**POL 8360: Small Group Processes and Democratic Deliberation**

**Thursday, 1:25-3:20. Social Sciences 1383.**

**Instructor: C. Daniel Myers (**[**cdmyers@umn.edu**](mailto:cdmyers@umn.edu)**)**

**Office: 1474 Social Science**

**Office Hours: Thursday 3:30-4:30 or by appointment**

The “deliberative turn” in democratic theory has inspired a range of new empirical research. This work asks how deliberative existing democratic systems are and what can be done to make them more so. Drawing on work in political science, communications, and psychology, we will examine this new literature, exploring such questions as: How can we measure the quality of deliberation? Can conversation about politics, whether in small groups, in the media, or in everyday conversation, meet the standards of deliberative theory? What can empirical research tell us about how to improve the quality of deliberation?

We will start by briefly reviewing the normative literature inspired by the “deliberative turn.” We will continue with the main topic of the course: exploring literatures on small group processes and what lessons this research can teach us about the feasibility of creating deliberation in institutions like deliberative polls, citizen juries, and other “mini-publics.” Finally, we will examine research on everyday political conversation among citizens, asking what such conversation looks like and whether it can play a role in a deliberative political system. This course meets the requirements of an elective class for the Ph.D. minor in Political Psychology.

**Class Structure**

As with most graduate seminars, this class will be structured around discussion of a series of important readings on a topic. During each two-hour meeting we will examine the following questions:

* What is the argument advanced by each reading?
* How is the argument structured? What are the premises and conclusions?
* How convincing is the reading’s argument? What are potential objections or qualifications?
* How does the argument relate to those advanced by other readings, including those assigned in the same week, those we have read previously, and other scholarship from outside of class?

For empirical papers, we will also focus on the following questions:

* What is the research question? How is it motivated by previous literature, normative or empirical?
* What are the theoretical framework and the central hypotheses? How well do these address the concerns raised in the research question?
* What methodological strategies are employed to test the hypotheses?
* How are the key concepts defined and measured? Are the measures valid and reliable? How might decisions regarding measurement affect the findings?
* How convincing are the article’s findings? What objections could we raise? What further work could make us more (or less) confident in these findings?
* How do these findings relate to deliberative democratic theory?

Each class will be led by a student discussion leader; I’ll try to guide the conversation as needed.

**Assignments and Expectations**

*Attendance:* Students are expected to attend all class sessions (with allowances, of course, for sickness and emergencies).

*Readings and Reaction Papers:* Students are expected to complete **all** of the required reading before each class section, and to critically reflect on the reading in preparation for class discussions. To facilitate this reflection, please write an informal 250-word reaction paper that describes thoughts and questions about the readings, as well as broader themes that connect them to each other and to other material from the course or elsewhere. These papers are due to the entire class 24 hours before class begins. Everyone should read all of the reaction papers before class so that we can begin with an understanding of the perspectives that everyone brings to the table.

*Leading Discussion*: Each class will have an assigned discussion leader. The discussion leader will complete an expanded and more formal reaction paper of 1,000 words. This paper should outline an overarching view of the assigned readings. It should address the questions listed above, as well as other thoughts or reactions to the assigned papers that the leader thinks will be fruitful topics of discussion. Like the reaction papers, this paper should be sent to the entire class 24 hours before class time so that everyone can read it.

*Seminar Paper*: The main assignment for the course is a research paper or research design related to the course’s theme. The paper should be as long as it needs to be and no longer, though something on the order of 6-8,000 words is generally acceptable. If you write a research paper, you should try to write something that can be turned into a conference paper and eventually a submission to a refereed journal. Research designs should serve as the template for a subsequent research project conducted outside class, with the ultimate goal of becoming a conference paper and subsequently a submission to a refereed journal. Seminar papers that are eventually incorporated into dissertations are the best kind.

*Research Proposals:* These papers should specify a clear research question and a design that is capable of answering that research question. The paper must (1) describe and motivate the research question; (2) review the relevant literature and explain how your study will contribute to it; (3) define the concepts, develop a theoretical framework, and derive testable hypotheses; (4) describe the data you propose to collect and how the variables will be measured; and (5) explain how you would analyze the relationships between the variables.

*Research Papers:* These papers do everything that research proposals do, and then actually analyze data to answer the proposed question. The paper must (1) describe and motivate the research question and explain why it is important; (2) review the relevant literature and explain how your study will contribute to it; (3) define the concepts, develop a theoretical framework, and derive testable hypotheses; (4) describe the data that you have available and how the variables are measured; and (5) analyze these relationships using appropriate methods.

