Åbo Akademi
University

20–22 June 2022
Turku - Åbo | Finland

Deliberative Democracy & Public Opinion Summer School 2022

Understanding Public Deliberation

UNIVERSITY OF TURKU

Tampere University

FIRIPO
The Finnish Research Infrastructure
for Public Opinion

FUTUDEM
Center of Excellence in Public Opinion Research

Summer School in Deliberative Democracy and Public Opinion Research

Understanding Citizen Deliberation – Contexts, Opinions, Consequences

Monday June 20

Location:	Arken, Fabriksgatan 2; Tehtaankatu 2
09:00	Registration opens in the lobby of Arken
10:15	Greetings from Åbo Akademi University, Arken, Auditorium Armfelt Rector **Mikael Lindfelt**
10:20	Welcome and Introduction to Keynote Lecture Professor **Kimmo Grönlund**
10:30	**Keynote Lecture** Professor **James S. Fishkin**: *Can deliberation cure the ills of democracy?*
11:40	**Break**
11:55	Introduction to Keynote Lecture Professor **Kaisa Herne**
12:00	**Keynote Lecture** Professor **Jane Suiter**: *Irish citizens' assemblies - the gradual process towards institutionalisation*
13:10	**Lunch**
14:35	Introduction to Keynote Lecture Professor **Maija Setälä**
14:40	**Keynote Lecture** Professor **Graham Smith**: *Landing citizens' assemblies: turning our gaze to bureaucracy*
15:50	**Short break**
16:00	Presentation of FIRIPO and the deliberation laboratories **Kimmo Grönlund**
17:00	Welcome reception, the Faculty's greeting Dean **Marko Joas**

20–22 June
Turku - Åbo
2022

More information about the Summer School:
https://www.abo.fi/institutet-for-samhallsforskning/summerschool/

Tuesday June 21

09:30 to 11:00   Paper session 1
Fänriken | Chair: Marina Lindell. Discussants: Alice el-Wakil & Maija Jäske

Arild Ohren – *The representative claim of deliberative mini-publics*

Abstract: Deliberative mini-publics can be seen as representative institutions, and it has been argued that representation is one of the more important features of this form of citizens participation. In fact, there is a growing tendency to conceive them as representative bodies. However, even though deliberative mini-publics can be seen as a form of representation, this form has been much undertheorized in the field. This paper aims to contribute to this ongoing discussion on representation and deliberative mini-publics. It starts with adopting a constructivist approach to representation, based on Michael Saward's framework, as this allows us to focus on the claim-making-process of deliberative mini-publics, and consequently looks at the representative claims put forward by designers and organizers of these deliberative mini-publics. In particular, the paper develops deductively a typology of ideal types for the sort of representative claims invoked by designers of deliberative mini-publics based on the different stratification categories used in the selection process. Based on different justificatory foundations, and roles of the claim, these ideal types include demographic claim, stakeholder claim, expansive claim, most-affected claim, discourse claim, and policy opinion claim.

Lisa Basishvili – *Importance of TV Media for democratic deliberation and civic engagement – the case of Georgia*

Abstract: In the light of the current political and pandemic crisis in Georgia, the local population supports democracy which is, unfortunately, experiencing a significant downgrading due to incompetence and misconduct of the current government. The present interdisciplinary study is a Ph.D. project that intends to explore the interrelation between television media and democratic processes in the country. Keywords: TV media, democratic deliberation, polarization, civic engagement and political participation, mini-publics. In Georgia, like in any other democratic country, the radio and television stations, print, and social media should be a mediator between society and politics. Even though the local media is pluralistic, only two opposition television stations allocate limited time and resources to discuss and analyze social problems. Other media outlets have different content, which is far from reality. Overall the media landscape is polarized with pro-government and opposition media sources affecting the population and its point of view. My Ph.D. project will be innovative in its methodological triangulation through integrating various methods of qualitative, quantitative, and deliberative research to understand the role of TV media in enhancing the need for deliberation among extremely polarized society members and their civic engagement for short or long-term policy changes. Such a methodological triangulation will provide a comprehensive perspective on the research topic in the context of the TV media and a completely new concept of deliberative, collaborative, and participatory decision-making mechanism for the first time in the history of post-soviet Georgia. Ultimately, this research project will show evidence of whether Georgian citizens support the idea of civic participation in public decision-making or not. This project will confirm whether the deliberation will ease contentiousness among community members or not through understanding that the complex social issues remain unresolved for years due to the polarized media, politically disengaged population, polarized public opinion, and distrust towards the government which makes it extremely hard to hold them accountable when in the meantime the civic participation is weak and a collective decision making culture is missing.

