politics

Research Article

Civic (Re)socialisation: The Educative Effects of Deliberative Participation

Katherine R. Knobloch

Colorado State University

John Gastil

Pennsylvania State University

This article examines the subjective experience of cognitive and behavioural change following public deliberation in two different nations. It examines short- and long-term survey data from two highly structured deliberative forums – the 2009 Australian Citizens' Parliament and the 2010 Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review. Results showed increases in reported deliberative and internal efficacy, some measures of external efficacy, and communicative and community-based engagement, though participants rarely reported increases in institutionalised political participation. Participants in an online process in Australia reported limited increases in their internal and external efficacy and communicative engagement. These findings suggest that well-structured deliberative governance can transform the meaning and practice of citizenship.

Keywords: citizenship; deliberation; online discussion; political efficacy; political participation

Neither the ideal nor the practice of democratic citizenship remains static. Contemporary understandings of the 'good citizen' reflect changes in the institutions that provide avenues for civic engagement and shape norms about citizens' roles in self-governance (Schudson, 1999). Though a professionalised and capitalistic public sphere has narrowed the scope of democratic citizenship in many countries (Knobloch, 2011), new deliberative structures have invited citizens into decision-making processes that model deliberative habits and dispositions (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002).

Although previous research has shown that deliberation can influence both civic engagement and attitudes towards citizenship, scholarly understanding of these effects remains limited. Studies tend to focus on short-term attitudinal or behavioural changes within a single context, typically a low-stakes face-to-face deliberation (Pincock, 2012). Longitudinal studies have shown some changes over time (Gastil et al., 2010), but no researchers have examined participants' subjective experiences of these changes. This is particularly important because in any public debate on democratic reform, citizens are more likely to testify on behalf of deliberation's transformative potential only if it is experienced as such.

To address these issues, we used self-report measures to record participants' sense of change in response to two highly structured but distinct deliberative forums held in different national contexts: the 2009 Australian Citizens' Parliament (Carson et al., 2013) and the 2010 Oregon

Citizens' Initiative Review (Knobloch et al., 2013). Survey measures were used both immediately after the events occurred and a year later.

Our results indicate that the implementation of deliberative governance can alter how participants understand themselves as citizens and their role in governance. Though participants in an online-only process reported few changes, participants in the face-to-face events reported increased faith in themselves and government as well as greater participation in communicative and community engagement. Such findings suggest that the institutionalisation of highly structured, face-to-face deliberative processes could have the power to transform democracy by providing citizens with a meaningful and effective way to engage in politics. Before inspecting these findings, we begin by reviewing the theoretical justification for hypothesising participants' experience of changing civic attitudes and behaviour.

Do public forums change people?

Conceptions of deliberative democracy come in many forms, from philosophical ideal (Dahlberg, 2005; Mansbridge, 1983) to a practical means of public consultation (Fishkin, 2009; Nabatchi et al., 2012). We agree with those who believe the best approach bridges theoretical and empirical work (Jacobs, Cook and Delli Carpini, 2009). As Blaug (1996, p. 75) argues, 'a fully adequate deliberative theory would need to be both normative and empirical, utopian and realistic'. One can conceive of, and experiment with, new deliberative structures (Nabatchi et al., 2012) while recognising the value of existing deliberative bodies, such as juries. Deliberative democratic theorists have often speculated about the possibility for deliberation to foster better citizens (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002; Fishkin, 2009; Knobloch, 2011; Warren, 1993), and empirical research on existing practices generally supports this view (Delli Carpini, Cook and Jacobs, 2004; Gastil et al., 2010; Pincock, 2012). Most prior research has focused on face-to-face deliberation, but participants in computer-mediated deliberation may also experience changing attitudes and behaviour (e.g. Gronlund, Strandberg and Himmelroos, 2009). Less clear is how often deliberation's effects persist over time and whether they are experienced directly by the participants themselves. In the discussion that follows, we review a range of subjective impacts deliberation could have on participants. After theorising these changes, we test participants' experience of these changes across two national contexts, across short- and long-term data, and across face-to-face and online processes.

Attitudinal changes

The four attitudes we examine address core claims of empirical deliberative theory. First, participating in such a process can instil confidence in deliberation as a means of resolving public controversies (i.e. one's 'deliberative faith'), which should help make deliberation a self-reinforcing experience (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002). Second, deliberation is believed to restore one's sense of political self-confidence, or 'internal efficacy' (Morrell, 2005), and generate sufficient perceived system legitimacy, or 'external efficacy' (Fishkin, 2009), to encourage one to take political action. Finally, a sense of collective identification can encourage public action in which people organise and participate together in public life, rather than as alienated, private individuals (Knobloch, 2011).

At deliberative events, participants build deliberative skills and habits and thus develop their ability to reach common ground across differences (Nabatchi, 2010). Because of this,

deliberation likely increases participants' willingness to engage in future deliberations (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002). For example, even when reluctant to participate initially, jurors generally leave the courthouse with more confidence in the jury process as a means of resolving criminal cases and civil disputes (Gastil et al., 2010).

Participants in Deliberative Polls have consistently shown increases in internal efficacy (Fishkin, 2009). Structured, online deliberation has been shown to increase participants' feelings of political self-confidence (Min, 2007). Many other results have been more equivocal. Morrell's (2005) experimental work has shown that those in face-to-face deliberations developed more situation-specific internal efficacy than those who only voted. A study of the National Issues Forums found that participation in deliberative education actually had a negative effect on *group* efficacy, by diminishing participants' confidence that the group was capable of performing political tasks (Gastil, 2004). Finally, Nabatchi (2010) found that participation in a 21st Century Town Meeting increases internal efficacy, but not to a statistically significant degree.

