



## Partecipazione e Conflitto

<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/paco>

ISSN: 1972-7623 (print version)

ISSN: 2035-6609 (electronic version)

PACO, Issue 16(1) 2023: 186-193

DOI: 10.1285/i20356609v16i1p186

Published 15 March, 2023

Work licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non commercial-Share alike 3.0 Italian License

## BOOK REVIEW

### Baogang He, Micheal Breen and James Fishkin (2022), *Deliberative Democracy in Asia*, New York: Routledge

Andrea Schiuma

[domenicoandrea.schiuma@edu.unige.it](mailto:domenicoandrea.schiuma@edu.unige.it)

**ABSTRACT:** This article reviews *Deliberative Democracy in Asia*, a book published in 2022 by Routledge and edited by Baogang He, Micheal Breen and James Fishkin. The review is divided into four sections: a short introduction about deliberative democracy, an analysis of the structure of the book, an investigation of the most important topics addressed in the work and a conclusion, stating whether the book is worth reading or not, and why. Throughout the review, of course, the strengths and the weaknesses of the book are underlined. The former particularly relate to the contents of the book and to some aspects of its structure, while the latter specially concern the work's comparative approach, which looks a bit weaker than expected.

**KEYWORDS:** Asian politics, comparative studies, deliberative democracy, deliberative pollings, villages' assemblies.

## 1. Introduction

Since the expression «deliberative democracy» was first used, according to many (Mansbridge, Hartz-Karp, Amengual and Gastil, 2006; Fishkin, 2013; Floridaia, 2018) by Joseph M. Bessette in some academic interventions between the end of '70s and the beginning of '80s, the theory of deliberative democracy has had a large impact on the development of political sciences. This impact has been so important that some scholars highlighted the existence of a «deliberative turn» in democratic theory and political philosophy (Floridaia, 2018; Goodin & Niemeyer, 2003), and the «coming of age» (Bohman, 1998) of deliberative democracy as a complete theory of democracy. Of course, not only has deliberative democracy been a crucial novelty for these fields, but it has also represented a significant innovation in democratic practices (Pellizzoni, 2015).

As far as deliberative practices are concerned, they spread all over the world. However, the implementation of these practices in some areas of the world has rarely been studied. This is why Baogang He, Micheal Breen and James Fishkin decided to edit *Deliberative Democracy in Asia*, published in 2022 by Routledge.

According to the editors, some problems in the academic literature concerning Asian deliberative democracy can be found. First: although literature about some Asian countries is growing, overall «*the scholarly work on Asian deliberative democracy is lacking*» (p. 1), Second: «*Most research work often examines an individual case of deliberative democracy practice in one Asian country*» (p. 2). The editors tried to face these problems through this book, which explicitly aims «*to develop a comparative study and create new knowledge of deliberative innovations in Asia*» (p. 2). He, Breen and Fishkin particularly stress the relevance of the book's comparative approach, arriving to state that this work is the first one to «*take a comparative perspective on the emergence and evolution of deliberative practices in Asia*» (p. 1). Actually, it looks like something similar, even though on a smaller scale and on a specific topic (public participation in science and technology) had been done in 2007 by *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: an International Journal* (Chen & Wu, 2007). However, this focus on comparison will be shortly investigated.

## 2. The structure of the book

The book features thirteen chapters, the first one being introductory and the last one summarizing the conclusions. Each chapter focuses on the study of deliberative democracy experiences in one Asian country. The total number of countries covered by the work is ten, given that Chapter 2 deals with China and Chapter 11 with Macao, which is a Chinese Special Administrative Region. The other countries included in the work are India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Japan, Mongolia, South Korea, Singapore and Malaysia. Chapters from the second to the twelfth can, according to the editors, fictionally be divided into three parts (just fictionally, because the book is not officially divided into sections). The first one features chapters from the second to the fourth, dealing with practices of village-citizens' deliberation in India, China and Indonesia. The second section features chapters looking into the implementation of deliberative practices into ethnically divided and semi-democratic countries, in particular Malaysia, Singapore, Nepal and Philippines. In the last section of the book, chapters investigating the introduction and the implementation of deliberative polls in Asia can be found. These chapters focus on Japan, South Korea, Macao and Mongolia. So, it must be noted that, although the number of procedures that can be considered tools of deliberative democracy is high (Molaschi, 2018), and although Asian polities have of course seen the implementation of other deliberative tools such as consensus conferences and citizens' juries (Chen & Wu, 2007; Myung-Sik, 2002; Dienel, 2009), there is a particular focus on just two deliberative policies: village and citizens' assemblies in Section 1 and Deliberative Pollings in Section 3. Chapters in Section 2 also have some references to citizens' assemblies and deliberative pollings, but they are very short and never the core of the chapters. The choice to majorly circumscribe the analysis to two deliberative policies seems understandable and acceptable and is probably one of the book's strengths. Investigating the implementation of more deliberative processes in Asian States would have probably made the book too confusing and overwhelmingly complex.