Tuesday June 21

09:30 to 11:00   Paper session 1
Fabriken | Chair: Lauri Rapeli. Discussants: André Bächtiger & Lucy Parry

Seraphine Arnold – *Roads to minipublic success: exploring "technocratic" and "democratic" pathways to uptake based on a new dataset of deliberative minipublics*

Abstract: Not only is the public use of deliberative minipublics is on the rise around the globe, some have claimed that this is accompanied by increasing consequentiality (OECD Report, 2020). But the issue of minipublic consequentiality is contested (Achen 2022) and under-researched. A few pioneering studies have addressed this issue, especially Font et al. (2016) who found that minipublic recom-mendations are "cherry-picked", but this finding is limited to the Spanish context. Similarly, Smith et al. (2015) found out of the Participedia database that the more deliberative minipublics are, the less policy effects they create; again this result is based on a limited number of crowd-sourced cases. The OECD (2020) has compiled an extensive database on deliberative minipublics, but de-spite an update in 2022 information on the uptake of minipublic recommendations is limited - es-pecially with regard to antecedents of mini-public success or failure - and fairly scattered across different contexts. In this paper I introduce a new dataset based on the Participedia platform, en-hanced by an "observer survey" complementing missing cases and updating missing information. The databank comprises over 150 minipublic cases conducted at the national and regional level in Great Britain, Germany, France, Ireland, Italy, Denmark and Finland as well as the European level in the period from 2000-2021. By focusing on a wide-range of potential antecedents of minipublic uptake, ranging from process design (e.g. initiative, purpose, size, composition), issue type (complexity and salience), political support (especially alignment of recommendations with preferences of political elites), and characteristics of the country context (e.g. open vs closed political systems), the dataset provides a new springboard for exploring the antecedents of minipublic uptake. I will provide first results exploring whether there is a "technocratic" or "democratic" road to minipublic success, i.e. whether minipublic uptake – defined as full, partial or no implementation of minpublic recommendations - only happens when minipublics are organized top-down, are designed for poli-cy appraisal and do not contest the preferences of political elites ("technocratic" road) or whether uptake also happens when some procedural features are more democratic (bottom-up).

Souvidhya Khadka – *Agenda setting and transmission mechanisms in local level deliberations in Nepal*

Abstract: Deliberative forums such as citizen's assemblies (CA) – engaging the public (ideally randomly selected citizens) in future visioning or making policies and decisions that affect them – not only deepens democracy, but also address democratic deficits in pluralistic societies. OECD and Participedia databases reveal that in last decade CAs are being organized in unprecedented numbers on a wide range of topics across the globe. While CAs are increasingly popular among citizens and policymakers alike, little is known as to 1) how (democratically) a CA sets its agendas or preferences and make its collective decision(s), when it is applied in the global south. More importantly, little is known as to 2) how such preferences transmit from the public sphere to the empowered sphere in Global South settings. Such transmission is a prerequisite for a CA to be consequential– i.e., the collective decisions of the deliberators get implemented, influence policy, or at least have some democratic impact on the participants and/or the polity. This paper seeks to answer these two questions based on Nepal's neighborhood level citizens assemblies organized by municipalities as a part of their annual planning process. I administered over 50 semi-structured interviews with participants as well as the non-participants in these forums, and with the elected representatives at 3 municipalities. I also recorded deliberations in these assemblies; three at the neighborhood level (face to face), and one at the municipality level (over zoom). The preliminary findings suggest that deliberations are somewhat authentic, while such forums are barely inclusive despite having strong inclusion policies in place. While the agendas in these forums are predominantly set by local elites, marginalized communities despite their weak participation are also successful in influencing the collective decisions. For common agenda setting in these forums, the nature and severity of the problem matters the most along with the eloquence and social identity of the participants proposing something. Regarding transmission of the common agendas from public spheres to the empowered spheres, some of the important aspects/influencers include but are not limited to the political connections, social and/or group identity and vote influencing power of the proposing individual and/or group; and repeated following up with the decision makers.

Tuesday June 21

Katariina Kulha – *Deliberative mini-publics – advancing shared understandings of justice in climate transitions?*

Abstract: Deliberative Citizens' Assemblies have been regarded as one cure for the inertia of many countries in climate change mitigation. In addition, the advocates of Climate Citizens' Assemblies believe that the Assemblies could advance social justice amidst the green transition. This raises the question of what is considered just, and who gets to define it. One solution suggested by Dryzek and Tanasoca (2021) is that deliberative mini-publics could act as formative agents that define the extent of justice in a given policy context. To fully grasp deliberative mini-publics' potential to advance social justice in climate transitions, a more detailed picture of their functions regarding the issue is needed. Previous research shows that mini-publics can increase meta-consensus and preference single-peakedness around an issue, i.e. help create a shared understanding of the core trade-offs related to a decision and diminish the possibility of cyclical majorities. In a similar manner, mini-publics could align participants' understandings of key social justice issues related to climate policy. This paper investigates the development of subjective justice perceptions of deliberative mini-public participants using Q-analysis. The analysis takes place in conjunction with a citizens' jury dealing with carbon-neutral road traffic in Uusimaa region in April 2022. The results will reveal whether the deliberative citizens' jury increased the uniformity of participants' preferences related to distributive justice and distribution rules regarding emission cuts in road traffic. References Dryzek, J. S. & Tanasoca, A. (2021) Democratizing global justice : deliberating global goals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

