ASSESSING THE PROBLEM OF GENDER INEQUALITY IN DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

by

KARA NOELLE DILLARD

B.S., Southern Utah University, 2003
M.A., Eastern New Mexico University, 2005

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology, Anthropology & Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Abstract

In deliberative democracy, attempts to reconcile questions of gender and civil society are deadlocked over fundamental assumptions concerning the role of deliberation and the possibility that exclusion and inequality are inherent in democracy. Normative theories of deliberation - encouraging free, equal and impartial participation by citizens are fueled by the power of reason. Reason giving is associated with dominant groups – namely white, middle-class men; passionate, emotive and particularized speech is associated with politically disadvantaged groups such as women, minorities and poor. Limited empirical findings indicate rational models of deliberation do not affirm theorized inequalities. In this case, female participants neither experience unequal access or treatment within deliberation. This dissertation seeks to provide a framework for resolving the debate posed by difference democrats over whether deliberative democracy remedies the problem of inequality by examining fourteen National Issues Forums public deliberations. One set of deliberations feature an equal mix of male and female participants, another set with more male than female and a third with more female than male participants. I examine the types of talk women and men use in deliberations and whether affective claims negatively affect deliberation. Ultimately, I find that inequality based on gender exists in most of the deliberative forums I surveyed. I argue that the type of inequality plaguing deliberative democracy exists a priori – before participants enter the forums – and then manifests itself inside the forum as well. The normative structure of deliberation that is supposed to screen or bracket out inequality and the strong influences of the economic and political elites just does not happen to the degree deliberative democracy needs in order to continue the claim that it is net beneficial over the status quo.

ASSESSING THE PROBLEM OF GENDER INEQUALITY IN DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

by

KARA NOELLE DILLARD

B.S., Southern Utah University, 2003
M.A., Eastern New Mexico University, 2005

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology, Anthropology & Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Approved by:

Major Professor
Robert Schaeffer

Copyright

Abstract

In deliberative democracy, attempts to reconcile questions of gender and civil society are deadlocked over fundamental assumptions concerning the role of deliberation and the possibility that exclusion and inequality are inherent in democracy. Normative theories of deliberation - encouraging free, equal and impartial participation by citizens are fueled by the power of reason. Reason giving is associated with dominant groups – namely white, middle-class men; passionate, emotive and particularized speech is associated with politically disadvantaged groups such as women, minorities and poor. Limited empirical findings indicate rational models of deliberation do not affirm theorized inequalities. In this case, female participants neither experience unequal access or treatment within deliberation This dissertation seeks to provide a framework for resolving the debate posed by difference democrats over whether deliberative democracy remedies the problem of inequality by examining fourteen National Issues Forums public deliberations. One set of deliberations feature an equal mix of male and female participants, another set with more male than female and a third with more female than male participants. I examine the types of talk women and men use in deliberations and whether affective claims negatively affect deliberation. Ultimately, I find that inequality based on gender exists in most of the deliberative forums I surveyed. I argue that the type of inequality plaguing deliberative democracy exists a priori – before participants enter the forums – and then manifests itself inside the forum as well. The normative structure of deliberation that is supposed to screen or bracket out inequality and the strong influences of the economic and political elites just does not happen to the degree deliberative democracy needs in order to continue the claim that it is net beneficial over the status quo.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

If I were to choose one professor from which to mimic when I grow up, it would be my major professor, Dr. Robert Schaeffer. Dr. Schaeffer is the true definition of professor. He writes books that explain complex arguments and issues with ease, he delivers lectures with eloquence, and is supportive and committed to all of the academic and intellectual endeavors of his students. And that is the most important quality of a great professor – a commitment to students. Dr. Schaeffer has that quality. As I begin my career as a professional academic, I will always hold him as the model to which I will strive.

Through the ten months it took me write this dissertation, Dr. Schaeffer was hands off when I needed him to be and was involved and provided insightful direction when I needed it. Initially skeptical of deliberative democracy when I first pitched the idea of this dissertation, he continued to challenge me to think more deeply about what deliberative democracy was, what it's benefits were, and why such a practice could be sustained in current times. I think his comment to me once was, and this is not a precise quote, "Hey, didn't we do that back in the '70's with consciousness raising groups? I mean, come on now." I welcomed his skepticism as a challenge to develop and refine my own views of the topic I hope to make my program of study for years to come. Much of chapters two and three are written with him in mind – attempting to navigate the muddy waters of a complex topic with an eye of convincing the skeptic that deliberation was a worthy endeavor. I owe this dissertation to him.

Dr. Gerad Middendorf, Dr. Charlie Griffin and Dr. Dana Britton have also been instrumental in guiding the theoretical and methodological basis of this dissertation. Each has provided a different insight or literature base to draw from that made this dissertation better. I could not have asked for a better committee.

I am also in debt to the staff, faculty and students at the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy, specifically Erika Imbody and Dr. David Procter. The four years I spent as a Graduate Research Assistant in their office was incredibly formative. They gave me a chance to think freely, to think critically, to learn how to deliberate and facilitate. I will graduate with skills I never would have had if they had not hired me (and kept me on), skills that I know will translate well beyond the university.

I never would have been able to complete this dissertation without the support of my family. My parents, Bill and LaRae Dillard have been waiting a long time for this dissertation to be finished. No one has been more supportive than they have during these long years. They paid my tuition (and more) when I didn't have the means to do so on my own. They cheered me up when I felt like completing my dissertation was beyond my means. I realize that I never would have been in the position that I am in today, a soon-to-be-graduate with a doctoral degree had they not adopted me and taken me in as one of their own children. I hope they are proud of me.

I cannot forget Dale and Jeanine Dillard and Alan and Kathy Souders who also provided me with support during graduate school and while writing this dissertation.

I owe much to my partner, Michael Souders, who supported me above and beyond what a partner should during the last frantic six weeks of writing. He has been my champion when I didn't feel so confident. He challenged me to be better when I didn't think it was possible. He asked me tough questions when they needed to be asked. When I needed time to be by myself and write or think, he let me have that space. No one has been there for me like he has. The past eight years have no doubt been difficult, but I hope with our dissertations behind us we can begin to live the rich life we imagined for ourselves.

I could not have written this dissertation without the help of one little Christian Souders (as well as Dora, Diego, Boots, the Backyardigans, SuperWhy, Ducktales, and Thomas). I will forever remember the early mornings and late evenings we spent both "working" on our "laptops." I could not have asked for a better kid. He is more loving, caring and sweet than I deserve. This dissertation is mainly for him. Love you, buddy.

A last thank you goes to the staff and baristas of the Bluestem Bistro and Panera Bread in Manhattan, KS, many of whom I consider friends. Their rounds of free coffee, offers to let me stay late while they clean, and general supportiveness is beyond what any customer is entitled to. They always made me feel welcome in their restaurants and were there with words of encouragement (and a cookie) when needed.

Dedication

To my parents, Bill and LaRae Dillard, for their love and support.

To my partner, Michael Souders,

And,

To my favorite, Christian Souders, for their love and support.

Preface

The research contained in this dissertation is solely the opinion of the author. Any interpretations and conclusions are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy or the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, its staff or directors.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

"With cameras rolling, lawmakers have managed this week to give the Capitol the gravitas of a middle school. Consider the lengthy debate on the House floor over the title of the budget legislation, which Republicans dubbed 'Cut, Cap and Balance' and Democrats called 'Duck, Dodge and Dismantle.'

'This is Ducking, Dodging and Destroying,' revised Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.).

'Better called the Slash, Burn and Pander Act,' recommended Pete Stark (D-Calif.).

'Cut, Slash and Burn,' suggested Gerry Connolly (D-Va.).

Nancy Pelosi, the Democratic leader, corrected them all. 'Cut, Cap and End Medicare,' she said.

'Cut, Cap and Default Act,' insisted Mazie Hirono (D-Hawaii).

'It's really Cash Cow for Billionaires,' proposed Ed Markey (D-Mass.)….

Markey displayed a poster of a cruise ship with a Monopoly man on board and old people in the water. 'Grandma is being pushed overboard!" he declared.

All decorum departed the chamber as lawmakers ignored regular reminders from the speaker not to address one another directly or to disparage the president."

--Excerpt from editorial columnist Dana Milbank's "Why American's Are Angry At Congress" *The Washington Post*, July 20, 2011.

The Sad State of Politics

Americans like to consider themselves citizens of the most democratic nation. But, when our national political discourse is shortened to sound bites and taglines meant more for grabbing headlines in the local newspaper than for encouraging meaningful debate, it is hard to believe we are as truly democratic as we claim. Scholars from a broad range of disciplines are calling for supplementing our current electoral democracy with citizen-based deliberation, claiming this is critical if democracy going to survive. Bringing citizens together to discuss policies in a setting that emphasizes equality and respect is more likely to provide solutions for tough political

decisions than debates like the one Milbank describes. Citizen deliberation has been identified as the critical component of a vibrant democracy. It provides a fresh, dynamic substance to replace the currently rotting interior.

Even though deliberative democracy is a relatively new phenomenon, it has a record of promising results. These new civic spaces which include deliberative polling, consensus conferences, study circles, planning cells, citizen juries, citizen assemblies, and participatory budgeting has been used to inform and influence public policymaking (Gastil & Levine, 2005). These forums have been used across the world in disparate situations and settings to generate citizen-based outcomes, including in Oregon's health care reforms, participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil, electoral reform and public transportation reforms in Vancouver, British Columbia, community policing and school board discussions in Chicago, plans for the development of a post-9/11 World Trade Center memorial and discussions about regulation of genetically modified foods in Denmark (Fung, 2007; Gastil & Levine, 2005; Karpowitz, et al, 2009). The result of these "minipublics" as Robert Dahl (1989) calls them, often generate policy recommendations, act to monitor the actions of local and state governments, and sometimes, as in the case of participatory budgeting processes, even directly contribute to enactment of policy decisions.

Keenly aware of the potential pitfall of inequality, forum conveners often exert control over the selection of participants, what and how issues are framed for discussion, the structure of forum agendas, and what the goal of the deliberation is. According to Karpowitz and his colleagues, these forums also use a variety of procedural safeguards in order to ensure all group members can participate freely and equally. Such safeguards include rules for discussion and facilitators trailed in eliciting responses from all participants and how to minimize dominant

behaviors sometimes exhibited by participants (Gastil & Levine, 2005). Empirical studies have shown that well-designed deliberative forums can succeed in lower participatory inequality and influence (Fung, 2004; Cramer Walsh, 2006; Hendricks, 2006).

While the chorus calling for citizen engagement has grown louder and more persuasive, engagement via public deliberation is not without its problems. The primary dilemma facing contemporary politics is the distinct realization that exclusion and inequality are inherent not just in aggregative democracy but in its more inclusive spinoff – deliberation (Krause, 2008; O'Flynn, 2006; Sanders, 1997; Young, 2000). In deliberative democracy, attempts to reconcile questions of gender and the public sphere are deadlocked over fundamental assumptions regarding deliberation's relationship to citizen access to democratic practices (Hickerson & Gastil, 2008). To date, theoretical critiques noting deliberation's with regard to gender difference in the public sphere have yet to be tested empirically (Hickerson & Gastil, 2008; Polletta & Lee, 2006). As such, deliberative democracy's advocates are at a theoretical stalemate with the difference critique.

Ultimately, this study is more a referendum on deliberative democracy than a judgment on gender or group composition. While the way I ask the larger question for study and the specific research questions requires specific anecdotes about gender and group composition, my main concern is how deliberative structures and norms alter or are altered by gender and group composition. My orientation to this topic is as someone focused more so on deliberation rather than on gender. Thus, when I began to examine transcripts and data I expected to fully be able to defend rational deliberation, or at least, to see less of the theorized effects of gender and group composition on deliberation than I argue does happen. Instead, the results point to the possibility that deliberation is severely wounded in its battle with gender inequality – something I did not

expect to argue. As I said earlier, scholars and practitioners of citizen-based democracy do not need to start over, but rather, be cognizant of the ways inequality does manifest itself into deliberation. I hope this research can begin to provide a theoretical and empirical framework from which scholars can undertake the study of how inequality, particularly as it relates to gender, functions in deliberative settings.

Understanding the context in which citizens participate in the public sphere requires adopting a sociological lens. Polletta and Lee (2006, p. 700) note, "the capacity of rhetorical forms such as arguments, explanations and stories to foster good deliberation rests not only on features of the form but also on social conventions of its use and evaluation." The credibility of particular rhetorical forms is more likely to be questioned by certain users and in certain contexts than others. Many studies have concluded that women and men speak differently when in the public sphere – what is unknown is the effect that talk has on deliberation in particular. The power of conversational norms and the authority behind particular rhetorical forms and gender statuses can hamper quality deliberation from taking place. Attention needs to be paid to the social organization of the public sphere which enables as well as constrains equality.

A Look Ahead

My goal in this dissertation is to examine the claims of inequality brought by difference and gender scholars against the neutralists supporting the rational form of deliberative democracy. Difference and gender scholars question whether deliberation actually eliminates participatory inequality. Hence, a challenge to the very premise of deliberative democracy, its advantage in terms of inclusion and political neutrality. I assess whether deliberation is exempt or complicit in the inequality typically found in status quo politics. In doing so, I examine female participants discursive experiences and impact in public deliberative forums. Unfortunately, my

research gives partial, although not total credence to the claims of inequality in deliberative forums along gender lines. While deliberative democracy may be superior to the status quo, it suffers from significant problems from its attempt to create civil politics.

Chapter two begins with the question of what's the matter with American democracy? For a long time now, American democracy has been a state of decline. Our commitment to core democratic ideals is fading at the same time that voter turnout is declining, citizens are disengaging and social capital is withering away. I argue that the trouble with democracy is that the power of the people has been replaced by the power of economic markets to represent the opinions of citizens. Americans have come to believe that the marketplace represent a far more democratic form of social organization than the aggregative means of democracy creates. The problem of marketplace democracy, I argue, is threefold. One, a globalized market democracy has created a democracy which is less responsive and accountable to the economic and social needs of minority populations. In fact, the voices of those in the middle and lower classes are less likely to be heard by government officials while "the advantaged roar with a clarity and consistency that policymakers readily hear and follow" (Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005, p. 1). Second, I argue that the relevancy of the news media and journalism in the public sphere is diminishing. Because of layoffs, closing of international news bureaus, and ever expanding increases in entertainment programming, citizens receive less information from news organizations, and thus reduced knowledge about important topics. Third, I argue is the erosion of citizenship and civil society. Citizens in the neoliberal model are devoid of social bonds or interactive constellations with others to pursue a common good. Instead, people are left to "naturally" pursue their own interests, and thus, actively disengage from a government they do not trust. In response to these challenges, scholars from a variety of disciplines have begun calling for a new form of

democracy, something to add to aggregative methods that engages citizens and makes government more citizen focused and driven. The answer to that call is citizen-based deliberation.

Deliberative democratic theory developed as early as the 1980's in response to varying theories contesting the role of citizens in the public sphere. In chapter three, I note that the earlier political theories of citizens and the state viewed citizens as dangerous to the stability of government. Social choice theorists, much like the elite theorists who were afraid of citizens, argue that political parties function as entrepreneurs competing to sell ideas in a market of citizen-political consumers. However, scholars such as Benjamin Barber and Robert Putnam began calling for a thicker form of democracy that involves direct citizen participation in the decision making process, and so deliberative theory was born. Under the classical model of deliberation, deliberative neutralists such as Jürgen Habermas, Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, John Dryzek and Joshua Cohen call for reason-giving to be the foundation of deliberative exchanges. In order to keep out political and economic inequalities that plague contemporary politics, all reasons must be subject to the force of the best argument which requires a constant interplay of argument justification until a satisfactorily universal and culturally neutral argument emerges that all participants can agree on. Ultimately, deliberation works to correct some of the problems of market democracy because, in Habermas' view, democratic legitimacy is generated from its citizen-based interactions. Deliberation attempts to ensure there is an inclusive way (via the development of culturally neutral reasons) to determine what citizens need and to ensure this information influences decision-making and legislative action from policy-makers.

I argue that deliberation's neutrality advocates have failed to view deliberation from a sociological perspective. For deliberative neutralists, interaction seems to exists in abstraction, devoid of the social relationships and interactions that make not only social life possible, but create the meaning and information exchanges that drive deliberative knowledge creation. Neutrality advocates see deliberation as culture-neutral (among other things), and in doing so, disassociate the social from the interaction. By creating an ideal form of deliberation that is absent sociology, deliberative democracy runs the risk of sounding less like a pragmatic alternative to the status quo's sociopolitical organization and more like the musings of those who have listened too much John Lennon singing "Imagine." By romanticizing and idealizing deliberation as a mechanism totally impermeable to power inequality, its advocates create a situation where the sociological implications of interactions are purposefully ignored.

Deliberative democracy's strict adherence to rational communication and the tenets of universality, neutrality and egalitarianism leaves the theory open to questions of power relationships and discursive inequality. Chapter four answers the question of how much of an issue this problem is. Difference scholars such as Iris Young and Lynn Sanders question whether deliberation can reach its stated goals of participatory equality. In general, these scholars argue that despite the procedural requirement for participation, the social norms behind the interactional patterns that make up rationally dictated citizen participation often create more insidious forms of discrimination and inequality. When combined with scholarship from the likes of Cecilia Ridgeway detailing how a person's gender status beliefs and the gender expectations a person has when participating in task oriented group settings, it is quite possible that deliberation's foundation is inherently unequal.

Ridgeway (2011) argues that gender inequality exists because the everyday use of sex/gender as a basic cultural tool for organizing social interactions prevents gender from staying within boundaries of reproduction. Gender as a framing device infuses gendered meanings and assumptions about inequality into all spheres of social life, including the public sphere. Gender inequality, Ridgeway continues, is continually re-written into new economic and social relations as they develop and emerge, preserving inequality in spaces that were thought to be, like deliberation, gender and power neutral. What deliberation needs is an infusion of sociology.

The basis for this study comes from the tensions between deliberative and difference and gender advocates. In an attempt to shed light on this theoretical impasse, I studied fourteen face-to-face public issues forums across one hundred and forty five participants who deliberated in one of three different group compositions based on sex. While my dataset is small, the transcripts from these forums provides a rich tapestry of interactions and talk. I set out to answer three general questions about deliberating in different group compositions including whether gender influences the types of talk in deliberation. Chapter five details the specific research questions and methods used to investigate them.

Chapters six, seven, and eight outline my responses to each of these lines of inquiry. Chapter six highlights the dynamics involved in predominantly female forums which feature a lot of storytelling and highly deliberative exchanges. Chapter seven presents the trials of female participants deliberating in predominantly male forums and chapter eight discuses the discourse in mixed-sex forums. Ultimately, I find that inequality based on gender exists in most of the deliberative forums I surveyed. I argue that the type of inequality plaguing deliberative democracy exists a priori – before participants enter the forums – and then manifests itself inside the forum as well. The normative structure of deliberation that is supposed to screen or

bracket out inequality and the strong influences of the economic and political elites just does not function to the degree needed sustain the claim that it is beneficial over the status quo.

This does not mean the end of deliberative democracy. Despite the problems identified in chapters six and seven, there is no reason to think that deliberation is too saddled by its normative baggage to be reformed. The concluding chapter offers some assessments of whether deliberative democracy as its currently theorized meets its equality goals. It also offers two possible solutions to the normative and structural problems plaguing the deliberative process. I argue that changing the norms of deliberation to include a much broader interpretation of acceptable argument as well as modifying the function of the force of the best argument in forums will create a normative change that will lead to a broader variety of arguments, more participation by citizens, and a better appreciation for arguments which come from personal standpoint.

Conclusion

At the end of her article, Lynn Sanders (1997, p. 362) writes that "learning to deliberate in America might be inseparable from indoctrination in the familiar routines of hierarchy and deference, because the settings where American's deliberate are not isolated from status inequalities." To some extent, I find Sanders' statement to be true. The process of learning to deliberate is highly contextual – we learn not just the process of deliberation and appropriate talk but learn those items in the context of gender and status. But, to understand why and how deliberation evolved in the first place, we must turn to a larger discussion about what is the problem with democracy in the U.S. today.

Chapter 2 - What's the Matter with Democracy?

Jon Stewart: I made a special effort to come on the show today, because I have privately, amongst my friends and also in occasional newspapers and television shows, mentioned this show as being bad. I felt that that wasn't fair and I should come here and tell you that I don't -- it's not so much that it's bad, as it's hurting America. But I wanted to come here today and say stop, stop, stop, stop hurting America.

Paul Begala: Okay, now.

Stewart: And come work for us, because we, as the people…

Tucker Carlson: How do you pay?

Stewart: The people? Not well.

Begala: Better than CNN, I'm sure.

Stewart: But you can sleep at night. See, the thing is, we need your help. Right now, you're helping the politicians and the corporations. And we're left out there to mow our lawns.

Begala: By beating up on them? You just said we're too rough on them when they make mistakes.

Stewart: No, no, no, you're not too rough on them. You're part of their strategies. You are partisan, what do you call it, hacks.

-- Excerpt from CNN's political talk show *Crossfire* on October 15, 2004. Hosts Tucker Carlson and Paul Begala engage Jon Stewart, host of Comedy Central's *The Daily Show with Jon Stewart* on political commentary in America.

What's the Matter With Democracy?

Democracy and citizenship is impossible without a credible, active public sphere creating the contexts necessary for people to cultivate a sense of community (Eliasoph, 1998). However, many citizens loathe participating in political conversations mainly due to uncivil discourse and

the perceived adversarial nature of talk in civil society (Eliasoph, 1998; Fiorina, 1999; Forgette & Morris, 2006; Mansbridge, 1983). Nowhere is the adversarial nature of talk in civil society better evidenced than in television news programming. For networks such as MSNBC, Fox News and CNN, the desire to capture audience attention has led to programming focusing on political conflict, drama and opinion (Bennett, 2005; Fox & Van Sickel, 2001; Morris, 2002). Even in situations where little conflict actually exists, cable news shows perpetuate high-conflict uncivil discourse because of its highly compelling nature (Forgette & Morris, 2006). People may enjoy watching pundits argue about policy, but these same citizens are ignoring public debates and withdrawing into a more private world, claiming to feel that they are "mere spectators in a polity were all the significant action seems to go on above their heads, with their views ignored by pundits and clashing partisans" (Skocpol, 1999, p. 504).

Crossfire, CNN's flagship non-news debate program, was a thirty minute broadcast featuring two pundits or journalists, two "from the (political) left" and two "from the (political) right" debating hot-button issues of the day. The show's debate format intended to let the four hosts hash out in a highly-interactive and combative manner, the ideas representing the both ends of the political spectrum. Featuring much shouting, cajoling, uncivil talk, and insults of the current U.S. congress, its members, and/or the president, *Crossfire* was more political theater than political discussion (Boler & Turpin, 2008).

Jon Stewart's appearance on *Crossfire* came less than one month before the 2004 presidential election between George W. Bush and John Kerry. What was supposed to be a discussion about Stewart's new book *America (the book): A citizen's guide to democracy inaction*, Stewart immediately went on the offensive, asking Carlson, the "right" representative and Begala, the "left" representative, why fighting was necessary and then pressing the hosts to

say something nice about Bush and Kerry. The pundits grimaced through their answers, with Carlson stating he "liked" Kerry and Begala thinking Bush will be "unemployed soon." Stewart posited that shows such as *Crossfire, Hardball* or (the fictional) *"I'm Going to Kick Your Ass"* are preventing candidates from speaking honestly and freely to the public. Then, as the transcript in the opening of this chapter shows, Stewart begins calling shows such as *Crossfire* bad for America and pundits like Carlson and Begala political hacks working for corporations and political parties and not for the American public. When the hosts start challenging the types of questions Stewart asks on his show, he replies, "I didn't realize - and maybe this explains quite a bit - that the news organizations look to Comedy Central for their cues on integrity… You are on CNN. The show that leads into me is puppets making crank phone calls….You have a responsibility to the public discourse, and you fail miserably."

No one at CNN imagined the firestorm that Stewart's appearance would cause. The episode was named the "top cited media event in the blogosphere in 2004" and 600,000 people watched the broadcast on television or streaming online (Boler & Turpin, 2008). This landmark moment illustrates some problems with function of democracy in the United States, namely that the media works for the political and economic elites while ignoring the interests of the public, thus failing its public interest responsibility. Stewart's populist sentiments rang true for many citizens blogging their reactions after the show - they too seemingly have lost faith in their ability to influence the political process (Boler & Turpin, 2008). In reaction to Stewart's surprise attack and citing the need to change the tone of the show to be a gentler type of news discussion show, CNN canceled *Crossfire* after 23 years on the air. Stewart's criticisms that leave no doubt that the validity and strength of America's democracy is in trouble.

Democratic Stagnation

Democratic expansion has, for decades now, been in "various degrees of stagnation" (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 23), if not in outright decline. New economic thinking of the last three decades demanding more deregulation, less government intervention, and substantial reductions in the welfare state system has weakened the prosperity of middle and lower class Americans. Over the past fifty years, Republican and Democratic presidents have presided over dramatically different patterns of wealth and income growth. Democrats, preferring stronger social safety nets and stronger corporate regulations have presided over twice the rate of income growth for middle class families as Republican presidents and real incomes for working class families have grown six times as fast under Democrats. Unemployment under Democratic presidents averaged 4.84 percent; under Republican presidents, unemployment increased to 6.26 percent. Bartels (2008) argues from these findings that escalating inequality is not an inevitable feature of economic cycles but can be specifically attributed to the policies and political priorities of the GOP.

As the U.S. government has become less involved in the workplace, more and more corporations have moved their businesses overseas to nations that allow their workers to be paid cents on the dollar. With the decline in the influence and power of labor unions, American workers have seen their jobs evaporate and wages stagnate or fall below the rate of inflation all the while being made to work more hours. CEO compensation during the 1990's was four hundred and seventy five times the amount paid to blue collar worker. To compensate for stagnating wages, workers dove into the stock market and, in the 2000's the housing market. In the case of the dot com and housing bubbles, the middle and working classes lost both their jobs and wealth while CEO's have seen their performance bonuses rise. Wealth in the U.S. has not been this polarized since the 1920's (Frank, 2000, p. 7). Growing wealth inequality has also

stratified voting patterns. Voting populations have contracted since the 1960's; the wealthy and more educated are more likely to vote in elections, support interest groups, give money to political organizations and protest, thus affecting who is elected to govern and who is seen as important constituents (Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005; Perrucci & Wysong, 2008). Stratified participation increases the power of groups or individuals who have a stake in maintaining the status-quo wealth gap (Bartels, et al, 2005).

Democracy stands at a crossroads. Western democracies, in particular the United States' commitment to democracy's republican ideals is facing declining voter turnout, increased citizen disengagement, declining social capital and relatedly, a lack of trust and faith in government (Mansbridge, 1983; Putnam, 2000). How did we as a global society get here? What has driven citizens away from traditional (i.e., American) notions of democracy? I argue it is not the citizens, per se, that have changed but that, as the title of this essay points to, it is democracy that has changed. What *is* the matter with democracy? And what consequences does that present for a twenty-first century world?

The Trouble with Democracy

The title of this chapter (and its inspiration) is shamelessly stolen from Thomas Frank's bestseller *What's the Matter with Kansas?* In the book, Frank asks why Kansas, a bastion of leftist protosocialist populism in the Civil War era, has recently adopted a form of economic conservatism that has made suburban Kansas City the wealthiest county in the U.S. at the expense of the rest of the state, which now resides in a general state of poverty. His question reflects a larger, more vexing trend in the United States: why has a style of conservatism focusing primarily on conservative values while continuing what Frank calls the fantasies of free-market miracles that have impoverished the nation taken hold? His answer, just as it was for

William Allen White, a Republican who originally wrote an essay titled *What's the Matter with Kansas?* in the late 1890's, is corporate capitalism.

The trouble with Democracy is that, in short, the power of the people has in recent years been replaced by the power of the economic markets to represent the opinions of citizens. I posit that Americans have come to believe that the markets represent a far more democratic form of organization than the aggregative means of democracy creates. Market populism, democratic capitalism, welfare capitalist society, economism, or privatization are all terms that express a mode of rationality whose primary characteristic is the assertion of economic criteria over all other modes of reasoning and promoting market-centric values above all other (Dahlgren, 2009; Mansbridge, 1983; Touraine, 2001; Young, 1990, 2000). This form of neoliberal socio-political theory to which the U.S. now subscribes views the markets as mediums of consent that express the popular will more articulately than any election will (Frank, 2000).

Identifying market populism in its practical and discursive forms is not new theoretical ground. Georg Simmel (1907/2004) and Max Weber noted the rationalization of society – in which society was shifting away from traditional modes of thinking and toward valuing bureaucratic standards. In taking up the Parsonian-Weberian systems and bureaucracy mantle, Habermas (1984, 1989) recognized the growing influence of the 'economic-administrative complex,' arguing that society is no longer oriented toward mutually agreed upon values and norms ('principles of social integration') but toward 'rational-instrumental' logic emphasizing the drivers of the economy and political system: money and power ('principles of system integration') (Edwards, 2004). In a more recent treatment, Benjamin Barber (2007) argues that the consumer-citizen is caught in a web of market relations which no longer values democratic principles of justice, equality and common ground. George Ritzer in the *McDonaldization of*

Society (2010) views rationality and bureaucratic values such as efficiency, calculability, control and profitability have replaced civic values such as the common good and consensus (Allen, 2005).

As the United States has transitioned to a market democracy, consumer choices and resulting fluctuation of the markets tend to represent the will of the people. For example, WalMart, McDonalds, and reality television are reported as popular because they offer what people want. We know them to be popular because people choose to eat, shop and watch those particular brands (Dean, 2008). The market and the people have become one and the same – production and distribution have become culture, identity and lifestyle (Crossley, 2003). .Appeals to a common citizenship where the notion of a citizen is as much a social role as it is a political role becomes marginalized by the role the 'consumer' can play in creating freedom and choice (Couldry, 2004; Miles, 1998). This freedom is created through the purchase of things; the market proffers a logic that says for every problem, there is a product that can provide a solution (Dahlgren, 2009). This form of consumer logic, in which identities are created around (a limited choice of) brand names have replaced traditional forms of ascriptive identity – race, gender, sex, religious affiliation – along with civic and political identities to the detriment of an active, vibrant public sphere (Barber, 2007). In fact, the market is more democratic because citizens are directly involved in market decisions unlike more formal mechanisms of democracy. Citizen-consumers show their political opinions via the plebiscite of their wallets (Calabrese, 2000), that "markets are voting machines; they function by taking referenda" (Wriston, 1992, p. 45). To steal a line from Thomas Frank referencing Thomas Friedman, "it's one dollar, one vote" (2000, p. 66).

The argument against market democracy does not just stop at the consumer. The neoliberal critique also has also taken aim at the sovereignty of the nation-state itself. As noted above, states are finding themselves at a loss in politically controlling capital mobility and the resulting cultural imperialism. Castells (1997, 1998) notes the diminishing power of the nation state has brought an increase in human trafficking and drug trafficking around the globe. In western nations, the neoliberal critique has made a play against the welfare state – arguing that it discourages independence and innovation while, through taxes, disencentivizing entrepreneurship and investment. Together, the welfare state is characterized as inefficient, ineffective, restrictive of individual citizen liberty, and irrelevant (Calabrese, 2000). And yet, in practice, market democracies require the backing of state governments to quell labor related strikes and violence to promote political and economic stability as well as enter into and sign international trade agreements that allow corporations to impoverish the nation.

Democracy finds itself under fierce attack from the neoliberal critique. Justifications of a commitment to equality, liberty and opportunity from the government to the people are strenuously attacked by a new ideology that asserts the markets can provide those qualities in a more efficient manner. But, as discussed above, the market ideology is not without consequence, particularly for the democratic process as we know it. There are deep concerns that market democracy creates an inequality and apathy far more noxious than any republican democracy might conjure. If so, democracy must face the problems generated by the neoliberal ideal in order to begin a transition into a stronger version of democracy.

The Problems of Marketplace Democracy

Democracy has long held a tremendous amount of legitimacy because the foundation of its political order is the mutual consent of the citizenry (Held, 2006). The consent of the

citizenry is generated because democracy claims to grant equal access to the political apparatus. However, capitalism – imperfectly at best- makes liberal democracy feasible (Dahl, 1985; Harrison & Berger, 2006; Mueller 1999). And so, over the past thirty years, democracy finds its foundation challenged in light of the fact that capitalism, via democracy, has created extreme wealth inequality. The wealth inequality generated in the last three decades has decidedly created a system where some benefit from capitalism and most (although they believe otherwise) do not (Dahlgren, 2009). Market populism succeeds because it is able to co-opt democracy's legitimacy as a provider of social equality. As market populism repackages its concept of social equality into one purposefully ignorant of inequality, people find themselves in a world more privatized and thus more unequal, a world where journalists lack credibility and where civil society and the concept of citizenship has been eroded to the point of non-existence. I will focus on these three problems as examples of market democracy gone wrong.

Globalization and Democracy

As I noted earlier, the last thirty years have been defined by market strategies intended to revive neoliberal political positions such as deregulation, free-market ideals, and privatization, much to the detriment of society and democracy. Multi- and transnational corporations claim no allegiance to the nation-states in which their operations are located, creating instability in the sovereignty and relevance of the nation-state itself. Deindustrialization of western nations and the industrialization of developing countries have put pressure to change democratic structures of the global north and south in negative ways. Deindustrialization of the global North has led to the near elimination of labor unions and the loss of labor advocates for workplace protection, fair wages, and job and benefit security. Workers and governments are now at the mercy of businesses claiming in backhanded ways that if regulations and taxes aren't reduced,

corporations headquartered in the North will (continue to) move operations to another nation. Developing countries are often forced to keep taxes or regulations low in order to attract business investment, thus reducing the ability or desire of these nations to care and protect their labor force. Thus, governments in the North and South are forced to act against the best interests of their citizens in maintaining rights for workers, instead capitulating to the demands of corporations and the marketplace. As corporations downsize (or "right-size" as businesses tell it), the middle classes now face declines in the quality and security of jobs while watching the number of low-paid, no benefit, insecure jobs mainly in the service sector increase. McJobs – low paying jobs in the service sector with little chance for providing upward mobility (Etzioni, 1986) – have become standard fare for those looking for employment in a post-Great Recession era. This downward mobility trend is particularly true for minorities and women in the United States; nearly two-thirds of black and Hispanic households have no net worth, young, married, black couples earn twenty percent less than their white counterparts.

A globalized market democracy has created a situation where citizens experience a democracy which is less responsive and accountable to their economic and social needs. In fact, the voices of those in the middle and lower classes are less likely to be heard by government officials while "the advantaged roar with a clarity and consistency that policymakers readily hear and follow" (Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005, p. 1). Bartels (2002) provides evidence, finding that U.S. senators are almost three times as likely to vote for the policy preferences of their most wealthy constituents; Gilens (2003) finds that policymakers are more likely to design legislation and policies that meet the needs of the wealthy; and as we saw with the mass amounts of money and contracts given to independent American business as Jacobs and Paige (2005) note, businesses are the drivers of American foreign diplomatic, defense and trade policies. With widening

inequality presents the problem of debilitating feedback cycle in which increased wealth and inequality reduces the responsiveness of government officials to the needs of the working and poor in the U.S. This produces policies that are detrimental to the interests of the poor, thus creating more inequality, and so on (Bartels, 2008). As globalization continues to entrench market-based democracy in the far most reaches of the world creating even more extreme levels of inequality, it is easy to imagine then a scenario in which that various kinds of anti-democratic governments may rise up or where democracy itself may no longer exist (Barber, 2001; 2007; Dahlgren, 2009).

The Twilight of the Media and Journalism

An active, engaged public sphere requires that the news media share information and ideas with citizens in order to facilitate participation in politics by citizens. A precondition for civic engagement has been the role of journalists connecting citizens to public-political life (Dahlgren, 2009; Yankelovich, 1991). The media – so critical to democratic vitality – has not been exempt from the impacts of market logic targeting its traditional roles in the public sphere, and thus has played a major part in transforming democracy (Castells, 1998; Dahlgren, 2009; Gandy, 2001; Garnham, 2000; Meyer, 2002, Bennett & Entman, 2001). To explain this change, Bennett and Entman (2001) link political changes seen in the twenty-first century – the growing irrelevance of nationalism and the nation-state and increasing cynicism in politics – to changing media processes, either as direct causes or at least as adaptive mechanisms.

Since its inception, the Federal Communications Commission has long treated the airwaves as national parks – something that belongs to the people (Klinenberg, 2007) because media outlets are vital to local democratic politics. This idea began when congress passed the Radio Act of 1912 which required that all radio operators be licensed, that distress calls take

priority over other programming and that the government manages and allocate bandwidth to various sectors including the military, private businesses, and individuals based upon their contributions to the people's interests. As the free-market idealism has infiltrated government policymaking over the last thirty years, the media system has seen an unprecedented trend in deregulation correlating with an increase in the number of mergers, and a changing definition of providing for the "public interests" entails. In the wake of the Telecommunication Acts of 1996 and 2002, the FCC "re-regulated" the industry to allow even more consolidation, creating what Klinenberg calls Big Media conglomerates, allowing expanded ownership across outlets so that one or two corporations own all of the broadcasting means in a community and often in an entire state (McChesney, 1997).

In the age of market populism, journalists are suffering a credibility issue. Journalism has traditionally been thought of as providing citizens with accurate, apolitical renderings of public life as well as providing evidence for public deliberations. However, market logic has also reduced the relevancy of journalism to a citizen's political life. Due to layoffs, closing of international news bureaus, and increases entertainment programming (McChesney, 1999), citizens receive less information from news organizations, thus reducing knowledge about important topics (Dahlgren, 2009) while forcing citizens to believe that they have no ability to influence the direction of policies (Gamson, 2001). Bohman (2000) argues that communicative divisions of labor have produced expert knowledge packaged by public relations experts that is often outside of the cognitive grasp of laypersons. This introduces message distortion and manipulation, threatening to undermine the quality of communication.

A more Marxist approach posits that citizen communication processes are reflections of class-material conflicts pervasive in capitalist societies (e.g., Chomsky, 1989; Herman &

Chomsky, 1988; Parenti, 1966. See also: Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972; Marcuse, 1964). Similarly, Bennett (1990) argues journalists have become so enmeshed with public relations firms and tied to political campaigns for news information that they are no longer able to objectively report information. For Gans (2003), this has meant a disempowerment of citizens and journalists in favor political and economic elites. Elite discourse has now become reflected in public opinion polling (Simon & Xenos, 2000); Iyengar, Peters and Kinder (1982), Zaller (1992) and Bennett (1990) argue that political elites define the parameters of social issues, thus news reporting, public discussion, and opinion polls merely represent the views of those at the highest political levels. Edelman (1988) argues that the news media constructs political spectacles (problems, enemies, crises) by creating a series of threats to the nation. Boler (2008) uses the run-up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2002 as an example of journalists creating the spectacle by reporting – and not critically questioning and not reporting alternative viewpoints- what political and economic elites present as policy.

This brings me back to Jon Stewart's interview on *Crossfire*. There are three major themes from Stewart's appearance, that shows like *Crossfire* are more about partisan hackery and spectacle than reporting, that these types of shows have lost touch with their responsibility for promoting the public interest, and at the same time prevents honest, civil discussion between citizens (Boler & Turpin, 2008). These criticisms highlight television news as more political theater than reporting, to the detriment of journalistic credibility and ultimately, to citizens as a whole. Given that nations with quality journalism and public service broadcasting have higher levels of electoral participation (Milner, 2001), it is no wonder that the U.S. has such dismal and dismaying civic disengagement.

The Erosion of Citizenship and Civil Society

Civic participation in public life is the cornerstone of democracy (Barber, 2003; Benhabib, 2006; Dahlgren, 2009; Dewey, 1954/1927; Fishkin, 1992; Mansbridge, 1983; Rahn & Rudolph, 2001). The concept of civic engagement in sociology typically means community service, volunteerism or efforts to solve community problems. Dahlgren (2009) uses the term "civic agency" to conceptually ground the enactment of citizenship. Citizenship is built upon a set of rights and obligations that traditionally underscore democracy's aims of universalism and equality. However, Dahlgren notes, exclusions, inequities and suppressions of citizenship have been historically abundant within democratic societies, including the United States. In fact, most gains in the historical recognition of citizenship have been the result of social movements such as the labor movement, women's movements, and the civil rights movement. For Dahlgren, the framework for state-based notions of citizenship acts as a pre-requisite for this type of political agency. His example is if members of an immigrant population find cultural or economic mechanisms hinder their participation in society they can participate in collective group or movement to secure the rights belonging to citizenship. But yet, the last thirty years have provided evidence of a dramatically changing notion of both what citizenship and the nation-state means. What are we to do if the state, which market populists wish us to believe, no longer exists in any meaningful capacity? What does active, engaged citizenship mean in a world of markets?

Democracy is defined by the political commitment a given governing body has to providing civic equality, liberty, and opportunity to its citizens (Gutmann, 2003). The neoliberal model posits that in order to promote individual liberty, governments should reduce impediments to free market exchanges which restrict consumer choices. This "thin" version of democracy, as

Barber writes (2003, p. 4), views equality, liberty and opportunity as "prudential and thus provisional, optional, and conditional – means to exclusively individualistic and private ends." Citizens in the neoliberal model are devoid of social bonds or interactive constellations with others to pursue a common good. Instead, people are left to "naturally" pursue their own interests (Dahlgren, 2009). Liberty means to be free from someone else's power or will. But, in the context of market populist ideology, governments have been the locus of power, proclaiming it the enemy of personal choice. When market populism attacks the government, it is actually attacking the operating guarantor of a person's liberty, or, as Hannah Arendt (1963, p. 221) writes, "political freedom, generally speaking, means 'the right to be a participant in government' or it means nothing." By making citizenship a private concept, citizens are afforded no other rights than what they are able to purchase through the marketplace.

The rhetoric of individualism and liberty used by market liberalism has taken from democracy an energized faith in the common good and replaced it with citizens who are absent any conviction. The idea of citizenship being a continual project requiring nurturing has been replaced by the idea that voting (usually done once every four years) is a citizens' only duty (Buchanan, 2001). Americans, consumed by the neoliberal ideology of privatization and self-interest, have ceased thinking of themselves as Americans. Thinking of themselves as a global cosmopolitan whose interests transcend the boundaries of the nation-state, Americans have become deeply apathetic to the decline of the United States (Lasch, 1995). Instead of coming together to discuss the public interest, market populism has created citizens who refrain from imposing their own opinions on others in the name of some measure of objective truth (Barber, 2003). Barber states that citizens then become willing agents in the political paralysis facing democracy – afraid to acknowledge public interests and unwilling to act to change things. What

happens when citizens refuse to impose their own values or a sense of public will on others, is that by default, market forces trample over everyone.

More importantly, abstaining from action does not secure the public from the tyranny of opinion. As Stewart's appearance on *Crossfire* indicated, in the absence of public voice on issues common to the citizens, private judgments prevail. In exchange for the sometimes misinformed judgment of the citizenry, market liberalism provides the judgment of the "information manipulating media." Citizenship as a concept of any weight cannot prevail if citizens are without conviction and willing to cede political judgment to the marketplace. Neoliberalism's goal is to make citizens do as little as possible in regard to acting on behalf of others; the result is to make citizenship a latent function at best, a meaningless concept at worst.

What has been lost in the advance of globalization is the idea of the *public*. When President Ronald Reagan adopted privatization as the philosophy of conservatism in the 1980's, the common good was eschewed because, under market populism, collective interests do not exist – in fact Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher once declared, "there is no such thing as society" (Barber, 2007). The neoliberal ideology dismisses the value of collective groups. But the public is something more than a random collection of consumers or an aggregation of identity politics. The public offers people a single civic identity in which the rights and social responsibilities inherent in its voice can control government and markets. Citizens cannot be thought of as merely consumers if democracy is to survive.

Barber argues the faulty logic of market populism destroys citizenship as s public concept by advancing individual citizens wants (or private desires) over common ground (a general will produced via democratic means). But, we know that private choices have public consequences. For example, the congressional health care debate in 2008-2009 featured a series of "I want"

statements in which citizens were not convinced that some 40 million uninsured or underinsured people deserved access to health insurance if it meant that taxes would increase or if choices for those currently with insurance would be limited. Government sponsored health insurance was ruled out because it presented an unfair competition to private, for-profit insurance companies, despite the fact that the so-called public option would have lowered health care costs for all. Citizens practicing what is good for "me" results in an inegalitarian and unequal society in which the most disadvantaged are even further disadvantaged while those with power and wealth move farther away from the public sphere. As a result, market populism has reversed the social contract, in effect "dissolving the bonds that tie us together into free communities and democratic republics. [Privatization] puts us back in the state of nature where we possess a natural right to get whatever we can on our own, but at the same time lose any real ability to secure that to which we have a right" (Barber, 2003, p. 143).

Sociologists have been documenting the decline of the public sphere for some time now. The most notable account, Robert Putnam's *Bowling Alone,* offers an almost parallel description of the rise of market democracy with the decline of civic engagement. Since the 1960's, voter turnout for national elections has declined by about 25 percent, the number of Americans attending a public meeting within the past year declined by one-third, church participation, union and PTA membership are all down; in 1992, seventy-five percent of American's stated they lack faith in the government. These trends have reduced the social capital – the collection of social networks, norms and trust that can be used for community problem solving. The more fragmented and atomized citizens have become, the more people have developed "I" mentalities in response to market calls, rejecting the "we" of civic society. In its wake, Skocpol (1999) documents the rise of the memberless advocacy organizations. Civic entrepreneurs no longer

identify a cause and then recruit citizens to advocate, instead choosing to open an office on K Street in Washington, D.C. and recruit lobbyists to advocate. If there are any members who pay dues or attend meetings, they "are likely to be seen not as fellow citizens but as consumers with policy preferences" (p. 492).

This is not to say that the public sphere is unitary. Habermas (1997) asserts that the public sphere contains many different species of communicative spaces, none of which are equal in access or impact. In strong public spheres, legislative decision making takes place. Informal settings such as coffee shops are home to weak public spheres, places where citizens can come together to talk about important issues, where collective identities can emerge and public opinion can be created. Dahlgren writes the vibrancy of democracy is judged by the interactions between citizens and between citizens and policymakers, thus the public sphere and the citizens in it create a performative dimension by communicating through social networks so that they in many ways constitute Anderson's "imagined communities."

If civic participation is truly the cornerstone of democracy and citizenship stems from the practice of democracy, the conclusion one could draw is that the markets have little need for traditional notions of democracy based upon engaged participants. Not only are citizens irrelevant but the nation-state is as well. In that case, there may seem to be no alternative to the rationalization of the consumer-citizen as a species of the private realm with democracy vanishing into the sunset.

Does Democracy Still Matter?

Democracy is more relevant today than ever before. In response to the conditions brought about by market liberalism, democratic theorists in a wide variety of disciplines now believe that we need to supplement electoral democracy with a version of strong, engaged democracy if

democracy is going to survive (e.g., Benhabib, 1996, 2002, 2006; Bohman, 1996; Chambers, 2003; Cohen, 1997; Dryzek, 2000; Fishkin, 1991; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996, 2004; Habermas, 1984, 1997; Mansbridge, 1983; Skocpol, 1999; Young, 2000). Strong democracy, as Barber defines it, is "the participatory mode where conflict is resolved in the absence of an independent group through a participatory process of ongoing, proximate self-legislation and the creation of a political community capable of transforming dependent, private individuals into free citizens and partial and private interests into public goods" (p. 132). Citizens brought together to discuss policies in a setting that emphasizes equality, respect and reason are more likely to bridge differences and connect with one another (Rosenberg, 2007). Effective associations such as the ones Putman identifies prior to the 1960's seek to influence and work with the government to check unchanneled market forces (Skocpol, 1999). This reconception of democracy rests on the idea of citizens who are united by a common purpose and action, its values conflict in that it creates points of discussion and judgment, it values a sociology of pluralism, and a separation of private and public. In doing these things, strong democracy strengthens the role of the citizen by integrating the multiple identities people play in a democracy to be consistent with the common will. Barber's conclusion is a call to revitalize the meaning of citizenship and civil society, the repopulation of democratic institutions capable of preserving liberty and capable of maintaining difference while participating in capitalist markets. Democracy can and must defeat the corporation –it is a political, not an economic task. The way to defeat corporatized democracy is reclaiming citizenship and decision-making powers for citizens.