However, as already said, this division is just fictional, and in some cases topics indeed tend to overlap throughout Sections. For instance Chapter 2, written by Baogang He, Huang Zhenhua and Wu Jinjin and called «*Village deliberative democracy and village governance in China*» also describes the interesting case of a modified deliberative polling occurred in the village of Guanming. Or, again, Chapter 8, edited by Nicole Curato and investigating «*An uneven trajectory of deliberative democracy*» (title of the Chapter) in the Philippines, at some point describes KALAHI-CIDSS<sup>1</sup>, a programme launched in 2002, similar to village assemblies, which «*empowers local communities to propose, design and implement projects at the local level*» (p. 128). The fact that the structure of the book is not too rigid can be considered one of the pros of the work.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kapit-Basig Laban sa Kahirapan (link arms against poverty) – Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services.

The major problem with the structure of the book is that the comparative approach announced by the editors in the first Chapter is not as strong as expected. Based on Goodrick's definition (Goodrick, 2014), comparative case studies should contain comparisons within and across cases, and analyze and summarize the similarities, differences and patterns across cases. As far as the first point is concerned, examples of comparison within cases can be found for instance in Chapter 4 about India, where the author, Prabhat Kumar Datta, analyzes the spread and population of *Gram Sabhas*, defined as «*the constitutionally mandated institution of village level direct democracy, [...] the crucial pillar of rural democracy*» (p. 54); or in Chapter 3, about Indonesia (title of the chapter «*Deliberate and deliver – Deepening Indonesian democracy through social accountability*»), where Hans Antlöv and Anna Wetterberg introduce village-level Musrenbang meetings. These ones have the aim to identify the main development issues in villages as a basis for a list of priority programmes to be funded through the district or national budget. Musrenbangs follow a pyramidal pattern, going from the ones implemented to the village-level to those conducted at the sub-district and district-wide level, culminating every year in a national Musrenbang. The authors compare the best of the village and sub-district Musrenbangs (that have been truly deliberative, with information actually provided to participants and citizens having the possibility to make joint decisions through facilitated discussions) with the majority of the other Musrenbangs, which ended up being ritualized events with long speeches delivered by government officials and an élite-driven prioritization.

Across-cases comparisons are much rarer and lighter, and they are never the core of the studies where they are located. Some can be found once again in the Chapter about the Philippines, where the author compares the already mentioned KALAHI-CIDSS to the Indian's *Gram Sabhas* and to the Indonesian National Program for Community Empowerment, which are also covered in the specific Chapters about India and Indonesia. Referring to Goodrick's definition (Goodrick, 2014), there is some analysis and synthesis of similarities, differences and patterns across cases, but it is almost exclusively located in the last Chapter, edited by Mark E. Warren, and for obvious reasons of space it cannot be too detailed. Overall, when it comes to across-cases comparisons, the work's comparative approach looks too weak, especially given that the book states it is the first to «*take a comparative perspective on the emergence and evolution of deliberative practices in Asia*» (p. 1).

### 3. The contents of the book

If the book's comparative approach is a bit disappointing, surely the same statement does not apply to its contents. *Deliberative Democracy in Asia* is indeed full of deep considerations about deliberative democracy in the continent, and in general.

According to its editors, the book asks three main sets of questions: «*1. What are the main motivations for introducing public deliberation into different political regimes? Have deliberative devices or practices successfully addressed the practical problems associated with the past public meetings? 2. How does public deliberation help to improve governance, solve practical problems, enhance representation, increase legitimacy, and in short, contribute to the advancement of democracy in Asia? 3. Can deliberative democracy, and in particular the Deliberative Polling technique, apply to all societies and countries regardless of their political and cultural differences? What modifications of Deliberative Polling are required to play different political communication roles in different societies*» (p. 8).