11:00   **Coffee break**

Tuesday June 21

Julien Vrydagh – *How much political influence should we expect from minipublics?*

Abstract: While minipublics are currently burgeoning, their sustainability ultimately depends on their capacity to influence public decisions. For they would otherwise boil down to symbolic citizen participation and lose their credibility. Previous studies have traced the uptake of minipublics' recommendations, but, when making their assessment, scholars rely on a set of implicit assumptions about what minipublics are supposed to achieve politically. This paper intends to problematize the concept of political influence and to write a summa of the literature on democratic theory and public policy to clarify what one should expect from minipublics. I argue that our expectations should depend on a configuration of factors. First, their political influence is contingent on two design characteristics—the number of participants and recommendations' advisory or propositional character. Second, the ambition of a recommendation predisposes their impact too, as minipublics can recommend small implementation changes or a broader policy paradigm shift. We should finally expect different sorts of political influences depending not only on the policymaking stage where a minipublic is embedded, but also on the context of democratic decision-making, including decision-makers' bounded rationality and political positions. Based on the assemblage of these factors, I develop a survey of the different forms and degrees of political influence one could—and should—expect from minipublics.

11:00   **Coffee break**

Tuesday June 21

Marie-Isabel Theuwis – *The effect of participation in a participatory budgeting on citizens' populist attitudes*

Abstract: Many citizens feel excluded from political decision-making, which in their eyes is dominated by an unresponsive political elite. Citizens with high populist attitudes yearn for more popular control and for 'the people' to be included in the political process. Democratic scholars have posed that innovative processes that include and empower citizens can curb such populist sentiments. Participatory budgeting events (PBs) should be particularly suited to address populist demands due to the fact that they are inclusive and focused on giving citizens actual influence on policy-making. Several studies have looked at the effect of participation in a democratic innovation on political attitudes such as democratic satisfaction, trust in parliament, and external political efficacy. However, so far no study has examined the effect of participation in a democratic innovation on populist attitudes. This study will fill that gap. It empirically assesses if and to what extent participation in democratic innovation events has an effect on populist attitudes. In doing so, we test the claims of democratic scholars regarding the potential of democratic innovations to decrease populist sentiments, as well as contribute to the existing empirical knowledge regarding the effects of participation in democratic-innovations on citizens' political attitudes. For our analysis we use survey data on participants to three local PB events in the Netherlands before and after participation. Additionally, we survey a control group of similar citizens not exposed to the PB at similar points in time. We conduct a difference-in-differences analysis with propensity score matching to estimate the extent and direction of the effect of participation in a PB event on citizens' populist attitudes. We subsequently conduct a regression analysis to assess the importance of several factors for explaining the observed effect.

Young Jee Kim – *Domination of extreme opinion and its impact in pulling others' opinion shifts*

Abstract: Using the data collected from online deliberative polls that were conducted for Americans in their young adulthood, I will study the heterogeneity of speaking times and its impact on the changes of opinions by assigned groups. Critics have pointed out the possible danger that lies in deliberation creating more extremity in opinions and bringing polarization to the extremes (Schkade et al., 2007). However, empirical research shows that polarization to the extremes is alleviated under specific settings such as hiring trained moderators and providing briefing materials with balanced ideas (Grönlund et al., 2015; Fishkin et al., 2021). While important in rebutting critical views on deliberation, previous research had not investigated the events within each small-group discussion "rooms." "Rooms" here refer to the groups that consist of 10 or 15 people so that the participants can deliberate with their peers. In Grönlund et al. (2015), like-minded deliberation assignments and mixed-opinion deliberation assignments both illustrated some differences in their effect of increasing tolerance to immigration policies. This result shows that deliberation's effect varies across "rooms." Rather than analyzing an individual's changes in opinion as to if an event's deliberation's effect is homogeneous, I am fitting the survey data to a multi-level model to examine the relationship between the time spent by participants with extreme views and the level of changes between pre-deliberation and post-deliberation opinion changes. Also, if people with extreme views influence the level of changes in opinions, I will investigate which types of argument (logical, narrative, or claims without reasons) were utilized by them. Before fitting this model, I will study if the participants with more extreme opinions than others in the room dominate the speaking time. REFERENCE Fishkin, J. S., Siu, A., Diamond, L., & Bradburn, N. (2021). Is deliberation an antidote to extreme partisan polarization? Reflections on "America in One Room". American Political Science Review, 115(4), pp. 1464-1481. Grönlund, K., Herne, K., & Setälä, M. (2015). Does enclave deliberation polarize opinions? Political Behavior, 37(2015), pp. 995-1020. Schkade, D., Sunstein, C. R., & Hastie, R. (2007). What happened on Deliberation Day? California Law Review, 95(Jun, 2007), pp. 915-940.