In general, research proposals are appropriate for cases where data to answer your research question are not readily available. Research papers are appropriate when answering the research question does not require extensive data collection.

Please talk to me outside of class about your ideas for the seminar paper well in advance of its due date. Your topic should not come as a surprise to me when I read your final paper. If you wish to write a theoretical paper instead of an empirical paper, please see me as soon as possible to discuss this.

**Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**

As per university policy, any student with a documented disability condition (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, systemic, vision, hearing, etc.) who needs to arrange reasonable accommodations should contact the instructor and Disability Services (615-626-1333 or http://ds.um.edu) at the beginning of the semester.

**Grading**

Grades in the class will be determined by the following criteria:

* 1. Attendance, participation, and reaction papers 40 %
  2. Discussion leader paper 10 %
  3. Final research paper 50 %

Letter grades should be interpreted as one of many forms of feedback that I will provide throughout the year on the quality of your work. A reminder: your G.P.A. as a Ph.D. student profoundly does not matter for anything.

**Readings**

Each week we will read somewhere between 5 and 8 journal articles, or a book and 1-3 journal articles. We will read most or all of the following books:

* Mansbridge, J. J. (1980). *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
* Walsh, Katherine K. 2007. *Talking About Race: Community Dialogues and the Politics of Difference.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
* Karpowitz, Christopher and Tali Mendelberg. 2014. *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation and Institutions*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
* Gastil, John, E. Pierre. Deess, Philip J. Weiser and Cindy Simmons. *The Jury and Democracy: How Jury Deliberation Promotes Civic Engagement and Political Participation*. New York: Oxford University Press
* Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative vs. Participatory Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press
* Jacobs, Lawrence R, Fay Lomax Cook and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2009. *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

We will read several chapters out of the following books. I will post scanned copies of these chapters to the course Moodle site, but all are important books that might be useful to own if you plan further work in this area.

* Gastil, John and Peter Levine, eds. 2007. *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
* Bohman, James and William Rehg, eds. 1997. *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 279-320.
* Young, Iris M. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
* Parkinson, John and Jane Mansbridge, eds. 2012. *Deliberative Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

All other readings are either journal articles available electronically through the library, or chapters that I will scan and upload to Moodle. If you have any trouble locating any reading, please email me.

**Course Schedule**

Each day is listed along with the assigned readings. For some weeks, I’ve included “optional” readings that are on the topic. I don’t expect anyone to read these for class, but you might find them useful if you plan on writing your seminar paper in that particular area.

**September 4 - Deliberative Theory**

* Cohen, Joshua. 1989. “Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy.” In The Good Polity, ed. Alan Hamlin, and Phillip Petit. Boston: Blackwell pp. 17–34.
* Guttman, Amy and Dennis Thompson. 2004. “What Deliberative Democracy Means.” Ch. 1 in *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press 1-63.
* Knight, Jack, and James Johnson.1997. “What Sort of Equality Does Deliberative Democracy Require?” In Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics, ed. James Bohman and William Rehg. Cambridge: MIT Press, 279-320.
* Estlund, David. 2008. “How Would Democracy Know?” Ch. 9 in *Democratic Authority.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Optional:

* Manin, Bernad. 1987. “On Legitimacy and Democratic Deliberation.” Elly Stein and Jane Mansbridge, Trans. *Political Theory*, 15(3): 338-368

**September 11 - Deliberative Theory: Critiques and Restatements**

* Sanders, Lynn. 1997. “Against Deliberation.” Political Theory 25(3): 347–376.
* Young, Iris M. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press. **Intro, Chs 1-3**
* Mouffe, Chantal. 1999. “Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism.” Social Research 66 (3): 745-758.
* Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. **Chs. 7 and 8. Skim or skip sections on voluntary associations.**
* Mansbridge, Jane, James Bohman, Simone Chambers, David Estlund, Andreas Fllesdal, Archon Fung, Cristina Lafont, Bernard Manin, and José luis Martí. 2010. “The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy.” Journal of Political Philosophy 18(1): 64–100.
* Bächtiger, André, Simon Niemeyer, Michael Neblo, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Jürg Steiner. 2010. “Disentangling Diversity in Deliberative Democracy: Competing Theories, Their Blind Spots and Complementarities.” The Journal of Political Philosophy 18 (1): 32-63

Optional:

* Knight, Jack and James Johnson. 2011. *The Priority of Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