If deliberation serves a legitimising function, it should also heighten citizens' sense that they have a say in government decisions – that their representatives care about their opinions. Such effects have been shown in longitudinal analyses of participation in 21st Century Town Meetings (Nabatchi, 2010) and Deliberative Polls (Fishkin, 2009). In addition, survey data indicates that discursive participation, either face-to-face or online, is associated with higher levels of trust in government (Jacobs, Cook and Delli Carpini, 2009). In the case of jurors, those who deliberated and were satisfied with the verdict developed greater trust in judges (Gastil et al., 2010).

Deliberative events also should allow individuals from different groups to understand their common concerns, as well as their distinct viewpoints (Benhabib, 1996; Dahlberg, 2005). Deliberative participation can produce positive feelings between members of in-groups and out-groups (Luskin et al., 2012). In fact, one of the cases studied here did lead to increases in participant expressions of collective identity (Felicetti et al., 2012; Hartz-Karp et al., 2010): By the end of the Australian Citizens' Parliament, participants began to form a shared identity with one another and crossed cultural and geographical divides despite Australia's heterogeneous makeup and traditional ambivalence toward national identity. We will test for the same effect in the other deliberative context examined in this article.

Behavioural changes

Deliberative participation can also spark three forms of political engagement. Though Mutz (2006) fears that heterogeneous communicative engagement disinclines people to political participation, other research has found a more positive connection (Jacobs, Cook and Delli Carpini, 2009). To test such effects, we distinguish those political behaviours linked directly to deliberation itself from those involving the local community or more conventional political practices. The first category is more akin to a self-reinforcing model of deliberation (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002), whereas the second looks at citizens reconnecting with their communities in nonpartisan ways (Mansbridge, 1983). The final category tests whether the novel experience of deliberation can spur participation in more institutionalised politics.

Taking part in structured deliberation should increase future willingness to engage in communicative public acts that draw on closely related skill sets (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002; Fung and Wright, 2003). Field studies of public forums found that participation resulted in

greater ideological and demographic diversity in people's conversation networks and less conversational dominance (Gastil, 2004). Both online and face-to-face deliberation has been shown to increase individuals' future willingness to deliberate (Baek, Wojcieszak and Delli Carpini, 2011). The effects of formal deliberation can extend to media use as participants learn how to sift through information or develop a greater interest in public affairs (Gastil et al., 2010).

Training in deliberative skills, along with an increased sense of collective identity, may spur local voluntary engagement, as well. In community-based, and often less controlled and strategic activities, participants have more opportunity for quasi-deliberative engagement than they would in hierarchical electoral institutions (Knobloch, 2011). Deliberation is conventionally associated with building community capacity on the macro scale (Kinney, 2012), even through follow-up actions after deliberating online (Baek, Wojcieszak and Delli Carpini, 2011).

Both of the deliberative forums we study link back to conventional politics, so participation may have spurred political engagement. Discursive participation correlates with higher levels of electoral participation (Jacobs, Cook and Delli Carpini, 2009), and jury deliberation often leads to higher voting rates – at least among previously less active voters (Gastil et al., 2010). Even formal online-deliberative engagement can produce a desire for conventional political participation (Min, 2007).

Participants' subjective experience

The preceding review suggests that well-structured public discussion can have a range of cognitive and behavioural changes, though past results have been inconsistent across deliberative methods and settings. What remains entirely unclear is participants' subjective experience of such changes – both their sense that they have undergone a change *and that this effect was due to deliberating*. This sense of change is often cited as an important purpose of convening deliberative events (e.g. Scully and McCoy, 2005). Historical and qualitative field studies have quoted individuals who attributed a changed civic identity to their engagement in group deliberation (Mansbridge, 1983; Polletta, 2002). Since participants who are more satisfied with their deliberative experiences are more likely to increase their political efficacy and civic engagement (Gastil et al., 2010), perceiving one's experience as transformative may make one more confident about taking public action. This is particularly important for deliberative processes that seek legitimacy because elites are often interested in understanding participants' experiences with deliberation.

In sum, we hypothesised that participants would experience all the aforementioned cognitive and behavioural changes and even attribute them to their deliberative experience. In both the short-term and up to a year later, participants in structured face-to-face or online deliberative events were expected to report that deliberating together increased their faith in deliberation, internal and external efficacy, and identification with larger publics. We also predicted that those same participants would attribute to their deliberative experience subsequent increases in their communicative political participation, community-based engagement and institutionalised electoral participation.

Research settings and rationale

We tested these predictions for two distinct events: the 2009 Australian Citizens' Parliament (ACP) and the 2010 Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review (CIR). The ACP convened a

representative body of Australian citizens tasked to create and evaluate policy proposals for the Australian federal government (Carson et al., 2013). It brought together one member of each federal electorate to address the question 'How can Australia's political system be strengthened to serve us better?' Participants at what we call the 'main meeting' were selected through stratified random sampling, with a special effort made to include Aboriginal participants. The 150 parliamentarians first met at one-day regional meetings, mostly in capital cities. They learned about the process and were encouraged to reflect on the central question. The parliamentarians, along with those citizens *not* selected for the main meeting, were invited into an online parliament, which developed an initial set of proposals. The main meeting took place over four days in February 2009 at the Old Parliament House in Canberra, the national capital. Parliamentarians were divided into 24 facilitated table discussions, which elaborated and weighed the initial proposals and reflected on expert testimony. Participants voted on a set of final recommendations, which they presented to the Prime Minister's Parliamentary Secretary. Previous research on the ACP has primarily focused on the implementation of the process, exploring its deliberative quality (Gastil, 2014; Lubensky and Carson, 2013; Sullivan and Hartz-Karp, 2013; Wiederhold and Gastil, 2013) and the role of facilitators (Hardy, Fisher, and Hartz-Karp, 2013; Li et al., 2013), among other process-oriented concerns. Relatively little work has examined how participants experienced the process and the changes they may have felt as a result, though two studies did show participation led to an increase in feelings of collective identity (Felicetti et al., 2012; Hartz-Karp et al., 2010).