Tuesday June 21

Vanessa Schwaiger – *What young people want from democracy: a conjoint experiment on democratic designs with 15-year old pupils*

Abstract: Research on democratic preferences has barely focused on young people. This is especially true for pupils in school, who are yet to become democratic citizens. Regarding democratic attitudes, the controversial study by Foa and Munck (2016) – using data from the World Values Survey- claims that young adults in the U.S. and Europe are abandoning democracy as the key procedural value. The various refutations notwithstanding (e.g., Norris 2017; Wuttke et al. 2020) I argue that such traditional survey research on democratic preferences may tap into non-attitudes, requiring the adoption of more advanced methods, namely scenario designs including an information package (see Goldberg and Bächtiger 2022). By the same token, existing research on democratic preferences using scenario designs usually focuses on representative vs participatory forms of decision-making (Werner and Marien 2021), ignoring the fact that citizens (and pupils) may also favour "executive" forms of decision-making (whereas studies focusing on technocratic ´Stealth´ attitudes only use traditional survey techniques; Van der Molen 2017). To close these various research gaps, I perform a conjoint experiment with a large-scaled representative sample of approximately 2000 15-year old German pupils in Baden-Württemberg (conducted in February/March 2022) focusing on three forms of policy-making using a conjoint experiment: a representative mode in form of a parliament, a participatory approach in form of a citizen forum, and an executive model approach focusing on an assertive "leader". The conjoint experiment contains further attributes, such as consultation with experts vs making decisions on their own, fast vs slow decision-making, various forms of authorization (including direct-democratic voting) as well as the winner/loser dimension. While I am interested in a global assessment which democratic modes are favoured by pupils, I also engage in subgroup analysis. I examine preferences of respondents contingent on their prior political dispositions (political sophistication) and psychological dispositions with a particular eye on depressive symptoms (Landwehr and Ojeda 2020), anxiety and threat-perceptions (Corona Pandemic, Climate Change, War). I expect that pupils with high levels of political sophistication prefer representative or participatory forms of policy-making, while pupils with populist attitudes and anxious pupils are more supportive of executive forms of policy-making.

Patricia Mockler – *Investigating the macro-political outcomes of deliberative mini-publics*

Abstract: Deliberative mini-publics (DMP) are being used by governments to address complex policy issues regularly in Canada and the United Kingdom. There is little doubt that they have an impact on those who participate in them (Fournier et. al 2011). While deliberative mini-publics have the potential to have a "macro-political impact" (Goodin and Dryzek 2006), the nature of this impact remains understudied empirically. The majority of empirical research on mini-publics focuses on short-term events with a limited number of participants, raising questions about the broader implications of mini-publics for democratic citizenship. This paper will address some of these broader implications by investigating the relationship between the decision-making processes used to create a given policy and citizens' assessments of policy outcomes (Ladam 2019). More specifically, this paper asks if policies that are created using a deliberative mini-public are seen more positively than those created from the traditional policy-making process by the general public. The paper uses data from an online survey experiment to assess the impacts of the use of a DMP in influencing public perceptions of policy in Canada and the UK.

Tuesday June 21

Simone Haarbosch – *Criteria for participation in the Dutch Energy transition: analysing the positioning of Dutch citizens in 6 Dutch RES regions regarding participation in the energy transition in light of energy justice*

Abstract: Major recurring themes in energy transitions revolve around questions of energy justice: how ills and benefits are distributed, how processes of energy choices are organized and who is recognized as a legitimate voice in these choices (and how) (Jenkins et al., 2016). In this research, we aim to apply the concept of energy justice and broaden it, by involving citizens in these considerations of justice. In participation trajectories in the energy transition in the Netherlands, citizens are frequently asked to distribute technical aspects in relation to the spatial quality of their region. A current omission in these mapping assignments are socio-economic factors, which is potentially problematic considering that economically disadvantaged regions, neighborhoods and individuals are at higher risk in relation to social, technical, and financial burdens (Jenkins et al., 2016; Walker & Day, 2012). Cartographic reflections should not focus exclusively on a physical rendering, but that it should raise questions involving the rendering of social significance, possibly by looking at areas traditionally quite alien to its fields, such as the language of technical and visual arts (Casti, 2015). Therefore, we make use of mapping assignments in deliberative sessions, charting how groups of citizens discuss and design aspects of energy justice. By doing so, we answer the question: 'What is the role of distributive mapping assignments during a deliberative session with local stakeholders and citizens to create a more just energy transition?'. During several deliberative sessions at different locations, citizens living in the Province of Overijssel in the Netherlands are asked to reflect on interactive regional maps to discuss the energy transition in their own region. Through the three tenets in energy justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, recognition, Jenkins et al., 2016) we analyze how citizens use elements of justice to design a just energy transition.