Just to provide a few examples of the answers that can be found, when it comes to the motivations for introducing public deliberation into different political regimes, in Chapter 7 («*Consultation as non-democratic participation*»), Garry Rodan explains that in Southeast Asia consultative modes of participation were often implemented to face problems associated with capitalist development. However, the three most important modes of participation implemented in Singapore, the polity the Chapter analyzes, ended up being non-democratic in nature; based on the idea that public policy can be apolitical; highly controlled by elites with regard to who could participate, how and on what topics; «*fostering political fragmentation of participants, militating against the formation of cohesive reform movements*» (p. 110); and giving elites high discretionary

power to choose what public feedback accept or refuse. Singapore's case shows that on some occasions deliberative practices can be, as Warren puts it in the conclusive Chapter, strategically used to «*undermine democratic organization*» (p. 209). Of course, fortunately, this is not what always happens, and in other cases public deliberation is sincerely used to underpin democracy. In Chapter 11 («*Deliberative Polling on the amendment of the press law and the audio-visual broadcasting act in Macao*»), the authors Angus Cheong, James S. Fishkin and Alice Siu explain that in Macao public consultation is often used when the government wants to start the process of formulating policies and laws, to solicit views and opinions from the general public. This is possible because Macao, although being a part of the People's Republic of China, is within that polity a Special Administrative Region, which can take advantage of a degree of autonomy and freedom higher than the other territories under the control of Beijing (even though it cannot be said how long this situation will last, given the recent social and political developments in the other Chinese Special Administrative Region, Hong Kong). In Macao, citizens are very used to being consulted, through different means such as seminars, online and telephone surveys, focus groups and deliberative discussions. The authors state that from 2011 to 2019 the incredible amount of 83 public consultations was held in Macao. However, the quality, the transparency and the credibility of these consultations have been criticized. Furthermore, the high number of consultations can cause tiredness in the public, and this reaction «*will therefore lead to a decrease in the effectiveness of the consultations and a search for a better approach to public consultations, namely the deployment of the Deliberative Polling methodology*» (p. 173).

As far as the second set of questions is concerned, stunning answers can be found. Once again, only few examples will be provided. In Chapter 4, about India, the author, Prabhat Kumar Datta, states that «*a clear positive linkage between the holding of the meetings of the Gram Sabhas and the improvement in governance has been identified*». He particularly refers to two studies, one of which (Swaminathan, 1990) is particularly interesting. Swaminathan analyzed the implementation of the Integrated Rural Development Programme in two Indian States, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu. Swaminathan investigated the leakage of IRDP funds to non-eligible households and discovered that in West Bengal the leakage was significantly below the Indian mean. The success in lowering the level of wrong identification of the beneficiaries must be attributed to the participation of the *Gram Sabhas* in the identification process. In Tamil Nadu, where hardly was there participation in the identification process, the levels of wrong identifications were in line with the national ones.

When it comes instead to how deliberation can help solve practical problems (because of course, the need to solve one-shot practical problems can be, not only in Asia but everywhere, one of the other reasons to introduce deliberative tools), Chapter 2 about village democracy in China, edited by Baogang He, Huang Zhenuhua and Wu Jinjin, investigates the implementation of a deliberative democracy experiment in 2006 in the village of Bianyu. The problem here was that the village had seen «*social disorder between local and migrants, and health concerns arising from environmental negligence*» (p. 28). Environmental pollution was a crucial problem for villagers, with garbage disposal and river's contamination being factors that affected their everyday life. To address these practical problems, village's cadres randomly selected eighty-five participants from nine social-political categories, plus twelve migrants, to organize four deliberative meetings. The topics of these meetings were rural reconstruction planning; migrant families, social order and sanitation; garbage disposal; village economy and afforestation. Attempts were made to ensure that all participants had the same opportunities to speak and the same access to information, in particular relying on twelve schoolteachers that «*were trained as moderators on how to facilitate discussion and make all the necessary information available to participants*» (p. 28). Before the meetings were held, all relevant data had to be prepared and distributed to participants. The authors assessed that the initiative was very well designed, abiding by the principles of publicity, deliberation, broad representativeness and equality which constitute the foundations of deliberative democracy. Moreover, the meetings managed to have villagers change their minds about some practical issues. For instance, before the meetings, participants supporting the building of public toilets in public parks and in the areas where lot of migrants lived were only 56.1%. By the end of the initiative, this number increased to 80.7 per cent. In the same way, before the roundtables 50.9 per cent of the participants thought that migrants had to pay to use the toilets. This idea was eventually rejected by 62.7 per cent of