The CIR was convened after the passage of a law by the state legislature and signed by the governor that established a trial process for a deliberative governing institution (Knobloch, et al. 2013). It gathered two stratified random samples of 24 Oregon voters to study two separate initiatives in the general election, and each panel met for five consecutive days in August 2010. By the end of the week, each CIR panel produced citizens' statements about the initiatives that appeared in the Oregon State Voters' Pamphlet. These statements contained key findings regarding the initiatives, as well as arguments for and against them. The process was highly structured and moderated, with panelists hearing from advocates, critics and background witnesses. The panelists played an active role in the deliberation, questioning witnesses and advocates and participating in small and large group discussions to distil information and formulate key questions and claims. Scholarship on the 2010 CIR has found the process to be highly deliberative (Knobloch, et al., 2013) and that it produced a statement containing information distinct from that found in other sections of the voters' pamphlet (Gastil, Richards and Knobloch, 2014). The CIR had a significant impact on the voting public. Voters who read the statement in the Voters' Guide learned new information and arguments about the initiative, and some members of the electorate changed their vote as a result (Gastil et al., 2011). Moreover awareness of this new governing process and use of the statements led to civic benefits for the wider public. Those who knew about the CIR reported increases in external efficacy while those who utilised it when voting increased their internal efficacy (Knobloch, Barthel and Gastil, 2013). The question remains, however, as to whether the participants experienced some of these same educative effects.

We chose to study deliberation's subjective impact in the context of the ACP and CIR on the assumption that civic benefits most readily occur when participants believe a deliberative process has real consequence (Fung and Wright, 2003; Gastil et al., 2010; Stromer-Galley and Muhlberger, 2009). Several previous studies of deliberation's transformative potential have either taken place in experimental settings detached from the larger public sphere (e.g.

Gronlund, Strandberg and Himmelroos, 2009; Morrell, 2005) or within the context of community events that are have no direct connection to governance (e.g. Gastil, 2004). In contrast, the CIR was adopted by the state legislature as a permanent part of Oregon's electoral process, and its results were disseminated through the official voters' pamphlet. Although not officially state-sanctioned as in Oregon, Senator John Faulkner spoke to ACP participants on their first day of deliberation at the main meeting and told them the government would consider their recommendations, which they then delivered to Australia's parliament and a representative of the prime minister.

Methods

Questionnaires distributed to the ACP and CIR panelists served as the principal method for assessing subjective change. Though other measures for understanding the educative effects of deliberative participation, such as interviews or ethnographic work, can provide a more nuanced portrait of how participants changed, survey methodology allowed us to understand whether or not a large number of participants experienced change in a consistent manner and how that change varied across contexts. Further, this article hypothesises that deliberative participation leads to specified attitudinal and behavioural changes. Survey measures may reveal the absence of change along these predefined measures, which may be harder to identify with other methods.

We will provide a brief description of each survey and the effects these instruments measured. The ACP follow-up survey was distributed to the 150 parliamentarians twelve months after the completion of the ACP. It had an 87 per cent response rate (all rates used AAPOR's RR2 metric). The survey was produced via a collaboration of ACP researchers and distributed by New Democracy (via mail in Australia) and Practical Evolution (via web-based survey). Its primary purpose was to measure self-reported changes in political engagement and efficacy as a result of the ACP experience. We also surveyed the 175 individuals who had a UserID in the online parliament but did not serve as parliamentarians at the main meeting. The substantially lower response rate for this survey was the first sign that the online setting provided a less engaging experience. Only 63 replies came back, for a response rate of 36 per cent. (That rate improved only modestly after removing non-working email addresses.) A majority (62 per cent) in the online parliament did not post comments during discussion, and 18 respondents said that they 'knew about but did not participate actively' in the online parliament. One 'did not remember' the event. Those 19 respondents were not surveyed further since our focal question was the impact of active participation in deliberation.

The first follow-up survey of CIR panelists was conducted online and over the phone to ask about the changes participants felt they had experienced as a result of their deliberations. The study was conducted from late October to early November 2010, a few months after the panels ended but before the general election (79 per cent response rate). A year later, from late October to early December 2011, we conducted a second survey online, over the phone and through the mail (77 per cent response rate).

These ACP and CIR samples varied considerably in size and, consequently, in statistical power (Cohen, 1988). The main ACP survey had enough power to detect moderate effect sizes, whereas the CIR and ACP online parliament surveys had roughly 38 respondents – sufficient only for detecting large effects. When such samples yield non-significance, caution must be used when inferring the *absence* of population effects.

Although political scholars often rely on self-report data, several studies have documented respondents' tendency to over-report socially desirable political behaviour. An analysis comparing self-reported voting behaviour in seven years of American National Election Studies to actual voting records showed that 10 per cent of respondents reported voting when they had not (Belli, Traugott and Beckmann, 2001), and comparisons of National Annenberg Election Survey respondents and Nielson ratings suggest that study participants are also likely to over-report tuning into network news (Prior, 2009).