Valgerður Björk Pálsdóttir – *Lack of consequences of democratic innovations on political decision-making processes: motivations and opinions of politicians in Iceland*

Abstract: In recent years, research on democratic innovations has expanded its focus from deliberative events and citizens' views towards the role of politicians in democratic innovations, especially in the political uptake of deliberative events (e.g. Nunez, Close & Bedock, 2016; Hendriks & Lees-Marshment, 2019; Caluwaerts et al., 2020; Thompson, 2019; Jacquet, 2019). While it is crucial to learn about public opinion of democratic innovations, it is also important to learn about politicians' opinions, especially when aiming to understand the motivations, political context and consequences of democratic innovations. Politicians' support and understanding of deliberative processes is the premise of successful implementation of democratic innovations' results into policies. This paper explores the motivations of politicians to establish democratic innovations and their opinions on deliberative democracy. The paper is a case study of the aftermath of the first and only Deliberative poll held in Iceland in 2019, where the government established a deliberative event as a part of a larger political process with the aim of changing parts of the constitution. The results of the deliberative poll were only integrated into the policymaking process to a limited extent and ended up not having any meaningful impact on the political decision-making process. The explanations are explored in this paper, with a micro-level analysis where motivations, actions and views of politicians are scrutinized, when it comes to their behavior and attitude towards participatory and deliberative processes. Qualitative methodology is applied with the main source of data being interviews with almost half of Icelandic MPs, where they share their views on deliberative democracy.

13:00	**Lunch**
14:15	**Roundtable, The Future of Deliberative Democracy,** ASA Main auditorium Chair: **Lauri Rapeli** Participants: Prof. **André Bächtiger,** Prof. **Nicole Curato,** Prof. **Kaisa Herne** & Prof. **Sofie Marien**
15:45	**Free time**
19:30	**Summer School dinner**

Wednesday June 22

10:00 to 11:00 | Fänriken, Paper session 3

Chair: Peter Söderlund. Discussants: Saskia Goldberg & Inga Saikkonen

Rodrigo Ramis Moyano – *Mini-publics and the ideology of their commissioners: a closer look at the deliberative wave at Europe*

Abstract: The OECD has identified a "deliberative wave" as the application of mini-publics such as citizens' assemblies, citizens' juries, consensus conferences and the like has increased over time. This wave in practice has been accompanied by extensive normative and empirical scholarship on the virtues or otherwise of this participatory institution. While our understanding of how deliberative mini-publics operate and their impacts has developed, one element of mini-public practice has had scant attention: namely, who commissions minipublics? More specifically, what are the ideological orientations of commissioners? Unlike other participatory institutions, we have little understanding of whether mini-publics are implemented primarily by left-wing parties or whether the institution appeals across the ideological spectrum. This paper draws on the OECD database, focusing on the application of deliberative mini-publics in Europe across the last five decades. It analyses the party allegiance of commissioners, paying particular attention to the impact of different points in the wave of implementation, variations across policy issues, differences in level of governance, choices of mini-public model and other design features, to offer insights into whether ideology matters in the practice of deliberative mini-publics

Julian Frinken – *Not merely "standing for", but also "acting for": the concept of „deliberative representation" in minipublics*

Abstract: Public authorities in many countries around the world are increasingly turning to minipublics as a tool to establish citizen participation. In the course of this development, the question of what roles these processes can and should play in political decision-making is the subject of both societal and academic controversy. Political theorists such as Landemore (2020) and Smith (2021) argue for some transfer of decision-making power to mini-publics, while Lafont (2020) has offered the most widely received critique of such "empowerment". Interestingly, authors at both ends of the debate agree that our understanding of political representation in minipublics remains undertheorized. While it is clear that minipublics are representative institutions, more work needs to be done on the ways in which participants are to be understood as "citizen representatives" (Warren 2008). This may add to the analytical toolkit of the debate around their "empowerment". So far representation in minipublics has been interpreted predominantly as descriptive representation, or, to speak in Pitkin's (1967) terminology, from a perspective of "standing for". My overarching thesis is, that to get a full picture of the ways in which participants can represent their fellow citizens, we need to complement this view with a perspective of "acting for" that leads to the concept of "deliberative representation". This concept, which is familiar but not identical to "discursive representation" (Dryzek/Niemeyer 2008), is already referred to by some authors (Rinne 2020; Wang/Woo 2021), but has not yet been theorized in detail for the case of minipublics. After reviewing this literature, I argue that the "representative claim" (Saward 2010) of minipublics is not just a descriptive one (Gül 2019) but always also a deliberative one and that these two are mutually dependent. In the end, I sketch of how some of the pitfalls and opportunities of establishing minipublics can be better understood from this view. On one hand, the danger of authoritative forms of political representation becomes apparent, but on the other minipublics seem to be particularly well suited for making non-consultable but democratically relevant goods, such as future generations or a democratically structured world public, visible.