Chapter 3 - Why Deliberation?

Woman: "Why do you continue to support a Nazi policy, as Obama has, expressly supported this [health care reform] policy? Why are you supporting it?"

Rep. Barney Frank: "When you ask me that question, I am gonna revert to my ethnic heritage and answer your question with a question: On what planet do you spend most of your time? ... As you stand there, with a picture of the president defaced to look like Hitler, and compare the effort to increase health care to the Nazis, my answer to you is, as I said before, it is a tribute to the First Amendment that this sort of vile contemptible nonsense is so freely propagated. Ma'am, trying to have a conversation with you would like be like trying to have an argument with a dining room table -- I have no interest in doing it."

-- Exchange between Representative Barney Frank (D-MA) and a citizen attending a town hall meeting on health care reform in Dartmouth, MA, August 18, 2009.

What Is Deliberation?

No, that exchange is not deliberation. Deliberation is:

> Generally speaking, we can say that deliberation is debate and discussion aimed at producing reasonable, well-informed opinions in which participants are willing to revise preferences in light of discussion, new information, and claims made by fellow participants. Although consensus need not be the ultimate aim of deliberation, and participants are expected to pursue their interests, an overarching interest in the legitimacy of outcomes (understood as justification to all affected) ideally characterizes deliberation (Chambers, 2003, p, 309).

Shows like *Crossfire* have trained citizens to think of public discussion and debate to be more like political theater than productive dialog and deliberation. The “discussion” between

Representative Barney Frank and one of his constituents is a good example of what deliberation is *not* – deliberation is not a combative activity, and, as the opening shows, a sort of political theater which is absent of civil discussion and lacks any sort of adequate rejoinder for opponents (Patterson, 2008). Simone Chambers provides a good, global definition of deliberation as an exchange that can produce revised opinions and justifiably legitimate outcomes (I will come back to this definition later in the chapter).

How could Rep. Frank respond to his constituents' characterization of the proposed health care reform legislation as a "Nazi" policy? What defense of health care legislation could be given in this already heated situation that would provide an opportunity for the constituent to adjust her opinion? Even if a reasonable claim could be identified, I would guess that the constituent would not have found those reasons justifiable. While Frank's response was not the most polite answer – referring to your constituent as intelligent and interesting as a dining room table is probably not the best vote getting strategy (although from the video of the town hall, his response did elicit cheers from the audience) - public discussion as political theater is not the type of deliberation that Habermas envisions nor the strong democracy Barber advocates.

As I argued in the previous chapter, what is reported as news is often created spectacle – conflict and drama where none might really exist. *Washington Post* columnist E.J. Dionne (2009) argues that in the case of Democratic-led health care town hall meetings, this was especially true. After surveying Democratic House members from highly contested districts about what happened in their town halls, Dionne concludes that what was shown on television was purposefully not civil dialog and deliberation about the legislation. One house representative was told by a reporter "your meeting doesn't get covered unless it blows up." Most of the town hall meetings, Dionne notes, were civil and informative, a chance for Democratic Representatives to

discuss health care changes with constituents in an effectual way. But that's not "news." If what we as citizens see on television news networks is not deliberation, then what exactly is deliberation? What does it look like? And more importantly, given the dire state of democracy identified in the previous chapter, how does deliberation solve the problems caused by market democracy? This chapter will provide an introduction to deliberation as the mechanism that can (hopefully) bring a reasonable balance to aggregative democracy. First, let me begin by discussing more specifically what I mean by deliberation.

Deliberation's History

For much of the twentieth century, popular theories of democracy viewed the public with both scorn and suspicion. Questions about the legitimacy of a democracy in which the last word in matters of public interest is not the plurality of competing interests, but the results arising from dialog and discussion loomed large in the development of democratic political theory. James Bohman and William Rehg's (1997, p. x) synthesis of these questions in their overview to *Deliberative Democracy* provides good insight as to the cynicism political theorists held toward deliberation:

> Is this ideal feasible or even desirable? What exactly is public deliberation? Given the complex issues that confront contemporary societies, is an intelligent, broad-based participation possible? In societies as culturally diverse as our own, is it reasonable to expect deliberating citizens to converge on rational solutions to political problems? Does deliberation actually overcome or only exacerbate the more undesirable features of majority rule?

Deliberation emerged in the 1980's as a response to the debate between two main traditions of citizenship in political theory literature: liberalism and communitarianism. To

understand how the debate between the liberal and community models of democracy produced deliberation, it is necessary to investigate the theoretical lineage of these two models.

Twentieth-century Suspicions

Early to mid-twentieth century theories of political structures centered around one particularly heated debate: whether citizens with individuated interests can come together for the common good. Both sides of this debate argued whether politics should emphasize the plurality of citizens' opinions via organized voting, whether the potential for civil unrest that such outcomes could produce should be emphasized or whether the emphasis should be on the possibility of the commonality of interests, values and traditions citizens have with one another to generate good policy decisions (Bohman & Rehg, 1997). Ultimately, the anti-populist sentiment led to two major theoretical positions: an elitist theory of democracy and the economic or social choice theory of democracy[1].

Elite theory posits that democracy is less the rule of the people as it is the rule of exceptional, charismatic elites and expert technocrats, for, as elite theorists believe, it is inevitable in any society that a minority must rule over the majority (Nash, 2010). Most theorists writing in the 1940's through 1950's drew upon Max Weber's liberal democratic politics. In general, Weber argued against participatory democracy because he felt it would be impossible for deliberation and participation to be practiced in large scale, complex societies. Individual freedoms of the citizenry in modern societies may be severely constrained by political bureaucracies, but, given that a majority of the population is ignorant or uninterested in politics,

[1] As Dryzek (2000) notes, critics of deliberative democracy from the political science discipline have tended to conflate parts of the social choice theory with parts of rational choice theory. Rational choice theory assumes individuals behave strategically; social choice theory is concerned with the aggregation of preferences into a collective decision. These theorists make no assumptions about the behavior of individuals. Like Dryzek, I choose to follow the social-choice-theoretic critique of deliberation which shares the assumption of the inflexibility of political preferences despite social or political interaction.

elites should not need to be accountable to the masses. In fact, Weber theorizes that elite accountability to the public would only make for a more inefficient and unpredictable governance structure because citizens could not accurately or convincingly entertain political ideas. Therefore, charismatic leaders, elected through an open vote and with a mandate from the people, should be responsible for the establishment of policy goals and actions (Giddens, 1972).

Driven by the rise (and fear) of socialism which suggested that participation by the citizenry could be dangerous to the stability of government, elite theorists such as Joseph Schumpeter viewed democracy in the same pessimistic fashion as Weber (Bohman & Rehg, 1997). Democracy, in turn, became a competition for electoral votes between politicians and parties "whose elites deal in votes just as businessmen [sic] deal in commodities" (Nash, 2010). In *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1942/1975), Schumpeter envisions democracy as best left in the hands of elite leadership, and that, when elected, elites rule with help from a bureaucracy of experts. Since there could be no common good agreed upon by an apathetic and unpredictable population, governance should be kept by elites and democracy should be tantamount to evicting poor, inefficient politicians from office at the next election.

Following Schumpeter's approach, the social choice theory views citizens primarily as consumers who participate in democracy via elections. The political process is not a search for the common good or for the good life, but is the struggle for power among competing interests (Bohman & Rehg, 1997). Social choice theorists, much like elite theorists, argue that political parties function as entrepreneurs competing to sell ideas in a market of citizen-political consumers (Bohman & Rehg, 1997). But, social choice theory vacated the position that the citizenry are unpredictable and therefore should not get a voice. Theorists in this tradition

became concerned with citizen motivations and, in combination with games theories (Riker, 1982), attempted to apply economic categories to voting preferences (Bohman & Rehg, 1997).

If deliberative democracy believes in the flexibility of individual preferences to change once those views come into contact with other, differing views as a part of deliberation (see Chambers' definition offered at the outset of the chapter), social-rational choice theory believed the opposite. Instead, social-rational choice theory posits that individual preferences are not changed through the course of social or political interaction (Dryzek, 2000). The only way to achieve any semblance of collective decisions is by aggregating individual preferences. Kenneth Arrow's (1963) general thesis is that even in the best cases, aggregation of preferences cannot satisfy the criteria of unanimity, non-dictatorship, transitivity, no restriction, and independence. The conclusion is that it is impossible to create a general will is not vulnerable to manipulation. Any conclusion reached would be, as Riker (1982, p. 241) claims, "inconsistent and absurd." Riker argues that there is no popular will that exists independently of any sort of aggregative measuring system such as majority rule (i.e., voting). In applying categories of the market, social-rational choice theorists reasoned that the sovereignty of the consumer is acceptable because the consumer chooses between actions that only affect him or her.

The elite and social-rational choice models have created the basis for the liberal version of democracy I outlined in the first chapter. Under the liberal model of citizenship, citizens pursue individual interests through rational choices. These choices take place in a marketplace of ideas where citizens are able to purchase the policy of their choice without regard to the needs of others. In addition to the problems created by liberal democracy as noted in chapter one, liberalism as a theoretical model of citizenship is oddly absent of any sociological perspective – people are seen as emerging from a socio-cultural black box as a fully formed citizen, ready to

play a role in democracy (Dahlgren, 2009). More importantly, disempowered groups – those that are more difficult to organize or integrate into policy discussions – exert less influence and often are excluded from policymaking because they lack resources for organizing action (Karpowitz, et. al, 2009). The conclusion reached, as Dryzek (2000) goes so far to say, is that liberalism is mostly silent about democracy with some liberal theorists not democrats of any sort.

The Development of "Strong" Democracy and Deliberation

Politics in the 1960's and 1970's was highlighted by broad political dissatisfaction in government and elite decision-making, exemplified by activism over the continuing Vietnam War (Mansbridge, 1983). The rise of new social movements in the 1970's and 1980's signaled a shift in democracy studies in which participation became the main focal point of democracy theory. Protests over ecology, abortion, gay and lesbian rights, anti-nuclear movements and women's movements replaced struggles over political access, position and wealth common in the first half of the twentieth century. Demanding recognition of gender differences from social institutions, new social movement groups began actively challenging the structure of the public sphere (Asen, 1999). This signaled a turn toward valuing social groups and networks as well as an idea of community.

Communitarianism evolved as a response to the liberal model's extreme deference to individual choices over common good. Communitarians such as Robert Bellah and Amitai Etzioni posit that community ties, shared values, and cultural cohesion are critical to functioning communities and political life. The liberalist-individual model of citizenship undermines family, religious and community relations and value-bases, leaving individuals feeling alienated from others and from their communities. As community ties are severed and seen as unnecessary, citizens are left to seek remedy from the marketplace where, if they have enough money, these

items are available for purchase. Communitarians see the liberal model constraining the state so that it is now a neutral arbiter which places only minimal demands on citizens, freeing them to pursue individual ideas of the good life. But, as Patterson (2008) notes, because the government does not actively seek to foster in citizens the idea of a common good, it has a trying time convincing citizens to commit to building communities. The result is a state hamstrung in its abilities to improve the lives of its citizens. Communitarians agree that public institutions should be oriented toward supporting communities and engaging citizens in civic-public life that can translate into common idea of social good.

Liberalism is not without a defense. Advocates argue that valuing community and civic-political life is compatible with a government that does not dictate what a good life for citizens might mean. Instead, citizens are allowed to determine what would constitute a good life within the context and constraints of their communities (Buchanan, 1989; Kymlicka, 1989, 1992; Patterson, 2008). Liberalism's advocates defend communitarianism's desire for community and civic life and their own push for individual autonomy – leaving individuals without a place in the social structure (Gutmann & Thompson, 1990; Patterson, 2008). Patterson argues that if a community's choice values certain segments of the population at the expense of others, then there is no logic under communitarianism that can challenge the right of those communities to define their value set. Hence, she says, individuals need a space in which they can advocate for themselves.

Noting the perilous conditions that liberalism and neoliberalism have placed democracy in, political theorists in the 1980's began to argue that an American liberal democracy based on individual interests and elites is a "thin" version of democracy (Barber, 2003). Barber suggests that no theory of citizenship, participation or civic virtue can arise from a democracy that defines

itself as the conduct of public affairs for private benefit. In fact, America's thin democracy undermines the democratic practices upon which individual citizens can develop and secure their interests because citizen freedom is the product of political activity, not the precondition. Similarly, Putnam's (2000) *Bowling Alone* highlights the problems of "thin" democracy in the U.S. – namely that social trust, civic engagement and political involvement have decreased as citizens have become more individual focused and less concerned about the common good of the public. Putnam understands that effective democracy is an outgrowth of small-group ties and networks and that when citizens regularly interact, they learn to work together to solve problems.

Deliberative democratic theory emerged from the debate between liberalist and communitarian advocates in the late 1980's and early 1990's. Deliberative theory rejects the social/rational choice ideas inherent in liberal democracy, namely the idea that people are economic actors and not citizens, and infuses the idea of civic engagement from communitarians into the idea that citizens should participate in and discuss political issues. Joseph Bessette (1980) first coined the term "deliberative democracy" in a call for a more participatory version of democracy. Early deliberative democrats based their ideas on observations from town hall meetings and organizations, democratic workplaces, voluntary associations and juries (e.g., Barber, 2003; Cohen & Rogers, 1983; Mansbridge, 1983; Pateman, 1970; Rawls, 1971). At its most basic level, deliberation intends to be a more "unitary" version of democracy focusing on bargaining and face-to-face discussion as opposed to an "adversarial" version in which citizen interests are in constant conflict (Mansbridge, 1983). Early theorizing about deliberation questioned whether rational choice frameworks provided the best model for decision making, whether government should be minimalist and dedicated to preserving the negative liberty of

individuals, and whether participation should necessarily be limited to voting (Bohman & Rehg, 1997).

Thirty years later, a wide variety of theoretical and empirical scholarship champions deliberation's ability to incite citizen enthusiasm for political participation (Delli Carpini, Cook, & Jacobs, 2004; Fung, 2004; Melville, Willingham & Dedrick, 2005; Siriani & Friedland, 2005; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999), views deliberation as a better avenue to a truly representative democracy requiring political officials to take deliberative decision-making seriously (Dryzek, 2000; Fung, 2004; Fung & Wright, 2003; Gastil, 2000, 2008; Yankelovich, 1991) while creating a more tolerant citizenry who understands that despite conflicting interests, they are interdependent and must work together (Chambers, 1996; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996; Mendelberg, 2002; Pearce & Littlejohn, 1997; Yankelovich, 1991). Empirical studies have shown that well designed public spaces and deliberative forums can diminish inequality in political participation (e.g., Cramer Walsh, 2006; Dutwin, 2003; Fung, 2004; Hendriks, 2006; Karpowitz, et al, 2009).

Classical Model of Deliberation

In chapter one, I argued that democracy is under assault from market populism and as a result, Americans no longer value the concept of citizen and citizenship. Deliberation, unfortunately, cannot recall neoliberal policies of the past, nor can it change the political-economic structure of the United States. If only the solutions to such large problems were so easy. Deliberative theorists do posit that deliberation can reduce political inequality among citizens, can make legislators take arguments advanced by public deliberation seriously (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004), and in general, counter anti-democratic trends in a commercially restrained mass media (Chambers & Costain, 2000). A discussion of why deliberation provides

a better form of democratic orientation for its citizens is bound up in the question of how deliberation works. This section will begin by discussing the classical model of deliberation – one defined by rational thought, reason-giving, justification and reciprocity that intend to create democratic legitimacy.

The Development of Reason-Giving

Two kinds of power were outlined in chapter one: the inauthentic power created by the influence of money and authority in politics; the other is the authentic power residing the communicative arenas of civil society and the public sphere. Deliberative democracy intends to maximize this second type of power by protecting deliberation from the influence of money and authority found in contemporary liberal politics. Habermas, one of the earliest and most authoritative theorist of deliberation, advanced a procedurally-focused idea of deliberation-based democracy in which the legitimacy of any decisions made by the state is driven by conclusions drawn from citizen discussions. Thus the deliberative turn represents a renewal of an authentic democracy in which substantive control over policymaking is given to engaged, competent citizens (Dryzek, 2000).

The power of citizens to influence decision-making is based in the use of rational discourse. In *The Theory of Communicative Action,* Habermas (1984) argues that any communicatively achieved agreement, in the end, must be based on *reasons.* Deliberative democracy assumes that humans have a tendency to be rational (Habermas, 2001) and that universal rationality is ontologically present in language and everyday discourse (Casullo, 2009). Individual rationality results in a public dialogue that creates understanding-oriented discourse. In his theory of communicative rationality, Habermas (1984, p. 10-11) specifies:

> Communicative rationality carries with it connotations based ultimately on the central experience of the unconstrained, unifying, consensus-bringing force of argumentative speech, in which different participants overcome their merely subjective views and, owing to the mutuality of rationally motivated conviction, assure themselves of both the unity of the objective world and the intersubjectivity of their life-world…An assertion can be called rational if the speaker satisfies the conditions necessary to achieve the illocutionary goal of reaching an understanding with at least one other participant in communication…from the one perspective the telos inherent in rationality appears to be instrumental mastering, from the other communicative understanding.

In short, the concept of communicative rationality is based on the central experience of the force of the best argument in which participants put aside their subjective views and agree on a vision of the way the socio-political world operates using reasons. Thus, communicative action is oriented toward practical argumentation and requires statement validity as a standard for resolving disagreement.

In deliberation, people talk. They talk to convince each other of their views and opinions. The rationality of a statement or argument depends on the validity of the knowledge embedded in it. The strength of such validity claims is measured by the soundness of the reasons - whether the argument is able to convince participants of the truthfulness or validity of its claims:

> We use the term argumentation for that type of speech in which participants thematize contested validity claims and attempt to vindicate or criticize them through arguments. An argument contains reasons or grounds that are connected in a systematic way with the validity claim of a problematic expression. The "strength" of an argument in measured in a given context by the soundness of the reasons; that can be seen in, among other things,

> whether or not an argument is able to convince the participants in a discourse, that is, to motivate them to accept the claim in question (Habermas, 1984, p. 18).

For Habermas, the semantic content of arguments must be open to criticism and defense via the force of the best argument. Criticizability satisfies the precondition for rationality if it has a relation to objective facts and those facts are open to objective judgment by those considering such facts.

Besides the force of the best argument, Habermas (1998) offered a set of conditions in which deliberative outcomes could be considered legitimate or valid. First, all outcomes must be generated from the discursive exchanges that create deliberation and not from pre-conceived ideas. Reasons are valid if they can meet with the acceptance of the public in a non-technocratic fashion. A second requirement for legitimacy is that reasons must be justified to other deliberative participants. Deliberative outcomes are valid when the particularized interests of all individuals are jointly accepted by all concerned without coercion. Tying reason to justification is meant to prevent the marginalization of specific worldviews by more vocal constituencies and, in general, to foster a hermeneutic sensitivity to a wide ranging set of contributions. Justified reasons are able to create symmetrical consideration of all views, "justification conducted in this manner selects norms that are capable of commanding universal agreement- for example, norms expressing human rights" (p. 43).

Even when these conditions are met, deliberation does not always function. Distortions, particularly those arising from unequal power relations, ideology, private economic and political interests, and conflicting beliefs and values that are endemic to liberal democracy also present a problem to deliberative democracy. These distortions must be eliminated, or at minimum suspended, if the kind of communication needed to evaluate validity claims with the most

convincing force can happen (Casullo, 2009). Habermas posits in *Between Facts and Norms* (2001) that undistorted deliberation can lead participants to generate an understanding of issues that would not have happened in other forums. This undistorted view of deliberation is presented as the ideal speech situation. The ideal speech situation features:

> (a) Processes of deliberation take place in argumentative form, that is, through the regulated exchange of information and reasons among parties who introduce and critically test proposals. (b) Deliberations are inclusive and public…(c) Deliberations are free of external coercion. The participants are sovereign insofar as they are bound only by the presuppositions of communication and rules of argumentation. (d) Deliberations are free of any internal coercion that could detract from the equality of participants…(e) Deliberations aim in general at rationally motivated agreement that can in principle be indefinitely continued or resumed at any time. Political deliberations, however, must be concluded by a majority decision in views of pressures to decide…(f) Political deliberations extend to any matter than can be regulated in the equal interest of all…(g) Political deliberations also include the interpretation of needs and wants and the change of prepolitical attitudes and preferences. Hence the consensus-generating force of arguments is by no means only on a value-consensus previously developed in shared traditions and forms of life (Habermas, 2001, p. 305-206).

The ideal speech situation for deliberation is, in effect, a neutrality principle, meaning that the procedures of deliberation are to be universal and culture-neutral. For Habermas, the cultural-neutrality of deliberation is necessary to avoid coercion between participants and to keep rational arguments subject to the force of the best argument. Combined with his theory of communicative action, rational discourse in communicative action "is generalized, abstracted, and freed from all

limits – the practice of deliberation is extended to an inclusive community that does not exclude any subject capable of speech and action who can make relevant contributions" (Habermas, 1998, p. 41). Thus, Habermas believes that deliberation is able to transcend particular interests, cultures and histories (Casullo, 2009).

By offering universality as condition of deliberation, all aspects of social, political and cultural life are subsumed in the reasons offered by deliberating participants and so, there is no need to highlight such differences. In essence, the universality or neutrality of deliberation posits a limitless deliberative process in which no topic is off limits, no person should be excluded, and nobody's sensitivities should be protected because, in the end, reason will produce the best outcome (Casullo, 2009). If everyone who participates in a public deliberation were to make these pragmatic suppositions, then it could be said that the discourse generated is for the public, all who are concerned were included with equal speaking rights, that only reasons that provide equal weight to all constituencies are able to influence the outcome of such practical discourses. And because citizens are honest in their deliberations and are not coerced, "nothing but reasons can tip the balance in favor of the acceptance of a controversial norm" (1998, p. 44).

The reason deliberation works to correct some of the problems of market democracy is, in Habermas' view, because deliberation generates democratic legitimacy from its communicative exchanges. Deliberation ensures there is an inclusive way to determine what citizens want and need and ensures that this information influences decision-making and legislative actions from policy-makers (Drake, 2009). Deliberations in the public sphere are able to identify and amplify social needs as well as influentially frame and thematize social problems in such a way that legislators have no other option but to take up the issue (Habermas, 2001, p. 359). As such, the unregulated public sphere acts as a "warning system" of the types of social

issues that must be recognized by political elites. The communicative power that citizens acquire through deliberation is transformed into legislative power because the opinions and ideas of the citizens in the public sphere "have been tested from the standpoint of the generalizability of interests" (2001, p. 371). It is not the influence of the public sphere but influence of such opinions and will-formation transformed into communicative power that legitimates legislative decisions. As this description of the power of the public sphere highlights, it is the *process* of communication and interaction in the struggle for recognition of social needs that creates democratic legitimacy, not voting or decision-making itself. And so, these honest, uncoerced outcomes from an unregulated, powerful public sphere can occur collectively among the group and thus provide a strong measure of democratic legitimacy to any public-generated decisions.

Musings From the First Generation

Heavily borrowing from Habermas' theory of communicative action, the first generation of deliberative democrats focused on the intrinsic values of deliberation and what preconditions were necessary to produce successful deliberation in the public sphere (Cohen, 2007). In affirming the core of Habermas' ideas, this first generation agreed that the most important precondition was the exchange of reasons. Joshua Cohen (2007, p. 219) understands that deliberation is "about weighing the reasons relevant to a decision with a view to making a decision on the basis of that weighing." Jon Elster in *Deliberative Democracy* (1998) emphasizes that deliberation is about rational and impartial argument. John Rawls insists that deliberation subscribe to "precepts of reasonable discussion" (1989, p. 238-239), and be responsive to "reasonable pluralism" (1993, p. 36). John Dryzek in *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond* (2000) notes that a defining feature of deliberation is that citizens participating in public deliberations are able, because of the exchange of reasons, to change their minds and preferences

and reflect upon those preferences without coercion. Dryzek's basic point about deliberation is that it is essentially about reasoning –about argument – and that communication within public forums must be "held to rational standards" (p. 167). In *Why Deliberative Democracy?* (2004, p. 3), Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson write that deliberation's "first and most important characteristic, then, is its reason-giving requirement" and that "when citizens or their representatives disagree morally, they should continue to reason together to reach mutually acceptable decisions" (1996, p. 1). Most recently, Schneiderhan and Khan (2008) emphatically state that reason-giving is the foundation of deliberation.

Procedurally, deliberation delivers on this promise by eliminating the endogenous problems of aggregative democracy and reshaping them in the mold of Habermas's ideal communicative space. People give reasons during the deliberative process with the expectation that those reasons and their justifications will be accepted or rejected not because they fit the preferences of the rich (for example), but because the force of the better argument was exercised. Gutmann and Thompson (2004) note that deliberative process must be accessible to all participants, meaning that evidence and reasons presented during the process must be comprehensible to everyone. Rawls (1989, p. 238) argues that reason in political deliberation prevents citizens from accusing others of self- or group interest, bias or ideological blindness. Rawls' idea of "reasonable pluralism" of ideas – ideas that have an overlapping consensus - is meant to provide a measure for citizens to use when judging which ideas are reasonable. The reciprocity standard advanced by Gutmann and Thompson in *Democracy and Disagreement* holds that citizens owe one another justifications for the policies they suggest and may ultimately enact. They argue that reciprocity regulates the exchange reasons and ensures that moral claims do not compete with selfish ones (Drake, 2009). Gutmann (1993) suggests that when deliberation

consists of the give and take of arguments that is respectful of reasoned differences is it concerned with the idea of reasonable pluralism.

Deliberation also attempts to screen out socioeconomic asymmetries or political power by relying on the force of the best argument as a procedure that governs the deliberative phase of decision-making. While deliberation does not presume that citizens are *literally* equal, it does require claims of authority or special knowledge to be contested. Those who invoke such expertise can be compelled by deliberating citizens to provide reasons for such claims. Since deliberation requires citizens to advance persuasive claims, it presupposes an equality of resources which is needed to remedy any asymmetry in the distribution of reasoning or articulation abilities between citizens (Knight & Johnson, 1997).

Just as importantly, the pluralism of ideas and opinions afforded to citizens in a structured deliberation gives citizens a chance to learn others' views and possibly contrary opinions (Gutmann & Thompson, 1996; Pearce & Littlejohn, 1997). This sort of listening ''leads to empathy with the other and a broadened sense of people's own interests through an egalitarian, open-minded, and reciprocal process of reasoned argumentation" (Mendelberg, 2002, p. 153; see also: Christiano, 1997; Mathews, 1999; Yankelovich, 1991). Empathy, while an outcome and not a normative condition for deliberation, has been cited as an outgrowth of reasoned argumentation. Bohman (1996) as well as Gutmann and Thompson (1996) argue that reason-based deliberation creates empathy for people with less social power. Mansbridge (1991) states that when people reason together they are better able to situate their own personal stake in a topic in the wider community. Through deliberative interaction, participants become cognizant of the effect their opinions and subsequent decisions would have on others and then act accordingly (Schneiderhan & Khan, 2008). If deliberation can take place in a space that is free of

regulation and in which citizens come to decisions uncoerced, then, these theorists argue, deliberation effectively neutralizes power inequalities.

Deliberation's normative structure also emphasizes the need to be inclusive of all participants. Citizens from diverse populations including minorities and citizens with diverse opinions must be included (Benhabib, 1996, 2002; Chambers, 2003). When the deliberative body has a wide range of views from a broad scope of citizens in the community, citizens are better able to negotiate solutions amenable to all. It is highly possible that what may be a minority opinion at the beginning of the deliberation may, with the exchange and justification of reasoned argument, might become the majority argument at the end of the deliberation (Hickerson & Gastil, 2008). At the same time, deliberation must work to economize differences between participants. By practicing the economy of moral agreement – giving reasons and justifications for opinions – citizens can work together to find common ground (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004).

Deliberation also requires an agreed upon outcome that is binding in some capacity or at least the finding of common ground between participants. Gutmann and Thompson (2004) argue that deliberation is not "just talk" (Conover & Searing, 2005) or an academic seminar; participants do not talk or deliberate just to talk or deliberate. Discussion not motivated by reason-giving is not likely to have any effect on individual opinions (Schniederhan & Khan, 2008). Thus, citizens expect their time spent in deliberation to mean something to an external constituency such as a legislature. It is reasonable to assume that outcomes of deliberation will be binding for at least some time. This does not mean that outcomes cannot be revised or challenged. Deliberative democrats do not always expect deliberation to yield an agreement, nor is the goal of all public forums a policy outcome. Partially this is because deliberative democrats

such as Seyla Benhabib (1992) argue that citizens do not come to deliberate with an ordered set of coherent preferences and opinions. In these cases, participants must perceive the potential for common ground, believe deliberation to the appropriate method of talk, and have requisite motivation (Burkhalter, et al, 2002) they are more likely to accept a decision they do not agree with. Rather, a continuing dialogue between citizens and between citizens and legislators is necessary to create quality, inclusive policy. The structural demand to come to some form of agreement emphasizes the need for perspective-taking and justification (Rosenberg, 2007). Thus, participation with agreement leads citizens to be self-reflexive and to interact in ways that use more reason-giving (Gutmann & Thompson, 1996), that are rational (Benhabib, 2002), self-critical (Dryzek, 2000), are just and considerate of the common good (Benhabib, 2002; Cohen, 1997) As long as the procedural conditions of deliberation are met, citizens without deliberative capacities can still participate and within the context of the deliberation, develop the requisite skills to participate (Rosenberg, 2007).

There is a catch-22 of sorts inherent in deliberative democracy. As envisioned by the first wave of democratic theorists, deliberative democracy places strong demands on the criterion of structural or procedural equality. Citizens must be engaged in the process of reason-based argumentation. If the speaker is unable to provide convincing or justifiable reasons, the interests inherent in those reasons will likely go unaccounted for in the decision-making process. As Knight and Johnson argue, this violates the fundamental notion that deliberative outcomes are products of equal citizens. Deliberative democracy must fulfill the demands for equality so that no person is too poor in resources, whether cognitive or cultural, to influence outcomes or avoid exclusion (Bohman, 1996; Young, 1994). And so procedural mechanisms alone will not ensure the type of political equality deliberative democrats seek. Substantive aspects, along with

procedural mechanisms in deliberation, are meant to ensure political equality for deliberating citizens (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Knight & Johnson, 1997). In fact, for Gutmann and Thompson (2004), the democratic element in deliberative democracy must revolve around how inclusive the process is.

Cohen (1989) lays out his version of substantive equality in deliberation by noting that in deliberative spaces any existing distribution of power and resources do not shape the chances of citizens participating in any stage of the process, nor does that process have an effect on their role once in the deliberation. The reason-giving standard is meant to create an equal discursive playing field. There is a strong, but complex connection between the social distribution of power and resources and the ability to achieve real political equality that deliberative democrats strive for. Asymmetries in the distribution of power and resources can affect deliberation in two ways. Deliberation requires that an equality of influence – that citizens not have an unfair advantage during deliberation. If, as Habermas advocates, participation and any outcomes must be uncoerced and voluntary, then individuals must not be able to use any advantage in power or resources to influence the outcome. Bohman (1996) calls this political poverty. On the other hand, any asymmetries between participants must not overtly disadvantage individuals without resources or power.

For deliberative democrats, these are significant challenges, but ones that are resolved by making sure participants are actively participating, that participants who are representative of a disparate population are recruited to participate (Kymlicka, 1995), or, like Cohen (1989) and Gutmann and Thompson (1996) argue, the use of reasons in argument and the requirement of justification and reciprocity allows deliberative participants to reassess their own positions and so individuals without power or with too much power may find themselves in a different position

at the end of the forum. When participants change their opinions or the minority opinion is given weight and adopted by the group, this ensures the legitimacy of deliberation because citizens must always be examining the reasons for the success and failures in deliberation (Cohen, 1989; Benhabib, 1996; Bohman, 1997; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). In short, during deliberations, participants are given equal opportunity to participate – open exchange is valued, and at least initially those exchanges are evaluated fairly. It is the quality of arguments advanced and filtered through the force of the best argument standard that determines the impact of argument on any agreements reached between participants, not the status or power of individuals. As a result, this type of discourse endemic to classical depictions of deliberation carry the normative demands of equality of opportunity to speak and thus protect individuals accordingly (Rosenberg, 2007).

Early on, deliberative democrats theorized the problem of insincerity and manipulation during deliberation. It was deemed possible that citizens could lie during deliberation or purposefully misrepresent themselves in order to gain acquiescence of an opinion. Given that deliberation strongly relies on participant interaction and that interaction is what fuels individual reflexivity and opinion change, this was seen as a real threat. In tackling this issue, theorists argued for a domain of eligible types of reasoned argument allowable in deliberative arenas. Dryzek (2000) summarizes some of these domain restrictions, noting Gutmann and Thompson's (1996) ruling out of arguments such as racist claims that deny political equality and those that do not respect human integrity. They also advanced what they consider to be core deliberative principles of reciprocity, publicity, and accountability. A second domain restriction comes from Elster (1998, p. 12) who describes the "civilizing force of hypocrisy," an idea similar to Gutmann and Thompson's publicity principle. Elster claims that individuals will stick to the arguments they announce in public or will couch their arguments in terms of the public interest

so as to motivate any listeners to adopt his or her position or risk losing face. Cohen (1997) follows by arguing that the likelihood of sincere representation of preferences will increase if requiring citizens to air them in the public sphere and the likelihood of strategic misrepresentations should decline. Benhabib (1992) agrees, stating the very act of articulating a view in the public arena creates a reactionary reflexivity on individual preferences. Citizens must support their claims with good reasons or risk being dismissed as mere assertions.

Summary

If the problem with democracy is the irrelevancy of the citizen brought about by market populism then deliberation, as classically theorized, goes a long way to bringing import and credibility to citizen opinions and ideas as well as proving citizens with a reason to participate. Despite not being easy, deliberative democracy does work. It requires knowledge, motivation and a commitment to civic identity (Ryfe, 2005) – characteristics that are missing from contemporary liberal democracy. Deliberative democracy builds up the idea of citizen and citizenship, the public, the public arena while attempting to level the playing field so that all citizens have the opportunity to participate and influence decision making. The framework provided by deliberative democrats helps create conditions where citizens can discuss issues with better information, without needing to resort strictly to self-interest, and can draft policies oriented to a common good.

Let me return to the definition of deliberation promoted by Chambers' that I cited at the beginning of the chapter:

> Generally speaking, we can say that deliberation is debate and discussion aimed at producing reasonable, well-informed opinions in which participants are willing to revise preferences in light of discussion, new information, and claims made by fellow

> participants. Although consensus need not be the ultimate aim of deliberation, and participants are expected to pursue their interests, an overarching interest in the legitimacy of outcomes (understood as justification to all affected) ideally characterizes deliberation.

Deliberation is a social event, relying heavily on interaction to create participants who are well informed. Deliberative interactions can take place in a variety of public arenas and do not have to be focused on finding public policy resolutions. The goal of deliberation is, as Chambers states, listening, revising opinions, and finding some sort of common, inclusive ground that citizens share. If properly organized and maintained and when all of the procedural and normative conditions have been met, deliberative democracy stands to filter out of the political decision-making process elements extraneous to the discussion such as socioeconomic standing and personal bias as well as passion, emotion, and narrative (Fontana, et al, 2004; Mansbridge, 1996; Young, 1997). The use of reasons in deliberative forums compels participants to argue reasonably and to use reasonable talk such that the outcomes from such talk are seen as legitimate – it is the product of mutually interactive discussion (Fontana, et al., 2004). The more people deliberate using reasons the more likely their opinions will be changed (Schneiderhan & Khan, 2008).

Reasoned interactions will also result in "respectful and reciprocal expression, correction, revision and restatement of views. In the process, thinking will become more logical…as a result, personal beliefs, values, and preferences will change…this will encourage the discovery of a common ground for agreement, one that will yield more just and legitimate recommendations for public policy (Rosenberg, 2007, p. 10). Deliberative democrats argue this will provide for a renewal and interest in democratic governance as well as keeping leaders

accountable to their constituents collective desires (Cohen, 1989; Dryzek, 1990; Gastil, 2000, 2008; Leib, 2004; Rosenberg, 2007).

Answering the Critics

The first conception of deliberative democracy has changed since Habermas, Cohen, Gutmann and Thompson and others first wrote about deliberation in the late 1980's and early 1990's. As with most theories, scholars have taken up the philosophy behind deliberation and have ushered in several changes that have impacted both the procedural and epistemic theory of deliberation. Deliberative democrats had to deal with the challenges posited by social-rational choice theorists who strongly deny the ability of deliberation to create opinion reflexivity while advocating preference aggregation via alternative mechanisms such as voting. More importantly, this new generation perceived reason to be crucial to deliberation, but were unsure if reason needed to be interpreted so narrowly. These theorists questioned whether deliberation should allow other types of communication or be restricted solely to reason, and if argument-type expansion is necessary, what type of communication best allows for collective reasons.

One of two major criticisms advanced against the deliberative version of democracy is the various "what now?" types of questions posited by social-rational choice theorists. Deliberation is at best an unfinished theory – citizens can talk and even deliberate their preferences for public policy but, at the end of the day, aggregation is still a requirement to determine the will of the group. Prezworski (1998, p. 141-142) states "deliberative theorists….wish away the vulgar fact that under democracy, deliberation ends in voting…it is the result of voting, not discussion, that authorizes governments to govern, to compel." The "so what" question is important to answering how deliberative results become collective decisions. Cohen (1997) revises his thesis of the public sphere as outside government to include the

institutionalization of deliberation. He argues that arenas in which citizens can debate public policy issues are a public good and ought to be supported by public money because doing so expresses a basic commitment to democratic order through free deliberation among equals. He contends that political parties should play a part in making deliberative democracy possible partly because they address a wide range of political issues and arenas more open-ended arenas for discussion. The caveat being, Cohen notes, that political parties and organizations must be independent and thus freed from the dominance of private resources.

As noted already in the discussion of how communicative power can influence policymaking, Habermas (1997) sees elections as the way public opinion and will formed in the public sphere via deliberation can be converted into law-making power. The caveat for Habermas' theory of communicative power is that it the collective decisions it creates from deliberation points law-making power in specific directions. Thus, voting does not produce binding choices, only the collective decisions that influence policymaking does (Dryzek, 2000). Continuing in the vein of Cohen and Habermas by situating deliberation within the state, Anne Phillips (1995) calls for efforts to be made to increase the presence of members of disadvantaged groups into deliberation because only members of these groups have the ability to speak to the exclusions they have experienced and thus, create a more inclusive group. In the end, she calls for quotas in legislative bodies for women. Iris Marion Young (1989, 1990) has a similar opinion but calls for consultation with disadvantaged groups and possible veto power over policies that directly affect them.

Some scholars have moved to consider the consensus challenge in empirical terms. Karpowitz and colleagues (2009) argue for deliberation to happen in enclaves of similarly situated citizens. These types of deliberation creates an fully inclusive discourse by giving

marginalized groups the chance to develop their own unique perspectives, leading to greater group solidarity, political efficacy and consensus. Deliberative polling, an initiative undertaken by James Fishkin and associates involves a representative sample of citizens who participate in deliberations under the National Issues Forums and then vote on outcomes. While the goal of deliberative polling is not policy making, its goal of issue education and explanation has led to more informed participants whose opinions change significantly after participating (Fishkin, 2003).

The profound number of ideas that deliberative democrats have investigated in response to the challenge of how best to determine the will of the group shows that these theorists consider the problem of consensus to be a problem. Deliberation is no longer strongly committed to the idea of binding agreement; consensus has been found to be "unattainable, unnecessary, and undesirable. More feasible and attractive are workable agreements in which participants agree on a course of action, but for different reasons" (Dryzek, 2000, p. 170; see also: Fung & Wright, 2003) that have sustained deliberative scrutiny. Along this line, deliberative democrats like Dryzek have taken reasoned agreement to a better operating principle for deliberation than consensus – and that is reflected in Chambers' definition of deliberation.

Deliberative democrats have also faced the problem of how to create consensus from rational discussion when reason-giving may not be the best form of communication to create consensus. With the changes to deliberative theory by the likes of Habermas and Cohen's revising the impact deliberation has on opinion reflection and policymaking, theorists also began to question the standard that rational argument is meant to provide deliberating citizens a way to arrive at reasonable results, not to propel them to action (Fontana, et al, 2004). Dryzek (2000), Young (1998), Gutmann and Thompson (1996), and Rehg (1997) started to recognize the need to

include rhetoric and discourse as a focus of deliberation. Dryzek argues that for opinion reflection to happen, deliberation should re-orient its emphasis on the contestation of discourses instead of reasonableness.

Deliberative democracy's strict adherence to rational communication and its tenets of universality, neutrality and egalitarianism certainly leave the theory open to questions of power relationships and discursive inequality. How much of an issue this problem is will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 - Why Gender? Why Difference?

Americans in particular are concerned with political equality and value democratic practices that give equal weight to all voices (Schlozman, et. al, 2005). Democratic deliberation has positioned itself as the antithesis to market populism's hyper atomistic view of citizens; instead of individuals being thought of merely as "a random collection of consumers or an aggregation of identity politics" as discussed in the first chapter, a democracy valuing citizen deliberation provides a restoration of the concept of *the public*. By creating a politically neutral public sphere in which citizens can engage in dialog and deliberation under standards that promote equality in participation and operate under the force of the best argument, deliberative democrats theorize that the validity of democratic decision-making will be restored. In essence, deliberative democracy does the hard work of re-politicizing and revitalizing the public sphere in a way that enables citizens to be involved in public policy-making decisions in never seen before ways. The procedural focus of deliberation – that a rational public sphere and an ideal speech situation will create a universal, culturally neutral discourse that can be spoken by all citizens – is meant to outright secure such equality while promoting better discourse.

However, deliberation is first and foremost a social event. Deliberation requires participants to interact with one another in order to create citizens who are knowledgeable about the topic and about the opinions of others to come to a conclusion as well as provide justifications for such decisions. It is the social nature of deliberation, its unstated emphasis on citizen-generated knowledge via interpersonal interactions that provide deliberation with the force to claim democratic legitimacy from its outcomes. While deliberative democrats may claim the procedural benefits of mandated rational, universal discourse, that philosophical choice, critics argue, comes with serious disadvantages.

Difference and gender scholars have begun to question whether deliberation can reach its stated goals of participatory equality. In general, these scholars argue that despite the procedural requirement for participation, the social norms behind the interactional patterns that make up rationally dictated citizen participation often create more insidious forms of discrimination and inequality. This is critique is particularly true of women's participation in the public sphere. Recent surveys of political involvement indicate that women participate less in the public sphere, both in terms of actually showing up to deliberate as well as speaking less than men despite the open call for participation (Goidel, et. al, 2008; Mansbridge, 1983; Schlozman, Burns & Verba, 1994; Verba, Burns & Schlozman, 1997). It is possible that a lack of interest in politics on the part of women may result from the view that politics as a man's game, framed in male terms, and focused on issues that women do not find salient (Gidengil & Everitt, 2003; Gidengil, 1995; Harell, 2009), or even that women are seen by men as less competent conversation partners on political subjects (Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1995), possibly indicating a likelihood that "issues of inclusion and identity lurk" (Ryfe, 2002, p. 365). This is a direct challenge to the very premise of deliberative democracy – its advantage over the status quo in terms of inclusion and political neutrality. Let me be clear on this point: politics has, and continues to be dominated by men (Verba, Burns & Schlozman, 1997), and deliberation occurs within this context. It also occurs within the context of small group interactions which tend to be governed by group norms. Thus, according to Sanders (1997), learning to deliberate in America might just be inseparable from the indoctrination of the routines of hierarchy because deliberative settings are not isolated from status inequalities.

This chapter assesses the critique of difference made by gender scholars as well as the more directed criticisms of deliberative rationality made by difference democrats – those who

espouse the benefits of deliberation while positing the need to recognize differences among participants instead of neutralizing or universalizing experiences. This is a disparate group of interdisciplinary arguments and this chapter draws on a wide range of literatures and scholarship. Just as the theory of deliberative democracy emerged in reaction to changing definitions of democracy and lack of a vibrant civil society, the difference critique emerged from a feminist-inspired theory of moral justice as well as in reaction to the increasingly strong hold that Habermasian-based rationality had as a foundational rule of deliberation which retains the public/private dichotomy of justice.

In this chapter, I make two general, but related arguments about the particular way gender differences influence deliberative interactions: (1) the rationalized, general speech pushed for by deliberative democrats in the Habermasian tradition favor dominant groups in society – namely, white, middle and upper class men; other forms of speech typically found not acceptable for use in deliberation are associated with politically disadvantaged groups such as women, minorities, and the poor. Thus, the normative assumptions of deliberation operates as a form of power to silence and devalue non-reason based deliberative discourse; (2) interactions occurring within task-focused group settings are governed by socially and group constructed sex/gender norms that can prevent people from being equal speakers. Individuals enter into interactions with specific, socially created expectations about the rules for interacting in certain settings. Those rules interact with a group's gender composition to shape the group's social norms which can influence which arguments as well as which speakers are seen as relevant and persuasive.

There are both process and outcome problems associated with these two criticisms of reasoned- based deliberative democracy. If, as gender scholars and difference democrats argue, some voices are essentially excluded by the focus and process of rational deliberation, then

questions arise as to whether deliberative decisions are just and valid. Has the decision been arrived at through the free expression of all points of view? If not, and despite the deliberative setting, is the decision any more legitimate than decisions made under contemporary aggregative methods? Or are we just assuming that the bracketing of elites' economic and political power is sufficient enough to make speakers equal in the eyes of all? Gender scholar Cecilia Ridgeway (2011, p. 76) argues that "expectations shape the extent to which actors assert themselves, whether their views are heard, how they and their ideas are evaluated, and whether they become influential and respected in the context." Difference democrats, such as Iris Young agrees, arguing that as long as one group is stereotyped, marginalized, or silenced, the democratic decision-making process cannot be taken seriously, "only if oppressed groups are able to express their interests and experience in the public on an equal basis with other groups can group domination through formally equal processes of participation be avoided" (1990, p. 95). More importantly, if the critique of gender difference is correct - that deliberation normatively excludes participation by certain groups or by certain speech types - then citizenship is neither activated nor exercised; citizenship will still be a privatized matter. The same political structure that currently allows political elites and interest groups to rule political discussions will continue. Thus, the ultimate question is whether deliberation can be prevented from reinforcing existing political structures? Whereas social-rational choice theorists see danger in the opening up of the political system to an exponential number of participants and unmanageable choices – the danger of variety - difference democrats see danger in uniformity (Dryzek, 2000). And as I explained in the first chapter, scholars ranging from John Dewey to Benjamin Barber and Seyla Benhabib all note that a full and vibrant democracy cannot exist without an active, engaged citizenry. These

are particularly salient problems for a political philosophy which espouses an equal discursive playing field as a critical component to legitimate citizen-based policy decisions.