To address potential errors related to social desirability, precautions were taken. First, because participants may provide socially desirable responses in an attempt to meet the researchers' goals (Podsakoff et al., 2003), they were asked questions regarding their attitudinal and behavioural changes in the context of an evaluation of the deliberative event. They were encouraged to think critically about the process with the goal of improving it. Moreover, although some surveys were conducted over the phone, 62 per cent of short-term CIR, 86 per cent of year-later CIR and all ACP surveys were self-administered, either online or through the mail, which may reduce over-reporting due to social desirability (Holbrook and Krosnick, 2010; Tourangeau and Smith, 1996). Finally, participants are less likely to exaggerate socially desirable behaviour when provided with more specific prompts (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, we attempted to provide contextual specificity or examples when asking questions about behavioural change.

The surveys distributed to participants contained items measuring the self-reported cognitive and behavioural changes that participants attributed to their deliberative experiences. Questions began with the preface: 'Please tell us whether you believe that participating in the [CIR or ACP] has led you to agree less or more with the following statements.' Respondents could say the event caused them to 'agree less', that it caused them to 'agree more' or that it 'did not change' their beliefs one way or the other. (A full statistical distribution of responses and complete item wordings appear in the results section below.)

To measure changes in deliberative faith, we asked participants if they had changed their beliefs about the effectiveness of deliberative discussion. Participants responded to items such as: 'Even people who strongly disagree can make sound decisions if they sit down and talk.' We chose to examine responses at the granular level – as individual items rather than as combined scales. This permitted us to observe any within-scale differences in results that might raise useful questions for future research.

To assess changes to participants' sense of efficacy, we relied on standard survey items (Morrell, 2003). Likewise, we asked panelists if participating in the forum had caused them to agree more or less or if it had not changed their sense of government responsiveness, using standard phrasings for external efficacy items.

The CIR follow-up surveys contained a single item asking whether participation in the event changed their sense that 'being an Oregonian is important to my identity'. In addition, ACP and CIR panelists were also asked an open-ended question about whether participating in the process had caused them to change how they think about other citizens. A previous study has already assessed in detail the changes to ACP participants' collective identity (Hartz-Karp et al., 2010) and will be discussed in the results section below.

The ACP and CIR follow-up surveys also contained items drawn from traditional scales of political engagement (Verba, Schlozman and Brady, 1995). Using the same basic structure as the self-reported attitude change items, these eight questions asked if 'attending the [ACP or

CIR] has caused you to change the frequency with which you do the following activities'. Respondents could say the event led them to do the activity 'less frequently', caused them to engage in it 'more frequently' or 'did not change' how frequently they did the activity. Within this item structure, CIR and ACP participants were asked four questions related to communicative engagement, two questions related to community-based engagement, and two questions regarding institutionalised electoral engagement. (Full statistical distributions of results and complete item wordings appear in the results section below.)

Results

To analyse the survey responses, we employed a binomial nonparametric test, which measured the likelihood that, after their deliberative experience, participants were more inclined to agree or disagree with statements regarding their attitudes and behaviour. The binomial analysis is a 'coin flipping' test to see if one result (positive change) is more common than its opposite (negative change), with every 'no change' response reducing the sample size of the positive versus negative comparison. Only a strong skew in responses to one side or the other (greater agreement or disagreement) yields a statistically significant result.

The results in Tables 1–2 show that those who participated in face-to-face deliberation at the ACP and CIR attributed to that experience significant positive changes in the full range of civic attitudes in our study, with the exception of one external efficacy item, as discussed below. Those who participated only in the ACP's online parliament, however, attributed relatively few attitude changes to their deliberative experience. This difference does not appear due to sample size as the CIR had a comparable sample yet yielded significant effects resembling those of the face-to-face ACP. Moreover, one of the online parliament's few significant attitude changes (a reduced confidence in whether people 'have any say') does not even match the *direction* of the ACP and CIR's effects.

Over two-thirds of the face-to-face participants said that they gained greater faith in deliberation along all three measures, both in the short and long terms. Online participants, however, did not significantly change their attitudes toward deliberation. Though more online participants reported gaining than losing faith in deliberation, as much as a fifth lost their faith along at least one measure ('People from different parties can have civil, respectful conversations').

As for internal efficacy, both ACP and CIR participants believed that their experience increased their political self-confidence, over both the short and long terms, particularly for face-to-face participants. Clear majorities of ACP participants felt more informed and better able to understand political issues as a result of their deliberation, with a significant but smaller proportion (28.9 per cent) more likely to consider themselves 'well-qualified to participate in politics'. The short-term CIR effects were comparable, if more subdued, and the long-term CIR responses looked similar, with 35–43 per cent reporting positive change. Even the online parliament participants reported a significant change, with over a quarter (27 per cent) reporting a better 'understanding of the issues' and no respondents feeling less able to do so as a result of their deliberative participation.

Changes in participants' external efficacy were more complicated. CIR and face-to-face ACP participants reported significant increases in perceived government responsiveness along two items, but *not* in their belief that 'people have the final say, no matter who is in office'. For both the ACP and CIR, this one item was most likely to generate results in the direction

Table 1: Self-reported changes in political and deliberative attitudes one year after participating in face-to-face or online ACP (percentages)

	Face-to-face ACP (N = 115)			Online parliament (N = 38)		
	Agree less	**No change**	**Agree more**	**Agree less**	**No change**	**Agree more**
Deliberative faith						
The first step in solving problems is to discuss them	0.0	17.0	82.1***	13.9	52.8	33.3
People who disagree can make decisions if they talk	1.8	16.7	80.7***	16.2	51.4	32.4
People from different parties can have civil, respectful conversations	3.5	19.5	77.0***	20.0	54.3	25.7
Internal efficacy						
More informed about politics/government than most	7.9	35.1	57.0***	5.4	70.3	24.3
I have a pretty good understanding of the issues facing this country	0.9	29.2	69.9***	0.0	73.0	27.0**
I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics	9.6	56.1	34.2***	13.5	67.6	18.9
External efficacy						
People have the final say, no matter who is in office	27.2	49.1	23.7	37.8*	54.1	8.1
People like me don't have any say about what government does	52.6***	33.3	14.0	32.4	48.6	18.9
There are many legal ways to influence government	3.5	29.8	66.7***	5.3	63.2	31.6*

Note: Significance was found using binomial nonparametric tests. *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

opposite from the one we predicted; in the case of the online parliament, this pattern reached significance, with 37.8 per cent reporting that their participation left them more doubtful of the people's 'final say' compared to 8.1 per cent reaching the opposite conclusion. In other words, it appeared that participants were more inclined to develop faith in themselves and the deliberative process than in contemporary political actors.