11:00   Coffee break

Wednesday June 22

10:00 to 11:00 | Fabriken, Paper session 3

Chair: Kaisa Herne. Discussants: Nina Tynkkynen & Jane Suiter

Christian Carl & Palle Bech-Pedersen – *Deliberation on two tracks*

Abstract: In this article, we show how compromise can be rendered compatible with deliberation in a way that does not sever the internal connection between deliberation and the epistemic search for the correct answer (consensus). Our article is divided into three parts. In the first part, we situate our position in relation to what we refer to as the skeptical view. This position holds that compromise (i.e. splitting the difference) subverts the epistemic logic of deliberation, according to which political decisions are to be based purely on their substantive merits . Against this view, we argue that the correctness of policies not only depends on their substantive contents but also on the extent to which they align with the political opinions of those subject to them. This explains why compromise can result from a distinct second-order judgment: political adversaries recognize that it would be counter-productive to have their first-order political judgments unilaterally implemented into law because the presumably good outcomes will not easily materialize if met with resentment by their political counterparts. Moreover, we show why deliberation among political adversaries is required to work out how conflicting positions can be combined into coherent policies. In the second part, we argue against the opposite position, which holds that deliberation should be unilaterally oriented to the goal of achieving compromise. This compromise-only view fails to make adequately sense of citizens' political practices. Political actors who defend certain positions are pragmatically committed to believing that these positions are correct, correct not just for themselves but for all parties. Otherwise, the whole point of persuasion would be meaningless. It is important, we argue, that deliberative theories of democracy do not lose sight of this constitutive of element of deliberative politics. In the third part, these arguments will lead us to articulate a position which we refer to as "Deliberation on Two Tracks": a consensus track and compromise track. We then show how political actors can meaningfully shift between the two tracks and how the logic of deliberation changes, depending on whether these actors are oriented towards persuasion (consensus track) or towards the goal of achieving widely accepted laws (compromise track).

Chiara Valsangiacomo – *Liquid assemblies: a legitimate democratic innovation?*

Abstract: Liquid democracy has been increasingly discussed in the academic literature as a democratic innovation that could complement or even replace some of the existing democratic practices. It is best defined as a novel decision-making scheme characterised by liquidity, namely the mixture of elements of direct and representative democracy, and which is based on the principles of voluntary delegations and proxy voting. Liquid assemblies are a hypothetical political device that could be used to institutionalise these liquid democratic principles. The present article contributes to this emerging literature by focusing on the following research question: which contemporary political problems does liquid democracy solve and, more specifically, why should we consider adopting liquid democratic assemblies? In other words, it considers the value and the possible benefits that liquid assemblies could provide over existing democratic institutions and alternative democratic innovations. Methodologically, the article adopts an ecumenical, problem-based approach to democratic theory inspired by Graham Smith (2009) and Mark Warren (2017). Variants of this approach have been replicated by an increasing number of scholars in normative democratic theory. The evaluation of the legitimacy of liquid assemblies is based on six normative principles: political equality, political participation, political freedom, political representation, deliberation, and quality of outcomes. The analysis starts by observing that the institutionalisation of liquid assemblies implies breaking down politics by topic or issue domains. In fact, a liquid assembly displays an innovative architecture that strongly resembles the idea of single-issue legislatures as envisioned by Alex Guerrero (2014, 2020). Consequently, the article puts forth two hypotheses. First, the arguments in favour and against liquid assemblies are generally attributable to the feature of issue-specificity. Second, issue-specificity marks out liquid assemblies compared to other democratic devices or innovations. The in-depth analysis of the legitimacy of liquid assemblies is driven by these hypotheses, and it highlights how liquid assemblies bear on each of the six criteria mentioned above. Beside contributing to the specific literature on liquid democracy, this article suggests that some of the democratic challenges we face today might be better addressed by allowing legislatures to become more specialised and issue-focused than they are today.

11:00   Coffee break

11:30 to 13:00 | Fänriken, Paper session 4

Chair: Nicole Curato. Discussants: Peter Söderlund & Janne Berg

Anne Nygaard Jedzini – *How do city council politicians facilitate co-creation? Evidence from Australia and Denmark*

Abstract: This article examines how Australian and Danish city council politicians understand and facilitate co-creation with citizens to develop public sector innovation. Despite the growing literature on how OECD countries have used representative deliberative processes (OECD 2020), the institutionalisation of local co-creation task committees remains relatively unexplored outside Scandinavia (Sørensen & Torfing 2019). The aim of this article is to explore how city council politicians understand and facilitate co-creation through a comparison of democratically elected representatives in Australian and Danish local governments. In particular, I examine the perspectives of city council politicians on co-creation to develop public sector innovation based on qualitative in-depth interviews. Based on my qualitative research, I found that city council politicians in both Australia and Denmark claim to know the theory and practice of co-creation. Second, I found that city politicians in both countries emphasised co-creation for its intrinsic value rather than instrumental value. Finally, both cases encounter obstacles in facilitating co-creation though the obstacles they encounter are slightly different. Overall, my study revealed that while elements of co-creation are commonly found in both Australia and Denmark, all city council politicians highlighted examples of co-creation in practice as a concept predominately occurring in non-institutionalised political settings facilitated by citizens, and not city council politicians. My research aims to draw implications for the frameworks of co-creation in local government by providing insights for a critical research agenda and how the institutionalisation of local co-creation task committees can take root in countries that are not social democratic.