**September 18 – The Role of Empirical and Positive Research**

* Thompson, Dennis. 2008. “Deliberative Democratic Theory and Empirical Political Science.” Annual Review of Political Science 11: 497–520.
* Mutz, Diana C. 2008. “Is Deliberative Democracy a Falsifiable Theory?” Annual Review of Political Science 11: 521-538.
* Burkhalter, Stephanie, John Gastil, and Todd Kelshaw. 2002. "A conceptual definition and theoretical model of public deliberation in small face—to—face groups." Communication Theory 12(4): 398-422.
* Mendelberg, Tali. 2002. “The Deliberative Citizen: Theory and Evidence.” In Political Decision Making, Deliberation and Participation, ed. Michael X. Delli Carpini, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Y. Shapiro. Vol. 6 New York: Elsevier pp. 151–193.
* Myers, C. Daniel and Tali Mendelberg. 2013. “Public Deliberation.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology, 2nd ed.* Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears and Jack S. Levy eds. New York: Oxford University Press.
* Wittenbaum, G. M., & Moreland, R. L. (2008). Small group research in social psychology: Topics and trends over time. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 187-203.

Optional:

* Bohman, James. 1998. “The Coming Age of Deliberative Democracy.” Journal of Political Philosophy 6(4): 400-425.

**September 25 – Ethnographic Studies**

* Mansbridge, J. J. (1980). *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
* Walsh, Katherine K. 2007. *Talking About Race: Community Dialogues and the Politics of Difference.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **Chs 1, 2, 6-10**

Optional:

* Bryan, F. M. 2004. *Real democracy: The New England town meeting and how it works*.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**October 2 – Group Decision Making and Cognition**

* Baron, R. S. (2005). So right it’s wrong: Groupthink and the ubiquitous nature of polarized group decision making. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 219-253.
* Stasser, G., & Titus, W. (2003). Hidden profiles: A brief history. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 304-313.
* Wittenbaum, G. M., Hollingshead, A. B. & Botero, I. (2004). From cooperative to motivated information sharing in groups: Going beyond the hidden profile paradigm. *Communication Monographs*, 71, 286-310.
* Schulz-Hardt, S., Brodbeck, F. C., Mojzisch, A., Kerschreiter, R., & Frey, D. 2006. Group decision making in hidden profile situations: Dissent as a facilitator for decision quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 1080-1093.
* Martin, Robin, Miles Hewstone, Pearl Y. Martin and Antonis Gardikiotis. 2008. “Persuasion from Majority and Minority Groups.” In *Attitudes and Attitude Change*, William D. Crasno and Radmila Prislin, eds. New York: Psychology Press 361-384.
* DeChurch, Leslie A. and Jessica R. Mesmer-Magnus. 2010. “The Cognitive Underpinnings of Effective Teamwork: A Meta-Analysis.” Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(1) 32-53

Optional:

* Lu, L., Yuan, Y. C., & McLeod, P. L. (2012). Twenty-five years of hidden profiles in group decision-making: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 16,* 54–75.

**October 9 – Group Creativity and Affect**

* Stroebe, W., Nijstad, B. A., & Rietzschel, E. F. (2010). Beyond productivity loss in brainstorming groups: The evolution of a question. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 157-203.
* Girota, K. Terwiesch, C. & Ulrich, K. T. (2010). Idea generation and the quality of the best idea. *Management Science*, 56, 591-605.
* Jones, E. E. & Kelly, J. (2009). No pain, no gain: Negative mood leads to process gains in idea generation. *Group Dynamics, 13,* 75-88.
* Barsade, Sigal G. 2002. The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 47, 644-675.
* Sy, Thomas, Stéphane Côté and Richard Saavedra. 2005. The Contagious Leader: Impact of the Leader's Mood on the Mood of Group Members, Group Affective Tone, and Group Processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2): 295-305.

**October 16 – Deliberation and Opinion Change**

* Barabas, Jason. 2004. How Deliberation Affects Policy Opinions. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4): 687-701.
* James N. Druckman and Kjersten R. Nelson. 2003. “Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 47:4: 729-745
* Christian List, Robert C. Luskin, James S. Fishkin and Iain McLean. 2013. “Deliberation, Single-Peakedness, and the Possibility of Meaningful Democracy: Evidence from Deliberative Polls.” *Journal of Politics*, 75(1): 80-95
* Neblo, Michael. “Change for the Better?” Unpublished Working Paper.
* Gastil, J., Black, L., & Moscovitz, K. 2008. “Ideology, attitude change, and deliberation in small face-to-face groups.” *Political Communication,* 25(1): 23–46
* Black, L. W. 2009. “Listening to the city: Difference, identity, and storytelling in online deliberative groups.” *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 5, Article 4.
* Andersen, V. N. and Hansen, K. M. 2007. “How deliberation makes better citizens: The Danish Deliberative Poll on the euro.” *European Journal of Political Research*. 46: 531–556

