there were tradeoffs. This was consistent with the group’s general tone that any weakness to an approach meant it was not a viable solution, and that public problems were just “vicious cycles” with little end in sight.

Group E, the other group without deliberation experience explored and seemed amenable to most of the options, but they too did not engage in a deep weighing of tradeoffs and tensions. Whereas Group D’s deliberation led to shut down possibilities and potentials, Group E initially stated their positions and then stuck to summarizing information from the issue guide, going through each option and restating the benefits and drawbacks of approaches to the national debt as listed on the guide. This resulted in significant issue rehash in Group E, as they did not contextualize the guide’s information or bring in their own views. In fact, Group E was the only group that had to be prompted by the moderator to continue the deliberation—not once, but twice.

Both groups without deliberation experience exhibited limited ability to do the challenging work of weighing tensions and tradeoffs, moving towards addressing

the issue through deliberation. In Group D's case, the deliberation turned unproductive as they shut down possibilities, going so far as to effectively limit contributions from one member who was engaging in more deliberative practices. In Group E's case, they continued to summarize and re-summarize each of the three options, but emerged with an inaccurate sense of their own discourse and decision-making.

Conclusion

Overall, the experiences of Groups A and B suggested a greater engagement with the *public work* of deliberation—fostering an understanding of tradeoffs and tensions through a deliberative perspective, creating a rhetorical climate of inclusivity, and working through the various options to try to prioritize appropriate, fitting, and politically possible solutions. While neither Group A or B consistently reached the capstone level of benchmark for weighing tradeoffs and tensions, both groups with prior instruction in deliberation demonstrated higher degrees of the understanding tradeoffs and tensions learning outcome than the groups without experience. In contrast, Group D's conversation remained locked in the frustration that no solution could be found, while Group E tended to rehash different positions without being able to work through the weighing of tensions to determine preferred action(s) and acceptable tradeoffs. Our work here also demonstrates how rhetorical criticism can help to understand the communicative exchanges of *how* deliberation participants encounter different ideas and understand tradeoffs and tensions—or fail to do so.

Implications for Studying Deliberative Pedagogy

In this study, we sought to articulate a theoretical justification for and method for assessing deliberative learning outcomes such as *understanding tradeoffs and tensions*. We were interested in determining whether there were differences in the rhetorical quality of deliberative public discourse based on whether students participated. Our analytical findings suggest that the character of the deliberations is quite different between groups with previous exposure to deliberation. Those who had not been exposed to deliberation struggled to work through the public problem. However, those who had been exposed participated in a more active engagement of the national debt problem, worked towards productively solving the problem through the process of weighing tradeoffs and tensions, even occasionally reaching the higher deliberative pedagogy benchmark of prioritizing tradeoffs and tensions in their deliberations. Furthermore, their conversations

reveal that understanding tradeoffs and tensions involves a deliberative perspective towards public problems, inclusivity, and a willingness to engage in the lengthy working through process.

For those who teach deliberation or deliberative methods, using a rubric of learning outcomes may be an effective, discourse-focused method of evaluating deliberative pedagogy's influence on participants and on rhetorical components of productive deliberation. The different levels of the rubric could be used to prompt classroom discussions amongst students, encouraging them to engage in self-reflection on their own capacity for and quality of deliberation by asking students to identify their own experience and the class experience on the rubric.

Finally, deliberation in the classroom is an extension of the public work of participatory democracy, and the learning outcomes of deliberative pedagogy represent an important focus on the theory and practices of deliberation and public conversation. Applying the benchmarks found in the Deliberative Pedagogy Learning Outcomes (DPLO) rubric, and specifically around the *understanding tradeoffs and tensions* learning outcome (Table A) enables researchers to consider and classify deliberation as an iterative process of gradual improvement, rather than an occurrence. This is important because deliberation is a complex rhetorical event with varied voices and features; as practitioners of deliberation, we must acknowledge differing levels of quality and attempt to understand the rhetoric of deliberative practice. To meet this purpose, we assessed focus group deliberations among college students by using humanistic methods of rhetorical analysis, applying theoretical principles of deliberative pedagogy; thus, we identified rhetorical features present in the recognition, understanding, and working through of tradeoffs and tensions. Analyzing the rhetoric of deliberation across a variety of settings may prompt teachers and practitioners to develop techniques to create more productive and higher quality deliberations in the future.

Limitations and Future Research

As a small pilot study, this research has limitations. First, the sample size (N=18, four focus groups) was small and homogenous, with a single-sex sample; this was a product of conducting this study on the public speaking course at a single small liberal arts college. Second, the participants had not experienced deliberation in the same classroom; it is therefore possible that there were variations in how deliberation was taught amongst the five instructors who taught public speaking at this study's liberal arts college in the three years preceding this pilot study. Third, due to the small sample size, we did not address factors such as class year, the semester in which the students took public speaking, and general attitudes towards

political engagement. Having a larger, more diverse population participate in a future study would enable greater comparison of these factors across groups.