Nicolas Côté – *Political de-polarization: a whole life-cycle approach to deliberative projects*

Abstract: Political polarization, the crisis of trust, the post-truth era. . . However one calls it, it is undeniable that the problem of 'whose knowledge is to believed' has seeped into policy-making institutions across the world, from the UK, to Argentina, Bulgaria, Brazil, Indonesia, Canada, or the United States. As such, redesigning parts of the policy cycle will become increasingly critical in the coming decade if democratic institutions are to keep functioning through rising polarization and mistrust. Although theoretical connections between deliberative democracy and de-polarization have been publicly established since the early to mid 2010s, newly emerging research clearly points to the potential for deliberative engagements to reduce polarization in the political process (Dryzek et al. 2019, OECD 2020, Fishkin et al. 2021). Building on a multiple case study of deliberative projects from across the world, this paper argues that integrating stakeholder participation methods throughout the entire life-cycle of the project, from design to communication, permits to maximize the de-polarizing impacts of the deliberative process. Eventually, this article formulates recommendations for developing policy processes that could be resilient to polarization. The author's hopes are that it may contribute to a conversation about best practices for reducing political polarization in the policy-making process.

13:00   Lunch

11:30 to 13:00 | Fabriken, Paper session 4

Chair: Maija Setälä. Discussants: Marina Lindell & Henrik Serup Christensen

Ernesto Cruz Ruiz – *Political inequality and democratic innovations in Latin America after the 1980s*

Abstract: Research on democratic innovations (DIs) has conventionally focused on cases and designs fostering deliberation and enhancing citizen participation in decision-making and democratic institutions. Lately, DIs research has centered on mapping DIs to, among others, compare cases, understand the effects of different and similar designs on citizens, legitimacy of processes, and their impact on democratic goods like political equality. However, I claim there is much promise in complementing such DIs research with theoretical and empirical analyses on the causes of DIs. Hence, drawing upon LATINNO's DIs database, I argue that political inequality drives the rise and emergence of DIs in Latin America, particularly after 'The Third Wave of Democratization' and the 'Washington Consensus.' I posit that those two events caused sociopolitical and economic shifts, triggering political struggles from which DIs emerged as changes in democratic institutions and practices distributing political power. I test my argument on the effects of political inequality on DIs emergence quantitatively, and I find a negative effect of the former on the latter.

Lisa van Dijk – *Minipublics as a remedy for political dissatisfaction? On the importance of trust when adding a small subset of ordinary citizens to the equation*

Abstract: In response to widespread dissatisfaction with contemporary politics, recent years have seen an upsurge in the use of deliberative minipublics. It is however far from clear whether and when minipublics can address political dissatisfaction. To assess if minipublics can shoulder this task, it is crucial to look at what minipublics add to the existing representative system and how this change is perceived by the general public. In this paper, I put forward that minipublics fundamentally change who is involved in political decision-making by adding a subset of ordinary citizens. This, I argue, could result in greater trust in the make-up of actors involved in decision-making when minipublics are used – especially in these times wherein many people hold elected politicians in low regard. If it does, I expect that such greater trust may, in turn, spill over into higher levels of perceived legitimacy of the decision-making process and its outcomes. To test these arguments, I will use pre-registered, original data from a cross-sectional survey (n = 1,789), a conjoint experiment and two survey experiments (fielded in spring 2022) in Belgium. In doing so, this paper aims to provide novel insights into the role that minipublics can play in addressing political dissatisfaction among the public at large.

13:00   Lunch

14:15 to 15:15 | Fänriken, Paper session 5

Chair: Inga Saikkonen. Discussants: Graham Smith & Nanuli Silagadze

Janosch Pfeffer – *Changing attitudes on climate change: Public deliberation versus elite direction*

Abstract: Climate change skepticism and policy support varies between and within countries (Lee et al 2015). Scholars disagree on how to convince skeptics and increase support for policies (Druckman and McGrath 2019). Research shows behavioral messages often have small or negligible effects on climate change action and policy support (Nisa, Schumpe, and Faller 2019; van der Linden and Goldberg 2020). Sometimes the intended effects of messages are limited or even reversed (e.g. Schultz et al. 2016). We present evidence from two concurrent preregistered survey-experiments in Germany and the United States of America focusing on the source of a message promoting a climate change tax. In both countries, we tested the effect of the same message from the government, an environmental NGO, or a deliberative minipublic—randomly selected small groups of citizens that deliberate on a public issue—on citizens' support and willingness to pay for said tax, as well as belief in the consequences of climate change. Taken together, the findings suggest that deliberative minipublics are more likely to raise or sustain policy support among citizens compared to the government or environmental NGOs. Across our three treatments in two countries (six tests) we found, on average, a significant small to moderate impact of minipublics in five instances, compared to two significant effects across 12 tests of messages from the government or an NGO. The evidence shows a minipublic endorsement of a climate change tax can a) prevent policy backlash; b) convince citizens to pay higher taxes; and c) influence beliefs about climate change consequences. These findings call for further research and experimentation on message sources, and especially minipublics.