CIR panelists also reported increases in collective identity, with a modest but significant portion stating in both the short-term (23.7 per cent) and year-later survey (32.4 per cent)

Table 2: Self-reported changes in political and deliberative attitudes two-to-three months and one year after participating in CIR (percentages)

	CIR 2–3 months later ($N = 38$)			CIR a year later ($N = 37$)		
	Agree less	**No change**	**Agree more**	**Agree less**	**No change**	**Agree more**
Deliberative faith						
The first step in solving problems is to discuss them	0.0	31.6	68.4***	0.0	35.1	64.9***
People who disagree can make decisions if they talk	0.0	21.1	76.3***	2.7	24.3	73.0***
People from different parties can have civil, respectful conversations	0.0	21.1	78.9***	0.0	27.0	73.0***
Internal efficacy						
More informed about politics/government than most	10.5	39.5	50.0**	5.4	51.4	43.2***
I have a pretty good understanding of the issues facing this country	7.9	47.4	44.7**	2.7	62.2	35.1**
I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics	2.6	68.4	28.9*	0.0	56.8	43.2***
External efficacy						
People have the final say, no matter who is in office	13.2	68.4	18.4	21.6	56.8	18.9
People like me don't have any say about what govt. does	47.4***	44.7	5.3	62.2***	24.3	10.8
There are many legal ways to influence government	2.6	39.5	57.9***	0.0	24.3	75.7***
Collective identity						
Being an Oregonian is important to my identity	0.0	76.3	23.7**	8.1	59.5	32.4*

Note: Significance was found using binomial nonparametric tests. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

that the experience made them more likely to consider 'being an Oregonian' an important part of their self-understanding. This parallels findings from an earlier study of the ACP (Hartz-Karp et al., 2010), which showed that participants came to view themselves as sharing a common identity and purpose, despite the cultural differences between white and Aboriginal participants, in particular.

As with the subjective attitude changes, the results for behaviour change generally supported our hypothesis for face-to-face deliberation but not for participants in the online parliament.

Tables 3 and 4 show that ACP and CIR participation led to increased engagement along some, but not all, measures, and face-to-face participants increased their engagement along more measures than online-only participants.

A majority of participants attributed their experience to an increased attention to public affairs while watching television and reading newspapers. In addition, face-to-face participants reported significant increases in talking with others about political issues or candidates and about voting, though online participants only reported increasing their frequency of talking with others about issues or candidates but not about how to vote.

Though no significant changes were found for online participants, face-to-face participants in both the ACP and the CIR reported significant increases in working or volunteering in their local communities and discussing local affairs with community members.

Our results suggest, however, that participating in a deliberative process has limited impact on individuals' perceived engagement in conventional, institutionalised politics. Though a small number of respondents indicated that they had increased their involvement in electoral activities, such as volunteering or attending meetings or fundraisers for a party or candidate, over 75 per cent of all participants said they had engaged in these activities neither more nor less frequently since their deliberative experience.

Conclusion

Returning to our original question, we conclude that the ACP – particularly the highly structured, four-day face-to-face gathering – and the CIR led many participants to experience subjective cognitive and behavioural changes, with participants often reporting a sense of greater faith in both their own political acumen and the political process generally, as well as increased communicative and community-based engagement.

These findings of subjective change suggest the potential for deliberative processes to transform how individuals view themselves and their role in democratic self-government. Through deliberative participation, many of the panelists underwent a civic transformation. They came to see themselves as more capable of participating in politics and as more active members of their local communities – all as a direct result of their common experience. Such experiences have the potential to not only change how individuals think about and participate in public life, but also how they understand their place in the political process. Deliberation can forge more empowered identities that foster a more active role in public life.

The consistency in results across the ACP and the CIR, as well as between the CIR short-term and year-later surveys, testifies to the robustness of these findings. Table 5 shows that we found nearly identical changes both when comparing two very different face-to-face events and for two separate CIR surveys, roughly a year apart. This suggests that highly structured deliberative processes that bring together a cross-section of a public can give participants a fairly consistent sense of attitudinal and behavioural change.