The stakes are high not just for deliberation, but for the prospects of a healthier democracy. The critique of difference and gender is more than just a question of decision-making efficacy, it is a question of democratic legitimacy. There is no competing, feasible substitute to deliberation that can better remedy the democratic stagnation caused by marketplace democracy in the status quo. Thus, providing an empirical assessment of whether gendered norms operate in a public space that is supposed to be gender neutral is vital if deliberation intends to remain a viable alternative to status quo politics. It is deliberation or bust. The few current studies focusing on the intersection of gender and deliberation provide no conclusive evidence as to whether gender and norms affect women's participation in and the outcomes of deliberation. The impasse between deliberative democrats who believe in the universality of reason-based deliberation and difference democrats who advocate for difference in deliberation and for particularized experiences to be shared needs to be resolved before deliberation can continue its theoretical and practical advancement. This chapter will engage the arguments against rationality and group sex/gender norms to assess whether reason-giving and the structure of deliberation is as gender inclusive (or at least gender neutral) as its advocates claim.

The Difference Critique of Rationality

Reason-giving as the valorized kind of talk in deliberative settings is not happenstance. Rational dialogue is meant to provide participants with a universal, neutral and egalitarian means of communication. It is a "request for a certain kind of talk: rational, constrained and oriented to a shared problem" (Sanders, 1997, p. 356). As a result, given deliberative democracy's norms of unity and universality, eliminating differences between deliberants is seen as necessary and

sufficient to create neutral spaces for discussion and in finding common ground to act. The elimination of difference in deliberation results in the exclusion of disadvantaged groups of citizens, particularly women from meaningful participation. Drawing heavily on the works of Iris Marion Young, this section will argue that structure of decision-making under rational deliberation – the requirements of impartiality, unity, force of the best argument, and common ground - denies difference and prevents deliberation from being gender inclusive. A summary is provided in table one.

Table 1. General Description of the Differences Between Deliberative Neutralists and Difference Democrats.

Deliberative Neutralists	Difference Democrats
Most important precondition is reciprocal exchange of reasons, evaluated through force of best argument. [1]	Universality does not eliminate power behind social norms- speakers are not all equal. [4]
Neutrality principle eliminates issues of power inequality from deliberation. [2]	Public sphere becomes rational, objective – dominant groups; passions, emotions, opinions meant for private sphere – disadvantaged. [5]
Neutral, universal public sphere (via the elimination of difference) –a level playing ground for all. [3]	Men and women speak differently in deliberations. [6]

1- Gutmann & Thompson, 1996. Habermas, 1994. 2-Knight & Johnson, 1997. 3- Cohen, 1989; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996. 4- Ferry & Kingston, 2008; Benhabib, 1996; Mouffe, 1996; Ridgeway, 1992; Sanders, 1997; Young, 1990, 1997. 5- Pateman, 1986, 1988; Elshtain, 1981; Glennon, 1979; Lloyd, 1984; Young, 1997. 6- In general, see Foss, Foss & Griffin, 1999; Gilligan, 1982; Tannen, 1994. Wood & Rhodes, 1992; In deliberation, see Benlevy, 2000; Hall, 2007; Mansbridge, 1991, 1983; Marder, 1987; Polletta & Lee, 2006; Sanders, 1997.

Discourse within the public sphere is premised on reason but also on the necessity of unity and neutrality while deliberating. It is worth re-quoting Habermas (1984, p. 10-11) as stating that communicative rationality relies on the "central experience of the unconstrained, unifying, consensus-bringing force of argumentative speech, in which different participants overcome their merely subjective views…owing to the mutuality of rationally motivated conviction." Thus, Habermas creates a discursive brightline between the type of discourse that

can effect and be effective in deliberations. This division ultimately defines the institution of the public sphere. Difference scholars see the dividing line between the public and private spheres involving a move from the "unreason and the sentiment of households to rational public justification" (Ferry & Kingston, 2008). As Young (1990) notes, the moral structures between the public and private are different – the logic of identity in the public sphere seeks to reduce difference to unity. Habermas goes so far as to say deliberation relies on the premise of unity, a claim echoed by the first generation of deliberative democrats. However, the philosophy of neutrality is a myth. There is no single public sphere, as Habermas would have us believe, nor is there is there a single public-type citizen, argues Pellizzoni (2001). Public reason cannot be detached from group membership, experiences, and social features (Young, 1989). For the sake of creating unity, deliberative democrats believe differences other than in political opinion are ignored and assigned to the private sphere (Gould, 1996). Thus, the public sphere is seen as a rational, objective deliberative space in which citizens are characterized as dispassionate, reason-giving rational participants. Relegated to the private sphere are passions, emotions and subjective opinions (Elshtain, 1981; Glennon, 1979; Hall, 2007; Krause, 2008; Pateman, 1988; Young, 1997).

For Young (1990), the ideals of impartiality and neutrality that gird the normative standards of rational deliberation deny difference. In order for citizens to be objective as they deliberate, they must adopt a universal, culture neutral, and impartial point of view that is shared by all other participants in the forum. According to Young,

> Reason seeks essence, a single formula that classifies concrete particulars as inside our outside a category, something common to all things that belong in the category…but the logic of identity goes beyond the attempt to order and compare the particulars of

> experience. It constructs totalizing systems in which the unifying categories are themselves unified principles, where the ideal is to reduce everything to one first principle (1990, p. 98).

As the neutrality principle of rationality denies the participants the chance to speak to the particularity of their situations, citizens are only able to view the situation through a lens that is solely neutral and universal. By restricting democratic discussion to a narrow definition of appropriate communication, the normative standards of deliberation creates a culturally biased context that tends to silence or devalue certain groups of people (Young, 1997). But also, assuming a deliberative situation in which participants are differentiated by group culture and social status, where some groups have greater material wealth or privilege, appeals to a "common good" or unity are likely to perpetuate privilege (Young, 1997, p. 66). Thus, advocates of rational deliberation tend to assume a purposefully exclusive public sphere where only certain groups are given privilege to speak and act (Ferry & Kingston, 2008; Benhabib, 1996; Mouffe, 1996; Sanders, 1997; Young, 1990, 1997).

The core of reason-giving is the force of the best argument - a standard for evaluating claims and a process under which democratic decisions gain legitimacy. Valid claims are measured by the soundness of the reasons presented by participants as well as the ability to withstand criticism and provide additional justification. This, argues Young (1997) turns deliberation into a venue for discursive competition between participants. The logical end of the force of the better argument implies that when a speaker is unable to think of any other counterargument to the one presented, they then concedes defeat. While Habermas and others may not envision the force of the best argument operating in this way, Young posits that this type of democratic discussion privileges those who like contests and know the rules of the game.

Assertive and confrontational speech in this context is privileged compared to conciliatory or exploratory speech. Women tend to speak less than men in contexts valuing assertiveness or argument competition; when women do speak in these situations – of which reason-based deliberation would be an example – women tend to give little information and ask questions rather than initiate controversial exchanges (Mansbridge, 1983; Marder, 1987). The norms of assertiveness and confrontation also privilege "better-educated white middle-class people" who tend to act as though their words carry authority; the same rules, levels of formality, and argument requirements act as an intimidation factor to other groups who will opt not to speak.

Gutmann and Thompson's reciprocity standard ensures that rational claims will win out over subjective, emotive or "selfish' claims because the justifications of opinions required by deliberation necessitate speakers using generalizable claims that all participants can agree to. Difference democrats argue that the force of reasons to bring a group to consensus advocates a form of communication that is orderly in its exchanges, contained and dispassionate (Sanders, 1997; Young, 1996, 2000). Under this guise, the force of the best argument specifically limits the types of arguments that can be made in deliberation. For example, giving testimony would not be persuasive because, under the idea of unity and neutrality, is not general enough nor could it withstand critique. Specific experiences, or narratives would also be invalid arguments also for these reasons. And thus, while deliberative democrats like to claim that rationality and the force of the best argument creates an equal playing field by letting all citizens participate, the only participants who could be effective in swaying the course of the deliberation are those who are skilled in persuasion.

The requirement for formal, general speech has the same effect. In more formal situations like town hall meetings or courtrooms, citizens tend to feel the need to apologize for circuitous

or less than straightforward speech. Sanders (1997) argues that those who have less confidence in making rational, formal arguments or have trouble articulating general reasons are more likely to have those views discounted because they are not shared in a way that resembles deliberative discourse. Some citizens are less likely to be listened to (Bickford, 1996). On the other hand, citizens may feel a sense of detachment from the context under which they present their arguments. Abstracting reason from sentiment divorces the citizen-participant from the motivating sources of human agency which are often found in affective attachments and desires that must be rejected if deliberation is to be impartial and neutral (Krause, 2008).[2] Gould (1996) expresses this concern also, fearful that those who cannot speak in public for any reason will be removed from participation in public life. Being able to articulate specific principles that can be applied to the discussion at hand is a skill that must be learned. Women with higher status may be primed to engage in rational deliberative discourse because they have had to use that type of communication to achieve success in the workplace (Hickerson & Gastil, 2008). Young (1997) argues that these skills are culturally specific and is a sign of social privilege. Thus, deliberation may not be open to all ways of making claims and giving reasons.

When disadvantaged groups are unable to express their particularized experiences when deliberating, these citizens are likely to consider any outcomes of deliberation to be unjust (O'Flynn, 2006), creating pseudo-democratic outcomes and undermining the objectives of deliberation. By privileging general concerns during deliberation, what citizens accept as "good" and "bad" reasons for action depend on who is presenting those reasons. Privileged groups are likely to see the reasons presented by disadvantaged groups as bad reasons (Williams, 2000). To bolster the claim that in contexts such as deliberation women and men speak differently, Young

[2] I do not mean to imply that impartiality must be abandoned in favor of reason; but as Krause (2008) and Hall (2007) indicate, recognizing that affect has a role in making deliberation truly equal is vital.

(p. 65) argues that the speech culture of "white middle-class men tends to be more controlled, without significant gesture and expression of emotion. The speech culture of women…tends to be more excited and embodied, more valuing the expression of emotion, the use of figurative language."

For public deliberative forums aiming to find common ground, citizens are implicitly asked to leave behind their particular experiences for reason-giving. However, the perspectives of the economically and politically privileged are still likely to dominate the trajectory of the discussion or to frame what common ground looks like because their discursive skills are more valued by the norms of deliberation (Sanders, 1997). As such, the common ground arrived at might be biased against those without power. Even though deliberative democrats have attempted to create power-neutral structure for civil dialogue, Sanders (p. 352) posits:

> The problem is how more of the people who routinely speak less – who though various mechanisms of accidents of birth or fortune, are least expressive in and most alienated from conventional American politics – might take part and be heard and how those who typically dominate might be made to attend the views of others.

Deliberative democrats, Sanders argues, have no answers for how to make those with economic and socio-political power more attentive to the needs of those without such power. Rational-neutral deliberation provides no solution to these sorts of internal exclusions that allow some participants to hear certain arguments but not others (O'Flynn, 2008). If deliberation and participatory democracy intends to eliminate power inequality within the public sphere then it also eliminates the cultural and social differences which make deliberation inclusive (Young, 1997), thus doing little to change the political status quo into a more inclusive and equitable society.

To this extent, Young in *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (1990) and Lynn Sanders in *Against Deliberation* (1997) posit rational and generalized public-political speech is associated with dominant groups in society – namely white, middle-class men making up the dominant group; passionate, emotive and particularized speech is associated with politically disadvantaged groups such as women, minorities and poor. And so, an increasing body of literature argues that women and men tend to communicate differently, especially in deliberative and task-oriented contexts (in general, see Foss, Foss & Griffin, 1999; Lakoff, 1975; Smith-Lovin & Robinson, 1992; Tannen, 1994. In deliberation, see Benlevy, 2000; Ridgeway, 2011; Hall, 2007; Mansbridge, 1991, 1983; Marder, 1987; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2007; Polletta & Lee, 2006; Sanders, 1997; Young, 1990, 1997).

The primary way in which deliberative democrats address (or, at least, have attempted to pre-empt) the difference critique is by claiming that rational-neutral deliberation creates contexts in which citizen-participants can share perspectives – the idea of stepping into someone else's shoes. Young (1997) frames the idea as trying to understand another person's point of view by finding commonality between the two interactants. James Bohman (1996, 1998) argues that in deliberations, citizens exchange reasons to resolve problems and that those reasons will have the general input of all participants, because "in speaking to them, answering them, and taking up their views that the many diverse capacities for deliberation are exercised jointly" (1996, p. 54). Benhabib (1992) advocates for considering issues from different viewpoints, by understanding the standpoints of those who are not at the deliberation. Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson's charge for reciprocity in deliberations limits out emotion. They argue that citizens must appeal to reasons that can be shared by similar citizens, that reciprocity demands citizens "publicly appeal to reasons that are shared or could be shared, by their fellow citizens, and if they take into

account these same kinds of reasons presented by similarly motivated citizens, then they are engaged in a process that by its nature aims at a justifiable resolution" (1996, p. 25). Reciprocity, then, requires perspective taking since it can only occur when there is some sort of mutual respect. n and Thompson (2004) offer little discussion of affect, but they do point out that deliberative theory should not accept a dichotomy between passion and reason because passionate rhetoric can sometimes be seen as reason.

As all of these primary authors indicate, perspective sharing is meant to generate empathy with other citizen-participants and help to create common ground, definitions or frames of the issue under deliberation that the group can then use to discuss. There are two reasons perspective-taking is problematic for difference democrats. First, because it obscures difference, and second because it denies emotion and affect from having a place in deliberative discourse.

By considering participants within deliberations to be symmetrical or complementary, rational-neutral deliberativists suggest that people are able to understand other's perspectives because they share a similar set of characteristics and are replaceable with one another. Young (1997) argues that assumptions of reflection support a projection of sameness at the expense of difference. Individuals do not share everything in common. Even when relationships could be defined by similarly socially structured differences such as gender, race, or class, individuals also find ways in which they are different. Individuals bring different histories and experiences into interactions which makes their positions irreversible. Assuming other participants in forums are similar and replaceable nullifies and creative exchange that differences might produce if participants assume that they cannot be put into another person's shoes. Also, when participants do attempt to put themselves in another's place during deliberations, these actors make false projections – they put themselves with their own experiences and history into what they see in

others. Young argues that when privileged participants attempt to place themselves in the position of those who are less privileged, they unknowingly misrepresent the other's situations but also reinforce a complimentary image of themselves. Perspective taking also has the problem of handicapping communication within forums. If a participant believes they already know how the others in the deliberation think and feel because he or she has already imagined their perspectives, there is a chance that they will not listen to other perspective carefully or openly. Along these same lines, if one imagines all persons are similar and share the same generic backgrounds, it is likely that no one need to revise their opinions or viewpoints. Without opinion change, citizens will not develop the necessary empathy for less privileged participants that deliberative democrats cite as key to neutralizing power inequalities.

Despite highlighting the need for perspective taking as a means of creating a starting point for finding common ground, the abstract and generalized terms in which these scholars advocate for perspective taking does not provide a serviceable way in which passion or emotion can be a component of deliberation. By framing emotion as perspective taking, these theorists inaccurately conceive of reason as a cognitive process that should be affect-free (Morrell, 2010). More importantly, the norm of dispassionate speech presupposes a dichotomy between reason and emotion, the mind and the body, leading to the association of dispassionate reasoning with objective deliberation and passionate reasoning with subjective deliberation. Considering how affect, emotion and experience are already relegated to the private sphere, it is no surprise that deliberative neutralists have chosen to focus mainly on perspective taking instead of creating empathy via the exploration of difference.

It is not controversial to say that politics involves passion. To be engaged in a deliberative discussion is to signify as affective investment in the issue (Dahlgren, 2009).

Certainly, passion has reasons: there is a valued object or idea that is wanted. The feeling toward the object or idea that a citizen is passionate about may be derived from a reasoned analysis (Morrell, 2010). Thus, passionate talk, narrative, emotion are all a part of rational analysis, not separate from it (Hall, 2007; Krause, 2008; Morrell, 2010; Polletta & Lee, 2006). The good news is that some deliberative theorists have shown an openness to including affect or at least recognizing its role in deliberative dialogues. Young (2000) situates passion in deliberative rhetoric. Dryzek (2000), like Young, attempts to move deliberation away from a strictly rational approach to one that is based in a broader range of general communicative practices that include rhetoric, emotion, testimony, and storytelling. Cheryl Hall (2007) argues that passion and narratives are based in reasoned political talk, an idea that Polletta and Lee (2006) echo. Sanders (1997) posits that American democracy must recognize other modes of communication besides reason-giving so as to allow for more perspectives and ideas shared. Morrell (2010) advises a more fully formed role, a process of sorts, for empathy and emotion in deliberation that integrates affect and cognition. Practitioners and facilitators have even joined in the view that strong emotion and affect play a valuable role in quality deliberation (Mansbridge, et al., 2006). If anything, this disparate group of scholars and research posit affect, emotion and other forms of communication as integral parts of deliberation. If rational deliberation continues to abide by the notion that argument is separate from affect and emotion, then women's experiences and perspectives will continue to be systematically excluded, again undermining any legitimacy the deliberative process would bring to public decision-making.

The Gendered Norms of Small Group Interactions

The gendered character of the public sphere has been under intense scrutiny for the past twenty years – with deliberation scholars in particular reacting to Joan Landes' proclamation that

"democracy in the modern world produced not only a discourse but a practice of gender difference" (1996, p. 296). Politics has traditionally, and continues to be, typically dominated by men, write Verba, Burns and Schlozman (1997, p. 1053). Indeed, it was the development of liberal individualism of the type identified in chapter one that has brought an acute awareness of the socio-political status of women in the public sphere (Pateman, 1989). Since gender inequality does exist in the modern world, proclaims Cecilia Ridgeway in *Framed by Gender* (2011), the more pertinent question is why. This section draws heavily from the work done by Ridgeway and other sociology of gender scholars as well as other social psychology and small group studies literatures ascribing to expectation-states theory. Drawing upon Ridgeway's various works, I argue that gender has become a cultural tool for organizing behavior and social relations. By using gender as a primary framing tool in interactions, and that people carry cultural meanings about gender into new settings such as deliberative forums. The reinscription of status assumptions into deliberative discourse preserves inequality into a system that actively attempts to bracket power and difference out.

If gender inequality exists, especially in rationally based deliberative settings, it is because gender is used as a way of making sense of people and as a way to organize our interactions with others. As I stated in the beginning of this chapter, deliberation is first and foremost a social event. Deliberative interactions rely on citizens' abilities to relate and interact with one another. In these interactions, people attempt to coordinate behaviors with others that requires participants to anticipate how others will behave in a given instance. Citing symbolic interactionists such as Erving Goffman (1967) and G.H. Mead (1934), Ridgeway (1992, 2006, 2011) argues that people coordinate everyday social behaviors by using a particular type of common or shared knowledge which is information that each actor knows or can reasonably

presume all other actors in the situation share, making it seemingly pubic or objective in character (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Chwe, 2001). Thus, shared knowledge is cultural knowledge. Shared, cultural knowledge allows actors to initiate the process of defining others and how each person can be expected to act. In doing so, actors bring these common definitional systems for categorizing each other, which inherently focus on differences between actors. The social difference codes that are developed when citizens develop shared category systems based on differences provide publicly available cultural devices for managing the coordination of behaviors necessary for interaction (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 37). Actors create these behavioral arrangements or microstructures quickly – sometimes within a few moments of interaction. Once these microstructures are created, these behavioral patterns and definitional systems become forces that, in turn, shape all subsequent interactions. Ridgeway (1992) posits that microstructures develop distinctive levels of social organization that tend to exert influence on individuals and on the larger organizations in which these structures may be embedded.

Sex/gender is one of a few "master roles" and thus is it particularly susceptible to being amplified into what Ridgeway (2011) calls a primary framing category for coordinating interactions that become microstructures. Sex provides a convenient and prominent shared cultural category system that actors can use to define others and coordinate behaviors because physical traits encourage a simple, dichotomous categorization system. Sex is visible, used as a foundation for personal identity and in terms of societal division of labor. Beyond the visibility of sex, sex categorization is a socially constructed process that depends on the recognition of social cues such as clothing to represent physical differences (West & Zimmerman, 1987). When sex is transformed into a primary category for framing interactions, the process of categorization relies less on being able to recognize physical features than having a culturally knowledgeable

reading of social cues (p. 39). More importantly, expanding sex categorization into a primary frame diversifies the cultural expectations for both men's and women's behaviors to the point where it is possible to associate most things that men and women do with their sex categories (Wood & Eagly, 2002). Ridgeway (2011, p. 54) argues,

> We automatically and nearly instantly sex-categorize any concrete other that we consider in relation to ourselves. As we do so, we unconsciously prime our shared cultural stereotypes of gender. If we cannot relate to another without sex-categorizing him or her and implicitly evoking cultural beliefs about gender, then gender will be brought into all activities that we carry out through social interactions.

The common cultural knowledge about sex categories leads actors to believe that someone they classify as male will behave in a certain way and someone classified as female will also act within a certain prescribed set of behaviors. Indeed, these cultural beliefs – stereotypes if you will – prescribe a series of rules for acting gender. Gender stereotypes act as a "genetic code" which contain cultural schemas for defining expectations and traits (Ridgway & Bourg, 2004). Positive prescriptions indicate traits that men and women should display whereas negative prescriptions indicate ones that should not be displayed (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). With these prescriptions about appropriate actions, gender almost always acts as a diffuse background identity. In situations where gender would not be the primary framing tool (Ridgeway gives the example of student-teacher classroom relationships), actors moderate or exaggerate in gender stereotypic ways their behavior as they perform their positively prescribed identities as male or female.

Gender status beliefs, when incorporated into cultural knowledge of who men and women are supposed to be, end up maintaining a status quo where men are presumably more

worthy and competent. This creates a situation where men are able to attain more power and resources within a variety of institutions (Reskin, 1988; Ridgeway, 2011). Because gender acts as a primary frame for social interactions, men and women have what Ridgeway notes as a deep sociocognitive interest in maintaining cultural beliefs that define who they are by highlighting differences (Ridgeway, 2011). When shared knowledge about gender become beliefs about inequality, the use of the sex/gender primary frame for interactions frames men and women in unequal terms. As actors organize their interactions on the basis of differences, difference tends to transform into status inequality (Ridgeway, 2011). This is particularly true when people work together on goal-oriented projects. In the micro-level social structures of face-to-face interactions, hierarchies tend to develop between participants in which some people have more influence in directing conversations and task directions than others (Bales, 1950, 1970; Berger, Conner & Fisek, 1974; Ridgeway, 1981, 1982, 1992, 2001, 2011; Wood & Rhodes, 1992).

I mention goal-oriented interactions for a specific reason. Ridgeway argues in her introduction to *Gender, Interaction and Inequality* (1992) that task-oriented interactions such as those experienced in committee work, community groups and juries are especially relevant for understanding inequality in men's and women's status and power. Interactions in these social arenas are where major decisions are made about the distribution of material resources and in which people gain access to authority and power. Face-to-face interactions in these settings is an important medium though which inequality is written into socioeconomic organization. Knowing that gender almost always is a background identity, Ridgeway (2011) argues that the extent to which actors modify or exaggerate their behaviors depends on the salience of gender in a given situation – the more salient, the greater effect on behavior. In settings that are culturally linked to a set of stereotypic skills, gender is said to be effectively salient (Wagner & Berger, 1997).

Expectation states theory – the major sociological theory about interpersonal statuses – focuses on situations where actors must accomplish a shared goal or task and attempt to explain how power hierarchies are formed. At their core, gender stereotypes encompass status beliefs that socially evaluate men as superior and more confident than women (Ridgeway & Bourg, 2004; Ridgeway 2001; Wagner & Berger, 1997). In deciding how to act and react in settings such as juries, community groups or committees, actors look for social clues by which they can anticipate the value of other's contributions in comparison to their own. Automatic sex categorization makes the gender status beliefs about men and women available to actors as they begin to form self-other performance expectations. According to Miller and Turnbull (1986), the self-other expectations has a self-fulfilling effect on behaviors and evaluations within the group. These beliefs "measurably" bias expectations only when gender is effectively salient, that is, in mixed-sex and other gender relevant situations (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 75). On the other hand, in same-sex and gender neutral situations, gender status beliefs tend to have little effect on performance expectations. Even if gender is a background identity, as long as it is effectively salient due to the group composition, gender status beliefs will tend to bias expectations. In situations or with tasks that are more strongly linked to certain gender expectations, gender status beliefs will more strongly bias (Berger, et al, 1992; Ridgeway, 2011). Performance expectations affect whether actors will assert themselves in group discussions, whether their views will be heard and evaluated, and whether those views will be influential and respected. Expectation states theory allows an evaluation of whether gender differences in interactions are unique to gender or are due to other status processes.

The theory makes a series of assumptions that are directly relevant to deliberation. Ridgeway and Bourg's (2004) theoretical review posits a number of patterns of interaction in

social relational contexts. Task-related, agentic behaviors include verbal and nonverbal interactions from which interpersonal status hierarchies are enacted. This includes participation rates, assertive gestures, assertive versus tentative speech, and influence. Evaluations include agreeing or positively evaluating ideas and inferring ability from other actors performances (Ridgeway, 2011). Specifically, in regards to mixed-sex settings, the theory predicts that with gender-neutral tasks men will have a modest advantage over women in performance expectations and in task-directed behaviors and evaluations. With stereotypically masculine tasks, men will have a stronger advantage over women. When the task is stereotypically feminine, women will have a slight advantage. Ridgeway (2011) argues this is because the culturally based expectations of women's specific skills combine with men's greater overall competence to give women only a slight advantage in terms of expected performance. In regard to same-sex settings, gender tends to not be salient unless the task or settings is gender-typed. Therefore, there may be no difference in expectations between men and women. When the task is gender typed, results similar to mixed-sex groups tend to occur.

Empirical examinations from studies using expectation states theory have found results that indicate a distinctive pattern of gender status effects. All things equal in mixed-sex groups, men talk more, make more specific task or goal oriented suggestions, use less tentative speech, use more assertive gestures when talking and are more visually dominating (Carli, 1990; Dovidio et al. 1988; James & Drakish, 1993; Wood & Karten, 1986). In these settings, men are seen as more influential than women (Carli, 2001; Pugh & Wahrman, 1983; Wagner, Ford & Ford, 1986). In mixed-sex settings with a masculine topic, men had a strong advantage on agentic behaviors over women, but when the topic shifted to a more feminine topic, the hierarchy reversed and women displayed higher rates of these behaviors (Dovidio, et al, 1988). In contrast,

same-sex groups with gender neutral tasks show little if any difference between men and women in participation (Carli, 1991; Shelly & Munroe, 1999). In masculine-typed tasks, women rated their participatory abilities lower than men did; with a gender neutral task, there were no differences in the way men and women evaluated themselves (Correll, 2004). Also, the number of women in a task-oriented group does affect the nature of the discussion. The tenacity of speech decreases as the number of women increase, the result being that people speak less definitively (Carli, 1990; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2007). In majority women groups, outcomes are more generous compared to majority men groups which tend to be stingy. In predominantly male groups, women take fewer speaking turns, utter fewer sentences, ask more questions, and are interrupted more (Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2007).

There is also an effect on legitimacy, leadership and authority. Leaders in task-oriented groups are high ranking members of status hierarchies not only influence, but are able to direct group's interactional activities. When gender is salient in a given task-oriented context, gender status beliefs effect whether women are seen as leaders or having legitimate authority (Berger, et al. 1998; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986; Ridgeway & Bourg, 2004). Because gender status beliefs attach a higher level of worthiness to men, they are seen by the group as "more socially expected, appropriate, and legitimate candidates for authority and leadership, as well as more instrumentally competent candidates" (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 80). Women, in comparison, are seen as having less legitimacy for roles of authority because, as Prentice and Carranza's (2002) research on gender stereotyping shows, group authority and leadership are associated with dominance and, therefore, is an undesirable trait for women. When women do attempt to assert themselves, they encounter a second problem created by gender status beliefs:

> Their assertiveness contradicts the hierarchical aspect of gender status beliefs and, thus, violates others' implicit expectations about gender and authority. The gender status incongruity of their assertive behavior makes it seem illegitimate and rudely dominant. As a result, the women encounter a resistive, backlash reaction to their assertive claims for advancement (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 81).

Other studies confirm this idea. In same-sex groups for women and mixed- and same-sex groups for men, assertive speech was seen as more influential than tentative speech. But, when women used assertive speech in mixed-sex groups it was less influential than when they posited ideas through tentative speech (Carli, 1990; Ridgeway, 1982). This seems to be what Young (1997) theorized would happen in these settings. Mansbridge (1983) and Marder, (1987) found in these settings that women refuse to initiate confrontational exchanges, opting to ask questions instead. The way for women to overcome the leadership deficit they face in mixed- and opposite-sex groups is to combine assertiveness with clear competence and also with social and expressive behaviors that make them seem friendly and cooperative rather than outright dominant (Eagly & Carli, 2003, Ridgeway, 1982). Ridgeway argues these effects are the result of the implicit, self-fulfilling effects of gender as a background identity in social interactions.

As we can see, group composition matters quite a bit when determining the salience of gender status beliefs. More specifically, even when gender differences between men and women are insignificant, even small differences can become large and consequential when amplified by a group's gender composition (Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2007). Because of the gendered norms groups draw from and in turn create, group composition has the possibility of mattering more than individual gender. According to Eagly and Carli (1981), when actors meet face to face and are instructed to communicate a series of preferences, women were found to conform to social

pressures more than men. Wood and Karten (1986) found that when women and men's expectations are equalized in mixed-group settings, sex differences in the specific task-directed behaviors disappeared, indicating that these effects are uniquely the result of status-based assumptions about gender that shape interactions and not the result of actual differences between men's and women's dispositions (Ridgeway, 2011). This is partially the reason that Karpowitz and his colleagues (2009) call for enclave deliberation among disempowered groups. In these deliberations, participants increased their knowledge about the issues rather than growing disillusioned with the dialog.

In sum, gender is a primary frame in interpersonal interactions through two reinforcing processes. First, people immediately and automatically sex-categorize everyone they come into contact with. Second, the association of male and female categories with culturally shared gender stereotypes define how both sexes are to behave in interpersonal interactions. Beliefs about the statuses of either gender are embedded into gender stereotypes which, when people work together on a task or goal oriented project, develop into hierarchies of statuses. When the group compositions of these task oriented interactions are mixed or favor men, gender becomes more salient and inequality of influence and participation arises.

Summary

In sum, difference democrats question whether reason-giving in deliberation merely substitutes one form of elitism for another, and thus, does not alter the status quo's exclusionary politics in a way that might make for a more inclusive society. Citizens do not limit themselves to solely rational deliberation but instead experience emotions that could impact their thoughts and opinions. For difference democrats, the opposite seems true. People of different social location and status levels experience deliberation differently. Women are discouraged from

experiencing emotions that impact their thoughts and opinions (Hickerson & Gastil, 2008). Because women experience exclusion, they are less satisfied with the deliberative process and its outcomes. Hickerson and Gastil (2008), in summarizing the difference critique, write that gender differences in deliberation thrives because women possess unique perspectives that tend to be ignored or undermined by the prevailing deliberative norms. In other words, they claim, because women are not treated as equals in daily life, it is impossible for men to recognize them as such in deliberation. Gender scholars theories of expectation states bear this out.

Young and the other difference democrats and Ridgeway and other expectation-states scholars would agree that men and women come into deliberative forums having gender beliefs based upon stereotypes and the public nature of deliberative settings. Because the public-political sphere has traditionally been male and because the rationally defined public sphere requires a certain type of language mainly associated with male characteristics, I argue that gender is then always implicit in deliberative settings. Despite the best attempts by deliberative democrats to neutralize inequality via bracketing, it seems to be not enough to counter the beliefs citizens enter with. I would also argue that Young and Ridgeway would advocate for the same outcome - making gender differences, however slight, acceptable is key to solving problems of inequality. When gender differences are recognized as acceptable in contexts that are assumed to be or are historically male, gender will become less noticeable and then, hopefully, not acted upon.

Until the gender gap is closed, gender will always be salient. The question is the degree to which gender effects task-directed outcomes. Ridgeway (2011) argues based upon a litany of other studies in gendered interpersonal exchanges that in gender neutral groups, gender is less salient with little or no effect. However, in mixed-sex or highly diversified groups where the task is stereotypically masculine (like public political debate and deliberation is), gender has a

stronger impact. Do the same expectations of gendered interactions happen in deliberations? Do the strong effects of gender on group construction have the same impact in a supposedly gender neutral sphere? The wide literature body of deliberative democracy, surprisingly, has had little to say on the subject.

Empirical Studies on Gender and Deliberation

The theoretical impasse between deliberative democrats and difference democrats has seen little resolution, partly due to a lack of conclusive evidence detailing women's experiences in civil society. The few empirical works testing the difference critique in deliberative settings have seen mixed results. This is also the first time these two literatures – gender and expectation states theory and deliberative democracy – have been in contact with one another to answer how gender inequality may operate in a supposedly gender-neutral socio-political practice. Part of the reason these two literatures are just now getting in concert has to do with deliberation and the critique of difference being a relatively new field of study, especially for sociology. Thus, there are relatively few studies in the deliberative democracy field that coherently attempt to answer the question of gender inequality. In this section, I will detail the few studies specifically looking at gender in deliberative contexts in order to provide some context for evaluating the difference critique and assumptions made by the expectation states theory.

In focusing on the rhetorical abilities of reasoned argument and storytelling to create quality deliberation among participants, Francesca Polletta and John Lee's (2006) examined whether the types of argument used by women are engaged differently than arguments made by men. In their study of online deliberations concerning the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site after the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks the authors hypothesized women using narratives would be responded to differently or even have their claims discredited. Their findings

indicate women were more likely than men to use storytelling as a means of advancing claims and their claims were not discredited despite primary association with women.

Polletta and Lee's work in storytelling and deliberation adds much to the debate over the effect of gender on the structure of deliberation. This research provides evidence that in online deliberative forums men and women do speak differently. Women were 1.72 times more likely than men to share stories as opposed to non-narrative claims. And despite women telling more stories during deliberation those claims were not discredited, indicating that women's use of non-rational argument did not affect the outcomes or structure of deliberation in these public forums. In spite of conclusions challenging the difference critique, Polletta and Lee do note some caveats to their online deliberation, most notably the issue of anonymity which may affect how citizens speak to one another, lack of polarizing discussion and discussion threads in which policy options were discussed were heavily tilted toward reasoned argument. Given that most public deliberations are about policy measuring reactions to women's contributions in a non-policy forum (something Polletta and Lee do note) may not provide a comparable framework from which to draw conclusions about the nature of deliberation[3].

In *Beyond Adversary Democracy*, Jane Mansbridge (1983) observed that women in Selby Vermont's town hall meetings attend as often as men in the community do, but talk less during these forums than their counterparts. In the three town hall meetings Mansbridge attended, forty-nine percent of the participants were women, but less than one-third of those women chose to speak during the meetings. The difference is more pronounced when looking at what women said during the forums. In one town hall, twenty-four percent of the speakers were women, but by and large gave reports and asked questions; eight percent of all major statements of opinion were

[3] See Polletta and Lee (2006) page 706 for in depth discussion of the limitations of online deliberation and comparisons between online and face-to-face deliberations.

offered by women and none of the ten controversial exchanges were initiated by or involved women. During interviews, women reported that other women they knew were more nervous than men about speaking in these meetings and that women do not like to go to town hall forums because they do not want to get involved in contentious debates. Women in Selby reported feeling overly cautious about expressing opinions during meetings, and, as one college-educated townswoman stated, "This is a very segregated society around here, with the women in the kitchen, so being a female, I might have a hard time getting anyone to take me seriously" (p. 107).

Examining juries may give deliberation scholars insight into whether gender composition produces a moderating effect on the type of talk and outcomes. The work of Andrea Hickerson and John Gastil (2008) focuses on deliberations via closed jury session. Hickerson and Gastil's survey results of King County, WA jurists about their deliberation concludes that gender does not affect the jury experience. While this conclusion is an important contribution to literature in civil society and gender, I take issue with the design of their study and other jury-based essays. First, Hickerson and Gastil's findings come from a self-reported survey of satisfaction and emotion. The authors did not have access to the transcripts of deliberation to be able to effectively judge quality of deliberation and treatment by fellow jurors based on what happened during discussions. Similar to Mansbridge's interview and survey findings, Hickerson and Gastil acknowledge this limitation, noting that gender differences may not have been found because women in the study may be suffering from what they call a false consciousness – women are so accustomed to subordination during deliberation that they cannot see their status. The authors argue the only way to refute the false consciousness claim is to analyze actual deliberations via text or observation.

Hickerson and Gastil study citizen-oriented outcomes (satisfaction with experience, satisfaction with verdict) and not whether gender differences affect the shape and scope of deliberations. For example, does a woman telling a personal story affect how other participants react to deliberations and in turn, how do those reactions re- shape the rest of the deliberation? The question not engaged by the authors is what happens to deliberation if/when it is influenced by gender.

Sandra Benlevy (2000) does study the jury deliberations and finds that jurors often behave in gender-specific ways. Female jurors tend to be concerned with understanding the circumstances of the proposed crime that may not have been presented during the trial as well as the implications of the jury's decision. Women jurors were concerned with the moral outcome of trials, understanding the motives of defendants committing crimes, and being worried about making the wrong decision because, as one female juror states, "I won't be able to live with myself if I make the wrong decision" (p. 6). While women were more likely to be the holdouts on juries, they did eventually side with the majority, not due to the persuasive power of the jury majority but because of the pressure that gender inequality exerted on the jury's group dynamic. Men were less willing to compromise on the outcome of the deliberation – being described by other jurors as "stubborn" and "rigid" – than women. One woman converted to the majority opinion after she reported a male juror "yelled" at her. In contrast, male jurors tended to decide their verdicts based solely on evidence presented during trial and were less accommodating to other ideas. For example, when one woman juror on a firearm possession case questions whether the jury should take into account the fact that the defendant had a reading disability, a male juror notes that speculative reasoning should not be used and that it is outside the scope of the jury's charge to try to understand what the defendant was thinking at the time of the crime. While

Benlevy concludes that her study is not representative of all deliberations, she does argue that in many cases gender differences do exist and influence the course of deliberation and the outcome.

A short note on jury deliberations: juries are closed sites of deliberation usually concerning topics that do not engage citizens the way open, public forms of deliberation such as town halls or forums do. Closed juried deliberations may not have the same expectations of outcomes that open public deliberations may have. Citizens are recruited for jury participation; citizens recruit themselves to public deliberations/town halls because they feel compelled to better understand and discuss a topic. How citizens then orient themselves toward the issue and their desire to participate affects how they deliberate.

Resolving the Debate Between Deliberative and Difference Democrats

The theoretical literature from difference democrats combined with empirical findings from gender-based expectation-states studies find that, given certain contexts, women experience deliberative settings profoundly different than men do. Not only is there a difference in speech and affect patterns, but their participation patterns are significantly altered. Women speak less, are less likely to be considered leaders within the group or have authority to direct conversations, and, when trying to be assertive, experience a backlash that prevents their ideas from seeming credibility when compared to men's ideas. Women end up having to capitulate by combining assertiveness with friendliness and temerity – in essence, they must play by their gender roles in order to get ahead. These problems go away when women are able to deliberate or work in same-sex settings. In short, according to difference and expectation-states scholars, gender matters and, depending on the gender salience of the situation, dramatically affect the discussion and outcome of deliberation.

However, the limited empirical findings on the specific subject of deliberation indicate the rational model of deliberative democracy does not affirm the inequalities that difference democrats theorize exist. While women do speak differently during deliberation, they neither experience unequal access or treatment within deliberation. In fact, deliberation is shaped by women's interactions as much as it is shaped by men's. If deliberation is affected by gendered types of talk and input via the likes of storytelling, citizens do not feel the process to be any less worthwhile. While the studies I cited above are methodologically sound and provide insightful and important results, all have limitations preventing a qualified resolution to the inequality question. And so, the debate between difference and deliberative democrats is at a standstill. Each have both theoretical and empirical evidence on their side, yet none is conclusive – at least in for the realm of deliberation.

This dissertation seeks to resolve the debate posed by difference democrats over whether deliberative democracy remedies the problem of inequality. Evaluating primary social conventions such as the normative assumptions of speech within the institution of the public sphere requires a sociological lens. In assessing this issue, I seek to answer what types of talk are used during structured, face-to-face public deliberations and whether there a difference between the types of talk used by women and men in these deliberations, whether the group composition of deliberative forums affects the types of talk within citizen deliberations, and how the gendered makeup of public forums shape and change the deliberative process.

The following chapter will detail the analysis methodology and results from my qualitative and content investigations into the possibility of gender inequality in National Issues Forums deliberations. The chapters will be based on a series of one of three forum types: predominantly women forums, predominantly men forums, and mixed-sex forums. Conclusions

will be drawn and discussed in the last chapter. At that point, I will provide some insight into whether deliberative neutralists or difference and gender scholars are not just theoretically right but empirically right about the possibility of rational deliberation being inherently unequal.

Chapter 5 - Research Design and Methods of Analysis

The theoretical divide over whether deliberation solves the problem of gender inequality in the public sphere is one that needs to be addressed sociologically. Ending the stalemate between deliberation and difference requires systematic research into whether deliberation, and in particular the National Issues Forums (NIF) model of deliberation is a site of gender inequality. This chapter, self-explanatory by its name, will detail the history and prevalence of the NIF model and the benefits for using it as the deliberative model for investigating gender inequality, the forum design and participants used in this study, as well as the general research questions highlighted in the previous chapter and specific inquiries into the three different types of forum group compositions.

An Example of a Deliberative Model: The National Issues Forum Model

The philosophy of the NIF model

One of the most popular and successful forum types is the National Issues Forums (NIF) model of deliberation (Gastil & Dillard, 1999; Ryfe, 2006). By best estimates, over four thousand NIF public deliberations have been held in one year alone (Gastil, 2008). NIF is a non-partisan, nationwide network of individuals and groups who sponsor public forums in local communities (Melville, et al., 2005). Funded and organized in large part by the Kettering Foundation in Dayton, OH, the NIF model is based upon the premise that "democracy does not begin with elections; it begins with conversations" (McAfee, McKenzie, & Mathews, 1990, p. 4). Deliberation, under the NIF model, is the act of weighing carefully and determining what actions are in the best interest of the public as a whole. During forums, citizens talk though an issue with their peers; they begin "talking to understand our options, face up to our limitations, and put ourselves in a position to make a serious choice" (McAfee, McKenzie, & Mathews,

1990, p. 17). Typically participants who come to NIF forums do not represent a special interest or group like they would at a town hall meeting or an issue hearing. Instead, participants come as themselves, representing only their own ideas and opinions. In doing so, the NIF model differentiates itself from other political processes by limiting out public interests that would possibly provide some sort of undue influence on the group. To make significant changes in their communities, citizens must be able to act collectively by making sound or wise judgments (Public Deliberation, n.d).

The NIF model assumes that deliberative conversations among citizens can help communities reach quality policy judgments on tough issues at the local, state, and national levels. Subjects to deliberate run the gamut, from abstract topics on the value of 21st century education methods and America's role in the world to more specific subjects such as the energy crisis, obesity, and health care. Local organizations and institutional affiliates of NIF often investigate more specific topics that directly address the needs of a community group or local political issue. For example, my work with the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy, a Center for Public Life with the Kettering Foundation and an NIF affiliate, has created issue books on the then-proposed Manhattan, KS indoor smoking ban as well as a deliberative guide for the National Alliance for Mental Illness-Kansas to use during their annual meeting. On these issues, the NIF frames the topic not as different policy options, but rather as competing, often contradictory, but sometimes complimentary value choices that participants must work through. The NIF model is designed to emphasize this process, which is called "choice work." Gastil (2008, p. 32) writes,

> All of the national issues that NIF addresses, such as health care and criminal justice, are those that 'engage our most deeply held convictions about what we value.' On these

> issues, 'policy options pull and tug on our values.' Real choice work forces us to acknowledge the negative implications of our favored choices and the positive value of alternatives; we must see the effects of policies on ourselves as well as others. Through careful and empathic listening, we force ourselves to come to understand and respect other people's perspectives, and we combine diverse viewpoints to create 'a sense of the whole.' When we engage in this kind of deliberation, political 'conflict is not only among us, it is within us.'

By focusing on value tradeoffs and not just policy, the NIF model encourages not just talk but actual deliberation (Gastil, 2008). The value of the NIF forums is that participants are continually reflecting on these choices and talking with other citizens, what were once previously private preferences become public judgments (Gastil & Dillard, 1999). The implications are two-fold: one, to borrow from the NIF vocabulary, citizens are able to "tell a comprehensive, public story" about what the group wishes to see done (or not done) to solve a problem (McAfee, McKenzie, & Mathews, 1990, p. 25); and two, the choice work done by citizen participants can be used to inform a range of possible policy options for decision-makers.

The NIF Deliberative Method

Forum organization

NIF deliberations feature trained facilitators who lead face-to-face groups of 10-15 citizens in deliberative discussions. As Gastil and Dillard (1999) note in their review of NIF forum organizing and hosting materials, the NIF process works best in small groups of 5-20 people because the model stresses the process of engaged choicework and deliberating issues thoroughly. Acknowledging that there is no best way to organize a forum, the NIF model leaves

room for a lot of variation in discursive rules of the forum, forum structure, time limits, place and so on.

There are a few actions and processes that the NIF model does prefer to hold constant. Usually before the forum starts, participating citizens are asked to preview an issue guidebook summarizing at least three policy or value choices with which to deliberate. Choices in the issue book present a balanced, factual, and informative view of the topic starting with the public's values and not expert opinions (Kadlec & Friedman, 2007). For example, one of the most recently published issue guidebooks is titled "Economic Security: How Should We Take Charge of Our Future?" The book outlines three approaches to the topic: (1) citizens should act more responsibly with their money; (2) citizens should look out for each other more; (3) the U.S. economy should grow its way out of the current recession. By framing the issue with three different approaches, the idea is that solutions to such major problems is not black and white (Naming and Framing, 2010). Some participants may not agree with any of the approaches; most likely, however, is that the group will agree with some parts of all three approaches. Then, the choicework begins: what of the parts of the three options the group likes can they live with and without. Because the issue guidebooks direct participants to weigh opposing ideas, the guidebooks encourage deliberation and not just talk about the issue (Kadlec & Friedman, 2007).

Each forum has a small group facilitator or moderator who is trained to be neutral, avoid conflict, summarize input, and draw connections between various comments. Forum facilitators are concerned with creating open, group atmospheres as well as ensuring the satisfaction of forum participants (Mansbridge, et al., 2006). In fact, NIF facilitators encourage careful listening of others' opinions so citizens can come to understand differing perspectives and viewpoints (Gastil, 2008). The first task of the facilitator when starting a public forum is to

announce the ground rules and process to the participants. While the National Issues Forums Institute has a series of ground rules available for use on their website, most institutions and organizations hosting forums use some combination of suggested and unique rules that reflect the context and setting.

Next, the facilitator briefly introduces the topic by reading the listed summary in the facilitator's guidebook and then playing a 10-15 minute introductory video that explains the topic. Moderators then lead the group into the first of three phases of deliberation (Blong, 2008). During the opening of the forum, the facilitator begins the discussion by asking the group to share what their personal connection to the topic is, what brought them to the forum, or what is of the most interest to the participant about the topic. The goal of such a line of questioning is to get the group to find areas of common ground by initiating the process of people's connections to the issue and to get the participants thinking of the already existing values they hold about the topic. The second phase is where the group considers each of the three framed approaches to the topic. The facilitator leads the group through the outlined positives and then outlined negatives of each approach as listed in the guidebook. The participants can address these pro's and con's as they wish. When the group needs a little push to consider a new train of thought or help the group work through a tough point, the facilitator can interject with a series of moves, types of talk or discursive strategies that can help further the discussion (Dillard, 2011; Lukyanova, 2009). During the conclusion or final phase of the deliberation, facilitators encourage the group to make some judgments and find common ground. Facilitators may ask participants to consider the tradeoffs specifically, they may also ask why the issue is so difficult to decide. At the end, the facilitator may choose to sum up what the common ground or at least common arguments heard were and then ask the participants to continue considering and discussing the topic.