participants. Generally throughout the book, the shifts in opinion induced by deliberative processes are analyzed after a careful description of the design of the processes, with these ones usually featuring some elements such as the preparation and distribution of balanced briefing material, the moderation and facilitation of small-groups discussions, the construction of a calm and safe environment, the implementation of plenary sessions with politicians and experts. Stressing the existence of these features is important because these mechanisms are crucial, since they should fight those small-groups discussions' distortions (Fishkin, 2013) which can have the opinion shifts happen for bad reasons, such as social pressure (Dryzek, 2017). Correctly, one author (Jieun Park in Chapter 10, about South Korea) also underlines that some topics may be more appropriate than others as the core of a deliberative process, because they could be easier for citizens and so make discussion easier as well.

Finally, answers to the third set of questions, concerning the possibility of implementing Deliberative Pollings in any context regardless of political and cultural differences, and possible modifications needed, can be found in Chapter 9, dealing with the implementation of Deliberative Pollings in Japan, and once again in Chapter 2 about China. In the former case, the author clearly states: «*Deliberative Polling can be implemented in in any environment as long as the environment is sufficiently prepared and trained moderators are available*» (p. 138). In the latter, the authors describe a modified Deliberative Polling which took place in 2010 in the village of Bianyu. This was a modified Deliberative Polling because all the inhabitants of the village being more than eighteen (143 people out of a population of 230) were requested to participate, in contrast to the standard Deliberative Polling's methodology, where only a random and representative sample of the population is allowed to participate (Fishkin, 2003).

While answering the three core questions listed in Chapter 1, many other topics are addressed throughout the work. Here, only some will be discussed.

The first one concerns deliberative theory and deliberative cultures. What emerges is that while the theory of deliberative democracy is surely a Western construction, deliberative Asian cultures are older than first Bessette's essays about deliberative democracy. This is for instance clearly stated in Chapter 8, by Nicole Curato, where the author links the roots of a deliberative culture in the Philippines to the anti-colonial struggles. In particular, the author highlights that «*the Kartilya or the code of ethics in Katipunan - the Philippines' revolutionary movement - emphasizes the counterpart virtues of the Enlightenment including equality (pagkakapantay) and reason (katuiran) [...] The virtues of equality and reason are manifest in Katipunan's commitment to deliberation*» (p. 123). The *Kartilya* was written in 1892 by Emilio Jacinto, one of the leaders of the Philippine revolution. Just to provide one more example, in Chapter 9 about Japan, the author Yasunori Sone reminds the reader that in 1868 the emperor Meiji declared, opening the Charter Oath of Five Articles (a short document outlining the goals and lines of action to be followed during the emperor's reign) that «*Deliberative assemblies shall be widely established and all matters decided by public discussion*» (p. 137), although of course this statement did not embody the beginning of deliberative democracy in Japan but the establishment of a political system. Nevertheless, Mark E. Warren has some important considerations about this point in the last Chapter. First: deliberative capacities and knowledge are likely to be found in most cultures, because «*solving problems and conflicts through deliberative influence is more productive and less costly than alternative approaches*» (p. 206). Second: in many Asian polities, deliberative cultures and knowhows are suppressed by other factors, such as caste culture and authoritarian regimes. This means that in Asia, just like in other parts of the world, the potentials of deliberative cultures are frustrated; and that deliberative influence must be protected by other influences, which explains why democratic contexts are needed to turn deliberative cultures into deliberative politics. Finally, Warren writes that deliberative cultures can clash with consensus cultures, because the latter «*value harmony over conflict, including deliberative conflict*» (p. 207).