Even so, additional research needs to clarify *why* such change occurs. Looking across the attitudinal and behavioural data, our results suggest that changes in attitudes are likely related to changes in behaviour. Out of all the attitudes measured, participants were least likely to increase their faith in the political process, particularly regarding their faith that politicians listened to the public (though face-to-face participants did have more faith in their own power to affect government decision making). In line with this, participants

Table 3: Self-reported changes in political and deliberative behaviour one year after participating face-to-face and online ACP (percentages)

	Face-to-face ACP (N = 115)			Online parliament (N = 38)		
	Engage less	No change	Engage more	Engage less	No change	Engage more
Communicative engagement						
Talking to people to learn about an issue or a candidate	2.6	48.2	49.1***	5.3	68.4	26.3*
Talking to others about voting choices	1.8	79.8	18.4***	2.6	89.5	7.9
Paying attention to news while watching television	0.9	31.6	67.5***	0.0	68.4	31.6***
Paying attention to news while reading the newspaper	1.8	39.5	58.8***	0.0	73.7	26.3**
Community-based engagement						
Voluntarily working in your local community	1.8	78.9	19.3***	7.9	84.2	7.9
Discussing local affairs with other community members	3.5	49.1	47.4***	7.9	76.3	15.8
Institutionalised engagement						
Going to political meetings, demonstrations, fundraising dinners	1.8	88.6	9.6*	5.3	94.7	0.0
Volunteering for parties or candidates	1.8	95.5	2.7	5.4	91.9	2.7

*Note: Significance was found using binomial nonparametric tests. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.*

Table 4: Self-reported short-term and year-later changes in political and deliberative behaviour after participating in CIR (percentages)

	CIR 2–3 months later (N = 38)			CIR a year later (N = 37)		
	Engage less	No change	Engage more	Engage less	No change	Engage more
Communicative engagement						
Talking to people to learn about an issue or a candidate	0.0	42.1	57.9***	0.0	40.5	59.5***
Talking to others about voting choices	0.0	44.7	55.3***	0.0	62.2	37.8***
Paying attention to news while watching television	0.0	50.0	47.4***	0.0	45.9	54.1***
Paying attention to news while reading the newspaper	0.0	55.3	44.7***	0.0	43.2	56.8***
Community-based engagement						
Voluntarily working in your local community	0.0	73.7	26.3**	0.0	70.3	29.7***
Discussing local affairs with other community members	0.0	44.7	55.3***	0.0	73.0	27.0**
Institutionalised engagement						
Going to political meetings, demonstrations, fundraising dinners	2.6	81.6	15.8	5.4	78.4	16.2
Volunteering for parties or candidates	2.6	89.5	7.9	2.1	86.5	10.8

Note: Significance was found using binomial nonparametric tests. $*p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$; $***p < 0.001$.

Table 5: Summary of self-reported changes in political attitudes and behaviours after participating in ACP and CIR (percentages)

	CIR, 2–3 months later (N = 38)	CIR, a year later (N = 37)	ACP Face-to-face, a year later (N = 115)	ACP Online, a year later (N = 38)
Attitudinal changes				
Internal efficacy	++	++	++	+
Deliberative faith	++	++	++	0
External efficacy	+	+	+	+/–
Collective identity	++	++	N/A	N/A
Behavioural changes				
Communicative engagement	++	++	++	+
Community-based engagement	++	++	++	0
Institutionalised engagement	0	0	+	0

Note: Figures in table represent net changes to participants' attitudes and behaviour. Significance was found using binomial nonparametric tests, p < 0.05. Summary indicators are as follows: ++ = all measures positive and significant, + = some measures positive and significant, +/– = mixed results, 0 = no effect, N/A = not available (unmeasured).

reported that they were not any more likely to volunteer for political parties or candidates after taking part in deliberation. In other words, participants' shifting sense of efficacy led them to eschew traditional, partisan politics for more community- and citizen-centred activities.

Though we traditionally measure external efficacy along a single combined scale, our results suggest that these items may have discrete meanings for deliberative participants, who distinguish their ability to use the political system for change from their institutions' attentiveness to the public's voice. Given the frequent emphasis in deliberative events on concepts such as public will and the role of citizens (Fishkin, 2009; Gastil, 2004; Scully and McCoy, 2005), such subtleties in public attitudes make sense.

None of these effects, however, are universal. As Table 5 demonstrates, less structured and unfacilitated forms of deliberative engagement, such as the ACP's online parliament, may lack the power to inspire the same levels of civic change. Though our research has validated the claim that online deliberation can have *some* of the benefits of face-to-face deliberation (Gronlund, Strandberg and Himmelroos, 2009; Min, 2007), online deliberation appears to have a less transformative power, as compared to intensive face-to-face events. Perhaps online deliberations structured in new ways, or ones that integrate online and face-to-face experiences, may yield more comparable effects.

In addition, it is possible that participants who are less satisfied with their deliberative experiences may not perceive the increased sense of empowerment demonstrated here.

Though comparable measures are not available for the ACP, the large majority of CIR participants were either satisfied or highly satisfied with their experience and reported they had learned enough to make a good decision (Knobloch, et al., 2013). Participants who do not have such positive personal experiences may not reap the same benefits, and this merits further exploration.

Researchers should continue to explore how different deliberative structures affect which cognitive and behavioural changes participants experience, both subjectively and actually. The CIR and ACP main meeting shared several structural components that may have led to their similar effects. Both were multi-day processes guided by trained facilitators. This gave participants the time and assistance to navigate through complex problems and difficult discussions, and that may have contributed to their boost in political self-confidence. Coupled with time devoted to explicating the rules for discussion, these factors may have also contributed to participants' increase in communicative engagement.

Furthermore, the results of both processes were directly connected to official decision making: the CIR statement was distributed through the state's voters' pamphlet and the results of the ACP were delivered to Parliament. Though the ACP had little permanent effect over Australia's governing system (Carson et al., 2013), the CIR became a permanent part of Oregon's initiative elections in 2011, and continues to influence state elections. Such sanctioning by government entities likely influenced the participants' subsequent increase in external efficacy and, possibly, their increase in collective identity and community engagement.

Future studies can advance our understanding of how deliberation affects individual participants by looking across even more diverse deliberative formats and across varied cultural and national contexts. The sheer variety of deliberative approaches (Nabatchi et al., 2012) warrants theory that can take into account how the design and experience of deliberation shapes participants' cognitive and behavioural changes. One especially interesting comparison might be made between empowered forms of participatory budgeting (Wampler, 2007) and more explicitly deliberative processes that give participants a measure of authority, such as the British Columbia Citizens' Assembly (Warren and Pearse, 2008). In such cases, coupling studies of subjective change with longitudinal measures should also clarify the link between one's experience of self-transformation and external evidence thereof.