Joanna Massie – *Bridging the gap between mini and mass publics: who volunteers for deliberative mini-publics?*

Abstract: There is a growing concern of a "democratic deficit" in which democratic organizations and structures fall far short of fulfilling the principles of democracy. Democratic theorists, advocates, and practitioners are responding by turning to democratic innovations to build or restore faith in both governments and democracy. Deliberative democracy is one such democratic innovation, in which citizens are given space to develop well-informed, considered, and collective opinion. Deliberative mini publics (DMPs) are a practical effort to realize deliberative ideals; in DMPs, citizens - broadly representative of the population - are given the opportunity to learn about, reflect on, and discuss policies. Studies suggest that deliberative approaches, such as taking part in meetings, is likely to have a positive relationship with trust, whereas activities that are driven by negative perceptions of government have a negative impact on trust; but is a baseline level of trust in the institution required to even consider volunteering? To further understand the interaction between trust and deliberation, using data from Vox Pop Labs' 2021 Vote Compass Canada Post-Election Survey (n=95,335), we analyze the extent to which citizens demonstrate willingness to volunteer in a Citizens' Assembly, when asked if they would volunteer to participate. I ask whether trust in government affects likelihood to participate, and if so, how? Given the threat of populism underlining democracy, I also explore whether citizens willing to volunteer place any more or less faith in the wisdom of ordinary people over the opinion of experts and intellectuals. Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic we have seen the importance of collective, rather than individual, action, and the importance of trust in government and fellow citizens to comply with regulations. However, if deliberative processes exacerbate pre-existing cleavages between those who trust government and those who do not, we risk further alienating sub-populations necessary to resolve this democratic deficit.

15:15   Farewell coffee

14:15 to 15:15 | Fabriken, Paper session 5

Chair: Nina Tynkkynen. Discussants: Nicole Curato & Sebastien Rojon

Lucas Henrique Nigiri Veloso – *Bodies, vulnerability and the deliberative system: the case of the Brazilian anti-asylum struggle*

Abstract: Based on political ethnography (Wedeen, 2010; Schatz, 2013; Yanow et al., 2017) carried out with the Brazilian anti-asylum movement, we generated a substantial body of evidence about an issue often neglected by the systemic turn of deliberation: the role of materialities and corporeities that are part of a deliberative system. As a mark of a fourth generation of the deliberationist approach, the notion of deliberative system defines deliberation as an activity performed in a distributed manner among different arenas and practices. Consequently, that systemic turn expanded the power of application of the concept of democratic deliberation (Mansbridge, 1999; Dryzek, 2010; Mansbridge et al., 2012; Elstub et al., 2016). Nevertheless, despite the important findings, important criticisms and problematizations have been addressed to the systemic proposition, especially those related to its conceptual stretching and structural-functionalist framework (Ercan; Dryzek, 2015; Owen; Smith, 2015; Mendonca, 2016; Curato et al., 2018). However, another rarely considered problem is that there is no in-depth reflection in the literature on how material and bodily potencies and vulnerabilities introduce differences in a deliberative system, especially as experienced by disadvantaged citizens, such as those in mental functioning suffering. In light of that issue, mobilizing the methodology of critical discourse analysis (Fairclought, 1992) on the ethnographic evidence generated about the networks of actors and events that built a Brazilian anti-asylum protest in the year 2019, we were able to understand that a deliberative system: a) cannot be considered as a metaphor or abstraction, given its dependence on networks of supports and embodied resources; b) that the primacy of systemic efficiency is generally an obstacle to parity, inclusion, and reflection of the most vulnerable bodies; c) that the interaction between the body-researcher and the bodies-subjects of research is an important way to map an embodied political system.

Franziska Maier – *Commonality in pluralistic societies: Solutions from a deliberative experiment*

Abstract: Liberal democracy makes minimal requirements for commonalities between citizens for the sake of pluralism. However, both theoretical and empirical investigations emphasize the importance of commonality between members of societies, for example in the context of solidarity or civic responsibility. There is a lively debate on how commonality can be combined with diversity in political theory, but few studies investigate how citizens themselves envisage this balance. This paper uses a deliberative experiment to study citizens' perspectives on commonality under conditions of pluralism. This paper presents results from a deliberative experiment with German citizens: First, it investigates deliberative opinion change on foreigner voting rights. It finds that a deliberative treatment increased skepticism towards introducing voting rights for non-citizen residents. In a second step, the paper attempts to explain this unusual result of deliberation transforming opinions in a less progressive direction. To achieve this, participants' substantive arguments are analyzed. The findings show that the rejection of foreigner voting rights is rarely based on purely ethnic grounds. Instead, participants have innovative ideas for generating commonality in ways that are potentially compatible with pluralism. The paper presents some of these ideas, for example the re-conceptualization of the German idea of a "lead culture" or practice-based ideas of belonging. The paper demonstrates that citizens themselves have promising and innovative ideas on the challenging issue of balancing commonality and pluralism.

15:15   Farewell coffee