Optional:

* Farrar, C., Fishkin, J. S., Green, D. P., List, C., Luskin, R. C., & Paluck, E. L. 2010. Disaggregating deliberation’s effects: An experiment with a Deliberative Poll. *British Journal of Political Science*, 40, 333–347

**October 23 – Group Composition**

* Farrar, C., Green, D. P., Green, J. E., Nickerson, D. W., & Shewfelt, S. 2009. Does discussion group composition affect policy preferences? Results from three randomized experiments. *Political Psychology*. 30: 615–647
* Esterling, Kevin M., Archon Fung and Taeku Lee. 2014. “Persuasion within Small Deliberative Groups: A Randomized Field Experiment on Fiscal Policy Discussion.” Paper presented at the 2014 Meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Rome, Italy.
* Esterling, Kevin M., Archon Fung and Taeku Lee. 2014. “How much disagreement is good for democratic deliberation?” Unpublished working paper
* Wojcieszak, M. 2011. “Deliberation and Attitude Polarization.” *Journal of Communication*, 61(4): 596–617.
* Price, V., Nir, L. and Cappella, J. N. 2006. “Normative and Informational Influences in Online Political Discussions.” *Communication Theory*, 16(1): 47–74.

**October 30 – Race, Gender, and Deliberation**

* Mendelberg, T., & Oleske, J. (2000). Race and public deliberation. *Political Communication.* 17: 169–191.
* Karpowitz, Christopher and Tali Mendelberg. 2014. *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation and Institutions*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
* Sommers, S. R. (2006). “On racial diversity and group decision-making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 597–612.
* Harris-Lacewell, Melissa V. 2004. “Policing Conservatives, Believing Feminists: Reactions to Unpopular Ideologies in Everyday Black Talk.” In *Barbershops, Bibles and BET: Everyday Talk and Black Political Thought*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. Ch. 4.

Optional:

* Karpowitz, Christopher F. and Chad Raphael and Allen S. Hammond. 2009. “Deliberative Democracy and Inequality: Two Cheers for Enclave Deliberation among the Disempowered.” *Politics & Society*, 37(4): 576-615.
* Mendelberg, Tali, Christopher F. Karpowitz, and Baxter J. Oliphant. "Gender Inequality in Deliberation: Unpacking the Black Box of Interaction." Perspectives on Politics 12 (2014): 18-44.

**November 6 – Game Theoretic Approaches**

* Austen-Smith, David and Timothy J. Feddersen. 2006. Deliberation, Preference Uncertainty, and Voting Rules.” *American Political Science Review*, 100(2): 209-217
* Steiner, Jürg. 2008. “Concept Stretching: The Case of Deliberation.” *European Political Science*, 7(2): 186-206 **Read entire debate, including reply from A-S & F, and replies by Goodin and Schneider**.
* Landa, Dimitri and Adam Meirowitz. 2009. “Game Theory, Information, and Deliberative Democracy.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2): 427-444
* Myers, C. Daniel. 2014. “Interests, Information and Minority Influence in Political Deliberation.” Unpublished working paper.
* Dickson, Eric S., Catherine Hafer, and Dimitri Landa. 2008. "Cognition and Strategy: A Deliberation Experiment." Journal of Politics 70(4): 974-989
* Goeree, J. and L. Yariv. 2011. "An Experimental Study of Collective Deliberation," *Econometrica*, 79(3): 893–921

**November 20 – Who Deliberates? What Effects Does it Have?**

* Neblo, M. A., Esterling, K. M., Kennedy, R. P., Lazer, D. M. J., & Sokhey, A. E. (2010). Who wants to deliberate—and why? American Political Science Review, 104(3): 566-583.
* Morrell, M. E. 2005. “Deliberation, democratic decision-making and internal political efficacy.” Political Behavior, 27, 49–69
* Gastil, John, E. Pierre. Deess, Philip J. Weiser and Cindy Simmons. *The Jury and Democracy: How Jury Deliberation Promotes Civic Engagement and Political Participation*. New York: Oxford University Press

Optional:

* Kevin Esterling, Michael Neblo, & David Lazer. (2011) “Means, Motive, and Opportunity in Becoming Informed about Politics: A Deliberative Field Experiment Involving Members of Congress and their Constituents.” Public Opinion Quarterly. Vol. 75, No. 3, pp. 483-503.