Research on the civic impact of deliberation has importance that reaches beyond theoretical debates because deliberative democracy is at once a philosophical ideal and a practical political project (Blaug, 1996; Fishkin, 2009; Nabatchi et al., 2012). There exist many potential justifications for deliberation, but as critics chip away at some of its bases, such as its epistemic moorings (Ingham, 2013) or its claim to equal opportunity (Allen, 2007), deliberative democracy may lean more heavily on its transformative power. Already, the preliminary results of this study have been used by proponents of the CIR to advocate for its adoption outside of Oregon. Both legislators and donors have indicated that they are interested in how this process can reinvigorate the electorate and revitalise democracy. Our study has shown that for at least in the case of highly structured face-to-face deliberative events, participants themselves have a palpable sense of such changes.

Such findings also validate the theoretical and empirical work that asserts deliberation's transformative potential (Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw, 2002; Delli Carpini, Cook and Jacobs, 2004; Fishkin, 2009; Warren, 1993). Deliberation does appear to make better citizens

– citizens who are more confident in their own capacity, more trusting of their government and one another, and more inclined to partake in political life. This directly contradicts those claims that citizens are not interested in political life and are happy to allow professionals and politicians to do the difficult work of democracy (e.g. Hibbing and Theiss-Morse, 2002). On the contrary, citizens who are given the opportunity to meaningfully engage in public policy decision making find a renewed sense of civic self and seek out more ways to engage in political life.

If what it means to be a 'good citizen' is partly a product of our political institutions (Schudson, 1999), then the adoption of deliberative governance may pave the way for a new definition of citizenship. The deliberative citizen is an empowered citizen – one who takes the work of democracy seriously and feels capable of undertaking the task. That subjective experience of empowerment will prove important should that same public be asked to judge the merits of adopting more substantial deliberative public institutions and practices in the future.

About the authors

Katherine R. Knobloch is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Communication Studies at Colorado State University, 1783 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA. E-mail: *katie.knobloch@colostate.edu*

John W. Gastil is a Professor in the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences and Political Science at the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA. E-mail: *jgastil@psu.edu*

Acknowledgements

References

Allen, M. (2007) 'Effective Opportunity and Democratic Deliberation', *Politics* 27, pp. 83–90.

Baek, Y.M., Wojcieszak, M. and Delli Carpini, M.X. (2011) 'Online Versus Face-to-face Deliberation: Who? Why? What? With What Effects?', *New Media and Society* 14(3), pp. 363–383.

Belli, R.F., Traugott, M.W. and Beckmann, M.N. (2001) 'What Leads to Voting Overreports? Contrasts of Overreporters to Validated Voters and Admitted Nonvoters in the American National Election Studies', *Journal of Official Statistics* 17(4), pp. 479–498. Available from: http://www.jos.nu/Articles/abstract.asp?article=174479 [Accessed 9 January, 2014].

Benhabib, S. (1996) 'Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy' in S. Benhabib (ed.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 67–94.

Blaug, R. (1996) 'New Developments in Deliberative Democracy', *Politics* 16, pp. 71–77.

Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J. and Kelshaw, T. (2002) 'A Conceptual Definition and Theoretical Model of Public Deliberation in Small Face-to-face Groups', *Communication Theory* 12, pp. 398–422.

Carson, L., Gastil, J., Hartz-Karp, J. and Lubensky, R. (eds.) (2013) *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Cohen, J. (1988) *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (second edition), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dahlberg, L. (2005) 'The Habermasian Public Sphere: Taking Difference Seriously? ', *Theory and Society* 34(2), pp. 111–136.

Delli Carpini, M.X., Cook, F.L. and Jacobs, L.R. (2004) 'Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature', *Annual Review of Political Science* 7, pp. 315–344.

Felicetti, A., Gastil, J., Hartz-Karp, J. and Carson, L. (2012) 'Collective Identity and Voice at the Australian Citizens' Parliament', *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8(1), Article 5. Available from: http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss1/art5 [Accessed 9 January, 2014].

Fishkin, J.S. (2009) *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Fung, A. and Wright, E.O. (2003) 'Thinking about Empowered Participatory Governance' in A. Fung and E.O. Wright (eds.), *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*, New York: Verso, pp. 3–42.

Gastil, J. (2004) 'Adult Civic Education through the National Issues Forums: Developing Democratic Habits and Dispositions through Public Deliberation', *Adult Education Quarterly* 54(4), pp. 308–328.

Gastil, J., Deess, E.P., Weiser, P.J. and Simmons, C. (2010) *The Jury and Democracy: How Jury Deliberation Promotes Civic Engagement and Political Participation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Gastil, J., Richards, R. C. and Knobloch, K. (2014) 'Vicarious Deliberation: A Case Study of the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review and Electoral Deliberation', *International Journal of Communication* 8(4), pp. 62–89.

Gastil, J.W., Knobloch, K.R., Reedy, J., Henkels, M. and Cramer-Walsh, K. (2011) 'Hearing a Public Voice in Micro-level Deliberation and Macro-level Politics: Assessing the Impact of the Citizens' Initiative Review on the Oregon Electorate'. Paper presented at the National Communication Association 97th Annual Convention, New Orleans, LA.

Gronlund, K., Strandberg, K. and Himmelroos, S. (2009) 'The Challenge of Deliberative Democracy Online: A Comparison of Face-to-face and Virtual Experiments in Citizen Deliberation', *Information Polity* 14(3), pp. 187–201.