The benefits of the NIF model

Because the NIF model is, perhaps, the most widely used deliberative format, there is a breadth of academic research on the efficacy of the model. The most recent summary of research was done by Gastil and Dillard in 1999. While this review is now over 10 years old, the baseline of benefits their work notes is still valid. At this point, I do not intend to provide a detailed review of all of the NIF literature; instead, I will note the arguments provided by Gastil and Dillard and update with some additional studies.

Existing empirical studies and reviews of NIF forums indicate three positive benefits for participants deliberating in this type of format: political sophistication increase, changes in political opinions, an increase in participant's interest in politics, and a change in the public nature of political talk. The first order goals of deliberation, and in particular the NIF model, are issue learning, improved democratic attitudes and skills (Carcasson, 2009). By deliberating through a process that asks participants to reason through tradeoffs and benefits to come to a reasonable series of expectations, citizens develop a new way of thinking about a topic, thus developing a more democratic attitude as well as skill set about how to consider issues. Because multiple views are expressed during the forum, participants are more likely to see the discussion as being fair and balanced, giving more credence to evidence and arguments that come from deliberation (Gastil, 2006). As such, the NIF format increases the self-efficacy or power citizen participants have to think critically and develop a public voice, tell a public story about an issue, and feeling more confident in being involved in the community to solve problems after participating (Doble, et al., 1996). Deliberative Polling, the method using the NIF method combined with large group polling has seen similar results (Fishkin & Luskin, 1999; Luskin, Fishkin, & Jowell, 2002).

The second major benefit, a change in political opinions, is something required by deliberation (see Chambers' definition in chapter two). By asking citizen participants to listen to others, to consider other points of view, and to continually weigh options and tradeoffs, experimental and survey research has found that NIF participants often change their views or, if their views aren't changed, their views become more nuanced. Doble and Richardson's (1991) research on NIF participants finds a move toward more moderate policy choices as well as a willingness among participants to compromise on options. Gastil, Black and Moskovitz (2008) had a similar finding. In fact, small group deliberants were more likely to disengage their previously held partisan beliefs and either find some sort of moderate stance or agree with the approach representing the other side of the political divide. Often, NIF deliberations lead participants to become civically engaged. Gastil and Dillard (1999)'s survey finds much anecdotal evidence that participants become more politically active, aware of the political events in the local communities and more willing to join a campaign or volunteer.

The last major benefit is the change in political conversations and behaviors. The good thing about deliberating face-to-face in small groups is that citizens begin to build connections among one another. Despite the difference based criticism of perspective sharing, citizens finding things in common in turn build networks related around those agreements and commonalities. Also, in recognizing that the NIF approach is perhaps more fair and political neutral when compared to town halls or public debates on topics, citizens Gastil and Dillard cite a study in which it was reported that citizens were more likely to rejoin the political conversation without fear of uncivil discourse or discursive retribution oftentimes found in other discussion formats.

There are a lot of positives that come from engaging the NIF framework when discussing contentious issues locally. While the format is not designed to lead to a series of proposed solutions, nor is it meant to create broad scale social capital for communities, its relatively modest goals of building democratic attitudes and skills has lead to a set of modest benefits that certainly make the NIF model more advantageous of a political process when compared to the politics of the status quo.

Why the NIF Model For This Study?

In arguing that the NIF model has been the subject of many studies proving its worth, I also wish to make the argument that the NIF model is not just an appropriate, but good deliberative method to study for the purposes of this dissertation. One reason is that the NIF process is popular, not just with academics but with civic organizations and citizens alike. As I noted above, research indicates that people get something from NIF forums, whether it is increasing their knowledge about the topic or a change in attitudes. The process works. It achieves at minimum first order goals and at best, it increases the political power of citizens and the efficacy of democracy. Because the NIF model popular and widely used, the process of political talk has become embedded in most of the communities surveyed in this dissertation. As an extension of this line of argument, the NIF forums attract a wide range of citizens that might not normally come to deliberate (Gastil & Dillard, 1999). Also, because the process is relatively uniform, NIF forums in Manhattan, KS will look similar in structure to forums in New York, NY. Since forums do not differ dramatically either in content or structure, any study of the process extending across locales and topics is more reliable and probably more generalizable than comparing town hall meetings or other local discussion forums.

Both the philosophy and design of the NIF process is specifically meant to remedy the problems with democracy highlighted in chapter one. While deliberation in general was designed in response to the troubles of status quo politics, the specific formatting of the NIF is meant to be responsive to the lack of citizenship currently exhibited and the lack of trust in the political and journalistic processes. The stated focus of the NIF process is getting citizens to build their democratic skills through face-to-face deliberations. The NIF model is not just political conversation between people, but actively creates a citizenry that that recognizes the need for a public focus to solutions. Also, because the process of deliberating requires citizens to listen to others and judge their opinions and ideas, citizens can begin to trust that NIF outcomes, whether just common ground or something more substantial, will have been carefully considered, fair, and inclusive. This sort of information gathering and processing model attempts to correct for a lack of faith in the political system by creating better evidence.

With that said, the NIF model straddles a fine line between relying on the rational precepts of the classical model of deliberation while integrating more modern notions of expression, emotion, story and inclusion, making it not just an appropriate site for study but an excellent vehicle in which to examine the inclusive properties of deliberation. Whether it intends to or not, the NIF model draws heavily on Habermas's ideal communicative situation and other models of in the classical, rational vein of deliberation. The "unifying and consensus bringing force of argument" is precisely the give and take, weighing, advocating, and modifying process that the NIF model proclaims as the process of choice work. But, instead of relying on facts as the basis of argument, the NIF model attempts to recognize a wider variety of speech tools that would allow for more voices and opinions to be heard. The ground rules used by facilitators typically do not limit out the types of discourse (except uncivil discourse), while usually

encouraging people to speak any way they feel comfortable. But, an implicit standard that the NIF model relies on is the Habermasian concept of justification. Even when using stories to argue a point, a participant must justify the use of the story, the moral point of the story, as well as what the impact is on the larger discussion. The question that concerns this research, however, is whether the facilitator's ground rules are enough to ensure that non-rational modes of talk are accepted and worked through the force of the best argument or choice work process, especially when spoken by women. Neutrality also plays a substantial part in the efficacy of the NIF model. Indeed, the NIF model attempts to be inclusive by being neutral, thus relying on the neutrality standard far more heavily than other concepts of deliberation. By being silent on political orientation and using three approaches that run the spectrum of political and social ideas, it creates a universal space that is devoid of political interest so that the result is all voices are welcome and even necessary to create deliberative exchanges.

Because of its popularity, the NIF model may be the best, most reasonable option for supplementing aggregative democracy with deliberative. Therefore, the NIF model is a great tool to study the prominent and perplexing feature of gender inequality. In essence, this dissertation is as much a referendum on the efficacy of the NIF process as it is deliberation as a whole. I make no arguments about other models and couch my results strictly in terms of what he NIF framework offers and where is suffers. If the NIF model is sufficiently inclusive, then advocates of deliberation can breathe a sigh of relief that their most popular forum method meets the criterion of inclusion. If not, then the credibility of deliberative democracy to be a real alternative could take a serious hit.

Forum Data and Participants

Forum Topics and Description

This dissertations studies a total of fourteen different NIF forums. In order to gain a variety of data, the forums in this study vary both geographically and on the topic up for discussion. Four public forums, those in Cedar Rapids, IA, El Paso, TX, Rindge, NH, and Mesa, AZ, were convened on behalf of the Kettering Foundation, the National Issues Forums Institute and videotaped for the PBS show "A Public Voice" in 2005. The Kettering Foundation has given me permission to use these recordings and transcripts in this and future publications. The two forums held in Kansas City, MO at the publishing headquarters of the Kansas City Star newspaper were sponsored by the newspaper, the Kettering Foundation, the National Issues Forums Institute and Kansas State University's Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy. These two forums, along with a third forum at the Johnson County, KS public library and a forum held at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene, KS were convened as a part of the Kansas City Star's 2010 community engagement effort titled the Midwest Democracy Project. The other eight deliberative forums were held at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene, KS, at the Kansas State University Manhattan, KS Alumni Center, and at Butler County Community College in El Dorado, KS. These forums, all with the topic of health care were conducted in late 2008 or early 2009 by the Institute for Civic Discourse along with the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene, KS. The health care forums were sponsored by the Kettering Foundation as a part of their annual series of forums on a pressing sociopolitical issue. All forums were conducted with facilitators trained in the NIF model and each forum used the requisite issue guide book and introductory video to forward the conversation.

Participants in this study deliberated on one of four NIF topics: immigration, health care, economic changes, and education. The four forums in Cedar Rapids, El Paso, Rindge, and Mesa focused on the topic of immigration. Titled "The New Challenges of American Immigration: What Should We Do?," this issue guide book posed three approaches. The first approach argued that immigration should be slowed to allow immigrants more time to assimilate into American culture; the second approach argued that America was built by immigrants and so need to welcome newcomers despite potential costs; third, this approach contends that immigrants strain social service budgets, compete for jobs, and exceed America's carrying capacity, therefore, immigration policy should restrict the number of immigrants legally allowed into the country. The Johnson County forum, one Abilene forum and one Kansas City forum were convened to discuss the issue of "Economic Security: How Should We Take Charge of Our Future?" This topic offered three options: making better choices about how individuals spend their money, the need to look out more for each other and others in the community, and, last, grow the economy out of the recession. The four remaining Abilene, KS forums in addition to the Alumni Center forum and the El Dorado, KS forum featured deliberations on "Coping With the Cost of Health Care: How Do We Pay For What We Need?" Approach one posited that citizens need to reduce the threat of financial ruin driven by health care costs by mandating insurance coverage. Approach two holds that out-of-control health care costs must be reigned in so that citizens can afford health insurance. Approach three asked whether health care coverage is a right that should be afforded to all citizens.

Forum Participants

A total of 145 citizens participated across the fourteen NIF deliberative forums. 71 women participated along with 74 men (Table 2). Since the status expectation literature indicates

group composition is a critical factor in determining the salience of gender, the fourteen forums were divided based upon composition. Four forums had a predominance of female participants in them, three had a predominance of male participants and the remaining nine forums were mixed-sex. Predominance in this case was determined to be a majority of one sex or another. For example, since one of the Abilene health care forums had five male and only two female participants, it was placed under the predominantly male category. When there was an even mixture of sexes or when there was not a majority of one sex or another, the forum was placed in the mixed-sex category.

Table 2. Forum description for predominantly female forums, predominantly male forums and mixed-sex forums.

	Forum location	*Subject*	*Number of women*	*Number of men*	*Facilitator sex*
Predominantly Female Forums	Kansas City, MO	Education	9	3	Female
	Abilene, KS	Health Care	5	1	Female
	Abilene, KS	Health Care	5	2	Male
	El Dorado, KS	Health Care	9	2	Male
Predominantly Male Forums	Mesa, AZ	Immigration	3	10	Male
	Kansas City, MO	Economy	2	6	Male
	Abilene, KS	Health Care	2	5	Female
Mixed -Sex Forums	Cedar Rapids, IA	Immigration	8	8	Male
	El Paso, TX	Immigration	6	8	Male
	Rindge, NH	Immigration	5	8	Male and Female
	Abilene, KS	Economy	6	7	Female
	Johnson Co, KS	Economy	2	3	Female
	Abilene, KS	Health Care	3	4	Female
	Manhattan, KS	Health Care	6	7	Male

It is important to note that most NIF forums are mixed-sex; predominantly men or women forums are not the norm. Thus, the majority of mixed-sex forums represents a realistic example of group composition in NIF settings. Transcribing duties were performed by either

undergraduate research assistants with the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy (all health care forums) or an independent, off site transcription service (education, immigration, and economy forums). Each transcriber was given the task of not just transcribing the audio recordings but also to label each speaker as man or woman. Transcribers were not made aware of the nature of this study so as to prevent any coding bias. After receiving the transcripts I reviewed all audio recordings in comparison to the transcripts to check for accuracy in dialogue and in coding.

While no data exists on the demographics of those who attended these specific forums, Goidel, et al. (2008) provides evidence from a series of non-NIF forums done in Louisiana about who does attend public deliberations. According to their study, attendance at public deliberations is anywhere from 5-20 participants – similar to the numbers of participants in this study. Also similar to my data is that more men than women tend to participate in public forums on a 50% to 40% basis. My data also indicates that typically more men than women participate in public political settings, although by a smaller majority. A majority of participants in Goidel, et. al's study averaged between $10,000-$49,999 and $50,000-$99,999 in income, indicating that most of the participants are working or middle class residents. Most participants are between the ages of 35-64 and are married.

Because I cannot identify the exact characteristics of the participants, the people in this study might seem to be treated as generic subjects rather than more dynamic participants. As a limitation to this dataset, this is partially due to the fact that I do not wish to insert or attribute status to the participants (beyond the sex and gender status that is the subject of this study) that may not be easily identified. In some cases, participants do use their positions to give more depth to their opinions and ideas. In the El Paso immigration forum for example, an immigration

attorney identifies herself as such and speaks as someone who deals with the trials of immigrants; a social worker in the same forum is able to use her occupation as a way to describe her interactions with the often poor immigrants she sees. In the health care forums, the physicians in attendance are able to discuss medical issues from their occupational standing. When participants did share their occupations or social statuses, it was their own choice; facilitators typically do not encourage group members to release that information, nor in the case of the forums in this study did the facilitator prompt for the group to share their jobs. Even though facilitators do not specifically call for such information, participants often divulge their statuses because those statuses (teacher, doctor, student, immigrant, accountant) is wrapped up in the personal stake a person has in the given topic. Because the facilitators do not require such information to be disclosed, not all of the forums had participants who relied on their statuses to support their opinions, and thus, it became difficult for me to accurately identify a person's status. The implication is also that participants in these forums did not always know the occupational status of the other group members. In many cases it was unknown (but could be intimated) what a person's occupation was. In the El Dorado forum, for example, the facilitator asked the participants to disclose issues that "strike home for you." The typical response was about a person's relationship to health insurance (had or had not) or their opinion on access and cost. Thus, participants themselves had limited information about their group mates. In reviewing the forum transcript data, I attempted to keep this limitation in mind.

The data used in this dissertation is not without limitations. At the end of each chapter I attempted to highlight limitations of the specific group-level datasets, specifically, the size and generalizability of the data. However, there are other limitations that should be taken into consideration that are less a problem of the data and more a problem of deliberation itself. In

general, self-selected participants in public deliberations tend to be disproportionally white, middle class or affluent college graduates (Ryfe, 2005; Karpowitz, et al, 2009). Organizations may find participants through their own social networks and typically do not spend a great deal of time or resources recruiting. Thus self-selection creates rather homogenous groups. Ryfe (2005) highlights research showing that civic participation is correlated with belonging to social networks that privilege civic identities and make access to political processes easy (Verba, et al, 1995). Civic participation is also associated with education levels which correlates with other variables such as race and class (Conway, 2000; Nie, et al, 1996). Thus, self-selection usually leaves groups of participants who are more likely to be white, college-educated and middle class. Participants in all of the forums presented here were self-selected. For most of the forums, the hosting or convening institution advertised the forum through mailing lists, advertisements in newspapers, blogs, and word of mouth. Participants were not selected for certain characteristics, nor did the forums search for a certain look or mixture of diversity. While I can only make an educated guess as to the characteristics of those who attended these forums, I posit they may be similar enough to Goidel and colleagues' findings. The deliberative participants in these fourteen forums were probably in the same age range of 35-64, and thus are more established in their careers. It is also likely that most of the participants were middle class and working class professionals. In one of the Abilene health care forums, the group was populated by medical professionals – nurses, doctors, and hospital administrators. In the forums held on college campuses or towns such as the Manhattan, KS (Kansas State University), El Paso, TX (University of Texas – El Paso), El Dorado, KS (Butler Community College) and Mesa, AZ (Mesa Community College), undergraduate and graduate students were a larger part of the participant population, thus moving the median age of the group down.

Self-selection can be beneficial. The participants who attended the forums did so because they were interested in the topic and felt compelled to deliberate. As a part of this self-selection, participants were not guided by any researcher or practitioner into a specific small group table to create gender equity. In settings like the Abilene health care forums where there were several small group deliberations, participants migrated to tables on their own and without guidance from any forum administrator. These forums present a real-world, unmoderated example of discourse in NIF deliberative forums. It is also likely that the participants in these fourteen forums had some previous connection to deliberation, either because they have participated in NIF forums previously or have a tie to the organizing group such as the Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene, KS or the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy or with the much larger National Issues Forums Institute. Despite their previous connections, the participants all attended the proceedings because they were interested in the deliberative topic. Thus, this dissertation is unique because of the self-selection, non-experimental format of this study.

Research Questions and Analysis Methods

Based upon the deliberative democracy, difference democracy, gender and expectation states theory literatures, I consider three general, related questions that will be asked of the predominantly female, predominantly-male, and mixed-sex forums:

1. What types of talk are used during structured face-to-face public deliberations? Is there a difference between the types of talk used by women and men in these deliberations?
2. Does the group composition of deliberative forums (i.e., the gendered context in which citizens deliberate) affect the talk within citizen deliberations?
3. How does the gendered makeup of public forums shape and change the deliberative process?

With the exception of question one, the methods of analysis for each of these questions will differ depending on the group composition, which I will detail in the upcoming sections.

First, let me operationalize one term that will be used throughout the remainder of this dissertation. At the heart of this study are the broader questions of whether people, particularly women participate in public deliberations, how they do so, and to what effect. In the most simplest of terms, I take participation to mean the very act of speaking, of turn taking. The act of uttering a statement, whether it is a simple "I agree," or a more lengthy story or opinion, the act of taking a turn and speaking is the way I chose to code participation. As I argue in later chapters, even a short statement such as "I agree" becomes important given the group composition, thus I chose not to add qualifiers to what participation meant and to use the simplest definition.

Question One: What Types of Talk Are Used During Public Deliberations?

Question one considers the possibility of different types of talk within deliberative forums. Certainly, the debate between reason-giving and narrative-affective talk is at the heart of much of the difference debate. Using previously established definitions and examples of narrative and reason-giving claims, narrative talk was coded based upon the degree to which these claims are present in each deliberation. In studying the process of deliberation and the content of shared stories, Ryfe (2006) purposefully advances a minimalist definition in which stories have a beginning, middle, and end and are centered on a problem. Stories are also situated within the context of the deliberative situation and are in essence interactive (Black, 2008, 2009; Ryfe, 2006). Stories, according to Polletta and Lee, (1) set up the situation in which the story takes place, (2) features a series of actions with a beginning, middle and end, and (3)

includes an evaluative statement about the story or topic. Together, these conceptions define storytelling in relation to identity and cohesiveness. An example of a narrative claim would be:

> I was a pastor for twenty-five years and one of the annual problems with the church was to look at the [health insurance] premium that they were going to have to pay for the pastor and it just grew and grew and our pool was so small in relationship to the total population that their insurance company finally went out of business. It was like $12,000 to $14,000 a year, which is twice as much as the average now.

Reasoned claims have typically been defined in relation to and opposite of storytelling. As such, reason-giving are those statements using reason and not an affect or story. Polletta and Lee identify four ways in which storytelling differs from reasons: stories integrate explanation; stories are detached from contextual discourse; stories are allusive; and elicit responses in story form. Reasons in deliberative contexts are justifications for opinions based on the opinions consistency with general principles and are also practical ("that option has worked elsewhere"), normative ("that is the fair or democratic thing to do"), or symbolic ("that option signals our commitment to freedom or environmental sustainability") [Polletta & Lee, 2006, p. 708]. The importance of stories is not that personal stories have a particular, personal quality but that stories integrate the specific and the general by way of plot. The plot provides the structure of the story; it orders events to highlight important qualities and excludes those that are not. Plots are drawn from a common, cultural stock and make sense against a backdrop of similar stories (Polletta, 1998; Polkinghorne, 1988; Polletta & Lee, 2006). In this way, the specific evaluative statements as stories made by, for example, female participants can help listeners comprehend like and unlike experiences (Polletta & Lee, 2006).

Coding of narrative and rational claims was done by two research assistants at the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy. At the beginning of this project, four coders including the author worked to code three independent forum transcripts for narrative statements. The goal of this exercise was testing coders' understanding of the operational definition of storytelling and to build consistency in the identification of stories shared in forums. Coders then compared results until a minimum of two-thirds agreement on narrative statements was reached. The coders then coded the first three transcripts from this project to re-test reliability. Once the two-thirds agreement was attained, one researcher coded the remaining forums.

Lukyanova (2009) provides an excellent taxonomy of deliberative speech in which I draw much of the analysis in the following chapters from. One way deliberation occurs is in the interplay between "generic" and "specific" evaluations which often determines the salience a person's perspective. Generic evaluations are large scale, global evaluations that involve talking about the issue in general terms, i.e., evaluations of the relationship between immigrants (e.g., "immigrants") and American's as a comprehensive group (e.g., "American people"). Often the government or economy is an actor. For example, this turn from one of the participants from the Mesa forum provides several instances of global or generic level evaluations:

> Where would this country be today without the massive immigration that took place in the early 1900's? Would we be as wealthy as a society as we have? And there were certainly economic costs back then, and at that time my sense is society was a little less welcoming and supportive of them, opening arms to help. But I do think the short-term and long-term costs is a good measure. I think it is also that issue of concentrations. You can overwhelm. And I think that one of the public services that deals...pays the toughest cost, the most cost is schools. Because we really do have, in particular in this state and

> other states too, a commitment to all kids. And we want them all to do well. Heard the superintendent of the school talk the other day. In the morning, they have kids speaking native languages, forty seven native languages who are attending school. And so some of them are English, others are not. And that is a very direct expense and cost. What's interesting, though is usually we see those kids a few years later and they have assimilated in terms of language very effectively and well but it is an upfront cost.

Specific level evaluations are at the other end of the continuum. Specific utterances focus on the evaluation of specific groups of actors. To illustrate:

> I saw that with the Somali refugees. A lot of them case to Cedar Rapids and for a couple of weeks they got food, they've got money, they've got rides, they've got some furniture, but then there is a cutoff point. And I mean, it was real evident in the community when that happened. But at the same time, I've seen a lot of those folks now, they've sort of done it on their own. Not to say that it wasn't perfect, or that they didn't have rocky times, but they're working, they've got cars, have got kids now. You wouldn't know that six or seven years ago they came to this country with literally what they had on their backs.

Often, specific evaluations were used when the group wished to discuss specific examples or situations.

Question Two: Does Group Composition Affect the Type of Talk in Deliberation?

Question two asks whether group composition affects the types of talk citizens use in deliberations. Certainly, the difference and expectation states bodies of literature contend that in gender salient situations, group composition has an effect on talk. To investigate this question, I

ask several sub-questions that will help determine both gender salience and the effects of group composition.

How much do women and men talk in deliberative settings that tend to be gender homogenous, heterogeneous or at least in settings that minimize the salience of gender? A host of studies finds that in gender neutral settings, women talk as much as men do but as gender becomes more salient, women talk less. An analysis of this question can be done by a simple sum of total speaking turns by sex for each of the forums in the three major categories of group compositions. In predominantly men and mixed-sex forums, there is a question of whether women initiate and engage in contentious exchanges or relegate themselves to asking questions or offering information.

How are different types of talk responded to? For this dissertation, identifying the types of stories used in each forum setting as well as the types of identities and markers used and how participants respond to stories will be the same. All three forum types will be tracked separately to gauge whether women share the same types of identities regardless of context or whether, given the makeup of the deliberation those identities and markers change to reflect the dominant sex type. I wish to be aware of gender differences in responses – if women's responses to women's stories are affirming or negating and whether men's responses to women's narratives intend to refute claims made in those stories.

Lukyanova provides a way to look at the quality of conversation by investigating how different groups acknowledge each other and whether they make concessions in their speech. Challenges can either be aggressive or soft. Aggressive challenges are deemed to be utterances where the speaker presents little compromise in their argument; a soft challenge involves significant concessions by the speaker. Aggressive challenges involve a clear preference for one

evaluative model over another to the extent that any concession should be discarded rather than incorporated into the evaluative model. To illustrate an aggressive challenge:

> I think within my community, first of all, let me just say one thing – the majority of the immigrants who come here, come here for economic reasons. Those who do come, do not come to stay on the system. They've come here for independence. That means financial independence, cultural independence. You keep saying assimilation. Assimilation as far as language is concerned. But they have their own culture. What is acceptable to them is not acceptable to us in some measure. You're talking about communities like Lewiston, Maine. They had initially like 1,000 Somalis came at first. They brought their families. They found that Lewiston was a wonderful place to live and they decided – Hey this is nice. Let's start businesses here. And they brought their families. And now I think there's like 5,000 of them there. The same thing has happened here in Cedar Rapids. You have Somalis, you have Kosovars, you have the people from Bosnia. They were brought here in resettlement groups. They found it was nice. They decided to stay. Most of them have businesses. There are very few of them who are on the system. You have – they don't want to live on welfare. To them, that's very denigrating. They want to be independent financially and culturally. In our mosque here, we have people from more than 34 different countries. And very few of them are on the system. I think for communities like Cedar Rapids and Lewiston, it's not an unobtainable thing to bring these people. They've added very - a deep richness to this city. Cedar Rapids has got a community of Lebanese that have been here for more than 100 years. And they've added to this city tremendously. You have people who say – It's no longer a Christian country. So what? That's what America is. You've got to accept us whether

> you like it or not. And no longer calling Christmas break Christmas break because it insults you, well what about us? Our religion – don't discount us because we're not Christian, we're not Jewish. I don't know any Jews who celebrate Christmas.

A soft challenge involves concessions, often with details in the form of personal experiences that can serve as proof that the speaker is making a concession. The soft challenge also recognizes different perspectives. To illustrate:

> I think one of these – and I'm married to a Lebanese that goes to the Mosque – I think one of the issues is taking from the personal. I've got a fellow who was a refugee from Iraq that worked for me and honestly I don't know if there's anyone I respect more in the world and this guy came with nothing and now he owns a lot of properties and he has a lot of business interests. He's a hard worker. I think most people would say that people coming in are hard workers. There's no – in general. But I also tell you that there's limits to what this country can absorb. We do have financial constraints. We have constraints socially. And I would beg anybody to go out to southern California or Arizona and not say that those areas haven't been overwhelmed with immigrants that they can't handle. You would take neighborhoods – even around LA – there used to be single family neighborhoods, and now you have situations where you got 5 cars parked in the front lawn. I know this from personal experience. And multiple families living in a house designed for one family. That's the reality. But at the personal level, these are good people. And they are generally hard working or they probably wouldn't be here. But there are – this country does have limits to what we can afford. We're not unlimited where we can just allow anybody in the world to come here because they're in need. It would be nice if we could, but not realistic.

Even though women outnumber men in these forums, do women take on leadership roles? This questions is a little more difficult to answer. The initial mode of analysis is to sum the number of times each participant spoke; the participants with the highest number of total turns taken during the deliberation may be seen as the discursive leader of the group. For sure, the highest turn taking count does not necessarily mean that participant is the leader. The next step is then to ask which ideas end up having force or group cohesion behind them and make it to the conclusion stage of the deliberation.

A content analysis was done based upon Lasker and Guidry's (2009) study power and influence in community decision-making situations. While studying five different community workgroups, Lasker and Guidry noted the participants represented a heterogeneous group with different voices and opinions but question whether those who are traditionally excluded, the poorest, least educated, most marginalized community members had a driving voice in their decision-making or whether those citizens were along for the ride. As the question of power in relation to gender is a critical one, examining the role of power in deliberation is important. In uncovering power in decision-making, Lasker and Guidry begin by tracking ideas presented in order to determine who had an active voice in the deliberation. Secondly, the authors looked at whose voices were most influential by tracking their ideas over time to see how they changed. If an idea was important to certain groups, the authors looked to see if those concerns were addressed or how strongly those ideas influenced the track of deliberation.

If women's ideas and opinions do gain sway or if women do become leaders of the deliberation, what are the discursive strategies they use to obtain authority? Analysis of this question is twofold. Building on the methods used by Lasker and Guidry, I look at those segments of the deliberation where women's claims withstood challenges, particularly by men in

the predominantly men and mixed-sex forums. I examine what discursive strategies were used by women in these instances and additionally note whether those strategies differ by gender compositions.

Question Three: How Does Context Shape Deliberation?

To answer this question, a more global understanding of how the deliberation functioned is required. One way of answering whether women's talk shapes deliberation is to assess whether deliberations talking place can be described as "good deliberation." Polletta and Lee's *Listening to the City* study evaluates whether storytelling in online forums creates good deliberation. Good deliberation is noted to include fostering open discussion with a diversity of speakers and opinions, the engagement of claims, the introduction of new issues, and a lack of manipulation when coming to common ground (Bohman, 1996; Guttman & Thompson, 1996; Mansbridge, 1983; Young, 2002). The quasi-rhetorical analysis performed Polletta and Lee evaluates the stories told against the measures of good deliberation – do stories allow for more opinions to be shared, to citizens respond to stories, do stories allow for new issues to arise, and does it prevent manipulation. In categorizing what types of stories were told and using content analysis and illustrative quotes to gauge the purpose of the story (an in, citizens told stories of what the World Trade Towers meant to them personally or sketching out future scenarios for rebuilding). Their study concludes by noting when women speak using affect and stories in advancing claims good deliberation ensues.

Summary

The theoretical divide over whether deliberation solves the problem of gender inequality in the public sphere is one that needs to be addressed sociologically. Ending the stalemate between deliberation and difference requires systematic research into whether gender-specific

enclaves of deliberations create good deliberation (Karpowitz, et. al, 2009). This dissertation builds upon earlier examinations of this important question by looking at the most popular form of public deliberation – NIF style citizen forums. This dissertation has the ability to answer several ideas posited by Karpowitz, et al. First, this research can begin to answer the question of whether homogenous deliberations can increase deliberative quality and equality. What this study brings to the table is a series of comparison groups in which to measure the types of talk, the shape and direction of deliberation and objective measurements can determine whether quality deliberation took place. Second, this dissertation can provide evidence that the NIF style of deliberation is more or less congenial toward homogenous and subsequently productive deliberation for traditionally marginalized groups. This will allow for practical implications to be developed for deliberative practitioners which can create more effective citizen deliberations.

Chapter 6 - Deliberating in Predominantly Female Forums

A Brief Review

I made the case in chapter three that gender matters when citizens wish to engage in public deliberations. Gender matters for two reasons: first is that participants come into deliberation with an already determined idea of the negative status of women in public-political settings. Even when the deliberative setting is supposedly inequality-free, citizens bring inequality in the door with them. Second, deliberation's supposedly inequality free setting is not that at all. In fact, the strong hold rationality and reason-giving has on appropriate and persuasive talk in public forums favors the style of talk used by men.

These are several ways in which gender can affect the ability of citizens to honestly deliberate. In situations where talk characteristically described as male is made prominent, women face a precarious situation in order to get their opinions heard. If they choose to engage in aggressive, tenacious types of talk, despite the fact that this is not the characteristic women are supposed to display, women risk backlash from the other participants, both male and female during deliberations (Prentice & Carranza, 2002; Ridgeway, 2011). When rational argument calls on the force of the best argument as the primary evaluating mechanism, women may feel they have no choice but to engage in aggressive talk and risk the same outcomes. Or, instead of choosing to adopt a more aggressive stance during the dialog, women may shy away from meaningful engagement altogether thus giving up any chance of having their ideas be a part of the deliberation (Mansbridge, 1983; Marder, 1987). Also, because the structure of deliberation is intended to be culturally neutral, forums may become biased toward those with prestige, power and material wealth (Young, 1997). Because public forums exist in the public sphere, those who lack confidence in making rational argument might have those views discounted (Sanders, 1997).

If citizens feel they cannot share their particularized experiences in forums, Young (1997) argues they may feel a sense of detachment. When deliberation limits out emotion, it creates a false dichotomy between rationality and emotion, public and private that reinforces the notion that only characteristically men's style of speaking is valued.

Despite what deliberative democrats have to say about the norms and structure of deliberation, the odds of equality for all participants seem slim. A wealth of theoretical and empirical evidence in a variety of private and non-deliberative settings indicate that women are more likely than men to be informally excluded from the engagement process. If this is true, it could be argued that deliberation offers no credible advantage over the status quo political system in terms of inclusion and equality. Deliberation has a lot going for it – attempts to broaden its horizons in terms of discourse allowed (Dryzek, 2000; Young, 2000), playing with different deliberative structures in order to increase the number of participants and quality dialog such as in the deliberative polling method (see: Fishkin, 2003). Even with these changes, questions abound as to whether deliberation is gender equal. To date, theoretical critiques noting deliberation's limitations concerning gender difference in the public sphere have yet to be tested empirically (Hickerson & Gastil, 2008; Polletta & Lee, 2006). Works on juries and face-to-face and online town hall meetings, for example, have not provided conclusive evidence for either side. As such, deliberative democracy's advocates are at a theoretical stalemate with what difference and gender scholars argue.

The four predominantly female forums featured in this section of the study certainly are not representative of all NIF forums, nor would they represent forums that happen to have a majority of women in it. There are too few forums in this sample size prevent any true form of generalizability. But, this analysis, however small, can provide some small insight into one facet

of the effect of group composition and gender. And, when coupled with the next two chapters, serves to provide a holistic picture on whether deliberation does indeed succumb to the difference and gender critiques.

Female and Male Talk in Predominantly Female Forums

Who Talks?

Having an idea of who speaks during the different gendered contexts of deliberation is an important prerequisite to making arguments about how talk might affect deliberative outcomes. Because the public sphere and politics specifically is seen as geared toward men both in talk and leadership, it seems likely that even under group composition conditions that do not favor them, men would still be heavily involved in the discussion. The results, shown in Table 3, indicate that men make up around a quarter or less of all speaking turns. Of course, since the men are outnumbered by women, this would make sense. In all but one of the forums, men are responsible for at least twenty percent of all speaker turns during the deliberation. The men in both of the Abilene health care forums and the forum in El Dorado were, on face, involved in their respective discussions. In the Kansas City forum, the two male participants seemed disinclined to be involved in the dialog, only making up less than eight percent of total turns taken during the deliberation. It seems quite surprising that the numbers for men's participation would be so low. Initially, this seems like this might provide some sliver of evidence that gender does have an effect on whether people choose to participate in deliberations – in this case, whether men will participate in settings in which the sex composition is not in their favor.

Table 3. Total Speaking Turns in Predominantly Female Forums by Sex.

	Sex	
Forum Name	*Male*	*Female*
Abilene 1	50	211
	(19.2%)	(80.8%)
Abilene 3	51	170
	(23.1%)	(76.9%)
El Dorado	35	120
	(22.6%)	(77.4%)
Kansas City	12	150
	(7.4%)	(92.6%)

Table 4 (last page of this chapter) provides a more detailed, nuanced view at in rates in which men and women speak during predominantly women forums. Whereas Table 3 shows an overall picture of participation, Table 4 breaks down by each participant in the forums and notes the sex of the participants. The individual rates of participation indicate a much higher rate for the men in the forums that Table 3 shows. This is because in three of the four forums, one of the males contributed a substantial number of speech utterances, and the other male in the forum contributed few, comparatively. In the case of the first Abilene forum, the lone male participant accounted for the second most turn-taking done in the forum (48 total turns). In the third Abilene forum, one of the two males contributed thirty seven total turns, making him the third most talkative speaker. The El Dorado forum also had a similar dynamic where one of the male participants had the second most speech turns taken while the group deliberated (37 total turns). In Kansas City however, both of the male participant spoke only a few times, putting them in the lower quartile of participant turns.

It seems from these two tables that men do tend to be involved, often quite heavily, in deliberative forums. While they were not the most dominant speaker – often the top speaker had quite a few more turns taken in the forum than the second-place male – they did speak quite a bit.

The deviation between each of the speakers and their turns taken is quite small, especially among the smaller groups. And, from looking at the results in Table 4, men's participation in these dialogs does not come at the exclusion of women's participation, meaning they tended to integrate themselves into the conversation instead of attempting to dominate. This does mean that clash did not exist, but that the men in these forums got involved and joined women in the deliberative process. Given this result, it is important to investigate the types of talk men and women used when they deliberated in forums with this sex composition.

Types of Talk

The speaking in predominantly female forums had a decidedly narrative tone. Table 5 indicates that even though the overall tone was strongly narrative, women were the drivers of the storytelling with men providing a majority of non-narrative statements. Over ninety percent of all narrative statements made across these four forums were made by women, compared to only six percent of all narrative statements. Men, on the other hand, used mainly rational talk with an occasional story. Seventy-five percent of all non-narrative statements (which would include both reason-giving statements as well as statements that were coded as neither rational nor narrative) were given by men, with the other quarter of responses being from women. This study indicates that when speaking in predominantly women deliberative settings, women tended to use a combination of storytelling and reason to get their views across. This is not entirely unexpected. The difference literature theorizes that women will speak using personal stories, especially when the context permits such talk.

Table 5. Narrative and Non-Narrative Statements in the Four Predominantly Female Forums.

	Men	Women	Total
Narrative Statements	13 (6.4%)	189 (93.6%)	202
Non Narrative Statements	257 (75.6%)	83 (24.4%)	340

The quantitative data indicates, at least on face, that women tend to use narratives more than men and men use reason more than women in women predominant forums. Besides having a beginning, middle, and end and being centered on a problem, the stories told in these forums had different features depending on the sex of the participant. The stories women shared tended to have a purpose as opposed to narrating more generally about a situation. The women shared specific, concrete stories that have a set of values built into the story itself (Polletta & Lee, 2006).

The following illustrations of women sharing stories provides some examples of how women intertwine narratives with values when deliberating. In the Kansas City education forum, participant three answers the facilitator's question of whether schools should teach character building or whether it should be taught at home:

> I can remember whenever I was in high school. I think that the teachers and schools just expected more out of all of us. And I think that is gone. Like, I think, like a good example is like, I was an athlete in high school and we were expected to do – you know, we were expected to make these grades and if you fell behind you weren't done until you got back up there. And I think that has just changed so much that we just don't know, we as teachers, we as parents, you know, all around us, don't expect that much out of our kids anymore.

Participant nine, also from the Kansas City education deliberation, talks about the need for quality teachers:

> In my old school I didn't realize until I got older that some of the books that I had in my all black high school were second hand books from the white schools. Okay, that a lot of the books we had when I was going to high school were actually second hand books. We weren't getting the new books. We were getting the old books. But, we had teachers who were doing that extra and we had high expectations for ourselves and our parents had high expectations.

Another participant in the El Dorado, KS health care forum shares her experience with insurance deductibles:

> In 1986 my husband retired, and I'm eight years younger and I had at the company he worked for was here in town I had my own insurance for eight years and I had major medical. It was a $2500 deductible and my premium was about $300 a month. That's back in '86. But I made it fine. I was lucky and didn't have a lot of medical problems but anyway that's what I'm paying back then.

Also talking about health insurance is participant two from the first Abilene health care forum. She is concerned about being 60 years old and uninsurable:

> I have been here in Abilene for six years. Before I moved here I had been self employed for twenty-five years. I had always done it just the way they say you did. I had my own health insurance was glad that I had it when I had an event and had to use that health insurance. I had melanoma and I was very fortunate that it was caught very early and I had the smallest amount of treatment possible for it. But, my health insurance company went out of business this year afterward and I have been uninsurable since then, so now I took what is available in my community which is a part-time job so that I have health insurance but I make half the money that I was making. I am sixty years old, this is a

> huge financial problem for me because I should be saving for retirement and I know a lot of other people who are in the same boat.

Continuing the line of values-driven inquiry and narrative, a female participant from the third Abilene forum questions:

> What about personal responsibility? In that my husband and I, our family, which used to be like eight people with his parents and his sister and her husband. They all except one are dead from smoking and the one that is alive had a heart attack at fifty. No he wasn't even fifty. So I have been in a hospital back in the days when you could smoke in the hospital and in a cardiac unit at Stormont Vale and there is a guy hooked up to an I.V. smoking a cigarette!

Another participant echoes the previous speaker's sentiments:

> I know, except my father in law he quit smoking when his nose started bleeding so bad they told him if he gets another one he's dead. He could stop. My brother in law had a heart attack and had the quadruple bypass, then he quit. My sister in law had a heart attack and then she quit.

It is clear that when women participate in deliberations with group compositions that favor women, that they tend to speak in story form. The quantitative data says as much. More importantly, and what the above illustrations show this that when women share stories in public forums, they share them not necessarily because this type of talk is the most accessible to women but possibly because it is the most persuasive way to get the group to consider the values inherent in such stories. Or, to think about the types of stories women tell a little differently, women push values because, in women heavy deliberation, there is not as strong of a focus on reason-giving or factual evidence as might exist in other forum compositions and thus ways to

evaluate claims based on the force of the best argument might be absent. This seems to be a difference in the way men and women deliberate in predominantly women forums. The values inherent in the stories shared above, individual responsibility for health choices, the expectations we as a society have for our children, the expectations we have for ourselves as learners, and the desire to keep healthy are important philosophical questions to consider that might not translate well to reason-giving. Certainly, values such as been described were meant to be screened out by the force of the best argument according to deliberative neutralists.

Take for example, an exchange in the first Abilene health care forum. While discussing requiring health insurance to cover catastrophic health events that normally would bankrupt people, the group discusses whether its morally acceptable for people who live "certain lifestyles" (smoking and drinking were mentioned specifically) to not purchase health insurance. One of the female participants adds:

> Well, I made a decision like that today at the grocery store. I was behind a lady who was buying something and she didn't have enough money and it was close and I thought I will give her the money, until I saw she was buying cigarettes. I'm not going to help her buy them but I don't know that, it's hard, it's a hard, hard question, and it's a big issue.

Because the force of the best argument operates from universal and factual claims, arguments like the one made by Abilene participant have a hard time being subject to such processes because they are indeed subjective and unreasoned. Instead, by focusing on values instead of fact, per se, in their stories, women in this group of forums place a strong emphasis on the context of actions (buying cigarettes even though the person does not have enough money) instead of just the abstract or general notion of the event.

While the lack of fit for the force of the best argument as an evaluative model might be one reason majority women forums feature value-based narratives, Benlevy (2000) provides a different set of possibilities of why value-based narratives are so prevalent. She argues that for women, morality plays an equal, if not bigger role in their decision-making processes than does evidence presented during the trial or the letter of the law. Her analysis indicates that women are more concerned than men about the implications of their decisions. As such, women frame their narratives as well as other deliberative statements as either a first-person account or by attempting to place themselves in the situation. Consider the two turns taken by women after the previous speaker questions the lifestyle choice of the woman in the store:

> (P6) [Female] As it happens, I know people who have had a diagnosis that absolutely refused to get it cared for because they don't want it on their insurance.
>
> (P5) [Female] Now, I've known women who have gone in for their annual pap smear and go to Planned Parenthood and lie about who they are because they don't want anything to come up on their insurance.

When men deliberated in majority women forums they sometimes told stories when the situation called for a narrative to be shared. In particular, male participants tended to tell stories when the group was already in the process of deliberating through the use of narrative. Instead of turning to reason-giving, male participants would join the exchange with their own stories. The difference between men's storytelling and women's storytelling is that whereas women embedded values into their stories, men tend to tell stories to relay broader ideas and situations. For example, in the El Dorado health care forum, as the group discusses rewarding healthy lifestyles with lower insurance premiums, one of the two men in the forum states:

> My wife had cancer in both lungs and mesothelioma around one. She didn't smoke, she didn't drink, she didn't eat out, and we were married 48 years but she still died from all this other stuff. Our insurance paid part of it and pat of it they didn't but that was something else. [Facilitator: So yeah, sometimes even healthy behaviors don't keep you from getting sick] She weighed 130 pounds and we went for a three mile walk every morning.

In a discussion in the first Abilene forum, the lone male participant describes his son's experience with the healthy lifestyle versus insurance coverage issue in a similar way as the male El Dorado forum participant:

> Our son is in the process of starting his own business and the transition from his previous job where he had insurance, he had to make arrangements for coverage for his family and himself. Well, the irony of this whole thing is he got coverage for his family with a group. He is a graphic designer and there is a group of designers that had this and because he had his doctor had a notation on his chart when he was preparing for a marathon about five years ago he had an anemic condition at that this, that is on his chart and they won't take him but his family is covered so he has got to work out some other separate…it just seemed like what a….

When men told stories, as they did, albeit, in very few circumstances, they often laced those stories with fact and not necessarily with value. Benlevy argues this is because men tend to rely solely on evidence and eschew understanding the context of a situation. The differences in deliberative style, at least in regards to the types of talk used, is a function of how the different sexes relied on evidence while evaluating options and issues. In jury deliberations, men feel they are sworn to perform a specific task within the judicial process and that they have no authority to

act beyond that specific task. Thus, men's assessments of guilt or innocence tend to be based solely on the evidence presented in the trial and not on contextual or empathic evidence. As such, uses and evaluations of evidence in a certain way reveal a gender divide. Despite the above example, the male participants as a whole tended to speak using reason, even in forums where the gender composition may heavily bias the type of talk toward something other than reason-giving. A short section from the third Abilene forum illustrates this divide.

> [Facilitator: Do you feel like though, you are getting your money's worth for what you pay for your health care cost?]
>
> (P6)[Female] Yeah, you are alive, you are taken care of, you were well taken care of and so yeah, I think you do feel like you were getting your money's worth. Until you get hit in the face by those bills that are going to start coming in.
>
> (P1)[Female] I think some of the perception is that you are paying for malpractice insurance, you are paying for all those overhead costs, and yes, you are getting taken care of but it's like inflating the pricing.
>
> (P7)[Female] Well, you are paying for the ten patients in the hospital who weren't able to pay for their bill. You are paying for the hypochondriacs that keep coming back and really don't have anything wrong with them and taking up the doctors and nurses time.
>
> (P4)[Male] There was a survey done a number of years ago that asked people what do you think is the number one reason for why health care costs are so high and this was a number of years ago and of course it has gotten worse as time gone by and it wasn't asking or giving your top five numbers it just asked the number one reason and it came there were about 20-25 top reasons as to people's opinions and a lot had to do with their experience but the point of that story of that survey is that there isn't one answer. There

> are literally 20-25 and you've heard a few of them here right now and if we worked hard enough we could come up with all 20 of them probably. There were a lot of physicians being required to practice defensively, to overuse medication, to underinsured people not being able to pay, to all kinds of things. So all of these contribute to the problem. So, I mean it's a complex list of what drives costs up.

The speech differences in this exchange are obvious. While women talked in value-hypotheticals ("I think some of the perception is that you are paying for malpractice insurance" or "you are paying for the hypochondriacs"), the male participant in the conversation spoke in reasoned terms, drawing on specific evidence to advance his claims. Even though both men and women drew from outside evidence (personal experiences, anecdotal evidence, and previously read survey evidence), the application of the evidence was different. Women framed their statements in "you"/"I" language which had the effect of making what are fairly general evaluative statements of health care costs as something more personal and subjective ("you are alive, you are taken care of…so yeah I think you do feel like you were getting your money's worth"). The male participant in this exchange did not use "you"/"I" at all, instead opting to frame and apply his evidence as an objective evaluation. At the end of his statement, the male participant states "So all of these contribute to the problem. So I mean, it's a complex list of what drives costs up." By closing his statement this way, the male participant is seen as taking the conclusions of the study as his own evaluation of what is wrong with health care costs without committing to any one point specifically. Compared to women in these forums who may commit to many specific evaluative claims within their narratives or their value-hypothetical statements, this example contends that men in predominantly women forums tend to not constrain themselves with any specific view.

The prior example is also indicative of the different types of evaluative statements within discursive challenges. Lukyanova (2009) argues that the interplay between "generic" and "specific" evaluations can determine how salient a person's perspective. As noted above, women in these forums tend to specialize in specific evaluations that sometimes encompass more generic-level evaluations. The importance of stories is not that personal stories have a particular, personal quality but that stories integrate the specific and the general by way of plot. The plot provides the structure of the story; it orders events to highlight important qualities and excludes those that are not. Plots are drawn from a common, cultural stock and make sense against a backdrop of similar stories (Polletta, 1998; Polkinghorne, 1988; Polletta & Lee, 2006). In this way, the specific evaluative statements as stories made by female participants can help listeners comprehend like and unlike experiences (Polletta & Lee, 2006). Men, however, tend to prefer generic evaluations, consistently preferring to project "large scale" evaluations that rely on universal, culturally neutral evaluations.