Another topic the reader can come across several times throughout the book is the role that civil society, common citizens and media can, or cannot, play to foster deliberative democracy in Asia. For instance, when it comes to the Chinese case, the authors of Chapter 2 underline that there were pressures to establish village deliberative democracy coming from several socio-political factors. One of these was that when Chinese villages became wealthier, their inhabitants started demanding participation in the financial decision-making

process. In the Chapter about the Philippines, Nicole Curato highlights that civil society organizations play a dual role in that country in cultivating habits of public deliberation, on the one hand producing discourses of accountability which challenge the state's abuse of power, on the other one «*articulating a range of contesting views using different discursive strategies*» (p. 130). Mohd Azizuddin Mohd Sani says something similar in Chapter 6, about Malaysia. Interestingly, the author does not address formal institutions of deliberations, but he deals with what Nicole Curato in Chapter 8 calls «*democratic spaces in the "wild public sphere"*» (p. 132), that in deliberative theory constitute the spaces where new discourses can emerge. Curato instead addresses both democratic spaces and some formal deliberative institutions. Sani identifies the growth of civil society as one of the four main factors able to foster «*the shift to a new politics of public deliberation*» in Malaysia (p. 90). The shift the author refers to is from consociationalism, which has been in place in Malaysia for decades and cannot be deliberative, because «*to maintain stability and ensure racial harmony*» (p. 90) it severely restricted political and civil rights, like freedom of expression. One of the other three elements Sani thinks can help this shift is the role of the new media, in particular Internet, given it has provided civil society a freer public sphere where Malaysians can deliberate critical views that challenge the government. The role media can play is also underlined by Nicole Curato, when she writes that they play «*a primary role in facilitating the circulation of contesting discourses in the deliberative system*» (p. 130). By the way, Curato also writes that in the Philippines the integrity of the media is at stake for several reasons, including elite ownership of media companies and pressures journalists must abide by «*to engage in sensational reporting to meet the demands of a competitive market*» (p. 131). Furthermore, if in Malaysia Internet played a positive role, opening spaces for citizens' deliberation, in the Philippines, according to Curato, Internet is invaded by troll armies, which increase the cost of expressing opinions that contest Rodrigo Duterte's government, for instance threatening with rape and death the users who those opinions express, amplifying fake news and hate speeches delivered by the President and his companions, and body-shaming celebrities who criticized Duterte.

Media, common citizens and civil society organizations also played a crucial role in Nepal, where a participatory constitution-making process took place. The Nepalese case is covered in Chapter 5 («*Participatory and deliberative constitution-making in a divided society*»), by Michael G. Breen, and it also is a good example of one of the most important topics in *Deliberative Democracy in Asia*: the relevance of deliberative experiences not only in Asia, but more in general. As Mark E. Warren correctly notices in the last Chapter, a common view exists stating «*that deliberative processes can be successful only when issues are relatively insignificant*» (p. 208). This relates to another common view, also supported by prominent scholars such as Luigi Bobbio (Bobbio, 2005), stating that deliberative arenas are more likely to be built for local-scope problems, and that they seem to work above all when conflicts are not too acute and disruptive. If Bobbio's first statement is surely true still nowadays, there have been cases which showed that deliberative practices can work quite well even before major issues and conflicts. Nepal's participatory constitution-making process is one of those cases, just like, for instance, the Deliberative Polling held in Macao about media regulation, covered in Chapter 11, or the Deliberative Polling implemented in South Korea about two nuclear reactors, described in Chapter 10 by Jieun Park.

Going back to the Nepalese process and to the role played by media, common citizens and civil society organizations in that case, Breen explains that, because of discrimination and political exclusion, a Maoist insurgency occurred, lasting from 1996 to 2005. In 2006 a comprehensive peace agreement was signed, foreseeing the election of a Constituent Assembly to prepare a new Constitution, and an interim constitution, which came into force in 2007, to underpin elections and the drafting process of the Constitution. Both documents contained commitments to the implementation of a participatory constitution-making process. The elections for the composition of the Constituent Assembly were held in 2008. The CA founded eleven Thematic Committees, and three Procedural Committees, which «*engaged the public through a variety of methods including surveys, information campaigns, technical consultations and by gathering public opinion on the penultimate draft constitution*» (p. 74). Overall, Nepalese citizens were extremely involved in the Constitution-making process, as at the local level participatory processes wanted by either the CA or international and civil society actors were implemented. Not all the institutions and the procedures involved in the participatory Constitution-making process were deliberative enough. According to Breen's assessment, the