Hardy, M., Fisher, K. and Hartz-Karp, J. (2013) 'The Unsung Heroes of a Deliberative Process: Relctions on the Role of Facilitators at the Citizens' Parliament', in L. Carson, J. Gastil, J. Hartz-Karp and R. Lubensky (eds.), *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 177–189.

Hartz-Karp, J., Anderson, P., Gastil, J. and Felicetti, A. (2010) 'The Australian Citizens' Parliament: Forging Shared Identity through Public Deliberation', *Journal of Public Affairs* 10, pp. 353–371.

Hibbing, J.R. and Theiss-Morse, E. (2002) *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs about How Government Should Work*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holbrook, A.L. and Krosnick, J.A. (2010) 'Social Desirability Bias in Voter Turnout Reports: Tests Using the Item Count Technique', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74(1), pp. 37–67.

Ingham, S. (2013) 'Disagreement and Epistemic Arguments for Democracy', *Politics, Philosophy and Economics* 12, pp. 136–155.

Jacobs, L.R., Cook, F.L. and Delli Carpini, M.X. (2009) *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kinney, B. (2012) 'Deliberation's Contribution to Community Capacity Building', in T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, M. Weiksner and M. Leighninger (eds.), *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 163–180.

Knobloch, K.R. (2011) 'Public Sphere Alienation: A Model for Analysis and Critique', *Javnost – The Public* 18(4), pp. 21–38.

Knobloch, K.R., Barthel, M.L. and Gastil, J. (2013) 'Emanating Effects: The Impact of Micro-level Deliberation on the Public's Political Attitudes'. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Conference, London.

Knobloch, K.R. and Gastil, J. (2013) 'Participant Accounts of Political Transformation', in L. Carson, J. Gastil, J. Hartz-Karp and R. Lubensky (eds.), *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 235–247.

Knobloch, K.R., Gastil, J., Reedy, J. and 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(2), pp. 105–125.

Li, L., Ziwoya, F., Black, L.W. and Hartz-Karp, J. (2013) 'Are They Doing What They are Supposed to Do? Assessing the Facilitating Process of the Australian Citizens' Parliament', in L. Carson, J. Gastil, J. Hartz-Karp and R. Lubensky (eds.), *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 190–203.

Lubensky, R. and Carson, L. (2013) 'Choose Me: The Challenges of National Random Selection', in L. Carson, J. Gastil, J. Hartz-Karp and R. Lubensky (eds.), *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 35–48.

Luskin, R.C., O'Flynn, I., Fishkin, J.S. and Russell, D. (2012) 'Deliberative across Deep Divides', *Political Studies* 62(1), pp. 116–135.

Mansbridge, J.J. (1983) *Beyond Adversary Democracy*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Min, S. (2007) 'Online vs Face-to-face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement', *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication* 12(4), pp. 1369–1387.

Morrell, M.E. (2003) 'Survey and Experimental Evidence for a Reliable and Valid Measure of Internal Political Efficacy', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67(4), pp. 589–602.

Morrell, M.E. (2005) 'Deliberation, Democratic Decision-making and Internal Political Efficacy', *Political Behavior* 27(1), pp. 49–70.

Mutz, D.C. (2006) *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nabatchi, T. (2010) 'Deliberative Democracy and Citizenship: In Search of the Efficacy Effect', *Journal of Public Deliberation* 6(2), Article 8. Available from: http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol6/iss2/art8 [Accessed 9 January, 2014].

Nabatchi, T., Gastil, J., Weiksner, M. and Leighninger, M. (eds.) (2012) *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Pincock, H. (2012) 'Does Deliberation Make Better Citizens?', in T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, M. Weiksner and M. Leighninger (eds.), *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 135–162.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003) 'Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88(5), pp. 879–903.

Polletta, F. (2002) *Freedom is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Prior, M. (2009) 'The Immensely Inflated News Audience: Assessing Bias in Self-reported News Exposure', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73(1), pp. 130–143.

Schudson, M. (1999) *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scully, P.L. and McCoy, M.L. (2005) 'Study Circles: Local Deliberation as the Cornerstone of Deliberative Democracy', in J. Gastil and P. Levine (eds.), *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 199–212.

Stromer-Galley, J. and Muhlberger, P. (2009) 'Agreement and Disagreement in Group Deliberation: Effects on Deliberation, Satisfaction, Future Engagement and Decision Legitimacy', *Political Communication* 26(2), pp. 173–192.

Sullivan, B. and Hartz-Karp, J. (2013) 'Grafting an Online Parliament onto a Face-to-face Process', in L. Carson, J. Gastil, J. Hartz-Karp and R. Lubensky (eds.), *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 49–62.

Tourangeau, R. and Smith, T.W. (1996) 'Asking Sensitive Questions: The Impact of Data Collection Mode, Question Format and Question Context', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60(2), pp. 275–304.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L. and Brady, H.E. (1995) *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wampler, B. (2007) *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation and Accountability*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Warren, M.E. (1993) 'Can Participatory Democracy Produce Better Selves? Psychological Dimensions of Habermas' Discursive Model of Democracy', *Political Psychology* 14(2), pp. 209–234.

Warren, M.E. and Pearse, H. (eds.) (2008) *Designing Deliberative Democracy: The British Columbia Citizens' Assembly*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiederhold, A. and Gastil, J. (2013) 'Hearing All Sides? Soliciting and Managing Different Viewpoints in Deliberation', in L. Carson, J. Gastil, J. Hartz-Karp and R. Lubensky (eds.), *The Australian Citizens' Parliament and the Future of Deliberative Democracy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 108–119.