To illustrate, when a female participant in the third Abilene forum attempts to get the male participant to commit to one cost driving problem, the male hesitates and pushes back against the idea that he should have to commit to an idea at all. The following exchange takes place immediately after the above dialog and is between two participants:

(P2)[Female] If you had to identify one, what would it be?

(P4) [Male] I don't subscribe to one concept, I mean, personally.

(P2) The highest priority. I'm not saying just you but truly you are on the inside so if you had to say the biggest of all of them, what would it be?

(P4) I'm sorry. I don't go with one because like with the ones I mentioned here and the uninsured piece part of it.

(P2) What percentage might that be?

(P4) Uninsured? Well what did the number [in the issue guide book] say? I think there are 47 million people that are uninsured in America and what do we have about 300 million people so whatever 47 million out of 300. That's a pretty high percentage already of uninsured. It's getting to be higher than that and the whole medical malpractice and physicians having to practice defensively because of what is taking place, expectations on the part of patients, insurance companies paying the bill, you not paying it yourself and so when you buy a TV you do what? You shop. Well, we don't shop, we only want the best health care and we let the insurance company pay for it and it's far enough removed that we don't have to feel the pain of doing that.

The female participant in this exchange is attempting to get the male participant to commit to a specific item, and thus to adopt an evaluative framework and type of talk that more closely matches the type of speech used by women in the forum. Whereas women participants in these forums tended to focus on the "you"/"I" types of statements, male participants tend to focus on large groups (e.g., "the uninsured"). Male participants might incorporate a specific evaluation within their generic evaluation in order to better flesh out their generic point. For example, one of the male participants in the Kansas City education forum provides a specific example within a more general evaluative claim of the Kansas City school system:

I keep reading in the *Kansas City Star* and I'm glad this year the rating system indicates that we are doing a better job at some schools test-wise. And I don't know how effective the teacher is that I work with. I've worked with her, this will be my fifth year and I get from kids statements like: "No, I don't get help from school. I don't get help from home

because my mother doesn't know how to add either." So, there is just an awareness that the school system is different than when I went to school.

This is the way that men tell narratives within predominantly women forums. Men tend to stick to global-level evaluations and sometimes will drop in more micro-level evaluations in order to buttress or even rebut a specific argument made by another participant (often a woman). The next section will discuss how the gendered nature of evaluative statements function within discursive exchanges.

In NIF forums, conversations often proceed in distinct stretches of speech that develop into consistent evaluative scenarios which uphold the specific ideas or values of the basic reference scene (Lukyanova, 2008). Much of the dialog that occurs in predominantly women forums involves these sorts of long conversational moves where their contributions add to an agreement or way to evaluate a specific point of the approach.

Given the long conversational moves present in these forums and the use of specific narratives in these forums, the outcome of the combination of the two is the development of value-based evaluative frameworks participants can adopt as a lens to evaluate policy options and create suggestions (Black, 2008). While suggestions for possible policy changes would not be unique, it is unique the way the group with its long moves and use of narratives comes around to the idea of tort reform. Whereas deliberative neutralists wish to avoid the use of narrative and subjective statements because they color the discussion in ways that could create a biased outcome, in the case of women majority forums that feature long moves, narratives, and value frameworks, this sort of talk does provide outcomes and solutions the group could come to agree on. One example comes from the El Dorado health care forum:

(P9) [Female] I kind of really like this second approach in that it would place on the compensation of health care executives and the doctors and it would also limit the litigation pieces and I think that those are two very high costs that if we could limit those, health care would be affordable to everyone.

(P3) [Female] A lot of doctors will tell you that the reason their costs are so high is because of their liability insurance.

(P9) I don't know how a nurse nowadays could go without liability insurance either. I mean, personal professional liability insurance.

(P3) We have to carry it in nursing school and then when I wasn't in nursing school I carried it every year on myself because I couldn't count on the company that I worked for to protect me in court. They were after their own interests.

(P9) You could go bankrupt. Somebody takes you to court they could take everything you have. That's really scary so I think we need to limit the litigations out there.

(P1) [Male] Our son is an intensive flight paramedic. He picks up the road kills on the highway and so he has to get insurance too. He has to have a lot of it because that's the next thing to protect. I have a niece and nephew in anesthesiology so they have that much insurance.

[Facilitator] So doctors and nurses have high costs.

(P3) We have to carry it because you know accidents happen, errors happen, people are human. It's not a computer giving you the medication or doing this procedure but the people in the United States have become so lawsuit happy that…

(P2)[Female] I've actually known doctors who have quit doing [labor and delivery] because the cost.

(P7) [Female] Yeah, I was thinking that maybe the government can regulate like set limits like how much a lawsuit can be. Because there is no set amount and they can sue the company for millions of dollars or maybe even more and that drives up the cost.

The conversation move highlighted above provides insight as to how conversational moves in predominantly women forums operate. In this exchange, the female-led group builds a complimentary and compatible frame of reference to justify certain costs – that health care costs are high because malpractice laws require practitioners to have exorbitant insurance rates – through their use of specific instances about their own experience in their professions. Even the male participant who contributed the information about his pilot paramedic son who needs liability insurance joined into the conversation move in a way that complimented the style of talk being used. These types of consistent and complimentary conversation moves happen frequently throughout the predominantly women deliberations.

Exchanges in predominantly women forums had a high degree of affective talk that was not just limited to the female participants. Both men and women on various occasions spoke with affect even if their claims were not necessarily narrative in format. When the male participants chose to speak with affect, they did so with aggressive language, often eschewing fact for personal opinion. When female participants spoke with affect, they did so as a way of drawing attention to the specifics of a situation. Again, Benlevy's reasoning on how women jurists deliberate applies here as well. When female participants in these forums use affect, they may be doing so because the context or situation is just as important as the reasons.

(P3) [Male] As far as, and this one I feel strongly about too, as far as the health care as a right. On my soap box, sorry. Health care to me is not a right, I do feel very strongly it's a social responsibility and I think that there is a difference between a social responsibility

> and a right and the reason it just can't be a right is because I have my right to free speech and that's my personal right. It doesn't affect anybody at this table. I have my right to religion that doesn't affect anybody at this table, it's my right. My right to health care? Oh my goodness, my right to health care affects hospitals, doctors, nurses. What about their rights? So it's not my individual right. Health care can never be a right. But I think it is a social responsibility. We have to do it because we are human beings.
>
> (P5) [Female] So how do we do this? There are programs in place right where it is a social responsibility and through Medicaid. How do we make sure that, you know, a five-year-old that gets his shots or you know, is there any way to do that without like you were saying having the emergency rooms flooded? They pay Medicare for the entire United States.

Men may have had some issues deliberating by using storytelling, they had no problems in these settings deliberating with affect. In this example from the third Abilene forum, these two participants both exchange ideas through affective talk. The female participant is quick to counter the heated, passionate rhetoric of the male participant by asking how can society ensure that all citizens receive the requisite care if they do not have access to affordable insurance. By drawing on the imagery of the impoverished five-year-old, the female participant is able to, via affective talk, counter the male participant. This exchange also confirms the Sanders (1997) and Young's (1997, 2000) ideas that deliberation should not be dispassionate or contained but instead be allowed to be affective and passionate.

Initiating and Engaging In Talk

One of the major questions arising from the deliberation literature on gender inequality is how women interact with men in deliberative settings. Mansbridge (1983) finds that women opt not to initiate confrontational exchanges and instead choose to be information givers or question askers, thus not engaging in any sort of contentious talk. I find that in predominantly women settings, this is not as true as it might be in differently composed groups based on sex. In this series of four forums, there were fewer confrontational exchanges than one might expect, but when they did occur, women were the ones who tended to initiate them. Contrary to literature on difference based democracy might theorize, make participants often participated in these interactions but were typically not the ones initiating or initially disagreeing with the original statement by the facilitator. One example comes from the third Abilene health care forum:

> [Facilitator]…If we were to have a national insurance program, if you had bad [health] habits, should there be additional fees and things take place?
>
> (P2) [Female] How are you going to enforce it and how are you going to pick the habits? There's the bold ones, but there's the little – how many drinks is too many? How many you know things like that, how do you police something like that?
>
> (P4) [Male] We have a certain amount of it already in the form of insurance companies regularly rate based on how much they are paying out and so are they relating it to what the habits are? Maybe not, but they are relating it to what the outcome is and so if you are in an accident then you know unfortunate pieces but they are also rating those things that are just genetic that we talked about earlier like if I inherited this condition because I was born into this family. It includes that along with the bad habits …

(P6) [Female] I don't think that insurance companies should be allowed to pick who they insure. I think everybody needs to share the risk. In other words, you just can't pick up those groups where they have good healthy habits and good genetics and those are the people you will insure. And universal insurance would do away with that, I hope.

(P3) [Male] So maybe eventually the insurance company rating their policyholders would mesh with the government to rate us as a country and then that's the rate for everybody?

(P6) [Female] Do you think the government is capable of that?

(P1) [Female] That just scares the daylights out of me.

(P2) [Female] It scares me too. If we do that, oh my. How are we going to pay for it?

(P3) [Male] Although, in this age of information technology and the information revolution we are going through, it may not be that far in the future where they could do that. Because, I know it's scary all the information that is out there about all of us.

One can infer from this series of challenges that women in majority female forums are not shy about challenging the facilitator's/issue book position on an approach as well as each other and the male participants in the group. The second female speaker in this interaction effectually challenged the first male speaker's position that the status quo already rates participants and that it is "dangerous" to be without insurance. The second female participant in this section of dialog challenges the previous statement, instead arguing that insurance companies should not be able to cherry pick the healthy customers. But also, two other female participants were willing to challenge the second female speaker's advocacy of universal health care by asking how the government is going to afford to pay for health care for all. So, women are willing to initiate confrontational exchanges that reshape the focus of the discussion, they are willing to challenge one another, and they are willing to challenge the men's stated positions. Women also tended to

approach confrontational exchanges from their specific evaluative stance, compared to the men in this exchange who continue to speak from a generalized, reasoned perspective.

When men did initiate confrontational exchanges, which they did rarely, they did so by using the level of specific evaluation with "I"/'you" statements instead of using generic-level statements. Interestingly, when men initiated confrontational exchanges, the group did not always follow their lead. For example, in an exchange in the third Abilene health care forum referenced specifically in the prior section of affective talk, one male participant responds to the facilitator's prompt about the negotiating power of the government for purchasing cheaper drugs by reasserting a point he made earlier about whether citizens have a right to health care. In this exchange, the female respondents do not react positively to the challenge and ask specific, directed questions about the male participants constructed framework for why health care is not a right. While I have quoted the first two turns earlier, it is worth quoting them again in context with the accompanying exchanges.

> (P3) [Male] As far as, and this one I feel strongly about too, as far as the health care as a right. On my soap box, sorry. Health care to me is not a right, I do feel very strongly it's a social responsibility and I think that there is a difference between a social responsibility and a right and the reason it just can't be a right is because I have my right to free speech and that's my personal right. It doesn't affect anybody at this table. I have my right to religion that doesn't affect anybody at this table, it's my right. My right to health care? Oh my goodness, my right to health care affects hospitals, doctors, nurses. What about their rights? So it's not my individual right. Health care can never be a right. But I think it is a social responsibility. We have to do it because we are human beings.

(P5) [Female] So how do we do this? There are programs in place right where it is a social responsibility and through Medicaid. How do we make sure that, you know, a five-year-old that gets his shots or you know, is there any way to do that without like you were saying having the emergency rooms flooded? They pay Medicare for the entire United States.

(P3) [Male] Well, but not everybody really needs that. I mean, we don't need Medicare to, you know, we need help with catastrophic insurance like everybody does, so everybody is a little bit different. There are people that do need help and whether it is a religious non-profit group that does that, whether its charity, whether it's the government, I mean, somehow that all has to be defined and that's complex.

(P1) [Female] Yeah, and with that particular segment in society, those of us that have insurance now trough the private industry, I think we should still be able to purchase the plan that we want that is going to benefit us. At our office, it is a different plan every year and what is going to be the best for the majority of people at our office. And I think we still need to have that right that we as consumers can go out on the free market and purchase what we want to purchase for our employees.

(P7) [Female] But, I'm thinking like the saving account or that you use toward your health care insurance that is being proposed. I guess it could be enforced but I'm thinking of a family who gets $5000 toward their insurance and they choose to use it on food and I just don't know how that is going to work.

The clash in this confrontational exchange provides a nice illustration of how women chose to interact with the male participants in settings where they are the majority sex. As Mansbridge notes, women typically will shy away from confrontational settings and exchanges. In forums

where they are the predominant sex, it seems they neither shy away from such exchanges but also are willing to challenge and engage them, even if such challenges are led by male participants. This exchange seems on face to be more contentious than the previous exchanges detailed. This could possibly be because the male participant led the confrontation or because of the way the male participant framed his statement with an individual focus ("health care to *me* is not a right"). The female participants countered with a focus on others ("five-year-old that gets his shots;" "family who gets $5000 toward their insurance and they choose to use it on food") that may have acted as an effective check on the more aggressive talk exhibited by the male participant.

This does not mean that women do not exhibit the information giving/question type of talk in forums that are composed in their favor. There were exchanges when the female participants tended to ask questions of the male participant in particular, especially when there were questions of a more technical nature or when the group did need to ground a decision or construct a decision framework around a series of facts. The third Abilene forum featured a lot of medical professionals – from nurses, health insurance officers and doctors. Much of the forum featured talk that has been described above – specific, yet value laden. Yet, when the group needed to grapple with some facts, they turned to the male participants in the group:

> [Facilitator] So I guess what I heard is kind of a lot of it is already being done. There are some other areas where it is not being done that hat is where I heard you say that maybe some things have gotten out of control…
>
> (P6) [Female] Let me ask you a question: Medicare caps your amount you can charge, but if are non-participating, can't you charge anything you want to or don't your patients have to pay the difference between what Medicare will pay or insurance?

(P3) [Male] Actually, believe it or not for Medicare age you are limited if you don't sign up accept assignment. I can't remember whether it's 10 percent or 15 percent but I can't charge more than that.

(P2) [Female] So if it's a $100 procedure that Medicare pays, you can only charge $115?

(P3) [Male] $115. I can't charge $200. That's the law.

(P5) [Female] Are they "baseable" rates? I mean, or is this something where you thought this number is completely off?

(P3) [Male] Actually, this is kind of a problem, too. It varies would be my short answer. The hospital might have some more input in here but basically the hospital with Medicare that helps them with their cash flow it doesn't help them with their profit. They make their profit with private insurance…

(P6) [Female] So private insurance is floating Medicare is kind of what you're saying?

(P3) [Male] In some ways it is but private insurance is getting very smart too and its only a matter of time. They parallel whatever Medicare does. They will pay a little bit more.

(P2) [Female] Doesn't it take the hospitals quite a while to get it collected from Medicare? I mean, that's not used in stability knowing you still need a check.

(P4) [Male] Medicare, actually the fee they pay tends to be faster than commercial insurance.

(P2) [Female] Really?

(P4) [Male] It's not the speed that's the problem, it's the shortage of payment.

In another example, a female participant directed the conversation toward a more specific, rational oriented perspective by asking one of the male participant to chime in on the topic of educational changes in the local school district:

(P2) [Female] One of the biggest challenges is focusing on different learning styles.

(P4) [Female] Learning – that's it!

(P4) [Female] One of the things that is going on in the Kansas City Missouri School District is that they are now trying to individualize. Maybe Barry might be better able to explain a little bit on what they're doing. Do you mind? You can probably explain it better than I.

(P7) [Male] Part of the game plan is to try to get to a point where students are in groups based on their abilities rather than groups based on ages.

In these four forums, female participants tended to not ask a lot of questions of each other, instead preferring to offer opinions and ideas. Any time women did ask questions, such as in the above example, they tended to ask specific questions, as opposed to more rhetorical questions, and tended to ask them of men. Any general-type questions were asked of the group as a whole and merely to clarify information, not to get the other speaker to explain in more depth their point or even to really challenge the claim (with the exception of the confrontational exchange noted above). Thus, forum dialogs seemed to be highly deliberative, with a lot of consideration and comparison of opinions and ideas through a lens of values. It is possible that the values focused dialog that women possessed in these forums may be the cause for the lack of questions. When women compared value frameworks, they tended to share competing, specific scenarios when challenging a framework or idea instead of asking questions.

In predominantly women forums, women had no problems engaging in confrontational exchanges. They also tended to use more assertive talk than they might use in contexts in which gender is more salient. In the four forums under examination in this chapter, when women used assertive talk it was either to challenge others' points in a way that was meant to produce some

sort of compromise or to concede a point. In the previous example from the third Abilene forum, the male participant gets on his proverbial soap box to challenge the ideas being floated by the participants in the preceding discussion about whether health care is a right. For the male participant and the responding female participants, the confrontation was made up of what Lukyanova (2008) calls assertive or tough challenges. In this case, the male participant challenges the framework of health care as a right because the ability to be cared for requires the cooperation of a network of doctors, nurses, hospitals and so on. In essence, his arguments is that health care should not be a right because care relies on others, unlike right to religious expression or free speech. His use of specific markers such as "I" and "we" ("I think there is a difference between a social responsibility and a right," "my right to health care affects hospitals, doctors, nurses. What about their rights?" and "we have to do it because we are human beings") make the claim personal. He is also responding to a statement made prior to the facilitator question on negotiating power about whether if health care is thought of as a right then people would flood the emergency rooms because it is more convenient than waiting for a doctor's visit. The initial response from one of the female participants is both confrontational in its directness ("So, how do we do this?"), in its challenge ("how do we make sure that, you know, a five-year-old…gets his shots") while at the same time, recognizing and incorporating a problem identified by a previous speaker.

What marks a tough challenge is that the speaker presents a clear preference for one evaluative model over another. In this case, there is a clash over who and how care should be provided – the male participant arguing for non-profit or for thinking of the issue as a responsibility and the female participants arguing that making care a personal responsibility does not help those who are poor obtain critical care. When the male participant is faced with a direct,

tough challenge, he essentially doubles down on his claims and offers no serious concessions, only a slight recognition ("there are people that do need help and whether it's a religious non-profit group that does that, whether its charity…"). However, the female participants are likely to include soft concessions into their challenges. For example, the third female speaker states she likes the previously mentioned idea of a health savings account for those who could afford such plans, but also affirms her stance on the necessity for considering care for all to be a right, especially for those in poverty ("I'm just thinking of the family who gets $5000 toward their insurance and they choose to use it on food and I just don't know how that is going to work"). Female participants were more likely than the male participants in these four forums to include concessions or at least attempts to recognize critiques of their position and make adjustments accordingly to their evaluative frameworks.

Leadership and Authority

Those with authority in small group settings enjoy the privilege of being able to direct the group's activities, its interactions, and its evaluative frameworks. Thus, being able to assert authority within the group and being seen as a leader is critical if a participant wishes to see his or her voice or opinion taken into consideration. This is true in n NIF-based deliberations, but with a slight twist. Facilitator's are the defacto leader in NIF forums and, by the structure and ground rules, are given the authority to direct the group's discussion, to move the discussion from approach one to approach two when necessary, and to redirect the dialog if it becomes unproductive or off track. So, women and men enter the deliberations in this study not necessarily having to jockey for position as the group's leader. However, not all facilitators take a strong approach to moderating public deliberations (Dillard, 2011). Depending on training, forum purpose, and facilitator preferences, an NIF facilitator can be deeply involved – a real

defacto leader - or someone who only directs speaker turns and lets the group members decide the flow and topic of conversation within the scope of the three approaches. Studies done by scholars on the expectations of performance by women and men in task-oriented settings indicate men are more likely to be accepted as group leaders (Ridgeway, 2011); women less so because in public-political settings, dominant behavior by women is less socially acceptable (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). At the same time, this research indicates that assertive speech (versus tentative speech) is more influential, especially in same-sex groups where gender is a less salient factor (Carli, 1990; Ridgeway, 1982). It is under this very fluid notion of pre-determined leadership and socially accepted rules for what each sex can do in public-political settings that women and men in NIF forums work to gain authority and leader roles.

The amount of talk a person does in deliberative forums is a significant factor in whether he or she is able to gain and maintain authority and leadership. The idea being that the person who shares their ideas the most or who posits their own evaluative schema and attempts to run each idea through that framework ends with a significant amount of turn taking and more time to justify their evaluations. This section attempts to determine if the participants that talked the most were given more consideration and if their ideas became more influential than someone who spoke less. The development of leadership or authority can be seen simply if the person who talks the most is able to influence the outcome of the deliberation.

As Table 4 suggests, there are few differences in participation rates between men and women, confirming similar results by Carli (1991) and Shelly and Munroe (1999). The male participants neither dominated the conversation, nor did they, as a whole, not participate (with the exception of participant four in the first Abilene forum). In each forum, a woman contributed the most in terms of speaking turns taken. In the first Abilene forum, the participants with the

most speaking turns were participant five (male) and participant six (female); in the third Abilene forum, the participants with the most speaking turns were participant two (woman) and participant three (male); in the El Dorado forum, participant one (female) and participant three (male) had the highest number of turns taken and in the Kansas City forum, participant nine (woman) and participant eleven (woman) were the speakers who contributed the most.

Were the ideas and evaluative frameworks advanced by those who talked the most given more consideration than ideas from other participants? When the facilitator asked the group to find common ground, then yes, the ideas and frameworks advanced by more talkative speakers were carried through to the end. When the facilitator did not ask for common ground, other ideas originating from less talkative speakers found their way into the final conclusions.

In the El Dorado health care forum, the group agreed that having choices in insurance plans and controlling costs were necessary for changing health care. The first time the topic of choice is mentioned specifically is when the group is discussing high deductible insurance plans. Participant eleven states that she is in favor of that idea because of the flexibility it provides in terms of being able to afford the plan premium, "so I think just being able to have options in my mind is a good idea…for somebody like me who feels like I'm young and healthy and probably not going to have health issues but I would like that backup just in case…" Participants one and two both agree that high deductible plans offer a degree of flexibility and choice that can protect people against catastrophic health events bankrupting people. Choice is echoed again when the group considers approach two and the idea of controlling costs. The two – choice and costs – are mixed together in a seemingly persuasive way by participant three. In a comparatively long monologue, participant three makes the argument that costs are high because of the lack of choice. In using evidentiary support from his student nursing experience at a local hospital, he is

able to focus the issue of costs onto doctors and hospitals and their culpability in skyrocketing costs:

> (P3) [Female] Well, part of the reason prescription drugs are as expensive as they are is because of the FDA because they have to go through so many clinical trials in this country, the same Lipitore you get the same tablet all over the world, the difference is that the other countries don't regulate it the way the United States does. The FDA has a stranglehold on any kind of prescription you have an they in part regulate the cost. Two, and this is just an example, I am a four semester nursing student at Butler County and I am doing my clinical at Susie B. here which is a great hospital please don't anybody take it wrong what I'm about to say but they have converted every one of their hospital rooms into single patient rooms. You want t know where they are going to make up their expenses. They are going to start charging more even though when you are admitted you sign a form saying "yes, I know I am having a single room but that is all we have." Now your insurance is still being billed supposedly like it's a double room and that you didn't ask for a private room but the cost is still going to be relayed onto you because whatever your insurance doesn't pay will come to you in your bill and they are very nice rooms. They are state of the art and if you want to know why your health care costs so much It's because you have got doctors that are, you know and I have worked for some that are ripping Medicare off. I went to the doctor because I had a kidney infection. I saw the PA for five minutes and my doctor visit bill was $250. That didn't include the IV's and the antibiotics I got. That was the five minutes I saw the PA. I didn't see the doctor, the doctor wasn't even in the building that day. Granted, I love this woman I used to work with her but five minutes worth of time I could have called her and told her what my

problem was and she could have called me in an antibiotic. So there is no, there needs to be and I hate to get the government involved because they couldn't tie their own shoelaces, but there needs to be regulation on how much a doctor can charge for a visit and how much hospitals can charge you.

[Facilitator] Well, I think that what you are touching on is exactly the question which is should the government get into the business of regulating these things…

(P3) And a lot of your insurances, like if you have PPK, like I can't go to Wesley Hospital in Wichita, I am stuck with the Via Christi Hospital. Your insurances determine where you can go, they make contracts with these places so you know I mean, that when, you're looking at insurance you need to look and see is it going to limit who you can go to. Do you have to pay extra to go to this hospital versus this hospital?

The discussion afterward amongst the group involves a specific focus on the role that doctors and hospitals play in keeping costs up. There is a long focus on medical malpractice insurance that has a lot of the elements that participant three noted, with participants sharing their own stories about how the necessity of having insurance because hospitals might not cover individual lawsuits. This indicates, at least at a surface level, that the participants are buying into the framework participant three has established for evaluating reasons for health care costs. Even when the facilitator attempts to change the subject to purchasing cheaper pharmaceuticals from overseas, participant three is quick to draw the focus back on items he already expressed and in doing so creates a strong framework for who the villains are in the high cost world of health care:

(P3) [Female] See, and that's one reason they don't allow like at one point in Wichita didn't they have the Canadian pharmacy and they shut them down because there wasn't any regulation that you were getting this pill. It was the same pill and that's one of the

> reasons that the pharmaceutical companies have a stranglehold on how much they can charge and they say, well, it's because they had to test it for seven years and they had to do this and then we had advertising. I mean, when one pill costs twelve dollars…

In the conclusion section of the deliberation, the participants seemed to grab hold of the framework that participant three had set up. As the facilitator called for ideas from the different approaches that the participants liked, the group began to sort through ideas based upon the villain framework and even added their own personal stories to justify their reasons. For example:

> (P5) [Female] I like the lowering doctors and hospital costs.
>
> [Facilitator] So you like number two and especially the idea that costs and paying it to an exorbitant payment to doctors and CEO's of pharmacy companies and things like that?
>
> (P5) I experienced that recently. I went to one doctor and he was going to charge me $3000 and I went to another doctor and it was just over $750.

What seems to happen in the El Dorado forum is that participant three, the top speaking male participant was able to authority and set the tone for how to evaluate ideas in the deliberation by adopting the larger discursive strategy of women deliberants – that is, to speak from experience and to use specific ideas. Referencing his time as a student nurse at a local hospital as well as his understanding of how insurance choices work, he was able to effectively frame larger concepts of who is at fault and how we should evaluate cost control and choices through that framework. By using the same discursive methods that the women in this study have exhibited, the male participant in this forum was able to have a lot of control over the global direction of the forum.

In the first Abilene forum, creating incentives for citizens to live healthier lives was a theme throughout the deliberation and finished strongly in the conclusion section of the

deliberation. The idea first arose out of an early discussion concerning a requirement for universal health care. The group begins by noting that some people have to make a tradeoff between food and costly medical treatments. Participant three questions:

> (P3) [Female] When someone is faced with health care costs either because they didn't take care of themselves appropriately or it just happens, who is going to measure all of that out anyway? If you didn't have insurance and you need some care, we need to make decision somehow somewhere to say, well, this is carried.

And participant six, the most talkative speaker in the forum, brings up the idea of punishment for poor health habits versus a policy of incentives:

> (P6) Do you think some people who don't take care of themselves should be punished?
>
> (P3) I don't know. Do you?
>
> (P6) I mean, if it's a smoker and they have a lung problem are we going to punish them or you know, it is a moral question that is very, very hard to answer.
>
> (P3) Because we all make decisions about our health.
>
> (P6) I heard about a person who had been an alcoholic and had a liver transplant because an alcoholic again. Now you know how those things are. It is a really hard question.
>
> (P3) The threat of financial ruin, I mean, if you can live a certain way because you have the money, you get sick and you take care of yourself that's one thing, but if you are facing financial ruin because you live a certain lifestyle and you can't buy insurance.
>
> (P6) Well, I made a decision like that today at the grocery store. I was behind a lady who was buying something and she didn't have enough money and it was close and I thought I will give her the money, until I saw she was buying cigarettes. I'm not going to help her buy them but I don't know that. It's hard, it's a hard question, and it's a big issue.

Not only does participant three frame the issue of healthy lifestyles as a those –who-do versus those-who-do not type issue, she gives specific reasons for who should be punished (for example, the alcoholic who gets a liver transplant). More importantly, when questioned by participant three that maybe there are people who just cannot afford health insurance, participant six counters by introducing an element of uncertainty – she saw a woman who was short on groceries and was going to give her the extra change until she saw that she was a smoker and thus chose not to help. The implication of such an example is that we cannot know if the poor who choose not to get health insurance really can't afford it or are just choosing unhealthy lifestyles over coverage. While I detailed the rest of this exchange in the section on types of talk, it is worth reviewing here. The exchange after participant three details her grocery store encounter is one of slight push-back against the insinuation that people might not be honest in their reasons for not getting insurance. Participant four describes how his son was not able to get coverage because of anemia but his family was; participant five claims to have known women to give false names to their doctors when obtaining an annual gynecological examination in case anything negative comes up. Participant six counters by agreeing that she had also seen people refuse treatment because they do not want negative marks on their health histories. By attempting to co-opt the turn in the discussion toward the victims (son without coverage, giving false names), participant three is able to keep her ideas about individual health choices viable.

The idea of incentives reappears in the discussion of approach two during which the facilitator asks "just speaking more generally, how would you control costs?" Participant four is quick to speak up and states, "Reduce the need by giving incentives to people to maintain health." Participant one agrees that is a "really good idea." Participant four adds, "that just really bugs me that there is not some incentive built into insurance plans for people who do everything

they can just to be healthy." The discussion then moves onto whether advertisements for unhealthy foods and drinks could be outlawed which might have an impact on keeping costs down. Participant four was able to argue that advertising works ("people will come in and request a drug they have seen on TV when there is one that works equitably") and so if we can eliminate such ads we might be able to cut costs and thus check unhealthy behaviors. When the facilitator again brings up the possibility of incentivizing healthy habits later in the approach, the group full on agrees:

> (P5) What annoys the heck out of me is that I have a pre-existing condition and I can't get insurance but a smoker can. I'm sorry, but that doesn't make a lot of sense.
>
> (P4) Punishing someone for smoking, well, who is going to police that, you know?
>
> (P2) Well, and just because he eats a lot.
>
> (P4) I agree people that smoke and treat their bodies badly and do all the thigns, there should be some kind of a…I don't know that necessarily they should be punished but the people that don't should have some incentive maybe but to try and prove one way or another is hard to do. I mean, I can't come to your house and see how much you are eating, you know.
>
> (P1) But wouldn't the proof be in the pudding? I.e., if I'm abusing fat and sugar I am going to be overweight.
>
> (P4) Somewhat, but not everybody is going to be that way.
>
> (P3) If you had say a year without having to use your insurance, could you not have reduced premiums the next year or something?

Participant four's original idea – punishing unhealthy people – quickly changed from framing people as villains to a more positive approach by focusing on incentives. When the group seemed

to respond to the idea of incentives versus punishment, participant four was quick to abandon punishment as an idea. When other group members, in this case participant five, tried to bring the discussion back to punishments ("I can't get insurance but a smoker can"), participant four redirected the discussion to incentives and then by linking back to costs. It is probably the relation to costs and participant four's framing of his ideas as an incentive to healthy people that allowed the group to catch onto the idea because they either see themselves as healthy or sometimes victims of unfortunate genetics and thus should not be punished. In the conclusion phase, the group loved the idea of incentives and spent time discussing the benefits in relation to cost cutting.

Like the first Abilene forum, personal responsibility was the strong theme of the night in the other Abilene health care deliberation. The initial inquiry into the role of personal responsibility was made by participant two, the top speaking female participant in the forum. She frames the ideas as most of her family has passed away from unhealthy habits and that she "has a tough time paying for other people's bad habits and lack of discipline. I mean, you know what I mean. It's a two-sided sword." The next speaker, participant seven, responds negatively to participant two's comments: "once you start trying to control different aspects then you start making judgments. Well, this person is that and they have all these health issues and this person is doing this and they have all these and they may not. They may not have had a sick day in their life." Again, the framing of personal responsibility as a penalty invites substantial criticism as it did in the other Abilene forum. Participants discuss how quitting smoking is hard to do, for example. Participant two, then reframes her argument: "I love the idea that I would get a benefit because I swim four times a week. I'd love that, but what happens if I inherit my mother's breast cancer? Would I get penalized for that?"

When the group begins considering approach two – controlling costs, the group does not seem to use the personal responsibility framework set up earlier. Instead, the group grapples mostly with identifying possible external causes for rising costs such as malpractice insurance and the supposed $125 box of hospital Kleenex. The next time the group does deal with the idea of personal responsibility on face is during approach three when participant three gets on his proverbial "soap box" to claim that health care is not a right, it is more of a responsibility. Participant three had the strongest voice during the deliberation in this section but was, as I detailed elsewhere, dismissed because the view did not cover specific groups of people who cannot afford care. Despite the point not being reflexive enough when presented in approach three, the idea was present in the conclusion. In the case of this forum, the participants who had the loudest, most assertive opinions or who spoke the most were not likely to have their opinions adopted wholesale but were likely encounter criticism.

In the Kansas City forum, the top two speakers were both women and neither of them started the ideas that became the group's consensus. In the Kansas City education forum, the group reached agreement in the conclusion phase on two ideas: that the current education and curriculum standards are "not like they used to be," and that higher standards and expectations for student achievement and character development need to be had. Both ideas were originally suggested by the facilitator and were a part of their issue book prompts. The issue of higher expectations and character development was suggested as a part of approach one:

> [Facilitator] One of the aspects of this approach is that it would mandate some higher standards because we would be making the students would be able to go, get out and get good jobs, take care of us in our old age. How do you think about that? Some people may not be able to keep up.

Participant three, Stacy, was the first to speak after the facilitator. She states "I don't understand the purpose of higher standards mandated if we're not meeting current standards." Participant eleven, one of the top speaking participants, makes the next comment, "I have a concern. I'm wondering why we don't focus on programs like Head Start since we know that some parents can no longer get these kids ready, then we should focus at the very beginning in preschool programs like Head Start, which I thought was a good thing." The discussion about the benefits of Head Start continues through the next four turns before the facilitator moves the group to the second approach. The next time the issue comes up again is when participant three exclaims:

> I can remember whenever I was in high school – I think that the teachers and schools just expected more out of all of us. And I think that is gone. Like, I think, like a good example is like I was an athlete in high school and we were expected to do – you know we were expected to make these grades and if you fell behind you weren't done until you got back up there. And I think that has just changed so much that we just don't know, we as teachers, we as parents, you know all around us, don't expect that much out of our kids anymore.

In her statement, participant three draws upon her previous argument about the lack of standards students are being held to while combining it with her own experience in high school to reaffirm her argument about lax standards. Participant three's claim that parents, teachers, and society as a whole no longer expect much out of students becomes the genesis of the second idea the group agrees on. Participant nine is the next to comment, stating "So there are some basic things that just basically need to be taught. A student cannot walk into my class and not say good morning." Participant three comments that "to be a responsible citizen, is like be kind to others, be respectful of other things…" Participant eleven redirects back to the focus on schools:

> Unfortunately, our students spend more time in school than they do at home. And a lot of times when they're home, they're in front of the TV or computer, okay so most of the socialization that they learn is at the school. I'm not saying that the teachers have to take the place of parents, but as a whole, the whole classroom is going to have an impact on how the student acts once he gets out into the world.

The conversation continues with participant nine arguing "A lot of young teachers and some older ones are intimidated by the parents that they would never go to their homes. They would be afraid. But that's why expectations aren't going as high." The conversation then draws back on the discussion about Head Start and early childhood education with participant twelve proposing parent mentors and participant eleven challenging the need for parents mentors:

> (P11) They're not falling behind in the third grade, they're just becoming stabilized with those that – with the other students that haven't been to pre-school. They did not have Head Start. But they are not falling behind.
>
> (P9) They should continue to progress rather than…
>
> (P11) No, they're moving with the same peers.
>
> (P12) Who are already starting, we're starting to advance according to achievements rather than…
>
> (P4) Right. They're not falling behind, they're just moving. The smart kids are moving up with the smart kids with the folks at home and the kids that, you know, aren't…
>
> [Facilitator] Let me check my understanding on something. It sounds like to me like what you all are saying is you like the kind of academic, high standards of approach one but you also like the kind of character development that you get in approach two.

(P3) If they are good citizens, if they are respectful to each other and respectful of adults and people around them then you can't have any of the other approaches…

The top two speaking participants – participant nine and eleven – are not the ones who came up with the ideas of higher standards and expectations but certainly have a hand in defining how they were used to evaluate the topic. By making the connection to a specific example (Head Start), participant nine was able to take the comment by participant three and make it into a viable evaluating mechanism. Doing so also put the need for higher standards into contexts in which the group could evaluate current educational policy – moving from the abstract idea of education when the participants went to school to what it is like to be an educator in today's schools. Even though participant three was really the driver of what became the main idea the group coalesced around, participants nine and eleven were able to, via their use of specific example, push it into the mainstream of the group dialog.

Which Speech is More Influential?

As I indicated in the prior section, male and female participants in the predominantly women NIF forums of this study used assertive, affective speech and initiated and engaged in confrontational exchanges quite often. When women used assertive speech, they did so to challenge previous points or modify evaluative frameworks. It does not seem that they did so in order to obtain leadership but merely to influence the course of the deliberation. It is possible that this may be unique to settings with this group composition compared to forums that are mixed-sex or are predominantly men. The question of whether assertive speech was more influential is hard to answer, given the lack of impact gender seemed to have on the group's norms. While men and women spoke differently and posited different types of frameworks for evaluations, it seems hard to make the argument that in predominantly women forums, the more

aggressive or assertive a challenge or statement was the more play it got. I find no evidence that any sort of hierarchy develop in which some participants ended up having more influence over others in directing the conversation. In fact, those that tended to initiate lines of inquiry or posited information that eventually became part of the conclusory section of the deliberation tended to not have a strong, forceful hand in shepherding their ideas to the end. Instead, it took a group effort with group buy-in to the idea that would lead to different ideas being selected as representative of the group. To modify what gender scholars of expectation and status posit on interaction hierarchies, I would argue that, at least in predominantly women forums, the sorts of power relationships identified in other task-oriented settings did not develop here.

Implications

The results of this section of the dissertation, while tentative because of the small number of data to work with, presents some interesting findings that can contextualize how gender operates in public deliberative forums. The types of talk exhibited in the four predominantly women forums are mainly what the literature on gender difference expects from deliberants in a group with mostly women: (1) narratives or stories accounted for a majority of talk, especially by female participants and sometimes by their male counterparts; (2) male participants did not experience an elevated status level over female; in fact, strong leadership by any sex was hard to discern outside of those who spoke the most. Ultimately, I conclude that while male and female participants in these forums did indeed speak differently and used different speech tools for different reasons, differences in talk did not substantially affect the dialog or deliberation. Let me now situate these results within the broader context of the three research questions posed at the end of chapter four.

What Types of Talk Were Used During Public Deliberations?

As expected, the predominant type of talk by women in majority female forums was storytelling and affect. When women told stories, they did so to convey a specific, concrete example of an issue or idea that reflected a set of personal values they wanted the speaker or the group as a whole to consider. Narratives were not told for the sake of telling a story or sharing a personal experience, they were told to provide context for the arguments under consideration in the deliberation. The modus operandi of narratives from female participants in these settings concurs with how Benlevy understands gender differences in jury deliberations. More importantly, I believe that women tell stories to supplement and provide some sort of context in which to better understand the three approaches of the NIF model. While the approaches outlined in NIF guidebooks often are value-oriented (for example, "health care as a right for all citizens" is a value approach versus "requiring citizens to purchase catastrophic care coverage" would be a more policy approach) with a foundation in rationality, I would argue that given the model of deliberation that the NIF-based forum provides, and Benlevy's argument that women prefer context over fact, it seems a logical extension of these ideas that women would have a preference for storytelling in these forums. Women did tell stories as a means of providing context (for example, stories of friends opting out of routine mammograms because of lack of insurance or their own experience with the K-12 education system) that the group could use as additional, contextual evidence.

In comparison to their female counterparts, male participants opted to speak mainly by reasoned analysis, although they did to a small degree share stories. Their stories were more likely to speak to broader ideas than the specific stories and examples of women and to imbed their stories in a foundation of reason. Part of the reason that most of the stories men told (when

they did tell stories) were based in reason is because, according to Benlevy, male jurists eschew contextual evidence. This provides a possible answer for why, at least in predominantly women deliberations, male and female participants used different speech types – the weight they give to evidence influences the types of talk each sex uses.

The evaluative statements used by female participants typically were framed as "you" or "I" type statements. The outcome of framing narratives or even factual statements this way was to put more general statements about health care or education into more specific terms that could be evaluated. Using "you" and "I" statements was meant to imply a way of evaluating or to model for the group how the speaker evaluated the claim and through what mechanism. The male participants in contrast rarely used the same sorts of evaluative statements, instead opting to frame evidence as objectively and tentatively as possible to the point of trying to not make a judgment. This presents a stark difference in how the male and female participants spoke in these deliberations. Women in these forums tended to use specific, aggressive statements, of which the "you" or "I" led comments were; men tended to use more general, tentative statements. This difference may not be a result of small group gender norms but rather a function of the deliberative setting. Mendelberg and Karpowitz (2008) argue that when groups operating under a majority rule mandate added more women causes the group to engage in *more* self-references and *less* other-orientation. Because the NIF model is not structured to require an outcome and instead focuses on getting participants through the process of deliberating that the type of talk male and female participants used in predominantly women forums was different than might be in differently gender composed settings.

Did the Group Composition of Forums Effect Talk Within Citizen Deliberation?

In short, yes, group composition does affect the types of talk male and female participants use in the predominantly women forums. While I argue that composition affects talk, it does so minimally. I agree with Mendelberg and Karpowitz that norms and institutional structures do matter for quality deliberation. As I just mentioned in my response to the first research question that male and female participants do speak differently in these forums and, in the case of nearly same-sex forums for women, it is possible that at least some of those differences might be attributable to the structure of NIF deliberations. Let me approach this particular question from the position of composition effects.

In what might be an unexpected result, male participants and female participants talked at nearly the same rate in these four forums. The male participants did not dominate the discussion by steering the discussion via a disproportionate number of speech turns toward their ideas or toward their methods of evaluating ideas. Neither did the female participants dominate the discussion, instead preferring to work on incorporating the ideas from as many of the participants as would offer them. As such, neither group dominated the other by taking over a significant portion of turn taking. While there was typically one female participant and one male participant who spoke the most in each forum, the rest of the participants were not far behind them in terms of participation rates. There were also few non-participants.

One possibility in explaining these results is that the group norms constructed in the early stages of the deliberation and refined throughout the process may have freed the participants from needing to stick to the stricter model of rational deliberation that difference democrats says inhibits certain groups from talking. Considering all of the female participants chose to be engaged in the deliberation, it seems that the discussion in predominantly women forums might

create a setting in which female participants feel comfortable and welcome to talk and challenge other participant's ideas. It is possible that these results indicate that female participants feel they are likely to be listened to, which may assuage fears that those who dislike speaking in public may be removed from participating (Bickford, 1996; Gould, 1996). This begs the question of whether these sorts of quasi-enclave deliberative settings relieve actors from the need to sex categorize before they enter the forum or whether the participants in these settings chose to reject those categorizations. Female participants actively spoke, challenged each other and the male participants, and worked toward completing the deliberative task at hand. With the strong use of narratives creating long conversational moves from both female participants and male participants, there was less use of Habermas's force of the best argument as a standard for evaluating arguments. The result was what Young (1990) predicted. Participants had a sense of attachment to particular histories and contexts that they shared and advocated for during the deliberation. Participants used values to compare ideas to one another. Because more people across both genders participated in meaningful ways, predominantly female forums might be more power neutral than deliberative settings that create culturally neutral spaces by bracketing out power inequality.

The evidence here is that participants across the board are involved in deliberating. Thus, the structure of what at times may be considered a form of enclave deliberation for women, may provide the best condition for public-political participation precisely because the female participants feel free enough to speak.

How Did the Gendered Makeup of Forums Change the Deliberative Process?

Gender does matter in deliberation: it changes the types of talk used, it affects the types of arguments seen as valid, different ways of evaluating arguments are present, and certainly participation and involvement rates are different. I have argued in answering these research questions that for women and men deliberating in predominantly women forums, gender is probably less salient than it might be in other contexts. There are differences, but those differences did not affect the outcomes of the forums.

The economically and politically privileged, those groups identified by Young (1990) and Sanders (1997) as typically white, middle class men, did not dominate the discussion. Neither was the passionate, particularized speech of disadvantaged groups such as women dismissed. The norms of assertive speech that is typically associated with dominant groups (Young, 1997) and seen as a negative attribute for women when they attempt to use such dialogue (Ridgeway, 2011) were not present in these forums. The gender stereotypes that often encompass status beliefs were not as salient or prevalent, thus confirming Ridgeway's (2011) argument that gender status beliefs will have little effect on performance expectations in task-oriented interactions.

I have made the argument that predominantly female forums were highly deliberative. Participants were engaged with each other and with the ideas and approaches presented. I would also argue that these forums featured the hallmarks of good deliberation as described by Polletta and Lee (2006), including free and open dialog with a diversity of speakers and opinions, participants engaging the claims made by others, the introduction of new issues, and a lack of manipulation when coming to common ground (Bohman, 1996; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996; Mansbridge, 1983; Young, 2001). Certainly, the deliberations featured in this chapter had a score of different ideas presented and evaluated by the participants in a fair, measured way. The

participation rates by all of the group members as a whole indicates that they were interested and engaged in the topic. There were few, if any instances where a participant's idea was challenged and then that member did not speak. Instead, the group members were constantly submitting ideas and evidence in support or to negate in a free-flow exchange of opinions. While coming to a decision or policy option is not a strong suit if the NIF model, each group was able to identify a couple of ideas the group could rally around. Those ideas were not the subject of undue influence or power – the easy answer is that the male participants did not dominate their dialog in order to get their ideas through, nor did any single narrative told in these forums with this particular group compositions carry more weight than another unless additional supporting evidence was provided by way of other stories.

While these characteristics are fairly subjective in their meaning, I agree that they provide a good eye-test for what good deliberation looks like. Ideas of open exchange, engagement, invested participation, and lack of manipulation is the core of what Habermas envisioned deliberation should be and is ideally what the first generation and newer scholars want deliberation to do. The more interesting idea is that these hallmarks were found in forums relatively absent of a preference for reason-giving over emotive arguments.

Conclusion

While the benefits of predominantly women deliberations seem numerous, the majority of actual deliberations do not take place with such group compositions. And unfortunately, it would probably not help the credibility claims of deliberative democracy if we only let women deliberate. The discourse coming out of predominantly female forums has a lot of positives and might provide some sort of template that deliberative democracy can use in going forward in revisions to its reason-giving focused structure.

In the next chapter, I will highlight the challenges of deliberating in predominantly male forums for women. If deliberating in majority women settings was seen as open and engaging, the opposite will seem true for majority male forums.

Table 4. Number of Speaking Turns Taken By Each Participant By Sex In the Four Predominantly Female Deliberations.

Forum Name	*Participants*											
	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12
Abilene 1	37	40	30	**48 (Male)**	42	62						
Abilene 3	35	42	**37 (Male)**	**14 (Male)**	30	39	24					
El Dorado	**31 (Male)**	19	40	1	13	12	5	2	14	**6 (Male)**	12	
Kansas City	1	11	16	5	**9 (Male)**	3	**8 (Male)**	12	37	4	20	36

Chapter 7 - Deliberating in Predominantly Male Forums

A Brief Review

If public deliberations with a majority of women can be described as successful, such accomplishment may be attributable to the openness of the dialogue, the lack of conversational domination by participants of either gender so that all group members actively participate, and for these reasons, gender could be seen as less a factor in creating bias and inequality that often hampers equal dialog. Unfortunately, if you are a woman who finds herself participating in deliberations with a majority of male members, the difference democracy and expectation states literature indicates you might be in for a rough night.