Additionally, this study did not utilize active facilitation methods in any group as an effort to study student's capacity for future deliberation on their own. However, democratic deliberation is a practice that frequently—though not always—employs trained facilitators. Future research could consider how trained facilitators can move groups without prior deliberation experience towards higher levels of understanding tradeoffs and tensions, and furthermore, how different styles of facilitation (Dillard, 2013) may influence deliberative capacity.

Future studies should also work to examine the effectiveness of a rubric for assessing a more extensive set of learning outcomes of deliberative pedagogy (Drury, Brammer, & Doherty, in press). In addition to researchers analyzing the rubric, studies could also be done on how students assess themselves and their peers utilizing deliberative pedagogy's learning outcome benchmarks. This might develop deliberation self-awareness in students, aiding the ability of students to critically assess their experiences in small group public discourse. Other studies might consider the longitudinal impacts of deliberative pedagogy on undergraduate students, and differentiate between types of deliberative experiences in the classroom. Such research may further understanding of deliberation, provide justifications for the important civic work that happens inside the classroom and our college campuses, and may bolster our future civic capacity.

References

- Abbott, J. Y., McDorman, T. F., Timmerman, D. M., & Lamberton, L. J. (2015). *Public speaking and democratic participation: Speech, deliberation, and analysis in the civic realm*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Adams, B. E. (2015). Working through disagreement in deliberative forums. *Social Science Journal*, 52, 229-238.
- Adams, B. E. (2014). Reason-giving in deliberative forums. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 10(2), Article 6. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol10/iss2/art6>.
- Asen, R. (2015). *Democracy, deliberation, and education*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Asen, R. (2013). Deliberation and trust. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 50, 2-17.
- Asen, R., Gurke, D., Conners, P., Solomon, R., & Gumm, E. (2013). Research evidence and school board deliberations: Lessons from three Wisconsin school districts. *Educational Policy*, 27, 33-63.
- Asen, R., Gurke, D., Solomon, R., Conners, P., & Gumm, E. (2011). "The research says": Definitions and uses of a key policy term in federal law and local school board deliberations. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 47, 195-213.
- Black, L. W. (2012). How people communicate during deliberative events. In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M Leighninger (Eds.), *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement* (59-81). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Black, L. W., Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J., & Stromer-Galley, J. (2011). Methods for analyzing and measuring group deliberation. In E. P. Bucy & R. L. Holbert (Eds.), *Sourcebook for political communication* (323-345). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boyte, H. (2014). Deliberative democracy, public work, and civic agency. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 10(1), Article 15. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol10/iss1/art15>.

- Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J., & Kelshaw, T. (2002). A conceptual definition and theoretical model of public deliberation in small face-to-face groups. *Communication Theory*, 12, 398-422.
- Carcasson, M. (2013). Tackling wicked problems through deliberative engagement. *Colorado Municipalities*, October, 9-13.
- Carcasson, M. (2009). Beginning with the end in mind: A call for goal-driven deliberative practice. *Public Agenda Occasional Papers*, No. 2. Retrieved from http://www.publicagenda.org/files/Pa_caPe_Paper2_beginning_SinglePgs_rev.pdf.
- Carcasson, M.; Black, L. W.; & Sink, E. S. (2010). Communication studies and deliberative democracy: Current contributions and future possibilities. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), Article 8. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss1/art8/>.
- Carcasson, M. & Sprain, L. (2016). Beyond problem solving: Reconceptualizing the work of deliberative inquiry. *Communication Theory*, 26, 41-63.
- Carcasson, M., & Sprain, L. (July 2010). Key aspects of the deliberative democracy movement. *Public Sector Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.cpd.colostate.edu/keyaspects.pdf>.
- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative democratic theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6, 307-326.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Condit, C. M., & Bates, B. R. (2009). Rhetorical methods of applied communication research. In L. R. Frey & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of applied communication research* (106-128). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dedrick, J. R., Grattan, L. & Dienstfrey, H. (Eds.) (2008). *Deliberation & the work of higher education: Innovations for the classroom, the campus, and the community*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.
- Dillard, K. (2013). Envisioning the role of facilitation in public deliberation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 41, 217-235.