**November 13 – Kinds of Deliberative Mini-Publics and Those Who Organize Them**

* Luskin, R. C., Fishkin, J. S., & Jowell, R. 2002. “Considered Opinions: Deliberative polling in Britain.” *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(3) 455–487.
* Gastil, John and Peter Levine, eds. 2007. *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
  + Chapter 3: National Issues Forums
  + Chapter 7: Citizen’s Juries
* Wampler, Brian. 2007. “Participatory Budgeting: The Rules of the Game.” Ch. 2 in *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil*. State College, PA: Penn State University Press
* Knobloch, Katherine R, John Gastil, Justin Reedy, and Katherine Cramer Walsh. 2013. “Did They Deliberation? Applying an Evaluative Model of Democratic Deliberation to the Oregon Citizens’ Initiative Review.” *Journal of Applied Communication*. 41(2): 105-125.
* Warren, Mark E. and Hilary Pearse. 2008. “Introduction: Democratic Renewal and Deliberative Democracy.” In *Designing Deliberative Democracy: The British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly Experiment*. Mark E. Warren and Hilary Pearse, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press.
* Jacobs, Lawrence R, Fay Lomax Cook and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2009. Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **Chapter 7**

Optional:

* Other Essays in Warren and Pearse and Gastil and Levine edited volumes
* Goold, Susan D., Andrea K. Biddle, Glenn Klipp, Charles N. Hall and Marion Danis. 2005. “Choosing Health Plans All Together: A Deliberative Exercise for Allocating Limited Health Care Resources.” *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 30(4): 563-602.
* De Vries R., Stanczyk A., Ryan K., & Kim, S. Y. 2011. A framework for assessing the quality of democratic deliberation: Enhancing deliberation as a tool for bioethics. Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, 6(3): 3–17.
* Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
* Fung, A. (2004). Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
* Cooper, E., & Smith, G. (2012). Organizing Deliberation: The Perspectives of Professional Participation Practitioners in Britain and Germany. Journal of Public Deliberation, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss1/art3>
* Hendriks, C. M., & Carson, L. (2008). Can the market help the forum? Negotiating the commercialization of deliberative democracy. Policy Sciences, 41(4), 293–313. doi:10.1007/s11077-008-9069-8
* Walsh, K. C. 2006. ‘Communities, Race, and Talk: An Analysis of the Occurrence of Civic Intergroup Dialogue Programs.” Journal of Politics, 68: 22–33.
* Walsh, Katherine K. 2007. *Talking About Race: Community Dialogues and the Politics of Difference.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **Chs 3-5**

**November XX (Thanksgiving Make-up Class) – Deliberative Systems Theory**

* Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. “Everyday talk in the deliberative system.” In Stephen Macedo (ed.), Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement. Oxford University Press. 211-242.
* Chambers, Simone. 2009. “Rhetoric in the Public Sphere: Has Deliberative Democracy Abandoned Mass Democracy?” Political Theory 37 (3): 323-350
* Habermas, Jürgen. 2006. “Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension?” *Communication Theory*, 16: 411-426
* Parkinson, John and Jane Mansbridge, eds. 2012. *Deliberative Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press. **Chs. 1, 3.**
* Lafont, C. (Forthcoming). Deliberation, Participation, and Democratic Legitimacy: Should Deliberative Mini-publics Shape Public Policy? *Journal of Political Philosophy*.

**December 4 – Everyday Talk as Deliberation**

* Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative vs. Participatory Democracy*.
* One essay from the symposium on *Hearing the Other Side* in Critical Review, Volume 25 Issue 2. Skim (or at least read the abstracts) of the others.
* Mutz, Diana C. 2013. “Reflections on Hearing the Other Side in Theory and Practice.” *Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society*, 25(2): 260-276
* Jacobs, Lawrence R, Fay Lomax Cook and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2009. Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **Chapters 2, 3**
* Conover, P. J., Searing, D. D., & Crewe, I. M. (2002). The deliberative potential of political discussion. *British Journal of Political Science*, *32*(01), 21-62

Optional:

* Conover, P. J., & Searing, D. D. (2005). Studying ‘everyday political talk’ in the deliberative system. Acta Politica, 40(3), 269-283.
* Walsh, Kathrine C. 2004. *Talking About Politics: Informal Groups and Social Identity in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
* Lazer, D. M., Sokhey, A. E., Neblo, M. A., & Esterling, K. M. 2010. Expanding the conversation: Ripple effects from a deliberative field experiment. Working paper, Ohio State University.