At the end of the last chapter, I argued that gender was not a salient factor in predominantly women forums because, despite differences in talk and deliberation styles, the variations between them did not have any effect on the outcomes or participation rates of participants. In the case of forums with a majority of men, the same results will probably not be found. There are several reasons why gender is expected to be more salient in majority men forums. First, the realm of politics and deliberation has historically been a male sphere of influence (Verba, Burns & Schlozman, 1997). Given the traditional notion that politics is a man's game, research indicates that women are less likely to show up to deliberate and if they do, they will speak less (Goidel, et. al, 2008; Mansbridge, 1983; Schlozman, Burns & Verba, 1994). It is possible that men view women as less competent of conversation partners on political subjects (Huckfelt & Sprague, 1995). It is under these conditions that gender becomes salient and has a resulting effect on the performance expectations for female participants. Considering that women have been found to be less interested in engaging in political discussions and are seen as not as competent (which I take to mean knowledgeable), women might expect to do little in these

,

conversations – to not assert themselves in the group discussion, to not have their views heard and evaluated, and that any opinions presented are less likely to be respected and thus not influential (Berger, et. al, 1992; Ridgeway, 2011). The self-fulfilling nature of such expectations may lead to a situation where even if the male participants are welcoming, women expect to be excluded and thus may choose not to participate. This might be the reason that Mendelberg and Karpowitz (2007) found that women in predominantly male groups took fewer turns, spoke fewer sentences, asked more questions and were interrupted more.

What happens if reason-giving is the primary mode of talk in predominantly male forums? As I outlined in chapter three, difference democrats concerned with the dynamic of reason-giving in settings that have historically served male populations argue that the universal and egalitarian means of communication it creates eliminates the ability of participants to speak from their specific location and are thus excluded from participation (Sanders, 1997). Not only that, but reason-giving would screen out storytelling from being an accepted type of talk because of its emotive and non-universal properties. The force of the best argument, an evaluating mechanism not strongly present in predominantly women forums is also likely to play a major role in assessing arguments. This has the potential impact of promoting and assigning value to lines of inquiry that stem from aggressive exchanges (Young, 1997). While female participants in majority female forums were engaged in assertive talk, scholars of mixed-sex town halls, jury deliberations, and other task-oriented groups have found that women choose instead to engage in conciliatory or exploratory talk (Carli, 1990; Mansbridge, 1983; Marder, 1987; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2007). This puts women deliberating in predominantly male settings in a possible leadership deficit. Gender status beliefs hold assertive talk to be appropriate for men and thus are expected to be the group's leader; dominant behavior for women in masculine setting is seen as

,

undesirable (Prentice & Carranza, 2002) and to engage in such behavior risks a backlash against the possibility of leadership and consideration of their ideas (Ridgeway, 2011). It is also worth noting Benlevy's (2000) depiction of the ways male jurists dominated deliberations and evidence evaluations. Male jurists were more likely to assert themselves as leaders and to be uncompromising in their evaluations of the evidence and so women were more likely to bend to the position of the male jurists than to continue arguing for alternate views. As I found in the previous chapter on predominantly women deliberations, when comfortable, women spent a significant portion of their talk expressing narratives and values in an often assertive manner. While I am not indicating that is how women speak in other settings (I will present that data shortly), it is useful to note the lack of retribution for using such talk.

Again, the three predominantly male forums featured in this section of the study from Johnson County, Abilene, and Mesa are certainly are not representative of all NIF forums, nor would they represent forums that happen to have a majority of men in it. The reason there are so few forums from which to sample from is that the vast majority of deliberations typically do not tilt so heavily in favor of one group or another. But, like the analysis of predominantly women forums, this section of this dissertation can provide some small insight into one facet of the effect of group composition and gender.

Women and Men's Talk in Majority Male Forums

Who Talks?

At first glance, the numbers of total speaking turns are seemingly comparable to the total turns taken by women in predominantly women forums (Table 6). In the Johnson County economic security forum, the Abilene health care forum and the Mesa, Arizona immigration forum, the male participants spoke over two-thirds of the time, with a total of only twelve

,

speaking turns or eight percent total taken by female participants in the Abilene forum and nineteen turns or sixteen percent in the Mesa forum. The Johnson County economy forum had less of a disparity between participants in the number of speech turns, with a little over thirty percent of all turns taken by female participants, but the difference is still substantial as the male participation rate is over the two-thirds mark. Given that the participation rate for women was down compared to men's participation rate in the majority female forums, it seems possible that this data may show a hint of women's exclusion.

Table 4. Total Speaking Turns in Predominantly Male Forums By Sex.

	Sex	
Forum Name	*Male*	*Female*
Johnson County	93 (58.5%)	66 (41.5%)
Abilene	134 (91.8%)	12 (8.2%)
Mesa	98 (83.8%)	19 (16.2%)

Table 7 (at the end of this chapter), like the corresponding table in the previous chapter, charts the rate of turns taken by each participant in these forums. In each of the forums for which there is data[4], the female participants were at or near the bottom in terms of speech turns taken. In the Abilene forum, the two female participants are two of the three least participating members of the group with eight and four speech turns; the rest of the participants in the group took anywhere from twenty six to thirty eight turns. In the Mesa deliberation, women were again in the bottom of turn takers, with seven, eight, and four turns taken. There was only one other member, a male participant who spoke less and two others spoke the same amount. Seven other

[4] Participant level data is not available for the Johnson County forum. The audio recording was not clear enough to detect and track individual speakers and therefore, I could not assign participant numbers to each speaker. The recording was clear enough to understand what participants were saying but not enough to consistently discern individual speakers.

,

participants spoke more than the three female participants. Whereas I argued in the predominantly women forums that men tried to integrate themselves into the forums without dominating them, it does not seem that is true for female participants in the predominantly male forums. The low number of turns taken by females across the forums does not suggest that women integrated themselves. Rather, it seems from the data here that women were backbenchers in terms of exchanges. That was not true of men in the majority women's forum because there was at least one male participant who ranked near the top of speech turns taken. In the case of majority male forums, women ranked near the bottom, indicating that at minimum the same dynamic is not at play in describing participation rates between the two forum types. Uncovering the types of talk and leadership dynamics at play will provide a better understanding of what exactly women's role is in deliberative forums with a majority of men.

Types of Talk

If the type of talk in predominantly women's forums could be classified as narrative in natures, the type of talk in predominantly men's forums could be categorized as largely rational. Similar to the previous set of deliberations, when women talked in these forums, they spoke mainly in story form. As expected, when men talk in public deliberations that are composed heavily in their favor, the male participants spoke using reasons (Table 8). The extent to which men spoke in reason-giving form is not surprising. Research has indicated that when men speak in public-political settings, they prefer to use reason-giving as their primary mode of talk. Whether they do so to maintain some sort of power advantage or because it is the method of talk that they have been formally and informally trained to use when speaking in such settings remains to be seen. Ninety-six percent of the non-narrative statements (which, again, would include reasoned statements, as well as all other statements) made were made by men, compared

,

to the less than one percent of rational dialogue spoken by women. Women also composed the majority of narrative statement users, with seventy-eight percent of all story-based statements, compared with twenty one percent of male participants.

Table 8. Narrative and Non-Narrative Statements in the Three Predominantly Male Forums.

	Men	Women	Total
Narrative Statements	13 (6.4%)	189 (93.6%)	202
Non Narrative Statements	257 (75.6%)	83 (24.4%)	340

What is surprising is the degree of divide between the way women and men spoke in majority male forums. In the predominantly women forums, men often adopted the primary types of talk that women used. In those settings, male participants were likely to share stories because it kept the flow of the long conversational moves. In the case of deliberations with a majority of men, the male participants, with rare exception, chose to speak with story. It could be hypothesized that when women find themselves in small group deliberations whose compositions favor men that they would, in essence, double down on the use of storytelling. Instead of opting to speak from a rational perspective, the female participants would choose to tell more stories in order to get their voices heard or their experiences recognized in the forum. However, this was not the case in this small sample. Instead of doubling down, women chose to use narrative less as a percentage of their speech than they did when the composition favored their gender. Narrative statements were over ninety percent of the type of talk used by women in the majority women forums; in majority male forums, it was less than eighty. Part of the issue might just be the fact that women, as a whole, spoke less in these forums and so, when they

,

wanted to speak, they chose a different mixture of rational and narrative talk. I will explore this possibility further in the following section.

When the male participants spoke, they mainly used rational arguments. As expected, these arguments took mainly the form of neutral and universal claims. The following illustrations of male participants sharing rational arguments provides some examples of how the use of rational argument functions in the deliberation. The reason-giving statements used by the male participants explicitly involved some sort of weighing mechanism or stated tradeoff that the speaker asks the group to consider. In the Johnson County economic security forum, a male participant responds to the facilitator asking a question about personal debt:

> (M1) Obviously, people need to be responsible for their finances. I think I would extend that to our financial institutions as well. Because I think a large part of the problems we're experiencing right now have to do with irresponsibility in our financial institutions. So, I would do it to encourage people to be responsible. I don't know, you can't really regulate that can you? You can't say, you know, watch it, don't spend what you don't have. You can say things like that but I don't know how far you can take it. I mean, look at the economic expansion in the 90's during the Clinton years. Our greatest economic expansion years ever. People weren't concerned about it at all, about whether people were living within their means and being responsible. Everything was just all fine. It was only after we deregulated again, then our financial situation went nuts with greed and we ended up back in a horrible economic situation again. So, I would extend that responsibility to it.

In the Mesa, Arizona forum, one male participant responds to a line of inquiry concerning the limiting of the number of immigrants coming into the United States.

,

> (P1) [Male]: Let me speak to the should we limit question. One of the founding value I think of, of America is that we are a melting pot. We accept all faiths, all races, all ethnic backgrounds and we assimilate them into the American way. I don't hate to see us do anything that would say we cannot keep the American Dream available. I think that's un-American to try to limit that. Having said that, there are laws – and I think we need to follow the law. I think we need to establish, as near as we can, follow the established rules and regulations of federal government and state government. If you don't like them, then we need to change them and legislate the change of those laws – because they need to be followed…

Both of these statements contain evaluative mechanisms embedded in them – a model of how the force of the best argument should work. In the Johnson County example, the male participant argues that despite the need for personal responsibility when dealing with money, if the government can't do it then why would we think individuals could. For the male participant in the Mesa forum, the question becomes how to balance America's idea of welcoming immigrants while staying within the confines of the law. When women told stories in the predominantly women's forums, their stories implied an evaluative mechanism that was based in values. For male participants in the majority men forums, their rational statements explicitly stated their approach to evaluation. For the Johnson County participant, the evaluation is whether personal responsibility is achievable; for the Mesa participant, evaluations need to take place within a framework of creating fair but just immigration policies. While the rational talk expressed by male participants in these forums does not sound (or read) any different than the rational exchanges made by men in the predominantly women's forums, the issue is whether the use of rational discourse affects the way women talk.

,

When women spoke in predominantly male forums, they tended to speak in narrative form. A female participant in the Mesa forum describes her experience with border security:

> (P10) [female] Couldn't agree with you more. I think one of the saddest things I've seen is - I have family in Douglas, which is one of the border towns. In fact. I'm going to go there this weekend. And the last time that I was there it was so sad. It looked like a military zone because you had so much armed border patrol and so much security. Growing up, I used to visit there often. I had never seen it get to such a state. So, to think that that's one of our US cities, having to operate and function that way, is just horribly sad. And that's reality. So no matter where you stand on the issue, you have to look at reality. That's reality. We need to do something about it.

Another Mesa participant also has a issue with border security:

> (P9) [female] I think that it's created an atmosphere of caution. And I work down in southeastern Arizona for all of my…for all the cases that I do. And yes, southeastern Arizona is beautiful. It's one of my favorite places in the whole state. There are a lot of road blocks. There are a lot of border patrol agents. But that's just what it is. I had a foreign exchange daughter a couple of years ago from Germany. Three years ago. And when 9/11 hit, she was appalled when she went to high school. The apathy of the students in her class, that they did not care to watch the aftermath, the news accounts. It brought to me, my eyes opened, that European nations, are sue used to this, used to terrorism, used to a bomb. If you're in the airport and there's a bag there, it's going to be looked at as soon as someone sees it. Here, well not so much now, because they're pretty good about it. But I would say four years if there was a bag, you'd walk right past it, so would the security guard. So to her, this was not – this was very important to what was happening

,

> in the United States, even though she was from Germany. And people back home in Germany were very concerned about the US, very concerned about the terrorists. And it opened my eyes to the apathy of not only students, high school students, but also adults. And before 9/11, I think that's what it all boiled down to. We knew that probably this wouldn't happen to us. And how could it happen to us? We were Americans. And so when I spoke to her, her family in Berlin, they said – You know, Americans finally, finally got it. And you guys are finally being aware of what's going on. And this is really nothing new. They were sad for us and they prayed for us. And it just really opened my eyes to how much we didn't know, or maybe didn't care. And so, that's something that I think is very important for the whole - the United States to know.

The female participants make specific evaluations or "you"/"I" types of statements, referring to themselves and their personal experiences with a security state. This distinction is not unlike how the participants spoke in the predominantly female forums ("we're Americans," "opened my eyes," "one of our US cities"). The talk of the male participants in majority male forums tends to take on a generic-level evaluations while the narratives of the female participants speaks to the more specific. The illustrations above from the male participants are all generic in their level of evaluation. The rational arguments produced by the male participants in the Johnson County and Mesa forums refer to a general set of groups, including "America," "the government," "the law" and "state government." The effect is to create the sense that the female participants are considerate of the specifics of the situation, of the people in it, thus their use of "we" in combination with their specific experience. Similarly to the way the male participants expressed generic evaluations in the predominantly women forums, they often wrapped specific

,

evaluations within much larger, general-level evaluations. For example, one male participant from the Johnson County forum discusses financial education:

> (P) [Male] I think education is important and I think at a young level, at an early age, is very critically important and we ignore it. And I have a friend who taught, who was a banker and when he retired ne went to a college and taught graduating seniors from college basic things about checkbooks, what to avoid, how to manage it, how to keep track, how to avoid that, how to save for things. And they did not have a clue even how to do that.

Compared to the narratives shared in the predominantly women forums, the female participants here share a different type of talk. In the previous chapter, I argued that women use value-heavy storytelling to push values because of the lack of overall reason-giving claims in the forums and the near absence of the force of the best argument as a weighing mechanism. While the female participants in these forums do use a value framework, their stories are less likely to merely imply such values. Their stories are likely to be more direct in their consequences, comparisons, and evaluations. For the female participants in the Mesa forum, they framed their narratives to give them import – one with border security the other with terrorism – and stated that they are real and important issues that need to be considered. In the set of forums in the previous chapter, the stories shared were less direct and more subject to interpretation. As I suggested in the chapter on majority women forums, this is possibly a reaction to the male participant's heavy use of rational statements. By their nature, stories are meant to be up for interpretation. However, in a setting in which the stories are specific and direct, with each having a statement of evaluation, it is possible that the female participants in this group of forums slightly modified their narratives in order to more easily appeal to the force of the best argument.

,

Initiating and Engaging In Talk

Male and female participants in predominantly male forums tend to, on face, use the same type of talk and in the same fashion as they do in predominantly female forums, with the exception of rationality being the predominant talk and narrative being the minority. There are, however, more substantive differences that should be recognized.

In the context of the larger exchanges within the deliberation, women tended to ask more questions than they did in the predominantly women forums. In the Abilene forum, questions or statements that functioned as questions accounted for four out of twelve total turns taken by the two female participants. In one series of exchanges about price controls, the male participants make rational statements about costs and the female participant chooses to ask questions:

> (P1) [Male] Okay in the perfect market solution, wealth of nations idea, which is a brilliant piece of work, if that is so true then most of the financial fiasco, the last twenty or thirty years the market hasn't automatically corrected itself. If we watch and the part that's always functioned rationally, if that was actually the truth and they could apply this well to the society that we have now, as it did to an English culture, and many of the culture they had at that time, that would probably be a valid way of looking at it. But, we have had enough one-on-one basic experience. And maybe the market gets it right about eighty percent of the time. But there is that twenty percent that can cost you a lot.
>
> (P5) [Male] It could eventually work. It could be drastic and dramatic. When it does work, and family care physicians are dwindling in numbers then you're gonna have to. You have to pay them more to get into that field.
>
> (P1) [Male] And what helping out in that new situation is…

,

(P6) [Female] Are people being set…because of the fact that docs are afraid that they are going to get sued? I means is that a part of it all? I mean, I've never really been a part of it by the medical issues. We were in the service and we had hospital and all the docs and all we had to do…we never paid anything and I am very fortunate that I have insurance now that takes care of what Medicare doesn't take care of so I'm not…the civilian side and what some of the problems are. I mean, is that an issue?

(P5) [Male] That may be part of that there but personally, I mean, I'm not sending someone to go see the dermatologist because….

(P6) [Female] Well, do the patients that are ask for it?

In this exchange, the female participant asked two questions. The first question wrapped together a question about whether doctors are pushing up costs because they are afraid of being sued with a personal story about the participant's lack of experience with for-profit health insurance. The question is somewhat informational and somewhat of a justification for asking such a question. The second question, about whether patients ask for specialist care, is merely informational. This result gives credence to Mansbridge's (1983) findings that in male settings, women tend to ask questions or provide information more than they do engaging in the conversation. Even though Mansbridge does not explicitly state that the group norms of the town hall deliberations she observes led to such dynamic, her interview responses indicate such effect. The women in Selby perceived the context of the town hall to be for men, that women have no right to try to influence each other through rational arguments. The result is that when women do participate, they do so through non-confrontational exchanges that do not attempt to influence the course of the deliberation. The above example is a good illustration. The questions asked by the female participant are hesitant, tentative and qualified by the fact that the female speaker really has no

,

specific knowledge about the topic itself. In essence, the female participant does not know whether the male speaker is correct in his assertions, but she is unwilling to challenge or even ask a direct question that could prompt the original speaker to clarify or provide additional information to his claim.

Even though women ask questions, those questions are not exchange-initiating questions. In fact, none of the female participants in the forums I studied for this chapter initiated exchanges – controversial or not. The closest one participant got was when the conversation turned toward whether medical care was a right:

> (P3) [Male] But is medical care a right? I think its evolving toward that the expectation is there. Yeah, we, it's an embarrassment that we have citizens who don't have medical coverage even though…
>
> (P2) [Male] In the UK. You are there, what three months. And the immigrants…
>
> (P7) [Female] Yeah, if you are there for three months you get the NHS.
>
> (P3) Whether you're a citizen or not?
>
> (P7) Yup, you don't have to be a citizen.
>
> [Facilitator] And you weren't obviously?
>
> (P7) Yeah, I was there as a student and, um, they required us to enroll in NHS. They brought in health care professionals, and they actually checked all of our health statistics. They gave us shots for one of the immunizations – meningitis – because I had never had a meningitis shot. But then there is also the downside of the NHS. I mean, I saw the good parts, but then I talked ot some of my friends that have lived in England their whole life and they see that the NHS and the NHS came into is when England basically lost their status in the world. I mean, when they started paying for everybody's health care. You

,

> don't get everything for free. If you have a prescription, you have to pay seven pounds ten for every single prescription, but that's for everything. Even if it's a knock-off prescription that would be three dollars here. Everything is seven pounds ten.

In this exchange, the female participant is responding to the inquiry of about the nature of health care in the UK. While it wouldn't be considered an illustration of initiating a exchange, it is an example of how the female participants did insert themselves into conversations at a time when they chose not to begin those conversations. In this example, the female participant takes a lead position in discussing the way the UK health care system works by including her own experience with it while as a study abroad student. She may not have initiated the conversation, but at least she took the lead in answering questions and then providing information in the form of narrative to the group in order to consider the question of whether health care is a right and how it might function cost wise. Despite taking the lead, this turn to the conversation quickly died out and the group turned toward comparing health care rights to the right of having national defense.

In conjunction with asking questions, the female participants tended to participate by agreement – meaning that often when they participated, they did so by agreeing with what the previous, often male, participant stated and then would tell a story. One exchange in the Johnson County forum provides an example of how, instead of initiating exchanges or even providing a critique of the male participants' arguments, the female participants choose to just agree:

> [Male] And I think that's bad for the future of our country because it's going to lead to a big upper class and lower classes that will leave civil unrest, disobedience, and fighting. I mean, I can see those things pulling this nation apart.
>
> [Facilitator] Do you seen yourself as a part of that middle class that's disappearing?

,

[Male] No. Well, personally, that's where you see your debt. Personally, I'm in pretty good shape. But I see a change over the last few years in the state of the middle class and I think it's scary.

[Female] I agree with everything he said.

[Male] So far!

[Female] So far! My husband and I benefit greatly from this more generous health care and pension and right now we're helping children get into daycare and it concerns me because I see the class that's been helping greatly. We've got to stop this or we're not going to be a major player.

[Facilitator] So you're living some of the options we're talking about right now?

[Female] Yes.

Another example from the Mesa forum:

(P1) [Male] It kind of cuts both ways. We've been talking about immigrants in the lower income stratum. But immigration takes place also with the highly skilled workers –the engineers and those that have a great deal of education. Those are coming out of China and coming out of India and other places – those are very highly skilled laborers and the United States needs those highly skilled laborers. They may not have the same profile that is here already, but if they've got a skill, the United States needs those skills because education and all those things that are being exported and the competition around the world we need to have available the immigration pool of talent.

(P9) [Female] I have an experience along Mr. Arnett's line. My daughter had a brain tumor removed and one of the doctors who worked on her was a fellow from India, a medical fellow from India. So, without the high skilled labor some of these things may –

,

> it doesn't create opportunity where opportunity may not, may not be there in the first place. So, it's important at least from my experience.

These two examples provide a small sliver of evidence that when the female participants speak in majority male forums, they tend to adopt a stance of agreement and story than a stance of soft confrontation. It is highly possible that the female participants just naturally agreed with the male participants contributions. In the illustrations so far, none of the male participants have said anything so totally out of left field that it would be a stretch for the female participants to find some agreement with. However, it is telling that there was not one example of a female respondent making a challenging statement; instead the majority of statements outside of questions were statements affirming the ideas and opinions of others. Wood and Rhodes (1992) argue that in male-oriented task settings female participants are more likely to display positive social behavior, of which agreement is. The friendly, supportive orientation that agreement provides is a product of social concerns of status within the group. Female participants become concerned in settings with amplified gender salience that they are not performing their gender status and thus will attempt to act accordingly. This mean that women will use positive social behavior such as agreement and accommodation in order to fit the gender expectations (Ridgeway, 2011). Wood and Rhodes find that women use friendly/agreeing behavior in order to diffuse tension within the group typically brought by male participants.

Often, but not in all cases, the stories told by the female participants implied a value framework; at other times, the stories shared were meant as more rational evidence. And, when the female participants shared stories in these situations, they received quite a bit of pushback in the form of the male participants rejecting the initial, central claim. According to Bales (1953), task behaviors build tensions within the group which is mitigated through positive task behaviors

,

such as agreeing or conceding issues. However, male participants are more likely to try to continue building tension during interactions, possibly viewing such tension as a way to move the group toward a conclusion or common ground. One example comes from the Mesa forum. In this long exchange, the participants are asked to consider the impact of day-labor centers for undocumented workers:

> (P13) [Female] I was a part of the Day Labor Taskforce in Chandler where an actual day labor site is at a local church there on Sarabosa Street, which is in South Chandler. And it didn't work. And if you drive in Chandler now, there's still plenty of gentlemen that stand on different corners there are it was because the contractors weren't willing to go through the center and actually submit their name and what company they work for because they wanted to treat these immigrants illegally. They didn't want to pay them their wages. They didn't want to even give them food and water. So the church, again, took it upon themselves. They had another nonprofit to come in to give them lunch, to make sure that they had enough money in case they did get stranded on the bus, just to ensure their safety. But it got put back on the contractors. They weren't willing to come and participate in the cities effort to concentrate, to make it a process in which they could gain employment and it just – it didn't work. It has to be put back on the employers that are actually soliciting their work.
>
> (P12) [Male] What about the Phoenix attempt? It's in north Phoenix, I guess, isn't it?
>
> (P11) [Male] Right up on Bell Road. There is a day labor center. It's currently supported by private sources, but at one time it was helped to get started with the city of Phoenix employees. And actually, there's a lot of misunderstanding about the genesis of the Phoenix Day Labor Center. The genesis of that center was a request by neighborhood

,

leaders and business owners – small business owners – in that area for a center of that sort because of the number of folks that were standing out in front of, on the street or in the parking lot. It was really hurting the local businesses. So it was they who came and said to the city and others, others working in the nonprofit world that we need to get an handle on this issue. And so it was they who asked for a center that would get a better handle in the issue. And, in fact, it's been a big success in terms of the local businesses saying that the business has gone up and people are much more willing to come to this area. And so one of the misnomers about it is that someone the day labor center was set up to facilitate the day laborers. That's actually not the case. It was set up in a way to help the neighborhood and help the small business owners in the community.

(P9) [Female] Along the same lines, I had a chance to tour the facility for two hours and listen to negotiations between day labor worker and employee. And the beauty of the day labor center and what it brings to the day labor worker is that he is in a position where he can negotiate his hourly wage. It's not an employer saying – I need some brick laying for seven dollars an hour. I saw the pride in that worker say fourteen or fifteen an hour. And then the whole negotiation starts. And as it got closer and closer and smaller and smaller as far as dollar amount goes, he said, "nah" and he went back and he sat down. That was the beauty for me. That he can negotiate his own, his own working hour and say no. Say no like the rest of us can.

(P1) [Male] I have to go back to the legality. For you to establish day labor facilities, you are embracing the illegality of what's going on. I understand the social implications and I understand that's a huge part and they are my neighbors, they're my brothers. And I understand that. But it also, at the same time is illegal. And so it is – I think that there's

,

> got to be a public will that we all come together and let's figure this thing out as American people. It's going to take all kinds of pieces. There's a whole lot of pieces, of very complicated pieces to this process, and make it legal for those people who want the work. I come from the perspective that I don't know very many that are here coming to work that are lazy. I think that the reason they're here is to try to make a living, try to earn money. And you can't earn money laying in bed or drinking beer or eating green burros or whatever the stereotypical innuendo is. So, I'm convinced that people really want to work, they want to have the pride of ownership, they want to own their own home, they want to support their family. I'm convinced of all that. But at the end of the day, we've got to make it legal. And for us to do illegal means, we're still going to be illegal. And that piece of it is not going to work until we make it legal.

This exchange is quite long (both in reading and in speech time during the forum), but highlights the way female participants tend to speak in forums and how their stories are often judged by male participants. Both of the female participants here spoke by sharing their direct experiences with day labor centers and used those experiences to imply a set of values that should be a part of the discussion (fairness and equality). In particular, participant nine speaks about the fairness inherent in a process where the day laborer can negotiate for a fair wage. However, in the next turn, a male respondent jumped in by arguing that the illegality of day laborers trumps any fairness or equity benefit from labor centers. Ultimately, his argument is that under no conditions could any benefit outweigh the fact that these workers are here illegally and thus, it does not matter what good participant nine saw from the wage negotiation between employer and hopeful employee – it is all illegal and therefore, not valid as a policy option. That last point is particularly important – the effect of the male participant's statement was not just that the female

,

participants were wrong but that their opinions and experiences were not valid. The last male respondent was even willing to deny the legitimacy of participant eleven's comment in support of day labor center in order to reject the claims made by the two female participants. There were few other exchanges in this forum that such an interaction took place. Men tend to rebuild tension in small group settings by escalating conflict directly (Wood & Rhodes, 1992). It seems that the male participant acted to rebuild tension within the group in order to prevent the group from considering day labor centers as an alternative to other reform options and thus to get the group moving toward an ultimate conclusion that focused on the legal possibilities. This exchange also had the purpose in keeping the male participant in a role of leadership and authority within the group. This type of interaction runs through other male-female participant exchanges in majority male forums. In another example, in the Abilene forum, a female participant shares her experience in the British National Health Service:

> (P7) [Female] You can get into any doctor within thirty minutes. If you want to go see your primary care physician, you might have to wait five to seven days to get an appointment, and I think that is pretty normal here. But, I mean, in an ER I was the only one there, and I was there on a Saturday night and I was in serious pain and I was in a college town, so I thought it would be packed, but I got there before the drunken crowd and I got in to see a doctor, and I think I had to wait about thirty minutes but that was more for, like, paperwork, but usually the wait for the ER is three to however many hours.
>
> [Facilitator] Let me just ask you what about the general check up? Had you been tempted to checkups? Did you do that while you were in England?

,

(P7) [Female] No, they don't offer anything extra, like, I mean, you only go when you have a problem or you are on a medication.

[Facilitator] So that's hypothetical to your idea of lets have incentives that make people take better monitoring care of them.

(P2) [Male] It's far worse than in all of Europe than here, they have introduced the smoking ban there but I can't believe more people don't keel over from lung cancer, and they definitely have a drinking problem.

When women's positive task behavior is met with negative task behavior, they are likely to withdraw from the conversation. In both of these exchanges, the female participants hedged within their stories a sense of concession in order to have their narrative gain more traction within the group. In Mesa, participant thirteen was willing to concede that day labor centers do not work in all locations. In Abilene, participant seven was willing to concede that wait times in British emergency rooms are long, but not when comparing to wait times experienced in American hospitals. This continues the trend seen from the majority female forums that female participants are more likely to provide concessions and to moderate their opinions when challenged. At the same time, male participants are more willing to be stalwart in their opinions. Both male respondents are excellent representatives of this idea as they both respond to female participants specific claims with unreflexive statements that indicate they are unwilling to consider alternate views on the subject.

In both the previous exchange and this one, the male respondents chose not just to refute the female speaker's claims but to outright deny their validity. In the Abilene forum, the male respondent said that health care in Europe was far worse than in the United States without providing any concrete evidence for such a claim but also neglected to present any evidence to

,

negate the female participant after she just presented several pieces of narrative-based evidence to her claim that the British care system is good. In deliberative settings, narratives are meant to be an equalizing factor, since all participants have his or her own stories to share, even in the absence of rational evidence. By telling stories, participants can gain an empathetic hearing for their experiences and values that might be unlike those of the majority. When stories are shared, it is meant to show how the particularized experiences might elude the universal categories imposed by the majority and thus, the minority group can expose the values and character of such principles (Polletta & Lee, 2007; Sanders, 1997; Young, 2000). In these two examples of storytelling exchanges, stories neither gained an empathic hearing nor did they equalize the relationship between the male and female participants. In fact, it seemed to have the opposite effect, drawing the male participants to reject the implicit value claims and the explicit worthiness of the viewpoint or plot of the story. Also, Benlevy (2008) argues that when female jurists are holdouts in deliberations, men tend to remain inflexible and unaccommodating and are likely to use power differences to force decisions. In the case of the Mesa deliberation, this certainly seems to have happened. Not only was the male participant unwilling to consider the social and economic implications of day labor centers, but he was not willing to consider any option that was not legal. In Abilene, the inflexibility of the "European system is bad" ideology that the male participant was not willing to accept the first-hand, contextual evidence the female participant had brought. The backlash experienced by the female participants in these two exchanges indicates that these women were not considered leaders nor did they have any authority to influence the discussion.

These two exchanges are illustrative of the problems female participants tend to face in majority male forums. Their primary modes of talk – storytelling, questions, and information

,

statements, provide them no equality within forums. As Polletta and Lee summarize, by telling stories, disadvantaged groups can gain a more empathetic hearing of their experience and values that may be unlike those of the majority. For female participants in majority male forums, this is not the case. Male participants are likely to reject narrative claims as not valid, not realistic or not applicable because their experiences fall outside the scope of legitimate action, as in the Mesa forum. In the Abilene forum, the problem is not quite the same. Because of the inflexibility of the male participants in changing their opinion, the group was unwilling to hear the positive experience of the female group member. Even when the female participants are willing to concede problems with their views or willing to make concessions to their value-based framework, the male participants in the group are unwilling to give up power to control the discourse and accepted-as-fact propositions. Because female participants tend to ask more questions than men (or than in majority female forums) and because they tend to not engage or initiate in controversial exchanges, there is a lack of opportunity for female participants to contribute quality exchanges that could build authority or legitimacy for any narrative statements made later in the deliberation. When all of these indicators are combined, I would argue that not only that equality does not exist normatively in these deliberations but that a hierarchy of evaluation was established quite early on that resulted in many of the female participant's claims being denied.

Leadership and Authority

I have made several arguments about the leadership deficit that the female participants find themselves in (and possibly make for themselves) when participating in majority male forums. Female participants tend to ask questions, eschew initiating controversial exchanges and talk by agreement and story. Compounding the problem is that the women in these forums speak

,

less. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the amount of talk a person does in deliberations is a significant factor in whether he or she is able to gain and maintain authority and leadership. Those who are able to submit their evaluative schema to the group and have it accepted are able to direct and lead the conversation. Across all three of the deliberations in this section of the study, the female participants spoke only ninety-six times, compared to the male participants who contributed over four hundred speech turns (Table 7). Male participants in primarily female forums spoke quite a bit – with at least one male participant contributing the second-most speech turns in the forum.

If male participants integrated themselves into majority female forums, women were seemingly tangential to it. When compared to how much their counterparts in the majority female forms spoke, it becomes even more clear that settings which might make gender a salient factor either shuts women out of the deliberative process or, at minimum, acts as a disincentive to contributing to the dialogue. Wood and Rhodes (1992) argue that because women are lower status group members, they do not contribute as much to the task as men do. Furthermore, for those in the group with higher status, affirmative responses such as those I documented earlier by the female participants, establishes a sense of leadership and authority within the group to direct the group and to enhance or maintain a position within the group's power and prestige order. Thus, when combined with a lack of talk, supportive behavior is not an opening to task activity.

It is with that description of female participant's behaviors in majority male deliberations that I turn to an examination of which ideas and evaluative frameworks were given the most consideration by other participants in the forum. If it is true that the ideas and frameworks advanced by the most talkative participants were carried through to the conclusion phase of the

,

deliberation, then it can be expected that the female participants will have few ideas considered legitimate enough for the group to accept in the final stage of the deliberation.

In the Johnson County economy forum, the group agreed that reinventing and reinvesting in the United States through more innovations was necessary to provide citizens with economic security. The first time this topic is mentioned is early on during the opening portion of the deliberation. The facilitator asks why the issue matters to each of the participants. The first person to respond, a male participant, states:

> [Male] From my standpoint, it's the future…I care a lot about my family and friends and it's all about the future. We need to put it in its place, the economic system that is going to allow this country to…carry on for centuries and we're making too many mistakes right now that we need to learn from. We can grow out of them but they're things that need to be corrected.

The next person to respond, also a male participant, echoes the same sentiment as the first respondent:

> [Male] What I was going to say is that we've had a lot of politicians for about fifty years that have been more interested in getting re-elected and power can be intoxicating. We were growing and now all of the sudden we're not. We might not be the big boy on the block anymore. There are other countries and cultures that are buying more stuff than we are. We're at a crossroads.

These first two comments, while vague and not specifically related to the idea of reinvesting in the United States, are the precursors to the idea. Both comment that America essentially is down economically compared to other countries and our own history and that significant changes are needed to make the US more competitive. The next time the idea is broached is during approach

,

two when the group considers the idea of community. Again, the conversation is not directly related, but contains more seeding for what develops into the group's conclusion:

> [Male] I grew up in a very small farming community and it was one of those things where if somebody needed help with their barn and everybody pitched in…if a farmer was sick and he couldn't milk his cows that day we all went out and took care of them. But now, communities….I don't expect the community spirit that we had when I was younger is going to be much, much harder because the younger people tend to be more self-centered in the technology…I think to try and emphasize this options right now, going forward in our future is going to be very, very difficult so I'm not placing much faith in this.
>
> [Male] It's going to be a different kind of community. Yes, there's a lot more technology but that almost instantaneously brings people together. Whether its live tweet or the Facebook and so it's a different type of community.

For the group, the idea of community was something that is holding back the reinvention of the US. Approach three asked specifically about the ability of American's to take advantage of opportunities and growth to reinvest in the US and "grow our way out." This is the first time the idea is specifically referenced. The group discusses the inventiveness of President Jimmy Carter's administration in putting solar panels up at the White House in order to wean dependency from fossil fuels:

> [Male] When Jimmy Carter was president he put solar panels up on the White House. Ronald Regan came into office, ripped those solar panels off, ripped the energy research positions of the country of their ability to fund new technology through technology. Reagan said we don't need any energies outside of fossil fuels. The Chinese came in.

,

> paid one million dollars for their research rights...now they've turned solar into a trillion dollar industry that's employing one and a half million manufacturing jobs in their country. They're doing the same thing now with this drill...We've almost completely given away the wind industry to Europe. Spain, India and China, Germany are all leading manufacturers now in this category. We have to completely commit ourselves to wind technology with it comes to materials…

The group considers other ways that political decisions to trade the renewable energy industry for fossil fuel support has led to a diminished capacity of the US to grow and be global economic leaders in emerging technologies. The participants point to the broken political system as part of the reason for such a breakdown, and whether funding green technology would help grow America. In the conclusion, the group makes the argument more specifically:

> [Male] I'm not sure about (approach) one, two or three…what I think is that we're seeing as a nation that after the second world war the rest of the world was basically decimated. We were the only real nation, the only real country who produced anything and we lived through a long period of time of prosperity and community. Now the rest of the world is catching up. They're revived. I think we spent too much money fighting enemies that don't exist. We can reinvest that in our own society – all these other things are great ideas but I think we as a nation we need to stop fighting everybody and just learn how to get along.
>
> [Facilitator] So is that – is there a theme there about reinvesting in the United States? That we invest within ourselves? Does that mean we have to do things differently?
>
> [Female] I believe we do.

,

> [Male] Reinventing, innovations. Clearly we can't keep doing things the way we've been doing them. That's the impression I'm getting.

Most of the conversations that led to the reinvestment framework were initiated and supported mainly by the male participants in the conversation with little or no verbal support from the female participants. The male participants were able to advance claims by using rational argument in citing a variety of reasons that the US has been decimated by its development mindset and how it has wrecked the notion of community, growth and inventiveness. The lone contribution to the discussion by a female participant came in the form of agreement with the ideas presented in the conclusion section – so at the end of the deliberation. In the case of this discussion, the female participants were absent from the exchanges that led to the ultimate conclusion.

In the Mesa immigration forum, the idea that immigration is necessarily a federal issue and not a local or state issue only was the main takeaway the group concluded. The participants spoke quite often about the local and state-based impacts of immigration policies or lack thereof but ultimately concluded that in order to solve the problem of immigration, a national, federal approach is needed. What is interesting about this conclusion is that it was an organic conclusion- it was not based off of one of the three approaches.

The third participant in the Mesa forum was the first to draw attention to the idea that, despite all of the local and state impacts that immigration has for Arizona residents, immigration is, ultimately, a federal issue. He does this in reaction to an almost throw-away line spoken by one of the female participants discussing the idea of a quota system for bringing immigrants into the U.S.:

,

(P10) [Female] I like what you said, too, about now matter what the economy is like in Mexico. But the counter to that is – as long as we have employers here who are desperate for that labor pool, people aren't going to be walking across the desert, risking their lives and dying out there if there weren't the economic benefits here. We have employers who have readily admitted that they depend on an immigrant labor pool in order to sustain their business. So long as we have that supply and demand, I don't think any federal quotas are going to make any bit of sense at all.

(P6) [Male] That brings a big question though. If they rely upon the immigrant labor pool but they're not paying these people taxes, they're not paying them social security or anything. Should they be in business?

(P3) [Male] Well, actually with regard to social security, some of these folks are working off false social security numbers. And I have heard from a pretty good source – I'll use one example here. The individual wants to be in the country so bad that not only was he paying into the social security system that he'll never get money back out of but he was paying someone's child support under that number. He just stopped paying for it six months ago opportunity…There is a workforce that's going to be needed. SO we need to stop looking at it at a state level – you brought up Prop 200. There was more to Prop 200 than just showing ID to vote. I think it was disgusting with racist, with racism, in my opinion. But I think you need a federal approach and that's some sort of work/visa program. Then you can talk about possible caps, albeit high, and securing your border.

The only other time a female participant had any influence on the direction of the conversation during the deliberation phase in relation to this topic is during the already referenced discussion on day labor centers. In that instance, participant one, a male, outright rejected the legality of

,

such centers. In the conclusion section, participant thirteen, one of the three female members, did express her agreement when the group concluded that immigration is ultimately a federal issue:

> (P3) [Male] What today reinforced to me is that immigration has so many different levels. And we talked about it at the city level and at the state level a little bit. But this is a federal issue. And it has to be dealt with at the federal level. I know we can speak cynically about it because they haven't done something for so long. But it's our responsibility to push this kind of thing. It sounds – but we really do. We need to call our congressmen, our senators and say "hey, what you doing about this issue because it's a big issue out here in Arizona." So its forums like this that will lead to that. And I do regret – I think President Bush has made some bold moves and we will soon get some sort of reform. That's my hope at least.
>
> (P13) [Female] That's along exactly what I was thinking. It's just like this whole day labor issue with – everything else that's going on. It's either you take action or you don't. It's not middle – oh, maybe we'll try this now. You either do or you don't. And we need to do, instead of on the other end and just kind of doing this. No, it's getting – like Jack said, we're starting to - the funnel here in Arizona. We need to start doing something about it and not just putting it back on the federal government while we wait. They're not doing anything. They are not doing anything. We have to start doing something.

What seems to happen in the Mesa forum is that the male participants were really the drivers of the conversations and the female participants had little way of putting themselves in positions of leadership or authority. As previously discussed, when two female participants did attempt to add to the conversation by sharing their experiences with day labor centers, their attempts to be seen as legitimate participants was soundly rejected.

,

The last forum from Abilene on health care reform had a similar dynamic. However, the female participants never put themselves in the position of being able to vie for a leadership position or when they do, their claims are rejected. Participant six, one of the two female participants only speaks by asking questions or making question-based statements mainly in the beginning of the forum. Some of participant six's statements I have detailed in other places in this chapter, but I wish to give one more example of how the reliance on questions prevents female participants from gaining leadership or credibility in the forum. In this exchange, the group is discussing the topic that will actually be the issue the group comes to agreement at the end of the deliberation. The group is considering the costs involved in covering all citizens:

> [Facilitator] So you are saying…qualify that idea, nuance that idea – not everything for everyone at every moment, but something for someone at sometime.
>
> (P3) [Male] I think that's what it would result in. I don't know that I am for that, but I think that the U.S. is the driving force in the world in medical care, research and everybody in the rest of the world is benefitting from what we do here, the treatments, the pharmacies that we develop and we are paying the high prices and then India rips them off and violates the copyright and that sort of thing. But, I think that applies to our level. If you are rich in Saudi Arabia you come to the U.S. for medical care you don't, well, maybe you go to Germany but the chances are you are going to go to the U.S. because you can afford it.
>
> (P6) [Female] I don't know how it will work out if everybody just pays something that would cut the costs.
>
> (P3) Actually, the co-pay and the deductible is an important part of it.
>
> (P6) I don't know how you can get it to a point where everybody can afford something.

,

[Facilitator] So you are saying the fact that a critical mass of people aren't paying in is what is contributing to an imbalance and an unsustainable situation for all of us?

(P1)[Male] All of this is an element that is central.

(P5) [Male] That's why they charge eighty dollars. The hospitals are trying to cover their butts so they are charging more….We are paying for everybody already.

When comparing the use of questions by the female participant to the use of direct answers and the assertion of evidence in response to the questions by the male participants it is no wonder the female participant can find no authority traction. The questions asked by the female participant, while timely and certainly possess a certain level of challenge to them, are never answered by the male participants except to agree that having all citizens pay something would be a central element in health care reform. After this exchange, the group moves along with the cost discussion without ever grappling with participant six's questions. The other example in which a similar exchange happens is with participant seven and her U.K. health care experience. Even though participant seven does not ask a question, instead opting to assert some level of evidentiary authority vis-as-vis her experience in the U.K., her claims are rejected by the male participants who do not want to consider whether the British (or European) models of public health care would be more advantageous.

Implications

The results of this section of the dissertation, like the previous section, are also tentative because of the small number of data to work with. However, these results present some interesting findings that can contextualize how gender operates in public deliberative forums. The types of talk exhibited in the three majority male forums are mainly what the literature on gender difference expects from deliberants in a group with mostly male participants: (1)

,

rationality or reason-giving accounted for a majority of talk, especially by male participants; (2) male participants did experience an elevated status level over women; in fact, women found themselves in a leadership or authority deficit in the forums. Ultimately, I conclude that not only did gender become a salient factor in the deliberations but that it significantly stifled the female participant's abilities to participate in the forums. Unlike the majority female forums in which the male minority was involved in the deliberations, female participants in majority male forums were decidedly not a part of the dialog. Let me now situate these results within the broader context of the three research questions posed at the end of chapter four.

What types of talk were used during structured face-to-face public deliberations?

As expected, the male participants used rational talk a majority of the time. When men talked, they presented culture neutral, universal claims that used generic level evaluations. The talk by the majority male participants also tended to present explicit approaches for how evaluate the topic at hand. These evaluative claims were aggressive and concrete in nature and, at times, was used to challenge the credibility of female participants statements. The female participants, on the other hand, spoke frequently with stories. Like the way narratives were told in the majority female forums by female participants there, these stories contained a value-based evaluation that again was framed in the "you/I" format. Their evaluative claims were modified to be more explicit in nature than female participants used in majority female forums. If the gendered division of labor of speech was not present in the majority female forums it certainly was in majority male forums. The speech differences – rationality and storytelling - are expected, but unlike majority female forums, the male participants in majority male forums did not attempt to adopt the rhetorical style of the female participants, nor did the show signs of accepting stories as credible means of argument.

,

The results of this small study confirms findings that female participants in gendered settings talk less speaking turn, when they do speak they speak in shorter sentences than the male participants do, they tend to ask questions and they are more likely to be interrupted (Goidel, et. al, 2008; Mansbridge, 1983; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2007; Schlozman, Burns & Verba, 1994). As I documented, female participants here did speak less on the whole when compared to the male minority in majority female forums. And, also in comparison to the length of talk male participants displayed in these forums, female participants here spoke with shorter statements – some of these relatively short questions or affirmative statements. Women chose not to use aggressive or dominant talk, instead preferring to ask questions, to speak from their personal experiences via shared stories, or to offer statements of agreement. The effect is that women offered much in the way of positive social behavior (Bales, 1950; Wood & Rhodes, 1992). They were non-dominant participants when compared to the males in this grouping. Male participants were willing to use challenging statements and tended to be rather inflexible in their positions throughout the forums. Often these challenges meant the group was confronted with accepting the first hand experience of the female participants (U.K. health care system and day laborer centers) or the (often) non-evidence based claims of a male respondent. In reaction, female participants tended to use questions and affirmative statements to diffuse the tensions usually instigated by the male participants.

Did the group composition of deliberative forums effect talk within deliberation?

I have argued throughout this chapter that female participants entered these public forums and deliberated under a leadership and authority deficit. In short, for a variety of reasons related to both gendered nature of the public-political sphere and the expectations accorded to female participants in public-political settings, the women in these forums had no chance of being a

,

group leader, and certainly did not have a chance in attaining argument authority. Whereas majority female forums had little effect on talk within deliberation, the group composition did seem to have an effect on how talk functioned in these forums.