best deliberation quality could be found at the local level, where deliberation managed to moderate vested interests, reach broad agreement around a high number of matters, and have its results taken into serious consideration by the Thematic Committees, which in 2010 ended the drafts of the various sections of the new Constitution. However, the whole Nepalese project seemed destined to sink between 2012 and 2013, because finding a solution to the most contentious issue, that is federalism and the borders of the to-be-established provinces, was becoming too hard. A second CA election became necessary, and it was held in November 2013. The solution to the federalist problem was found thanks to two factors. First: two parties, the Nepali Congress and the UML, won a number of seats so high they could have forced a new Constitution, but gave up this opportunity, deciding to keep on seeking consensus. The Maoist party, previously the one with the highest number of seats, lost many and, seeing what was at stake, started compromising and changing its discourse. For instance, it began denying it had ever asked for ethnic federalism (the choice was between an ethnic and a territorial federalism, based on viability). The second factor was the shift, in the general public and in the media, from polarized positions to clearer preferences. In 2010, Breen reports, support for ethnic and for territorial federalism was for both at 25%. After five years, support for the former had declined to 12%. From 2008 to 2010, 43% of relevant media reports and interviews advocated ethnic federalism, and 51% territorial. After the second CA was established, so, support for a pure ethnic federalism heavily decreased; the idea of a mixed model emerged and gained support; and *«there was more emphasis on territorially focused options, especially among those parties that had previously oscillated between the two options»* (p. 80). In conclusion, the final Constitution was consistent with the outcomes of local level deliberations, the shift in the prevalent discourse and the prevailing public opinion. Deliberative processes managed, according to Breen, to seriously affect Constitution-making.

#### **4. Conclusion**

In conclusion, *Deliberative Democracy in Asia* is definitively worth reading. Although its comparative approach is weaker than expected, its structure is clear and well-balanced. Its contents shed light, among the others, on the implementation of deliberative practices in Asia, on the role civil society, citizens and media can play in both democratic and authoritarian Asian regimes, on the opportunity of implementing participatory policies in ethnically divided countries. In this way, the works' contents could be extremely interesting for both Asian politics and deliberative democracy scholars. After reading this work, probably some scholars in one field will start being curious about the other one and decide to explore it. In this way, the book surely fosters the dialogue between different but close disciplines.

## References

- Bobbio, L. (2005). La democrazia deliberativa nella pratica. *Stato e Mercato*, 73(1), 67-88.
- Bohman, J. (1998). Survey article: the coming of age of deliberative democracy. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 6(4), 400-425.
- Chen, D.-s. & Wu, C.L. (2007). Introduction: public participation in science and technology in East Asia. *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: an International Journal*, 1(1), 15-18.
- Dienel, H.-L. (2009). Citizens' juries and planning cells: deliberative democratic processes for consultation on conflictual problems. In Liu, P. & Traub-Merz, R., *Public participation in local decision-making: China and Germany* (p. 159-179), Shanghai: Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2017). The forum, the system and the polity: three varieties of democratic theory. *Political Theory*, 45(5), 610-636.
- Fishkin, J. (2003). Consulting the public through Deliberative Polling. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 22(1), 128-133.
- Fishkin, J. (2013). Deliberation by the people themselves: entry points for the public voice. *Election Law Journal*, 12(4), 490-507.
- Florida, A. (2018). The origins of the deliberative turn. In A. Bächtiger, J. S. Dryzek, J. Mansbridge & M. E. Warren, *The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy* (p. 35-54). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodin, R. E., & Niemeyer, S. J. (2003). Where does deliberation begin? Internal reflection versus public discussion in deliberative democracy. *Political Studies* 51, 627-649.
- Goodrick, D. (2014). Comparative Case Studies, *Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 9*, UNICEF Office of Research, Florence.
- Mansbridge, J., Hartz-Karp, J., Amengual, M. & Gastil, J. (2006). Norms of deliberation: an inductive study. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 2(1), Article 7.
- Molaschi, V. (2018). *Le arene deliberative. Contributo allo studio delle nuove forme di partecipazione nei processi di decisione pubblica*. Naples: Editoriale Scientifica.
- Myung-Sik, K. (2002). Cloning and deliberation. Korean consensus conference. *Developing World Bioethics*, 2(2), 159-172.
- Pellizzoni, L. (2015). Community, participation and deliberative democracy: an Italian experience. *Quaderni di Sociologia* 68, 149-152.
- Swaminathan, M. (1990). Village level implementation of IRDP: comparison of West Bengal and Tamil Nadu. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 25(13), 17-27.