- Drury, S. A. M. (2015). "Deliberation as communication instruction: a study of a climate change deliberation in an introductory biology course." *The Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 26(4), 51-72.
- Drury, S. A. M., Brammer, L. R., & Doherty, J. (in press). Assessment through a deliberative pedagogy learning outcomes rubric. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy and democratic engagement*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Drury, S. A. M., Brammer, L. R., & Doherty, J. (January 2013). Learning outcomes of deliberative pedagogy. Working paper for the Kettering Foundation's Deliberative Pedagogy Research Exchange.
- Eberly, R. (2002). Rhetoric and the anti-logos doughball: Teaching deliberative bodies the practices of participatory democracy. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 5, 287-300.
- Gastil, J. & Xenos, M. (2010). Of attitudes and engagement: Clarifying the reciprocal relationship between civic attitudes and political participation. *Journal of Communication*, 60, 318-343.
- Greitens, T. J. & Strachan, J. C. (2014). Citizen deliberation in prospective public management: Recognizing its value, overcoming its challenges. In C. Conteh, T. J. Greitens, D. K. Jesuit, & I. Roberge (Eds.), *Governance and public management: Strategic foundations for volatile times* (117-130). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hansen, K. M. (2012). Deliberative democracy: Mapping out the deliberative turn in democratic theory. In C. Kock & L. S. Villadsen, *Rhetorical citizenship and public deliberation* (13-27). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Harringer, 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>.
- Hartz-Karp, J. (2007). Understanding deliberativeness: Bridging Theory and Practice. *The International Journal of Public Participation*, 1(2). Retrieved from http://www.iap2.org.au/sitebuilder/resources/knowledge/asset/files/31/journal_issue2_hartzkarp.pdf.

- Hess, D., & Gatti, L. (2010). Putting politics where it belongs: in the classroom. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 152(Winter), 19-26.
- Hogan, J. M. (2010). Public address and the revival of American civic culture. In S. J. Parry-Giles and J. M. Hogan (Eds.), *The handbook of rhetoric and public address* (422-447). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jacobs, L. R., Cook, F. L., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2009). *Talking together: public deliberation and political participation in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Kindle Edition.
- Knobloch, K., 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
- Lawrence, W. Y., & Bates, B. R. (2014). Mommy groups as sites for deliberation in everyday speech. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 10(2), Article 7. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol10/iss2/art7>.
- Levasseur, D. G. & Carlin, D. B. (2001). Egocentric argument and the public sphere: Citizen deliberations on public policy and policy-makers. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 4, 407-431.
- Longo, N. V. (2013). Deliberative pedagogy in the community: Connecting deliberative dialogue, community engagement, and democratic education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 9(2), Article 16. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art16>.
- Mansbridge, J., Hartz-Karp, J., Amengual, M., & Gastil, J. (2006). Norms of deliberation: An inductive study. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 2(1), Article 7. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol2/iss1/art7>.
- Mathews, D. (1999). *Politics for the people*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Mathews, D. (2008). Democracy's megachallenges revisited. *Agent of Democracy: Higher Education and the HEX Journey*, 207-223.
- Mathews, D. (2014). *The ecology of democracy: Finding ways to have a stronger hand in shaping our future*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

- Maurer, H. (2015). Best practices in problem-based learning. In J. Ishiyama, W. J. Miller, & E. Simon (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching and learning in political science and international relations* (369-383). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Musil, C. M. (2015). *Civic prompts: Making civic learning routine across the disciplines*. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Murphy, T. A. (2004). Deliberative civic education and civil society: A consideration of ideals and actualities in democracy and communication education. *Communication Education*, 53(1), 74-91.
- Nabatchi, T. (2012). An introduction to deliberative civic engagement. In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M. Leighninger (Eds.), *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement* (3-18). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning & democracy's future*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/civic_learning/crucible/index.cfm.
- Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.
- Ryfe, D.M. (2006). Narrative and deliberation in small group forums. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 34 (1), 72-93.
- Scully, P. L. (2014). A path to the next form of (deliberative) democracy. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 10(1), Article 12. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol10/iss1/art12>.
- Shaffer, T. J. (2014). Deliberation in and through higher education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 10(1), Article 10. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol10/iss1/art10>
- Sheeler, K. H.; Weiss, A., & D'Souza, R. A. (2015). Communication and Citizenship: Reflections on Classroom Practice. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 11(2), Article 7. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol11/iss2/art7>.

- Steffensmeier, T. & Schenk-Hamlin, W. (2008). Argument quality in public deliberations. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 45, 21-36.
- Stitzlein, S. M. (2010). Deliberative democracy in teacher education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), Article 5. Retrieved from: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss1/art5>.
- Stromer-Galley, J. (2007). Measuring deliberation's content: A coding scheme. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 3(1), Article 12. Retrieved from: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol3/iss1/art12>.
- Thomas, N. L., & Hartley, M. (2010). Higher education's democratic imperative. *New Directions in Higher Education*, 152(Winter): 99-108.
- Tracy, K. (2005). Reconstructing communicative practices: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In K. Fitch and R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (301-319). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tracy, K. (2010). *Challenges of ordinary democracy: A case-study in deliberation and dissent*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Wharton, T., & McAfee, N. (2011). *A Nation in Debt: How Can We Pay the Bills?* The National Issues Forum Institute.
- Weiksner, G. M., Gastil, J., Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2012). In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M. Leighninger (Eds.), *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement* (261-274). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to public judgment: Making democracy work in a complex world*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.