The very nature of the realm of politics and deliberation as a male sphere of influence certainly seemed to cast a heavy shadow for the minority participants in these forums. Given their talk-behaviors, it seems plausible to say that the female participants were caught up the gender expectations for contributing to the group discussion. For the most part, these expectations included talk that was less aggressive and more conciliatory and included more positive social behaviors including sociable and affirmative talk. Ridgeway (1992) argues that interactants create microstructures of social norms that, in turn, shape interactions. As women engaged other participants with questions and stories it is possible that these exchanges created the microstructures of social norms Ridgeway notes that, in turn, left women with no other possible choices for talk. These behavior had somewhat of a self-fulfilling nature to them. As the male participants continued to build tensions into the discussion, female participants were left with only stereotypically gendered talk and action that did nothing to grant them authority. It is also possible that such expectations had the effect of making female participants seem less competent of conversation partners, and so when women did speak with some authority, their claims were easily rejected (Huckfelt & Sprague, 1995).

The other impact that the gendered composition had on female participant talk was that women could not speak credibly from their social location. Sanders (1997) references this specific problem as a downside to rational deliberation. The one advantage that the female participants did have in sharing credible evidence is their experience with health care, immigration, or the economy, but when those viewpoints were shared, they were put down as not

,

credible. This has the effect of severely limiting the types of talk female participants have if they wish to contribute meaningfully to the conversation. The only conversational tactics left at that point are questions and agreement statements, and neither of those will help a female participant influence the dialogue. Thus, it could be argued that the economically and politically privileged that Sanders and Young (1997) identify – those with access to rational talk and could speak with other, more aggressive strategies – dominated the discussion at the exclusion of those who are not politically privileged.

How did the gendered makeup of forums change the deliberative process?

As I argued in the previous chapter, gender does matter in deliberation. In these case of majority male forums, gender was salient enough to influence the types of talk available to female participants and affected the reactions to such talk by male participants. Gender was salient enough that, even though women were present and contributed, those contributions were nearly ignored by the rest of the participants. This had the larger effect of denying any real participation by women in these forums.

Conclusion

Before I conclude, let me caution readers that the small number of forums in this study is not representative of deliberative forums as a whole. But, when put into contrast with the predominantly female forums, it is easy to see how a change in the gender composition of a deliberation changes the interactional dynamic. The good news is that majority male forums are also not the most prevalent gender composition that is seen. The bad news is that mixed-sex forums might not be substantially better than majority male forums. In the next chapter, I will highlight the challenges of deliberating in mixed-sex forums for women.

,

Table 5. Number of Speaking Turns Taken By Each Participant By Sex In the Three Predominantly Male Deliberations.

Forum Name	*Participants*												
	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
Abilene	26	34	38	7	29	**4 (Female)**	**8 (Female)**						
Mesa	12	7	10	8	4	11	14	10	**7 (Female)**	**8 (Female)**	11	11	**4 (Female)**

* No participant level data for the Johnson County forum.

,

Chapter 8 - Deliberating in Mixed-Sex Forums

A Brief Review

If gender mattered little in the majority female forums and mattered quite a lot in majority male forums, it might be safe to assume that mixed-sex forums fall somewhere in the middle. Gender might only be salient in situations where there are more men, or if the topic is more interesting to men than women, or a host of other issues that could plague female participants. Unfortunately, this argument puts too much faith into a normative structure of deliberation that, when looking at the previous two chapters, is not unbiased and does not screen out gender inequalities. I argue that the reasons that make gender salient in majority male forums are equally applicable in mixed-sex settings.

The gender status expectations women experience when they enter into deliberations constrain the speech types and discursive behaviors that can be used in the forums. Non aggressive behaviors and talk, positive social behaviors of accommodation and tension negation, as well as friendliness are the sorts of stereotypical expectations women experience in small group task settings (Bales, 1950; Wood & Rhodes, 1992). The expectation that men use rational dialogue creates the request for a certain type of talk that is constrained, rational, and oriented to a shared problem that intends to eliminate differences (Sanders, 1997). These gender stereotypes hold status beliefs that create interpersonal evaluative scenarios where men are seen as superior and more confident than women (Ridgeway & Bourg, 2004; Ridgeway 2001; Wagner & Berger, 1997).

In mixed-sex settings, as in majority male settings, these beliefs bias the expectations for performance for male and female participants. Stereotypically or historically masculine tasks like deliberation and political involvement in the public sphere give men a stronger performance and

,

leadership advantage over women (Ridgeway, 2011). Studies in the expectation-states vein find that, all things equal in mixed sex groups, male participants talk more than female participants, are more likely to direct the group using specific task or goal oriented suggestions, their speech is more concrete and not tentative and are more visually dominating during deliberative exchanges than women (Carli, 1990; Dovidio et al. 1988; James & Drakish, 1993; Wood & Karten, 1986). Research on gender stereotyping shows that the characteristics of leadership and authority as strongly associated with dominance – typically a characteristic that is undesirable for women when gender is salient (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Because the high salience of gender status expectations, men tend to be seen as more influential during the course of the discussion than women (Carli, 2001; Pugh & Wahrman, 1983; Wagner, Ford & Ford, 1986).

Expectations for performance tends to effect whether forum participants will assert themselves in group discussions and whether those views will have the opportunity to be evaluated. Those with less confidence in making rational arguments in settings that seemingly require them are more likely to have those views discounted (Sanders, 1997). The problem is that these expectations have a self-fulfilling effect (Miller & Turnbull, 1986). Even the possibility of gender expectations creates a situation where female participants feel their comments will not be taken seriously because they are not seen as credible speakers and thus will opt not to speak (Berger, et al. 1998; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986; Ridgeway & Bourg, 2004). And so, when female participants speak with these expectations in mind, the result is that the male participants have a difficult time considering such reasons as "good" reasons and views as valid (Williams, 2000). Without valid viewpoints, women are not able to have their opinions and ideas seen as credible, they are not able to earn a leadership role or authority within the group.

,

More importantly, when disadvantaged groups are unable to talk in deliberations, it is hard to consider any results to be just (O'Flynn, 2006).

The result is that women end up not participating in any meaningful sense. Their talk does not influence the group and at worst, women are seen as non-credible communication partners in deliberative exchanges. I do not expect mixed-sex settings to be any different. The problem is that the vast majority of public deliberations take place within a mixed-sex form of group composition. Thus, this chapter, more so than the previous two chapters, presents results that more strongly reflect the types of deliberative talk and discursive exchanges seen in public forums. It might be easy to dismiss the problems female participants face in the majority male forums because so few forums actually take on that gender distribution. However, if as I contend here that the results seen in majority male forums will follow a similar pattern in mixed-sex forums, then the ability of deliberative democracy to call itself more inclusive than the status quo will be in serious jeopardy.

Women and Men's Talk in Majority Male Forums

Who Talks?

This chapter analyzes the dialogue in seven mixed-sex deliberative forums. The topics up for discussion are the same as before: health care, immigration and economic security. Table 9 provides a snapshot of how talk in each of the forums was distributed. In six out of seven forums, the male participants spoke more than the female participants – often by a significant margin. The Abilene economy forum and the El Paso forum had the male participants accounting for over sixty percent of the talk compared to just thirty percent of the turns taken by female participants. Four forums – Johnson County, Manhattan, Rindge, and the Abilene health care forums all had more equitable splits in the fifty to forty percent range. The interesting forum to

,

highlight is the one in which the female participants spoke the most. In the Cedar Rapids forum, women spoke more than men, on a fifty one to forty eight percent basis.

Table 9. Total Speaking Turns By Sex in Mixed-Sex Forums.

	Sex	
Forum Name	*Male*	*Female*
Johnson County	88 (57.9%)	64 (42.1%)
Abilene Economy	92 (65.7%)	48 (34.3%)
Cedar Rapids	69 (48.9%)	72 (51.1%)
El Paso	82 (61.7%)	51 38.3%)
Manhattan	64 (55.2%)	52 (44.8%)
Rindge	89 (53.3%)	78 (46.7%)
Abilene Health Care	89 (53.3%)	78 (46.7%)

Unlike the turn taking distribution seen in the majority male and majority female forums where the majority party tends to account for most of the speaking, the turn taking in mixed-sex forums is relatively equitable across the forums. In the majority female forums, the female participants made up seventy to ninety percent of all turns taken; in the majority male forums, the male participants spoke anywhere from sixty to ninety percent of the time. Thus, the lack of substantial spread of speech turns across the forums is somewhat surprising. The results in table 9 could indicate that female participants experience the next closest thing to equality in mixed-sex forums. In these forums, they are being given the opportunity to speak unlike the female participants in the majority male forums. It is also possible that because the turn taking numbers are so high for the female participants their early claims and discussion points are gaining traction and so they are earning credibility and authority within the group. While this might be

,

possible, such a conclusion would go against most of the expectation states literature I reviewed earlier in this chapter.

Table 10 (see the end of the chapter) provides a more in-depth look at how women and men speak in these forums.[5] As a general trend, at least one female participant was involved enough in the small group deliberations to speak the most or the second most in almost all of the forums. In the Abilene health care forum, one of the three female participants spoke forty-six times compared to the next highest speaking participant, a male, with thirty-eight total turns This same distribution happened in the Johnson County forum where one of the two female participants spoke fifty times – the next nearest turn-taker, a male, spoke thirty-three times. In the Cedar Rapids forum, female participants accounted for two of the top three turn-takers in the forum. In the Rindge and Manhattan forums, the female participants were either tied for top speaker or where in a close second.

Also, from looking at the data, it seems that often one female in the forums was the strong, vocal participant, with the other female participants hesitating to get involved in the discussions. For example, in the Johnson County forum, one female participant spoke fifty times, the other female participants spoke fifteen. This is similar to the Abilene health care forum where the top speaker is a female participant with forty-six turns, but the other two female participants account for thirty-two total turns between the two of them. In Rindge, one female participant spoke twenty times, making her the second most talkative in the forum. The other five female participants spoke little – one made two comments, one made three, one made five comments, the other two made seven and twelve. The male participants in the Rindge forum all

[5] Participant level data is not available for the Abilene economy forum. The audio recording was not clear enough to detect and track individual speakers and therefore, I could not assign participant numbers to each speaker. The recording was clear enough to understand what participants were saying but not enough to consistently discern individual speakers.

,

spoke the same or more than the female participants. At this point, I hesitate to say that female participants are being excluded (although some are not speaking) without having further evidence.

Types of Talk

The types of talk female participants used in the predominantly male forums are, for the most part, the same types of talk used in mixed-sex forums. Female participants tend to ask more questions than their male counterparts, although the number of questions asked was down significantly. One difference between the mixed-sex forums and the majority male forums is that female participants tended to rely less on questions as a means of getting a point across. Instead, questions from female participants were used to gather more information or to explore or clarify another speaker's claims. The questions also were more likely to be used with a sequence of other questions instead of in isolation. For example, three participants in the Manhattan forum discussed the necessity of the primary care physician:

> (P3) [Male]: …I haven't talked to any primary care physicians anywhere that is thrilled with how the system is right now. You look at medical students right now and it is an all time low as far as which ones are going tin to the primary care fields.
>
> (P13) [Female] Where do they go?
>
> (P3) They go to specialists because the way the system is set up you get paid for what you do, not for how you think. So, I can sit in a room for a half hour trying to get my patient who has diabetes, hypertension, high cholesterol, and has had a heart attack get all their meds straight because they are completely confused and I am confused and I get paid peanuts compared to the cardiologist who puts the stint in…Thirty years ago one physician could have done everything because we didn't know much. Compared to now

,

where there is so much knowledge and so many things that can be offered you can't ever try to do it all.

(P13) We need more people like you primary care physicians. There should be more incentives and help to get more people.

(P3) I'm waiting for it!

(P13) Why is the person putting in the stint getting paid so much?

(P3) Because of the way the payment system is.

(P13) I know, but where does that come from?

(P1) [Male] Some government regulation, and the insurance industry says that is an important feat, and so they give that more because it is life threatening.

(P3) It goes back to the '80's. They basically applied the certain value of all these different procedures and care and every little code you put in there has a certain value.

(P13) A maximum you can't go over?

(P3) Well, just relative to other things, so the more risky something is the more value is placed on it.

In this line of inquiry, the female participant seems to ask a series of questions in order to better understand the issue of why there are so few primary care physicians. Her line of questioning is relevant and does attempt to clarify some critical issues. This type of questioning is not unexpected. Mansbridge (1983) discusses how women prefer to engage in non-confrontational talk during forums by asking questions. The interesting thing about the role of questions in public deliberations is that questions are in large part asked by women to men. Men rarely ask questions and if they do, the questions posed are largely rhetorical since the male participants tend to answer their own questions.

,

Agreement also had a large place in the talk of the female participants. Like the use of affirmative or agreement statements in the majority male forums, female participants would issue some sort of affirmative statement and then tell a story as evidence for why they agree. For example, in the Johnson County economy forum, one participant uses an agreement statement alongside a story:

> (P5) [Female] Yes. I think that you hit on a really good idea, that we need to have financial planning or everything that goes along with that in our schools. I learned how to manage a budget and how to do things from my parents and I think a lot of kids to today. But there are a lot of kids whose parents don't know how to do it and they arne't teaching their children how to do it, so they don't really know and they see what they see on television, they see what their friends have. I have a grandson – I have two grandsons who were adopted and I'll just speak of one, the older one who's twenty and now he's going to junior college and he's living at home…He has money to go to the movies and he has money to eat his lunches out and then he doesn't have money for other thigns that he needs and wants like his car insurance and this and that…but when I was his age, I was married and we watched television. We didn't go to the movies. We didn't go to movies for years and I still don't hardly ever go to a movie…I think it's important to get it from your parents and I think it needs to be taught in schools, too.

The majority of agreement statements issued by female participants in mixed-sex forums also included a story for evidentiary purposes. When male participants agreed with previous statements, they tended to speak more rationally and provide more general reasons. The use of agreement allowed female participants to avoid using confrontational speech while providing

,

contextual evidence for their arguments. For example, a male participant in the El Paso immigration forum responds to the question of the "browning of America":

> (P5) [Male] I agree with that. And not only that, but going back historically, it's always been a problem with new people coming in. It was a tremendous think when people from eastern Europe started coming into the country. They were saying – oh, these people are not even human. When the Irish came in, if you look at the way they were being depicted, they were depicted as apes coming into the country. And to kill an Irishman is no big thing. And so, we've always had the same thing. It's just a cycle…

The benefit of agreement for the female participants in the majority male forums was to help keep themselves in the conversation as legitimate interaction partners. Typically, low-status group members use these sorts of friendly, supportive orientations to increase the chance that their claims will find success and their ideas will have some impact (Wood & Rhodes, 1992). That idea seems to be true in the case of mixed sex forums as well. However, as Wood and Rhodes note, positive responses from someone in the group (e.g., women's use of agreement in order to gain footing in the conversation) gives the male participants an opportunity to direct the group toward completing a task, subsequently, to enhance or maintain their position within the group's prestige and power order. Consequently, these sorts of supportive behaviors are typically not openings for leadership.

Value- hypotheticals also played a large part in the talk of the female participants. While value-hypothetical statements are often vague as to what their expressed evaluative framework are or proposed the course of action, such talk is one way for low status group members such as women to legitimize their task contributions (Wood & Rhodes, 1992). Value statements and "you/I" framing is meant to create the impression that their task performance is motivated not by

,

the desire to achieve status power within the group, but instead is motivated by group-oriented, rather than self-oriented concerns. The benefit is that the use of such statements may convince others than such exchanges are legitimate (Ridgeway, 1982, Wood & Rhodes, 1992). In the Abilene economy forum, one female participant argues for the need for families and communities to pull together:

> [Female] What this made me think of was living alone and the incredible number of people who live alone right now. I guess I've lived along quite a bit and it seems to me like we're healthier when we don't live alone. I'm healthier when I don't live alone. So I think at least part of this is to increase our sociability, our social skills, our capacity to make decisions together because we need to live together. So I'm just thinking of the benefits that could come from all those people who are living alone to say gosh, it would be more economically viable for everyone if we learned how to collaborate and have new ways of cooperation out of economic necessity.

If the goal is to move the conversation from generic to specific, female participant's use of the "I/you" frame in mixed-sex deliberations does not have that effect. The male responses following that statement are all generic level evaluations, including talk of "farming roots" from one respondent, "community" from another, and "government" from a third. As I explored in the chapter on majority male forums, men tend to talk in generic statements that have the effect of making the discussion based on abstract ideas or on global level players, "the government" being an example. The interplay between "you/I" specific level evaluative statements and more global level evaluations is a strong tension that exists throughout the mixed-sex forum exchanges. Mostly, this tension is seen in how male participants react to female participants' use of narratives.

,

As expected, the majority of talk used by the female participants in mixed-sex forums was narrative. The stories told in mixed-sex forums had a lot of the same qualities as those found in both the majority female and majority male forums. Often, the stories involved some sort of conciliation to the majority gender in the forum. Stories in these forums tended to be specific, as seen in one Johnson County woman relates her experience losing her retirement funds in the 2008-2009 economic crash:

> (P3) [Female] Well, I'm somewhat frustrated because I believe my husband and I did everything right because we went to a lot of trouble to get good educations and we worked many years and saved. In fact, my husband said before he married me he never had any savings program. He just didn't spend any money. We've been very, very frugal and thought we'd planned very well for our retirement and the, as she said, everything went to heck and we lost a lot of what we saved, which is a major disappointment. Not only that, but it makes us feel very insecure now about our future. We never expected this to happen at all. And we don't know what to do.

In response, a male participant uses reasons to explain the causes for the economic crash:

> (P4) [Male] I don't like the whole concept. I mean, I don't know. I wouldn't blame myself, I think, for not spending. I mean, I don't like this whole concept that the whole U.S. economy is based on housing and consumer spending. I mean, its not really, I mean, I don't know. We can't go back to the early twentieth century where we were making iron, but this whole notion that the only way we can get the economy going gain is through spending, to me, is just sort of wrong-headed. There's got to be a better way than just enticing consumers to spend. I mean, its just going to be a bubble and burst economy if the only way you expect the economy to revive is by people buying houses again. Then

,

> you'd see a housing bubble and it crashes, people speculate on real estate. And I don't know which option this fits into but, I mean, there has to be a better way to base the whole economy on than just consumer spending.

Both of these exchanges are also illustrations of the tension between specific evaluations and generic evaluations that exist particularly in mixed sex forums. In majority male forums, a large part of the evaluative statements made were in the form of generic evaluations, and because stories were often discounted by the male participants, specific evidence and frameworks had no influence on the outcomes of deliberation. In the case of mixed-sex forums, narratives and specific-level evaluations were a larger part of the discussion and tended to draw the group into considering individual-level impacts.

In sum, the types of talk expressed by both male and female participants is quite similar to the types of discourse seen in majority male forums. Female participants tend to ask questions, but less so than in majority male forums; female participants continue the trend of relying on statements of agreement before prefacing their arguments as a means of integrating themselves into the conversation. Also, the division of labor in talk – the expected divide between narrative and rationality exists. While the talk may be similar, the reactions to the use of such talk, particularly storytelling, is quite different and indicates that group composition has an effect on the discursive dynamics of public deliberation.

Leadership and Authority

In mixed-sex groups, the male participants are assumed to be the legitimate leaders of the group unless there are structures of opportunity to elevate women to that position (Smith-Lovin & Robinson, 1982). Thus, the default of any mixed-sex task-oriented group interaction is that the male participants will be the ones directing the conversation and maintaining the social order of

,

the group. It is under these conditions that the female participants in this study endeavor to gain credibility and authority. By looking at table 7.1, the argument could be made that mixed-sex forums must have some sort of normative structure that elevates women to equal status since they contribute nearly half of all speech turns. One of the major arguments from deliberative neutralists is the call for free and open participation by all citizens in a community. So, it seems plausible that mixed-sex forums provide that structure. Table ten even confirms that the female participants often have a large role to play in the conversations, speaking as frequently as their male counterparts. In places like Cedar Rapids and the Abilene health care forum, women spoke the most. Does this mean that mixed-sex forums have it right? No.

The Cedar Rapids deliberative forum is somewhat an anomaly in that the female participants accounted for more of the speaking turn than men, albeit by a relatively small margin (Table 10), so I wish to address this forum first. The top speaker was a female, participant sixteen; the third speaker was participant eleven, a female as well. The top six speakers all had relatively close number of speaking turns. However, neither participant sixteen or eleven had any real effect on the outcome of the deliberation. First, most of the turns taken by participant sixteen were used during a brief exchange with another participant eleven over whether immigrants pay taxes, so the numbers are inflated somewhat. Also, the type of talk used most by participant sixteen was story and agreement with story statements. The same is true of participant eleven who used a majority of her speech turns to speak in narrative as well.

In Cedar Rapids, the group did not come to a specific conclusion, but they did have a tentative agreement in the idea that immigration was a federal issue. Participant eleven has some effect on the outcome of the topic. She argues that her experience as an attorney representing refugees and that the U.S. should change its policy and not persecute people who come to

,

America who were slaves in Sudan, to borrow her example. She also is able, as an attorney, to give anecdotal evidence that permanent residents must wait nine years in order to be reunited with their families. This line of inquiry leads the group to consider the legal situation of immigrants. Later in the forum, participant eleven mentions that there is not a lot of ways to become a legal citizen and that immigration law needs to change to address the needs of those immigrants already here. The claims made by participant eleven are aggressive, non-tentative claims. Even on the occasion that she shares a story, the story is direct and specific. Part of the reason that participant eleven's claims did not gain more traction than they did was that she never pressed her opinion or legal input on the group unless there was a reason to – or unless there was a call for some sort of specific knowledge that her background as an immigration attorney could provide. So, despite speaking the second most out of all of the forum participants, those turns could be described as merely reactionary. While participant eleven was not the driver of this conversation, she contributed to it in ways that did not gather any immediate backlash.

Even though women speak frequently in mixed-sex forums, does not mean that they have a place of leadership within the group, nor does it mean their views are taken as credible and worthy. Smith-Lovin and Robinson (1992) argue that inequality will occur in mixed-sex exchanges unless there is a legitimate authority structure that gives women leadership status. Narratives could possibly be that structure. And, in fact, when female participants used narratives to advance claims, they were greeted with one of two reactions: (1) acceptance, or (2) challenge. That stories were not met with immediate rejection is a step in the right direction for the female participants who use them and wish to gain some credibility within the deliberation. But, let me temper my claim. Acceptance of stories was not the reaction most female participants received

,

when they shared their narratives. Let me first share more about the situation in which narratives were accepted.

The lone example of general narrative acceptance came from the Cedar Rapids forum. I would attribute some of the reason that narratives were accepted as worthy evidence was that the forum facilitator encouraged the use of storytelling and would continually localize the specific issues under discussion or would ask for personal connections to the topic. This had the effect of making stories legitimate and thus facilitated their use in the forum. In this example, the facilitator begins the discussion by asking about the need to limit immigration:

> [Facilitator] With this approach, the contention is that we need to limit immigration for some specific reasons. Because of the stress put on the system, because of our inability to assimilate as rapidly as we are receiving new people. Is there legitimacy to that position? (P10) [Female] I'm a former refugee resettlement worker, and I can only speak from my own experience, but – and as a social worker the job was very demanding. But in the time that I worked the job, it became more demanding and I felt, again only from my perspective, that I couldn't meet the needs of my clients. It was far too difficult. And I think that's a common scenario for many social workers. But the complexity of the issues in refugees that I saw – many mental health issues, medical issues, employment issues – were so complicated. I don't know that we have an adequate system set up to handle that. And I don't think we address it honestly. And in trying to – myself as a social worker at that time – trying to express my own frustration, I think it was met to with very much a closed door. So I think we – from both ends – we have entry, but we don't have adequate services, but really nobody is willing to address what's the solution. So I don't – and I don't have a solution myself.

,

(P13) [Male] I saw that with the Somali refugees. A lot of them came to Cedar Rapids and for a couple weeks, they got food, they got money, they got rides, they got some furniture. But then there's a cutoff point. It was real evident in the community when that happened. But at the same time, I've seen a lot of those folks now, they've sort of done it on their own. Not to say that it wasn't perfect or they didn't have rocky times, but they're working, they've got cars, they've got kids now. And you wouldn't know that six or seven years ago, they came to the country with literally, with what they had on their back. But I'm glad you addressed that because it was – you saw this movement, all these people, and there was no real safety net.

The conversation continues when the next respondent, a female participant argues that "some things were acceptable in [immigrants] home countries to use for medications, for example, marijuana in some countries, is quite acceptable and not a problem. And it's illegal here. That makes it a problem." The facilitator intervenes and localizes the issue by directing the conversation toward considering the experience of another town, Lewiston, Maine who dealt with an immigration influx. The first respondent takes on the problem presented by the previous speaker and speaks with a challenge:

(P15) [Female] I think within my community, first of all, let me just say one thing – the majority of the immigrants who come here, come here for economic reasons. Those who do come, do not come to stay on the system. They've come here for independence. That means financial independence, cultural independence. You keep saying assimilation. Assimilation as far as language is concerned. But they have their own culture. What is acceptable to them is not acceptable to us in some measure. You're talking about communities like Lewiston, Maine. They had initially like 1,000 Somalis came at first.

,

They brought their families. They found that Lewiston was a wonderful place to live and they decided – Hey this is nice. Let's start businesses here. And they brought their families. And now I think there's like 5,000 of them there. The same thing has happened here in Cedar Rapids. You have Somalis, you have Kosovars, you have the people from Bosnia. They were brought here in resettlement groups. They found it was nice. They decided to stay. Most of them have businesses. There are very few of them who are on the system. You have – they don't want to live on welfare. To them, that's very denigrating. They want to be independent financially and culturally. In our mosque here, we have people from more than 34 different countries. And very few of them are on the system. I think for communities like Cedar Rapids and Lewiston, it's not an unobtainable thing to bring these people. They've added very - a deep richness to this city. Cedar Rapids has got a community of Lebanese that have been here for more than 100 years. And they've added to this city tremendously. You have people who say – It's no longer a Christian country. So what? That's what America is. You've got to accept us whether you like it or not. And no longer calling Christmas break Christmas break because it insults you, well what about us? Our religion – don't discount us because we're not Christian, we're not Jewish. I don't know any Jews who celebrate Christmas.

(P1) [Male] I think one of these – and I'm married to a Lebanese that goes to the Mosque – I think one of the issues is taking from the personal. I've got a fellow who was a refugee from Iraq that worked for me and honestly I don't know if there's anyone I respect more in the world and this guy came with nothing and now he owns a lot of properties and he has a lot of business interests. He's a hard worker. I think most people would say that people coming in are hard workers. There's no – in general. But I also tell you that

> there's limits to what this country can absorb. We do have financial constraints. We have constraints socially. And I would beg anybody to go out to southern California or Arizona and not say that those areas haven't been overwhelmed with immigrants that they can't handle. You would take neighborhoods – even around LA – there used to be single family neighborhoods, and now you have situations where you got 5 cars parked in the front lawn. I know this from personal experience. And multiple families living in a house designed for one family. That's the reality. But at the personal level, these are good people. And they are generally hard working or they probably wouldn't be here. But there are – this country does have limits to what we can afford. We're not unlimited where we can just allow anybody in the world to come here because they're in need. It would be nice if we could, but not realistic.

Just because narratives were accepted, does not mean that the discourse was not filled with tension or with direct challenges, nor that they were even evaluated equally. When ideas between male and female participants are in competition with each other, the female participant's ideas tend to receive less attention from others, are seen as less competent and less influential (Wood & Rhodes, 1992; Ridgeway, 1981, 1982). Even when female participants have quality ideas or present solutions to problems, low-status group members will find these reactions. Participant fifteen's defense of immigration and how cities are better off culturally when immigrants come is spirited and passionate. It evokes a response from participant one, a male, who chooses to speak from personal experience in return to challenge the participant fifteen. His argument, that there are limits to what communities can "absorb," both culturally and financially, is a direct response to culture question of the previous speaker. In having a mixed-sex setting where narratives are accepted creates a unique situation – narratives are used in comparison with one another in a way

,

that invites direct clash of the type that had not been seen in majority female forums. Both of these participants attempt to invoke the "reality" of the situation in order to evaluate which personal statement is the most true or believable. This clash also has the possibly unintended effect of drawing out positive social behavior from other female participants who work to defuse the tension generated by this passionate exchange. The next two speakers, both female respondents, move from specific to general levels of evaluation, one arguing that the discussion "demonstrates the depth of the problem" and "part of the problem is the numbers in concentration in certain areas."

Sometimes, acceptance comes in the form of support from male participants with facts to supplement the female participant's narrative claim. In El Paso, one participant makes the claim that "the strength of the nation is in its homogenous – because it is a homogenous entity." The next respondent, a female participant, argues:

> (P3) [Female] I disagree with that. I am the second generation of an immigrant family. As you can tell, I know how to speak English fluently. And Spanish fluently – that you can't tell. But I'm also learning French. My point is that they have come to assimilate. And it's not that hard to believe that somebody who is seeking the American dream will do everything in their power to not just achieve it, but embrace the culture of the company – company – of the country that they are entering.
>
> (P6) [Male] Well, I try to listen because I'm part of this debate on a national level. But there are certain things that are, at least from my viewpoint, very obvious. First of all, a lot of the concerns, I think, are being fed by all of the things that I categorize as the browning of America, which I think leads to the viewpoints that – Look, people are coming in here and they're trying to change what America is. When in reality, it's quite

,

> the opposite. You know when you speak English and Spanish, you can communicate with 68% of the world. I think that's something that most people forget. I know that's something that I drum into my kids, to make sure that they focus on being bi-lingual, like this young lady. But as we deal with the issues of immigration, illegal and otherwise, I hope that the argument stays on a higher level when we – in fact, he took my statistic. I was just in China last week and I'm always reminded that they have more people in that country learning to speak English. Why, because English is the international language. We landed in North Korea last week and the international traffic control system is based on English. So there isn't any argument about what the world subscribes to as the international language. I think it's more of an internal thing for us to get over this issue that – I think it's fed by all these articles on the browning of America.

As I stated earlier, claiming narratives were accepted must be tempered with the idea that there are caveats to such acceptance. In mixed-sex groups, the default leadership position resides with the male participants (Smith-Lovin & Robinson, 1982). Unless male participants create alternate leadership structures for women to gain credibility, agreeing with narrative claims is not going to give women authority. Both of these examples of narrative acceptance are not acceptance in the traditional sense. Despite the fact that the first speaker in the El Paso forum, a female was a second generation immigrant who specifically addressed the desire of immigrants to embrace American culture and assimilate, the claim needed the authority provided the use of reasoned argument to become valid. Participant six, a male, talks about how the Chinese are trying to learn English and that traffic control system is written in English. In the Cedar Rapids example, using narrative did not give the female participant any unique traction when speaking in the forum. In fact, in that particular example, a story was used to challenge the original speakers narrative

,

claims. In the case where the type of evidence used by both the male and female participant are deemed valid, the default person of authority is still the male participant and, in that example, he frames his narrative in terms of what "reality" is so as to deny the validity of the claims within the story. This is a positive move from considering narrative a not valid type of talk in majority male forums.

Having narrative claims accepted was not common across the mixed-sex forums. Often narratives were challenged in ways that were similar to challenges in presented in the majority male forums. Male participants in mixed-sex forums tend to be more critical of others' views and opinions because of the higher status performance accorded to them (Wood & Rhodes, 1992). Thus, male participants constantly challenge the claims made by female participants in particular in order to maintain a stable social hierarchy (Ridgeway & Diekema, 1989). The problem with the way male participants challenge the claims made in the narratives presented by female participants is that it has the effect of denying the specific experience of the female speaker. In the Manhattan forum, the group is considering the problem of accessibility of health care compared to the affordability of care. One female participant initiates a confrontational exchange by discussing her mother's experience with living in a rural area and needing an oncologist:

> (P2) [Female] : Can I just say one thing. So we lived in Laramie, Wyoming, university town, great place to live in. My mom gets breast cancer, not an oncologist, there is not a radiologist, there is not an oncologist. There is nobody that can even look at her and say well this might be an issue. She has a complication, it's not a choice she made to have breast cancer, she gets a complication, they say you are going to have to drive to Denver, which is 2 ½ hours away because we can't do anything for you but her complication is a minute will matter, if you do it now she survives, if you don't... So is that really her

,

problem, is that really her choice? That is what I am saying when there are 60 million people that don't have access, and I am not just talking they get strep throat or driving there. There is certain needs that they need and even if they have health insurance, at that moment, at that second they won't be able to get there in time.

(P5) [Male] Your expression of that is absolutely on point; the challenge though is there is a disparity for everybody because of accessibility. Whether you are two blocks away and you get there and have a line of 15 people that is why I said I am not sure equity and accessibility is easy to achieve. When I had my stint in Manhattan, they couldn't put it in Manhattan, and they went in and didn't think I needed anything but it turned out they had to haul me to Topeka to put the stint in. Now you can do it in Manhattan. So you know that was Manhattan, Kansas and I'm not that old it was only a few years ago. And so it is a changing moving target so we will never have equity and accessibility I think now the plea to do it, absolutely but how do you define it?

(P1) [Male] Also we would have to bring in why is there not accessibility? You know, are there doctors not there because there is just not you are right if they are in an area where there is one person every 50 miles around I can understand why there is not a doctor there you are choosing to live there you are taking a chance. But if you have a doctor in a town like Wamego's size, 3,000, that is several hours from everything else that they are not there because they can't afford the premiums you know there's other issues, that to me is something that we should be able to talk about, and I do not have the answer, but to talk about and try to come up with some answers.

(P6) [Male] To me there's two sides to that, one is there enough business for the doctor to stay in business in Laramie or the other side is my mom who is retired, when she talks

,

about where she is going to move to, she has to be for cancer, close to medical that will meet her needs. She can't just pick anywhere; she has to limit her life.

When female participants use narratives to gain credibility or authority in the group, they tend to experience the same sort of backlash and challenge they did in the majority male forums. In the case of mixed-sex forums, the speech tool that is narrative is more accepted than in majority male forums, but at the same time, the stories themselves are more likely to be challenged with specific claims. The effect of such challenges, especially when used by male participants is to deny the validity of such experience or even to deny the initial story any serious consideration. It is hard not to argue that these challenges represent some type of backlash against the female participant's use of aggressive talk. Ridgeway (2011) argues that when women are assertive, their behavior contradicts the hierarchical aspect of gender status and beliefs and, thus, violates others' expectations about gender and authority. The Manhattan and Cedar Rapids female participants presented their stories in ways that were slightly aggressive in nature or at least presented a challenge to the dominant discourse at the time. In this case, the male participants reacted with strong challenges that attempted to deny women leadership and authority in the group.

Females in mixed-sex forums also experienced pushback when they attempted to present conclusions as representative of the group's deliberation This form of leadership – summarizing and presenting conclusions as possible common ground for future action – was treated very negatively by the male participants. Often, when this happened, male participants deployed several different strategies in order to discount what the female participants stated as a possible conclusion of the group. The goal of such action was to maintain the ability of the male

,

participants to frame and direct the group's resources and conclusions. To provide an example, at the end of the Manhattan forum, one female participant states:

> (P4) [Female] I was really surprised maybe and very happy to see that at least it seems from what I am getting out of this group that most of think that health care is at least some sort of right or basic necessity that we as citizens should have and I guess I came away out of the last presidential election feeling that there is a good percentage of our country who does not think health care should be a universal right. So it helps me better believe that we can come to a consensus at some point if we have a group of people and we as a society do believe that everybody should have health care.

This statement was met with two different responses by two male participants, both of which had been extremely vocal during the course of the deliberation. The first response was immediately challenged the authority of such outcome presented by participant four:

> (P11) [Male] I was wondering whether we are a representative group because if you went to a very poor section or a city you would have a completely different discussion. Or if you went to a meeting of CEO's and hospital administrators and all you would have a totally different perspective. The other thing, this has been very interesting me to and I wasn't sure I would find it that way. The issue that Milo raises about a basic level or that there is and I think we would all agree there is some level of health care that should be available to everyone but if you are talking about equalizing to the point that everyone has equal access to everything, that is an ideal but it ain't gonna happen. It will never happen in our system.

,

The second response was no less aggressive or challenging. Participant one argues that the claims made by the participants in the forum, including those advanced by way of story and personal experience are not grounded in fact, and are at best false and mere myths:

> (P1) [Male] One of the things I find here is I did probably about ten to fifteen hours of research preparing for this. I came in with oodles of data. I am very surprised that I know some of the people in this group and the amount of information that we believe to be true but when you look at the data doesn't support what we think is true. Many of the comments that were made here that you have stated that certain things you believe this to be a certain thing but when you look at the data that I have looked at in the last three or four days it contradicts exactly what we have commented here. So that is what is really something that I have gathered. And again we talk about who needs the education? Who needs the information? The thing that I think we need is a lot of data. People need to interpret and understand that data. I find that I am, and confining me to three approaches that none of them are really good in terms of solving the problem I think is really limiting to me. I thought we might have a broader discussion and have option four or five or six and many others. So I think that missing out or buying in to many myths because I actually went into an article that talked about twelve myths that was very interesting and we have discussed almost all of those myths and we tend to believe a number of those myths when the data shows differently. It wasn't just the one but it was a nice summary of many of the research points that I had so.

This sort of concrete denial of the claims made by the previous participants, including stating that because they are not a representative group the conclusions reached are not valid, had the effect of controlling the conversation to the point of excluding the viewpoints of anyone who

,

does not meet the narrow parameters of acceptable conclusions or evidence. When combined with some of the other reactions female participants received when their narratives were challenged, it seems gender is certainly a factor. I would argue that these reactions are meant to maintain stable social hierarchies in which the male participants are the default authority figure (Ridgeway & Diekema, 1989). The escalation of negative behavior as seen by these two male participants could plausibly reflect the competition between them for higher status within the group. Since one way to maintain or enhance one's position within the group is to be critical of others' views, these two competitors may be sacrificing the possibility for common ground in order to gain a status advantage over another male participant (Eagly, Wood & Fishbaugh, 1981).

Moreover, the claims made by participant one in this exchange reinforce the idea that storytelling is not an acceptable form of data; the only way to contribute is to use fact and reasons. This purposefully excludes those who use storytelling the most in these forums - women. Thus, Sanders (1997) and Young (1997) seem correct when they argue that the perspectives of the economic and political elites tend to be privileged in political discussions – they are able to dominate the conversational trajectory or frame the group's common ground because the rational skills and data driven talk they possess are seen as more valuable by other group members.

Implications

The results of this section of the dissertation, like the previous sections, are again tentative because of the small number of data to work with. Even though there is a larger pool of data to work with, I would be hesitant to generalize. However, I do think these findings present

,

some interesting results that point to the contextual nature of gender and how it may operate in public deliberative forums.

Deliberation in mixed-sex forums mirror the deliberations in the majority male forums. The only difference being the increase in the amount of speaking turns female participants took. Thus, the types of talk exhibited in these seven forums are mainly what the literature on gender difference expects from deliberants in a group with mixed-sex and even mostly male participants: (1) the male participants spoke with mainly reasons and female participants spoke with stories and other displays of positive social behaviors; (2) male participants did experience an elevated status level over female participants; female participants again found themselves in a leadership or authority deficit in the forums. Ultimately, I conclude that gender was a contextually salient factor in the mixed-sex deliberations. Even though the female participants were accorded the opportunity to speak, it is questionable as to whether they were part of the dialog. Let me now situate these results within the broader context of the three research questions posed at the end of chapter four.

What types of talk were used during public deliberations?

Strategically speaking, the types of talk female participants used in mixed-sex deliberations did not help their cause in attempting to gain authority within the group nor credibility for their positions. The use of positive social behaviors such as conciliation and agreement as a point of entry into deliberative conversations did not gain participants any additional traction (Wood & Rhodes, 1992). The continued use of questions, either to stand in for the use of a challenging statement or to more generally probe for additional information, had the same effect. One difference between majority male forums and mixed-sex forums was that the female participants tended to use questions less in mixed-sex than they did in majority male. The

,

reduced use of questions was replaced by the use of storytelling, a speech tool that has a lot more upside and possibility to it than questions and affirmative statements (Polletta & Lee, 2006). Value statements, including narratives and "you/I" framed statements, were also frequently used as a way to allay group concerns that the opinions and ideas of the female speakers were not biased in favor of a certain constituency but in fact more considerate of the group's needs (Ridgeway, 1978, 1982; Wood & Rhodes, 1992).

Storytelling played a significant role in the talk used by female participants; male participants stuck mainly to reason-giving. If this dynamic was at play in the majority male forums then it certainly is expected that this division of labor would be present in mixed-sex forums as well. Differences between the stories told in majority male forums and mixed sex forums did exist. The stories used by female participants in mixed-sex forums were more aggressive than stories told in majority female or majority male forums. They were even more pointed and passionate than the stories told in majority male forums and were more likely to contain a direct challenge. Male participants were often able to control the course of the deliberation by moving the conversation from the specific focus of storytelling toward a more generic level evaluation, thus cutting short any ability to examine the claims made in the narratives. In short, the stories told in mixed-sex settings were more aggressive than the speech used by female participants in either the majority female or majority male forums.

In sum, the female participants in mixed-sex forums attempted to use a variety of speech tools to gain credibility. Often, the female participants would attempt to overcome the perceived leadership deficit by combining assertive statements and stories with competence vis-as-vis their personal statements of experience with the particular issue up for deliberation, along with positive social behaviors that make themselves seem friendly and cooperative (Eagly & Carli,

,

2003; Ridgeway, 1982). Even this unique combination of talk types was not enough to help female participants gain credibility.

Did the group composition of deliberative forums effect talk within deliberation?

The brief answer to whether group composition effects the talk within these seven deliberative forums is yes, clearly so. The only indication that female participants were not affected by the group composition is that they had some semblance of speech turn equity. More female participants increased their use of narratives but that did not lead to a corresponding turn in the credibility of such stories nor their ability to influence the flow of the conversation. This suggests something about the confluence of status beliefs and deliberative structure.

Part of the reason gender composition is so important, particularly when deliberating in mixed-sex forums is that female participants tend to experience a credibility deficit. This is due partially because of what I call the default status of male leadership in public deliberative forums. In mixed-sex forums, male participants are assumed to be the drivers of the conversation and unless structures develop to give female participants an equal chance to contribute, male participants will be the ones with authority. So, male participants take their expected role of forum leader quite seriously.

The male participants in the mixed-sex forums were quite active in a variety of capacities in enforcing normative standards of appropriate talk in forums. It just so happens that that talk is the reason and data-driven talk used mainly by male participants (Sanders, 1997). The conclusion of the Manhattan forum is the best example, but by no means the only example, of this happening. Male participants had a stake as the default group leader to make sure the group comes away with an idea of common ground or a conclusion that the leader can agree with or approves. When a couple of the female participants cite areas of common ground that possibly

,

were not what the participant one and eleven considered acceptable, they struck out with strong, aggressive counter-claims to deny the validity of the female participants claims. These are not just ordinary, run-of-the-mill force of the best argument type challenges. Such challenges would involve counter-evidence are reasons why the group decided against coverage for all citizens. Instead, the two male participants seemingly went on a "scorched earth" campaign to deny nearly every claim the group had made because either the group was not representative or the group did not clearly understand the facts of the situation. Wood and Rhodes (1992) are right – when the ideas of female participants come into competition with those of the male participants, the female participants tend to be out of luck. Their claims in the mixed-sex forums received less attention, were seen as less competent, and tended to be less influential.

If one reason that group composition affected the talk and outcomes of deliberation had to do with the expectations participants have for male actors to be the group leader, a second reason would focus more on the status beliefs of the female participants. Automatic sex categorization leads participants to believe that those they classify as male will behave in a certain way and those classified as female will act in a different way (Ridgeway, 2011). These stereotypes prescribe a series of rules for acting out gender.

Two different scenarios played out in mixed-sex forums. In one scenario, In the case of mixed-sex forums, female participants often adopted these gender stereotypes in order to guide their face-to-face deliberative talk and behaviors. Female participants tended to use non-dominant, positive social behavior in order to gain entrance in to the conversation. However, these sorts of behaviors did nothing to promote an opening for leadership for female participants. Not only that, but due to the use of narratives and conciliatory language, female participants tended to be seen as less credible conversation partners because their language was not as

,

aggressive – the type of language that a forum or task leader should have. For female participants, the double bind keeps inequality in mixed-sex forums in place: female participants tend to use a lot of positive social behavior in order to diffuse any possibility they will be seen as partisan or dominating. The problem is that tends to automatically disqualify them for leadership because they choose not to use the language and demeanor necessary of leaders – that of aggressive, dominant talk.

The second scenario also works within the vein of this double bind. When female participants do use aggressive talk, they risk backlash for being unfeminine and thus for trying to challenge the microstructure of gendered interaction or hierarchy established prior. One clear example among many is the exchange that occurred in the Cedar Rapids forum about the benefits of immigration. The female participant, participant fifteen, challenges the notion that immigrants bring different cultures with them and that creates social problems for communities. She argues with specific, direct language, "You have people who say it's no longer a Christian country. So what? That's what America is. You've got to accept us whether you like it or not. And no longer calling Christmas break Christmas break because it insults you, well, what about us?" This passionate defense of immigration led to the male respondent arguing that there are social constraints to immigration – "that's the reality" – and despite immigrants being "good people," America has its limits. The male respondent does not engage in any particular sense the cultural argument participant eleven makes except to say that it is wrong, that in effect the female speaker is not being realistic in her assessment of assimilation practices and that America cannot afford to take her argument seriously. A similar incident happens in the Manhattan forum where the female participant discusses her mother's need for access to cancer treatments only to be rejected in a similar fashion for trying to directly move the group to consider an alternate idea.

,

So, when female participants use aggressive language they risk backlash that not just denies their argument but has the effect of deeming their personal experiences as not valid for consideration, even though male participants are able to make claims without any substantiated data or cheap warrants.

How did the gendered makeup of public forums change the deliberative process?

The result of such challenges in both contexts is not better deliberation or better outcomes but a maintenance of the status quo that deems male participants more worthy and competent (Ridgeway, 1997; 2011). The findings from mixed-sex forums, as predicted by the expectation states literature, was that women were seemingly less influential when using this type of talk (Carli, 1990; Ridgeway, 1982). Thus, the gendered composition of mixed-sex forums does not change the deliberative process so much as reinforce the status-quo structure that was, by default, never equal in the first place. Ultimately, those small differences in talk and the increase in number of speech turns taken by female participants did nothing to pre-empt the interactional hierarchy of discursive dominance set out by the male participants. So, my answer to this particular research question might be that the composition of mixed-sex forums did not change what was expected from deliberative forums where the male participants are expected to be the natural leaders.

Conclusion

Before I conclude, let me caution readers that the small number of forums in this study is not representative of deliberative forums as a whole. But, when put into contrast with the three other forum types, it is easy to see how a change in the gender composition of a deliberation can change the interactional dynamic. The bad news is that mixed-sex forums provide no relief for female participants looking for a political structure that allows them to meaningfully participate.

,

In the next chapter, I will provide some conclusions as well as some possible ways to reshape deliberation to make it more inclusive.

,

Table 10. Number of Speaking Turns Taken By Each Participant By Sex In Six of the Mixed-Sex Deliberations (PART 1).

Forum Name	*Participants*												
	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
Johnson County	**26 (Male)**	**33 (Male)**	50	**28 (Male)**	15								
Cedar Rapids	**11 (Male)**	**5 (Male)**	8	2	**10 (Male)**	**15 (Male)**	**7 (Male)**	6	**4 (Male)**	9	13	9	**9 (Male)**
El Paso	8	8	**8 (Male)**	9	**12 (Male)**	**15 (Male)**	8	**7 (Male)**	**9 (Male)**	**8 (Male)**	**7 (Male)**	**10 (Male)**	4
Manhattan	**19 (Male)**	7	**13 (Male)**	5	**3 (Male)**	**7 (Male)**	7	10	**4 (Male)**	6	**6 (Male)**	**10 (Male)**	19
Rindge	**32 (Male)**	**8 (Male)**	20	7	**7 (Male)**	12	**15 (Male)**	5	3	**12 (Male)**	**7 (Male)**	2	**4 (Male)**
Abilene Health Care	**22 (Male)**	**38 (Male)**	46	**24 (Male)**	18	**5 (Male)**	14						

*No participant level data for Abilene Economy forum

,

Table 10. Number of Speaking Turns Taken By Each Participant By Sex In Six of the Mixed-Sex Deliberations (PART 2).

Forum Name	*Participants*			
	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16	Participant 17
Johnson County				
Cedar Rapids	**7 (Male)**	10	16	
El Paso	8	**5 (Male)**	6	1
Manhattan				
Rindge	**10 (Male)**	1		
Abilene Health Care				

,

Chapter 9 –Implications and Conclusions

We live in a time of incivility. Since I started this dissertation less than a year ago, the U.S. House of Representatives member from Arizona Gabrielle Giffords was shot while hosting a "meet your congressperson" event at a local grocery store and citizens lined up to protest at town hall meetings against U.S. House of Representatives member from Wisconsin Paul Ryan's budget proposal to radically remake the Medicare system. One needs to look no further than the way bitterly divided government and uncivil rhetoric has affected the ability of congress to come to a deal on raising the debt ceiling level (see the introductory chapter of this dissertation). While all these vignettes and contemporary examples might date this dissertation quickly, I have resigned myself to believing such actions and events are unfortunately not relics of "the bad old days." Clearly we need to change politics as we know it if our democracy is going to survive. If a citizen like me – someone who will wade through the partisan garbage because being a good, active citizen is important – is turned off by political rhetoric, then something is terribly wrong.

Toward the end of writing the end of chapter seven, I received a telephone call from my U.S. House of Representatives member Lynn Jenkins asking me stay on the line in order to participate in a "tele-forum" she was hosting for her Kansas constituents. I was intrigued. Is this some new alternative, something similar to the type of deliberation I'd been studying? I'd never heard of a tele-forum and, as someone with an obvious interest in politics and public discussion, I was curious as to what this forum would be about. Rep. Jenkins was nice and polite during her opening monologue describing her and her political party's stance on issues such as health care reform, taxes, the debt ceiling debate, deficits, and the federal budget. She spoke for about twenty minutes or so while, I assume, her staff was trying to get other callers on the line, and then asked if us folks out here in Kansas had some questions for her. If so, we needed to press

,

star-three and we'd be placed in a question queue. As a soon-to-be-graduate, I had a question I wanted to ask her about her stance on unemployment. So, indeed, I pressed star-three and waited in the queue to fulfill my civic duty as an active, engaged citizen.

I would describe the question and answer portion of Rep. Jenkins' tele-forum as uncomfortable, unpleasant and a little frightening. The callers ranged from the deliriously enraged man named Rick from Manhattan who seethed with disgust at the political stalemate over raising the debt ceiling. He yelled and ranted about how the national democratic leaders were "dumb" and "ignorant" and that he does not care what sort of action happens on the debt ceiling just as long as "it gets done." Another citizen from Manhattan said he prayed for Rep. Jenkins every night that she will "stand strong" against President Obama. This citizen in particular got himself so worked up that he said "we need to throttle that fella," referring to Obama. But, it was not just that these partisans were upset at the Washington establishment, people with alternate views were met with varying amounts of what I can only describe as rage. When a self-identified Democrat asked a question (also phrased in an angry tone) or when someone from Lawrence called, they were ridiculed and vilified by the next series of questioners. I stayed on the phone for about seventy minutes. After forty minutes of listening to such heated, vitriolic rhetoric I decided that my interest in the hometown dates episode of *The Bachelorette* was more pressing (and comparatively more interesting), so I hung up. Never mind your political persuasion, something is clearly wrong with our political system and the state of public discourse.

Deliberation has been posited as a potential alternative to the types of dialogue I saw in Rep. Jenkins' tele-forum. More than just a new way of talking, deliberation has been envisioned as a way to reinvigorate the idea of citizenship and public life that would hopefully solve the

,

problems plaguing status quo politics. Thus, I take the task of investigating and theorizing the way deliberation works quite seriously. It is the only alternative model we have. As I said at the beginning of chapter three, it is deliberation or bust. The current inquiry in deliberative theory involves questions of whether deliberation is, in fact, more inclusive than our current practice of aggregative democracy. My dissertation starts with this abstract, general question – does contemporary deliberation foster political equality?

I realize this is a grand inquiry, wholly unanswerable with one study, if it can be answered at all. As I said in the introduction, this study intends to provide an initial, modest framework in which empirical research can be done. In order to provide some resolution to the inquiry of whether deliberation is inherently unequal, I studied fourteen face-to-face public issues forums across one hundred and forty five participants who deliberated in one of three different group compositions based on sex. While my dataset is small, the transcripts from these forums provides a rich tapestry of interactions and talk. I hope these results give some indication as to how to proceed past the theoretical impasse between the deliberative neutralists and the difference democrats.

My purpose in this final chapter is not to necessarily revisit in great detail the answers I provide to my three major research questions. Instead, my intent to take up in brief form the larger question of whether deliberative democracy in its current capacity meets its equality goals and then to discuss ways to move forward. I hope to provide some suggestions that can be of use in developing a working model of difference and gender in twenty-first century deliberative democracy. These suggestions are neither grand in their scale, nor sweeping in their vision. The changes I will suggest involve deliberative democracy theorists and practitioners reassessing the

,

normative standards that deliberation operates with. In order to understand why such changes might be necessary, we need to revisit some of the basic points that I made in chapter three.

Does Deliberative Democracy Meet Its Equality Goals?

My answer to whether deliberative democracy meets its goals of equality and openness is: it depends. The results presented in this dissertation reside in somewhat of an uneasy middle ground - on the one hand, deliberations with a majority of female participants feature dynamic discussions, but on the other, deliberation is less dynamic the more rational and male-oriented the group becomes. I argue that the type of inequality plaguing deliberative democracy exists *a priori* – before participants enter the forums – and then manifests itself inside the forum as well. Thus, deliberation works best (it is more efficacious and meets its goals of openness and being free from coercion) when gender is not a salient feature. But, given the dynamics at play in the majority male and mixed-sex deliberative groups, gender is salient in a vast majority of deliberative forums.

The findings I report here serve as caution against deliberative theorists and practitioners implementing a deliberative design that in certain cases and settings does not eliminate inequality. Independent practitioners, Foundation groups, University organizations, and the like who have genuinely and enthusiastically supported citizen deliberation should proceed more cautiously in considering forum design, structure, and norms. As Mendelberg and Karpowitz suggest, sponsoring efforts to promote citizen engagement in the political process is laudable if the efforts are evaluated before recommended to the public as a measure of legitimate representation and decision-making. When citizens deliberate, at least in National Issues Forums deliberations, they will indeed content with the influence of gendered norms and structures that promote certain behaviors. In certain settings such as forums with a majority of female

,

participants, this can produce increased empathy for different views; in other settings, it may produce the type of deliberative discourse theorists and practitioners want to avoid. The normative structure of deliberation that is supposed to screen or bracket out the strong influences of the economic and political elites did not happen in majority male and mixed sex forums to the degree deliberative democracy needs in order to continue the claim that it is net beneficial over the status quo.

I would also concur with Ridgeway's (2011) assessment of the stickiness of sex categorization and gender norms in social institutions in general and the ability of such behaviors and norms to segue into new institutions. Gender will always be a background identity that works its effects in combination with other salient identities in a given context. The public sphere in which deliberation happens is not gender neutral (Schlozman, Burns & Verba, 1994; Verba, Burns & Schlozman, 1997). The public sphere is often seen as a man's game, framed in male terms, and focused on issues that women do not find salient (Gidengil & Everitt, 2003; Gidengil, 1995; Harell, 2009). In contexts where political discussion is the main objective, women are often seen by men as less competent conversation partners (Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1995). This is the situation in which female group members deliberate. For female participants in the majority male and mixed sex forums, the act of deliberating in the public sphere often violates the gendered norms of behavior associated with them for such settings. These contextually created inequalities are what allow status beliefs to remain a large part of the normative structure of deliberation.

What, then, explains the lack of gender salience in the majority female forums? I argue that the same sorts of assumptions about stereotypical behaviors associated with female participants was not as present in these four deliberative settings, and thus, the socially created

,

context in which the participants engaged each other in did not rely on such inequalities. Thus, the dynamic between the cultural associations of gender and the performance expectations at various goal-oriented tasks changed. Indeed, the changing material circumstances may have created a situation where the effects of gender stereotyping on the performance expectations are able to be subsumed by other, even more contextually powerful factors. I argued at the end of the chapter on majority female deliberations that the background identity of gender was even more disassociated from the link between certain types of talk as being gendered. In these contexts, is was possible that the task then began to shed the gender biased connotation for one that was gender neutral.

Contributions

This dissertation provides a several contributions to the study of deliberative democracy. First, the work in this dissertation attempts to marry the social with deliberative interactions, a practice currently missing in political philosophy, political theory and only hinted at in communication studies. By bringing together several disparate literatures that previously have not been in contact with one another, I hopefully have shed some light on the normative and structural conditions of inequality in deliberation. Despite having large, independent literature bases, the scholars of small group deliberation, scholars of deliberative differences, and the more sociological works of gender and specifically expectation states scholars have not been brought together in the way I do in this dissertation. Second, the findings presented in this dissertation provide an additional, albeit small, empirical study to add to the few specific inquiries on deliberation and gender inequality. Considering the mixed results of the studies I highlighted at the end of chapter four, I hope these findings can provide new information.

,

One of the positive results from my findings is that, in general, people come to public deliberations to talk. They come to participate and engage in a serious discourse on an issue they feel is important. The rates of speech across all three forum types indicates that, on the whole, people do participate. Some people participate more than others, of course, but the results would seem to trend in the right direction. Even more important is that in the majority female and the mixed-sex deliberations, the female participants spoke quite frequently. It would be quite easy for female participants even in the majority female forums to let the male participants take over because that is the stereotypical gender behavior women tend to have of themselves when participating in these sorts of tasks. This is even more true for those participating in mixed-sex deliberations. Thus, knowing that female participants were willing and wanting to speak is positive and is something that deliberative theory can use as a building block to a more successful model.

A second positive note is that in the mixed-sex and majority female forums, there was a plethora of talk types. Narratives were a large part of both conversations. On a surface level, I would argue that participants felt comfortable enough with the setting and structure to move away from reason-giving. In some cases like the Cedar Rapids forum, the facilitator actively encouraged all of the participants to share their personal experiences via storytelling. One concern identified by difference democrats was that the reliance on the use of good reasons and rational communication posited by the Habermasian model of deliberation would preclude participants from speaking from their own personal experiences. This did not happen. Female participants used narratives often as a means of providing reasons. It is also worth noting that the female participants stuck with storytelling instead of adopting reason-giving as a kind of talk,

,

thus turning the forum into a one-talk type show. Passionate rhetoric was also a part of mixed-sex and majority female forums.

A third positive note is that there was no sense of *overt* pressure for the group to follow a series of norms when deliberating. Nothing happened like what Benlevy says occurs on occasion during jury deliberations where the male jurists might scream, yell, or otherwise verbally intimidate the female jurists into a decision. Nor were there any cases in the forums I studied where such pressure applied that the female participants were manipulated into agreeing with a larger point or conclusion. I would argue there were certainly displays of implicit pressure, but it seems that the requirement of civility did keep the more egregious and overt hostility from having any sort of presence.

If deliberative theorists wish to judge deliberation's efficacy for inclusion based on the standards of free and open exchange then, on face, deliberation meets these goals, at least in group compositions consisting of majority female and in mixed-sex company. People, particularly female participants joined the conversation to speak, were given access to speech time, and used a variety of discursive tools used in the dialogues. However, making a judgment about inclusion based on the mere presence of narratives and the fact that women spoke is a little misleading. Inclusion, as I argued at the beginning of this chapter, depends quite a bit on the salience of gender status beliefs.

The problem with way deliberative democracy is currently theorized is that it has no ability to recognize issues of inequality outside of generic questions such as "did women speak?" I argued in the chapters on the predominantly male and mixed-sex forums that the female participants experienced something akin to a leadership deficit. I describe the phenomenon more in depth at the end of chapter seven. Participants come into deliberations with notions about what

,

behaviors are appropriate for each gender to use while in public-political settings. When women and men enter the deliberative sphere and specifically the public forum itself, they are immediately sex categorized and labeled by gender. This creates a scenario where gender roles and stereotypes define the social norms of the group and the roles each person plays rather than the normative structure of rational deliberation. In the case of the mixed-sex and predominantly male forums, female participants adopted gender stereotypical language in their deliberations, including non-dominant, positive social behavior in order to gain entrance in to the conversation. But, I argued, these sorts of behaviors did nothing to promote an opening for leadership for female participants. Not only that, but due to the use of narratives and conciliatory language, female participants were seen as less credible conversation partners because their language was not the type of dominant, aggressive language that a forum leader should have. A related problem is that when female participants do use dominant types of talk, they risk backlash for being unfeminine and thus for trying to challenge the gender hierarchy established a prior. The problem with such a double bind is that it keep inequality built into the status quo while masquerading deliberation as equal because there were free and open opportunities for female participants to speak.

There were significant constraints on the ability of female participants to speak freely because gender constructs determine appropriate types of talk. There was also the external problem of the power of the force of the best argument to determine valid claims. As I noted in the predominantly male forums, the use of rationality and the force of the best argument had an effect on the ability of the female participants to have their opinions and views heard. The male participants were often able to shrug off the stories told by female participants because stories

,

are typically not considered to be "good" reasons. This is something that both Young and Sanders warned about in their works.

The requirement for impartiality and neutrality, while randomly enforced during the predominantly male and mixed-sex forums also had an effect on the ability of the female participants to have their views considered. The closing of the Manhattan forum is an example of how the requirement for neutrality guised under whether the group was a representative sample or not data driven enough determined that the contributions were too partial and subject to manipulation and thus should not be considered. While the female participants spoke frequently during two out of the three forum groups and used storytelling as a primary speech tool, those stories were often rejected because they did not meet the neutrality standard.

Ultimately, in terms of deliberative democratic theory, the empirical findings presented here raise serious issues about the normative value of deliberation as a form of citizen engagement. Even if the NIF deliberative forums here were open and did allow participants the discursive space to participate, deliberative discourse maintained existing social divisions and hierarchies. Consequently, the types of democratic deliberation that happened in the majority male and mixed sex forums did not offer the normative or practical benefits the deliberative neutralists hoped. As I noted in the introductory chapter, the foregoing results reflect merely the flawed way in which neutralists have envisioned deliberative theory. Instead of adopting another alternate approach to status quo democracy, I suggest and discuss later in this chapter several different ways to approach deliberation that can focus on how best to create the conditions in which deliberative exchanges can promote gender equality.

,

Limitations

There are several data-based limitations that I wish to note. At the end of each chapter I attempted to highlight limitations of the specific group-level datasets, specifically, the size and generalizability of the data. Some forums sets were small – the predominantly male group had a total of three forums from which to draw from, thus problematizing the generalizability of the data. And, in general, this dataset is quite small. Fourteen forums is indeed small and limited to only a critique of the National Issues Forums model and not of a larger variety of deliberative organizations and models. Thus, the findings from this research can only be applied to NIF model and certainly, can only provide a first step to a much larger empirically-based research agenda on deliberative democracy and gender norms.

There are other limitations which should be taken into consideration that are less a problem of the data and more a problem of deliberation itself. In general, self-selected participants in public deliberations tend to be disproportionally white, middle class or affluent college graduates (Ryfe, 2005; Karpowitz, et al, 2009). Such homogeneity in the data might undermine the aim of equal participation and diversity of views. It is possible that the fourteen forums in this dataset fall victim to the problem of homogeneity; I do not have the demographic data to make a claim either way. In making assumptions about the social status of the participants in these forums, I would say that there were certain forums (i.e., Abilene health care, Mesa) that held more professionals than non-professionals. I would guess, since several forums were held in rural Kansas locations that the majority of participants in those deliberations were white, working to middle class citizens. I would think that there were very few, if any, citizens who lived at or below the poverty level - the exception might be the few college students who attended the forums.

,

Recommendations

The problems facing deliberative democracy are not insignificant challenges, but they are problems that are not too hard to overcome. Part of the solution involves infusing deliberative democracy as a theory with a bit of sociology. I argued in the introductory chapter that deliberation is clearly absent sociology. What seems to be missing from deliberative theory is an understanding of the social forces that influence how people behave and the conventions they bring with them into the deliberation that affects talk and response. Deliberative neutralists see deliberation as something that should be culture neutral; it eschews the personal context present that can be found in evidence, and in doing so, disassociates the social from the interaction. Deliberative neutralists hope that by claiming impartiality and neutrality that participants will be just that. The three studies provide some compelling evidence that the structure of deliberation does not prevent participants from bringing inequality in the door with them, nor does it keep inequality out. Difference democrats like Young attempt to provide some sort of sociological inquiry into deliberation but fail, at least in terms of the effect gender differences have on discourse to account for the a priori influence that factors such as sex categorization and stereotypes can bring.

In short, I believe that those supporting deliberative neutrality may need to reassess the normative standards girding their theories if deliberation is to achieve participant equality. Recognizing that inequality exists in the structure of deliberation and that people bring gender norms into the forums is an important first step. Thus, I offer two possible solutions that exist to some degree interdependently.

First, deliberative theorists need to re-examine the role of and their adherence to the force of the best argument. The best argument instills in the norms of deliberation encourages

,

discursive competition between participants, among other things. Since female participants are supposed to be conciliatory and express positive social behaviors, the competition in the process of justification and counterargument only further entrench the low status position of female participants in the forums. In the mixed-sex and majority male forums, aggressive and dominant discourse was not given legitimacy. I am not proposing abandoning quality argument or abandoning argument at all. I am proposing that the argument evaluation process be modified in a way that might expand the parameters of what is considered the best argument and what would constitute the force of such arguments. If the best argument can be viewed in a format that is not entirely built upon reasons or rationality then the process may not necessarily involve something akin to a contest. It is also possible that by expanding the idea of what the best argument is to include more considerations of values versus reason, a better dialogue and more comparison building between stories and between stories and reason might result. This could, at minimum, eliminate the possibility of narratives being rejected because stories do not fit the traditional model of rationality. This sort of modification could make the deliberative process more inclusive.

A second possibility would be to include and value the role that stories, emotions and experience play as important tools in the deliberative process. The way this could be done would be to focus on better small group facilitation practices – a change in the design of the deliberative process. In the cases where stories made by female participants were rejected, there was no facilitator who redirected the group back to the values in the narrative. Facilitators have an important role to play in deliberations, including the enforcement of written rules, and the power to regulate the time citizens spend deliberating on each topic. They work to ensure that each participant who wants to speak has a chance to, and they work hard to ensure that civility reigns.

,

However, facilitators often choose not to create or even enforce normative rules of deliberation. I attribute this more so to a lack of sociological understanding about the social factors that can influence behaviors than I do facilitator ineptness. Making facilitators aware of situations in which narratives might be rejected or even to be conscious of the group composition might help. Future research could include an examination of whether facilitators react differently while leading groups of different sex compositions. Do female facilitators guide and respond differently when in charge of leading majority male groups or majority female groups? How do male facilitators respond when asked to lead majority female groups? A part of this research could ascertain whether the group composition has any effect on the facilitator's ability to lead a group effectively. Facilitators are tasked with setting the ground rules for the deliberation, including discursive standards, time keeping, and topic enforcement. Doing so requires the group to give some deference to the facilitator to help maneuver the group through the deliberative process. But, this research begs the question of whether, for example, female facilitators have more difficulties leading all male or majority male groups or even mixed sex groups. Do they have credibility? Deliberative neutralists would posit that the facilitator's gender should have no effect, but it would be worth exploring if the facilitator does have an effect .

A third possibility would be to consider the use of enclave deliberation among traditionally disempowered groups as a way of promoting equality. My suggesting this option is is not the most sexiest answer, and if anything, feeds into the essentialism critique that may plague this research. However, recent empirical research from Karpowitz, Raphael, and Hammond (2009) shows that deliberating in homogenous groups has several benefits. Deliberating among peers can make citizens more open minded, willing to listen to minority views, and resolve conflict in a way that leaves all participants feeling that they received a fair

,

hearing (Karpowitz & Mendelberg, 2007). Deliberation among the disempowered may also be necessary to broaden the range of voices heard within the wider public sphere. Enclave deliberation can possibly avoid the race and class problems of self-selection by promoting the views of those who participate less in the political system (Delli Carpini, et. al., 2004). Karpowitz and his colleagues argue that enclave deliberation can serve the larger cause of a more inclusive public discourse by giving marginalized groups an opportunity to develop their own unique perspectives and arguments which otherwise might be ignored or overlooked. In their most recent case study of enclave deliberations about broadband internet access, participants increased their knowledge, experienced small increases in self-efficacy and interpersonal trust rather than cynicism about civic engagement. Like Karpowitz and his colleagues, I would posit that enclave deliberation should be thought of as one step in a larger public discussion that includes cross-cutting talk among other social groups. Future research in this area could compare enclave deliberation versus a more heterogeneous group composition to determine what creates deliberative quality and equality. Research into enclave deliberations in other settings besides the NIF format might also be helpful in determining the benefits of such modes of deliberation.

Continuing to build upon this dataset with additional forums to add to the different group composition-based forums would make the dataset stronger and give the results from such analysis a stronger ability to generalize. Future studies could add to the investigation of group composition in a wider variety of deliberative models such as town hall meetings or participatory budgeting sessions. This would increase the explanatory power of this sort of empirical work by not being solely limited to the NIF model. I also would advocate for additional empirical research that further investigates the ways in which female participants navigate different group

,

compositions. A pre-post test type quantitative study that asks participants more detailed information on how they view their experiences while deliberating could add some depth to investigations on participation rates by female participants.

These solutions can provide structural and normative changes to the way deliberation would function. By formally expanding the types of acceptable arguments and modifying the way the force of the best argument works, deliberation could be open to a wider variety of argument types that could enrich deliberation and provide female participants more credible access to deliberative discourse. Also, by empowering the facilitator, there is a possibility of changing the norms involved. The facilitator could enforce positive social norms including the use of a diversity of speech tools. Again, these are some not quite developed solutions that could remedy some of the problems deliberation faces.

Deliberative democracy, at least as it is currently structured, is not necessarily a good replacement for the more aggregative means of democratic practice. As other studies have shown, the social psychology of group norms and group effects as well as politics do not disappear when deliberation happens. Indeed, as Karpowitz and Mendelberg note, both group norms and politics are "deeply ingrained in deliberation, influencing the outcomes in subtle, but nonetheless powerful ways" (2007, p. 125). With that said, I do not find that this is a situation where we, as a progressive society, need to throw the proverbial baby out with the bathwater. There are a lot of positives happening in deliberative forums that should be recognized and promoted. Academics spanning across the spectrum of liberal arts and social science disciplines agree that there is something unique to the way the theory of deliberation envisions citizen engagement and what the larger implications of citizen renewal can bring. This is not to say that deliberation has no faults, and as I show in the chapters on majority male and mixed sex

,

deliberations, those faults are often debilitating to the female participants who want to meaningfully contribute. But, even the faults I highlight are not reasons to dismiss deliberation outright. Theorists should take up the challenge to investigate these influences and extend upon these results to provide more solutions for how to remedy problems of inclusion. Deliberative democracy should have a bright future, and hopefully that future will be equal.

,

References

Allen, D.S. (2005). *Democracy, Inc.: The press and the law in the corporate rationalization of the public sphere.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso Books.

Arendt, H. (1963). *On revolution*. New York: Viking.

Asen, R. (1999). Toward a normative conception of difference in public deliberation. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 35,* 115-130.

Arrow, K.J. (1963). *Social choice and individual values*, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley.

Bales, R.H. (1950). *Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bales, R.H. (1970). *Personality and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.

Barber, B.R. (2007). *Consumed: How markets corrupt children, infantilize adults, and swallow citizens whole*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Barber, B. (2003). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barber, B.R. (2001). *Jihad vs. McWorld: Terrorism's challenge to democracy*. New York: Ballantine Book.

Bartels, L.M. (2008). *Unequal democracy: The political economy of the new gilded age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bartels, L. (2002). *Economic inequality and political participation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA. Available at: www.princeton.edu/~bartels/economic.pdf. *Last accessed on September 10, 2010.*

,

Benhabib, S. (1992). *Situating the self: Gender, community and postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.

Benhabib, S. (1996). Toward a deliberative model of democratic legitimacy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, S. (2006). Democracy and difference: Reflections on the metapolitics of Lyotard and Derrida. In L. Thomassen (Ed.), *The Derrida-Habermas reade*r. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Benlevy, S. (2000). Venus and Mars in the jury deliberation room: Exploring the differences that exist among male and female jurors during the deliberation process. *Southern California Review of Law and Women's Studies*, 9 S. Cal. Rev. L. & Women's Stud. 445.

Bennett, L. (2005). *News: The politics of illusion, 6th ed*. New York: Longman.

Bennett, W.L., & Entman, R.M. (2001). *Mediated politics: Communication in the future of democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, W.L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations. *Journal of Communication, 40*, 2, p. 103-125.

Berger, J., Conner, T.L., & Fisek, M.H. (1974). *Expectation states theory: A theoretical research program*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

,

Berger, J., Norman, R.Z., Balkwell, J.W., & Smith, R.F. (1992). Status inconsistency in task situations: A test of four status processing principles. *American Sociological Review, 57*, 843-855.

Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Berger, J., Ridgeway, C.L., Fiske, M.H., & Norman, R.Z. (1998). The legitimation and delegitmation of power and prestige orders. *American Sociological Review, 63*, 379-405.

Bessette, J. (1980). Deliberative democracy: The majority principle in republican government. In R.A. Goldwin & W.A. Scambra (Eds.), *How democratic is the constitution?* Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

Bickford, S. (1996). *The dissonance of democracy: Listening, conflict and citizenship*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Black, L.W. (2008). Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments. *Communication Theory, 18*, 93-116.

Black, L.W. (2009). Listening to the City: Difference, identity, and storytelling in online deliberative groups. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 5*.

Blong, L. (2008). *Making public deliberation: A study of moderator episode work at National Issues Forums*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation from Fielding School.

Bohman, J. (1996). *Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity and democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bohman, J. (1998). Survey article: The coming of age of deliberative democracy. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 6*, 400-425.

,

Bohman, J., & Rehg, W. (1997). *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boler, M. (2008). The state of the media: An interview with Robert McChesney. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Digital media and democracy: Tactics in hard times*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Boler, M., & Turpin, S. (2008). *The Daily Show* and *Crossfire*. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Digital media and democracy: Tactics in hard times*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Buchanan, A.E. (1989). Assessing the communitarian critique of liberalism. *Ethics 99*, 852-882.

Buchanan, B.I. (2001). Mediated electoral democracy: Campaigns, incentives and reform. In W.L. Bennett & R.M. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated politics: Communication in the future of democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J., & Kelshaw, T. (2002). The self-reinforcing model of public deliberation. *Communication Theory, 12*, 398-422.

Calabrese, A. (2000). The means of communication and the discourse on sovereignty. In S. Chambers & A. Costain (Eds.), *Deliberation, democracy and the media*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Carcasson, M. (2009). *Beginning with the end in mind: A call for goal-driven deliberative practice*. Center for Advances in Public Engagement Occasional Paper, 2. http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/PA_CAPE_Paper2_Beginning_SinglePgs_Rev.pd

Carli, L.L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 941-951.

,

Carli, L.L. (1991). Gender, status, and influence. In E.J. Lawler, B. Markovsky, C.L. Ridgeway, & H. Walker (Eds.), *Advances in group processes*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Carli, L.L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 725-742.

Castells, M. (1997). *The power of identity*. London: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1998). *The rise of the network society, 2nd ed.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Casullo, M.E. (2009). *Expanding the borders of democracy: Deliberative democracy and pluralism*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation from Georgetown University.

Chambers, S. (1996). *Reasonable democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative democratic theory. *Annual Review of Political Science, 6*, 307-326.

Chambers, S., & Costain, A. (2000). Introduction. In S. Chambers & A. Costain (Eds.), *Deliberation, democracy and the media*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary illusions: Thought control in democratic societies*. Boston: South End Press.

Christiano, T. (1997). The significance of public deliberation. In J. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chwe, M.S. (2001). *Rational ritual: Culture, coordination, and common knowledge.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cohen, J. (1989). Economic bases of deliberative democracy. *Social Philosophy & Policy, 6*, 25-50.

Cohen, J. (1997). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In J. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

,

Cohen, J. (2007). Deliberative democracy. In S.W. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Deliberation, participation and democracy: Can the people govern?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, J., & Rogers, J. (1983). *On democracy: Toward a transformation of American society*. New York: Penguin.

Conover, P.J., & Searing, D.D. (2005). Studying "everyday talk" in the deliberative system. *Acta Politica, 40,* 269-283.

Correll, S.J. (2004). Constraints into preferences: Gender, status, and emerging career aspirations. *American Sociological Review, 69,* 93-113.

Couldry, N. (2004). The productive 'consumer' and the dispersed 'citizen.' *International Journal of Cultural Studies, 7,* 21-32.

Cramer Walsh, K. (2006). Communities, race, and talk: An analysis of the occurrence of civic intergroup dialogue programs. *Journal of Politics, 68,* 22-33.

Crossley, N. (2003) Even newer social movements? Anti-corporate protests, capitalist crises and the remoralization of society. *Organization 10,* 287–305.

Dahl, R. (1985). *A preface to economic democracy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and political engagement: Citizens, community and democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dean, J. (2008). Communicative capitalism: Curculation and the foreclosure of politics. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Digital media and democracy: Tactics in hard times*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

,

Delli Carpini, M.X., Lomax Cook, F., & Jacobs, L.R. (2004). Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science, 7,* 315-344.

Dewey, J. (1954/1927). *The public and its problems*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Dillard, K.N. (2011). Bringing the facilitator back in: Re-envisioning the role of the public forum facilitator. Unpublished report for the Kettering Foundation.

Dionne, E.J. (2009, September 3). The real town hall story. *The Washington Post*, last accessed November 29, 2009 from Lexis Nexis Academic Universe.

Doble, J., & Richardson, A. (1991). *A report on the 1990-1991 NIF research forums results*. New York: Public Agenda Foundation.

Dovidio, J.F., Brown, C.E., Heltman, K., Ellyson, S.L. & Keating, C.F. (1988). Power displays between women and men in discussions of gender linked tasks: A multichannel study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 580-587.

Drake, A.M. (2009). *Constructing democratic space: Inclusion, efficacy, and protest in deliberative democratic theory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation from Queens University.

Dryzek, J.S. (1990). *Discursive democracy: Politics, policy, and political science*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Dryzek, J.S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics and contestations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dutwin, D. (2003). The character of deliberation: Equality, argument, and the formation of public opinion. *International Journal of Public Opinion, 15*, 239-264.

,

Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L.L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly, 14,* 807-834.

Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L.L. (1981). Sex of researchers and sex-typed communications as determinants of sex differences in influenceability: A meta analysis of social influence studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 90,* 1-20.

Edelman, M. (1998). *Constructing the political spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, G. (2004). Habermas and social movements: What's new? In N. Crossley & J.M Roberts (Eds.), *After Habermas: New perspectives on the public sphere*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Eliasoph, N. (1998). *Avoiding politics: How Americans produce apathy in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elshtain, J. (1981). *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Elster, J. (1998). *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Etzioni, A. (1986, August 24). The fast food factories: McJobs are bad for kids. *The Washington Post*. Last accessed on July 28, 2011 from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

Ferry, L., & Kingston, R. (2008). Introduction: Emotions and the history of political thought. In R. Kingston & L. Ferry (Eds.), *Bringing the passions back in: The emotions in political philosophy*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Fiorina, M.P. (1999). Extreme voices: The dark side of civic engagement. In T. Skocpol & M.P. Fiorina (Eds.), *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

,

Fishkin, J. (1991). *Democracy and deliberation: New directions for democratic reform*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fishkin, J.S. (1992). *The dialogue of justice: Toward a self-reflexive society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fishkin,. J.S. (2003). Consulting the public through deliberative polling. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 22,* 128-133.

Fishkin, J., & Luskin, R. (1999). Bringing deliberation to the democratic dialogue. In M. McCombs & A. Reynolds (Eds.), *A poll with a human face: The National Issues Convention experiment in political communication.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fontana, B., Nederman, C., & Remer, G. (2004). Introduction: Deliberative democracy and the rhetorical turn. In B. Fontana, C. J. Nederman, & G. Remer (Eds.), *Talking democracy: Historical perspectives on rhetoric and democracy*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Forgette, R., & Morris, J.S. (2006). High conflict television news and public opinion. *Political Research Quarterly, 59*, 447-456.

Fung, A. (2004). *Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Foss, K.A., Foss, S.K., & Griffin, C.L. (1999). *Feminist rhetorical theories*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fox, R.L., & Van Sickel, R.W. (2001). *Tabloid justice: Criminal justice in an age of media frenzy*. Boulder, CO: Rienner Press.

Frank, T. (2000). *One market under god*. New York: Random House.

,

Frank, T. (2004). *What's the matter with Kansas? How conservatives won the heart of America*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Fung, A., (2007). Minipublics: Deliberative designs and their consequences. In S.W. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Deliberation, participation and democracy: Can the people govern?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fung, A. (2004). *Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fung, A., & Wright, E.O. (2003). *Deepening democracy*. London: Verso.

Gamson W. (2001). Promoting political engagement. In W.L. Bennett & R.M. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated politics: Communication in the future of democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gandy, O.H. (2001). Dividing practices: Segmentation and targeting in the emerging public sphere. In W.L. Bennett & R.M. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated politics: Communication in the future of democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gans, H.J. (2003). *Democracy and the news*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garnham, N. (2000). *Emancipation, the media and modernity: Arguments about the media and social theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gastil, J. (2000). *By popular demand: Revitalizing representative democracy through deliberative elections*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gastil, J. (2008). *Political communication and deliberation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gastil, J., & Dillard, J.P. (1999). The aims, methods, and effects of deliberative civic education through the National Issues Forums. *Communication Education, 48,* 179-192.

,

Gastil, J., & Levine, P. (2005). *The deliberative democracy handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Giddens, A. (1972). *Capitalism and modern social theory: An analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gidengil, E. (1995). Economic man – social woman – the case of the gender gap in support for the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement. *Comparative Political Studies, 28,* 384-408.

Gidengil, E., & Everitt, J. (2003). Conventional coverage/unconventional politicians: Gender and media coverage of Canadian leaders' debate, 1993, 1997, 2000. *Canadian Political Science Review, 36,* 559-577.

Gilens, M. (2003, November). *Unequal responsiveness*. Paper presented at the conference on Inequality and American Democracy, Princeton University.

Glennon, L. (1979). *Women and dualism*. New York: Longman.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior, 1st ed.* Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Goidel, R.K., Freeman, C.M., Procopio, S., Zewe, C.W. (2008). Who participates in the "public square" and does it matter? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72,* 792-803.

Gould, C.C. (1996). Diversity and democracy: Representing differences. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gutmann, A. (1993). The challenge of multiculturalism in political ethics. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 22,* 171-206.

Gutmann, A. (2003). *Identity in democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

,

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (1990). Moral consensus and political conflict. *Ethics, 101*, 64-88.

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action volume one: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Trans. by T. McCarthy). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (Trans. by T. Burger & F. Lawrence). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1997). Popular sovereignty as procedure. In J. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1998). *The inclusion of the other: Studies in political theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (2001). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy* (Trans. by W. Rehg). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hall, C. (2007). Recognizing the passion in deliberation: Toward a more democratic theory of deliberative democracy. *Hypatia, 22*, 81-95.

Harrell, A. (2009). Equal participation but separate paths?: Women's social capital and turnout. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy, 30*, 1-22.

Harrison, L.E. & Berger, P. (2006). *Developing cultures: Case studies*. New York: Routledge.

Held, D. (2006). *Models of democracy, 3rd ed*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

,

Herman, E., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media.* New York: Pantheon.

Hendricks, C.M. (2006). When the forum meets interest politics: Strategic uses of public deliberation: *Politics & Society, 34*, 571-602.

Hickerson, A., & Gastil, J. (2008). Assessing the difference critique of deliberation: Gender, emotion and the jury experience. *Communication Theory, 18,* 281-303.

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T.W. (1972). *Dialectic of enlightenment* (Trans. By J. Cumming). New York: Seabury.

Huckfeldt, R., & Sprague, J. (1995). *Citizens, politics, and social communication: Information and influence in an election campaign.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, L. & Paige, B. (2005). Who influences U.S. foreign policy over time? *American Political Science Review, 99*, 107-124.

Iyengar, S., Peters, M.D., & Kinder, D.R. (1982). Experimental demonstrations of the 'not-so-minimal' consequences of television news programs. *American Political Science Review, 76*, 848-858.

Jacobs, L.R., & Skocpol, T. (2005). Studying inequality and American democracy: Findings and challenges. In L.R. Jacobs & T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Inequality and American democracy.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

James, D., & Drakich, J. (1993). Understanding gender differences in amount of talk: A critical review of research. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kadlec, A., & Friedman, W. (2007). Deliberative democracy and the problem of power. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 3.*

,

Karpowitz, C.F., Raphael, C., & Hammond, A.S. (2009). Deliberative democracy and inequality: Two cheers for enclave deliberation among the disempowered. *Politics & Society, 37,* 576-615.

Klinenberg, E. (2007). *Fighting for air: The battle to control America's media*. New York: Henry Holt.

Knight, J., & Johnson, J. (1997). What sort of equality does deliberative democracy require? In J. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Krause, S.R. (2008). *Civil passions: Moral sentiment and democratic deliberation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1989). Liberal individualism and liberal neutrality. *Ethics 99,* 883-905.

Kymlicka, W. (1992). The rights of minority cultures: Reply to Kukathas." *Political Theory, 20,* 140-146.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Landes, J.B. (1996). The performance of citizenship: Democracy, gender and difference in the French Revolution. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lasch, C. (1995). *The revolt of the elites*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Lasker, R.D., & Guidry, J.A. (2009). *Engaging the community in decision-making: Case studies in tracking participation, voice and influence*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co, Inc.

Leib, E.J. (2004). *Deliberative democracy in America: A proposal for a popular branch of government*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

,

Lukyanova, K. (2009). *Pilot analysis of two public forms on immigration*. Unpublished report for the Kettering Foundation.

Luskin, R., Fishkin, J., Jowell, R. (2002). Considered opinions: Deliberative polling in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science, 32*, 455-487.

Mansbridge, J. (1983). *Beyond adversary democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mansbridge, J. (1991). Democracy, deliberation and the experience of women. In B. Murchland (Ed.), *Higher education and the practice of democratic politics*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Mansbridge, J. (1996). Using power/fighting power: The polity. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mansbridge, J., Hartz-Karp, J., Amengual, M., & Gastil, J. (2006). Norms of deliberation: An inductive study. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 2*.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Marder, N.S. (1986). *Gender dynamics and jury deliberations*. Chicago-Kent College of Law. Last Accessed on July 28, 2011 from http://works.bepress.com/nancy_marder/21.

Mathews, D. (1999). *Politics for people: Finding a responsible public voice*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

McAfee, N., McKenzie, R., & Mathews, D. (1990). *Hard choices.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

McChesney, R.W. (1997). *Corporate media and the threat to democracy*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

,

McChesney. R.W. (1999). *Rich media, poor democracy: Communication politics in dubious times*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mendelberg, T. (2002). The deliberative citizen: Theory and evidence. *Political Decision Making, Deliberation and Participation, 6,* 151–193

Mendelberg, T., & Karpowitz, C. (2007). How people deliberate about justice: Groups, gender, and decision rules. In S.W. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Deliberation, participation, and democracy: Can the people govern?* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Melville, K., Willingham, T.L., & Dedrick, J.R. (2005). National issues forums: A network of communities promoting public deliberation. In J. Gastil & P. Levine (Eds.), *The deliberative democracy handbook: Strategies for effective civic engagement in the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, T. (2002). *Media democracy: How the media colonize politics.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Miles, S. (1998). *Consumerism as a way of life*. London: Sage.

Miller, D.T., & Turnbull, W. (1986). Expectancies and interpersonal processes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 37,* 233-256.

Milner, H. (2001). *Civic literacy: How informed citizens make democracy work*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Morrell, M.E. (2010). *Empathy and democracy: Feeling, thinking and deliberation*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Morris, J.S. (2002). *The new media and the dramatization of American politics*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.

,

Mouffe, C. (1996). Democracy, power and the "political." In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mueller, J.E. (1999). *Capitalism, democracy, and Ralph's Pretty Good Grocery*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Naming and framing local issues for public deliberation (2010). A Kettering Foundation publication. Last accessed from http://nifi.org/stream_document.aspx?rID=18725&catID=6&itemID=18724&typeID=8 on June 10, 2010.

Nash, K. (2010). *Contemporary political sociology: Globalization, politics and power*. New York: Wiley Blackwell.

O'Flynn, I. (2006). *Deliberative democracy and divided societies*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Parenti, M. (1966). *Dirty truths: Reflections on politics, media, ideology, conspiracy, ethnic life and class power*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pateman, C. (1989). *The disorder of women*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Patterson, M.A. (2008). *The dynamics of deliberation: Power and structuration in democratic communication*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation from University of California Irvine.

Pearce, W.B., & Littlejohn, S.W. (1997). *Moral conflict: When social worlds collide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

,

Pellizzoni, L. (2001). The myth of the best argument: Power, deliberation and reason. *British Journal of Sociology, 52,* 59-86.

Perrucci, R. & Wysong, E. (2008). *The new class society: Goodbye American dream?* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Phillips, A. (1995). *The politics of presence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State Univ. New York Press.

Polletta, F. (1998). It was like a fever. . .Narrative and identity in social protest. *Social Problems, 45*, 137-59.

Polletta, F., & Lee, J. (2006). Is telling stories good for democracy? Rhetoric in public deliberation after 9/11. *American Sociological Review, 71*, 699-721.

Prentice, D.A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 269-281.

Prezworski, A. (1998). Deliberation and ideological domination. In J. Elster (Ed.), *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pugh, M.D., & Wahrman, R. (1983). Neutralizing sexism in mixed-sex groups: Do women have to be better than men? *American Journal of Sociology, 88,* 746-762.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuester.

Rahn, W.M., & Rudolph, T.J. (2001). National identities and the future of democracy. In W.L. Bennett & R.M. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated politics: Communication in the future of democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

,

Rawls, J. (1971). *Theory of justice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1989). The domain of the political and overlapping consensus. *New York University Law Review, 64*, p. 233-255.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rehg, W. (1997). Reason and rhetoric in Habermas's theory of argumentation. In W. Jost & M. Hyde (Eds.), *Rhetoric and hermeneutics in our time*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Reskin, B. (1988). Bringing the men back in: Sex differentiation and the devaluation of women's work. *Gender & Society, 2*, 58-81.

Ridgeway, C.L. (1981). Nonconformity, competence, and influence in groups: A test of two theories. *American Sociological Review, 46*, 333-347.

Ridgeway, C.L. (1982). Status in groups: The importance of motivation. *American Sociological Review, 47*, 175-188.

Ridgeway, C.L. (1991). The social construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces, 70*, 367-386.

Ridgeway, C.L. (1992). Introduction: Gender and the role of interaction in inequality. In C.L. Ridgeway (Ed.), *Gender, interaction and inequality*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ridgeway, C.L. (1997). Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review, 62*, 218-235.

Ridgeway, C.L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 637-655.

Ridgeway, C.L. (2011). *Framed by gender.: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

,

Ridgeway, C.L., & Berger, J. (1986). Expectations, legitimation, and dominance behavior in groups. *American Sociological Review, 51,* 603-617.

Ridgeway, C.L. & Bourg, C. (2004). Gender as status: An expectation states approach. In A.H. Eagly, Beall, A., & Sternberg, R.J. (Eds.), *Psychology of gender*. New York: Guilford.

Riker, W.H. (1982). Liberalism against populism: A confrontation between the theory of democracy and the theory of social choice. San Francisco, CA: W.H. Freeman.

Ritzer, G. (2010). *McDonaldization of society 6th ed*. New York: Sage Publications.

Rosenberg, S.W. (2007). An introduction: Theoretical perspectives and empirical research on deliberative democracy. In S.W. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Deliberation, participation, and democracy: Can the people govern?* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Ryfe, D. M. (2002). The practice of deliberative democracy: A study of 16 deliberative organizations. *Political Communication, 19,* 359-77.

Ryfe, D.M. (2005). Does deliberative democracy work? *Annual Review of Political Science, 8,* 49-71.

Ryfe, D.M. (2006). Narrative and deliberation in small group forums. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 34,* 72-93.

Sanders, L.M. (1997). Against deliberation. *Political Theory, 25,* 347-376.

Schlozman, K.L., Page, B.I., Verba, S., & Fiorina, M.P. (2005) Inequalities of political voice. In L.R. Jacobs & T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Inequality and American democracy: What we know and what we need to learn*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Schlozman, K.L., Burns, N.E., & Verba, S. (1994). Gender and the pathways to participation: The role of resources. *Journal of Politics, 56,* 963-990.

,

Schneiderhan, E., & Khan, S. (2008). Reasons and inclusion: The foundation of deliberation. *Sociological Theory, 26*, 1-24.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1942/1975). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy.* New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

Shelly, R.K., Munroe, P.T. (1999). Do women engage in less task behavior than men? *Sociological Perspectives, 42*, 49-67.

Simmel, G. (1907/2004). *The philosophy of money* (Trans by T. Bottomore & D. Frisbey). New York: Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Simon, A., & Xenos, M. (2000). Media framing and public opinion. *Political Communication, 17*, 363-376.

Siriani, C., & Friedland, L. (2005). *Civic innovation in America: Community empowerment, public policy, and the movement for civic renewal.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Skocpol, T. (1999). Advocates without members. In T. Skocpol & M. Fiorina (Eds.), *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Skocpol, T. & Fiorina, M.P. (1999). *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Smith-Lovin, L., & Robinson, D.T. (1992). Gender and conversational dynamics. In C.L. Ridgeway (Ed.), *Gender, interaction and inequality*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work*. London: Virago.

Touraine, A. (2001). *Beyond neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

,

Verba, S., Burns, N., & Schlozman, K.L. (1997). Knowing and caring about politics: Gender and political engagement. *Journal of Politics, 59,* 4, 1051-1072.

Wagner, D.G., & Berger, J. (1997). Gender and interpersonal task behaviors: Status expectation accounts. *Sociological Perspectives, 40,* 1-32.

Wagner, D.G., Ford, R.S., & Ford, T.W. (1986). Can gender inequalities be reduced? *American Sociological Review,* 51, 47-61.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1,* 125-151.

Williams, M.S. (2000). An uneasy alliance of group representation in deliberative democracy. In W. Kymlicka & W. Norman (Eds.), *Citizenship in diverse societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, W., & Karten, S.J. (1986). Sex differences in interaction style as a product of perceived sex differences in competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 341-347.

Wood, W., & Rhodes, N. (1992). Sex differences in interaction style in task groups. In C.L. Ridgeway (Ed.), *Gender, interaction and inequality*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to public judgment: Making democracy work in a complex world*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Young, I.M. (1989). Polity and group difference: A critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. *Ethics, 99,* 250-274.

Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

,

Young, I.M. (1994). Justice and communicative democracy. In R. Gottleib (Ed.), *Tradition, counter-tradition, politics: Dimensions of radical philosophy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Young, I.M. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, I.M. (1997). *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy, and policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, I.M. (1998). *Inclusive political communication: Greeting, rhetoric and storytelling in the context of political argument.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.

Young, I.M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zaller, J. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

,

,