



*Version 1.3 (210207)*

***DELIBERATIVE CITIZENS' CONSULTATION  
TURIN, MARCH 24-25, 2007***

*Pierangelo Isernia  
University of Siena*

## INTRODUCTION

This report spells out the rationale and the research design for the Deliberative Citizens' Consultation (DCC) experiment to be held in Turin in March, 24-25 2007. The Deliberative Citizens' Consultation is supported by two different projects, both aiming at better understanding the conditions and setbacks of furthering participation in Europe and at the European level: the INTUNE Project and the European Citizens' Consultation Project. The INTUNE (Integrated and United: The Quest for Citizenship in an Ever Closer Union) Project ([www.intune.it](http://www.intune.it)), financed under the 6th Framework Programme, is explicitly aimed at studying the evolution of citizenship in Europe integrating sound scientific comparative research methods. Among the methodologies the project will use to integrate basic and policy-research, the Project has chosen Deliberative Polling<sup>®</sup>. The European Citizens Consultation project (<http://www.european-citizens-consultations.eu/3.0.html>) want to promote a pan-European debate involving citizens from all 27 Member States about the future of the European Union across the boundaries of geography and language. The project is funded and organised by an independent consortium of foundations and non-profit organisations from all over Europe and led by the King Baudouin Foundation and it is co-sponsored by the European Commission's communication strategy "Plan D" (Democracy, Dialogue and Debate). The DCC will take place in Turin, in March 2007, and it will make possible to explore the nature and conditions of free exchange of ideas about European issues, at different levels.

## THE INTUNE AND THE ECC PROJECT

*INTUNE* is the acronym of «Integrated and United, Integrated and United: A Quest for Citizenship in an 'ever closer Europe'», a quadrennial Integrated Project (Contract n. CIT3-CT-2005-513421), financed by the EU Commission under the Sixth Framework Programme. It involves more than 100 researchers from 30 Universities and Research Institutes in 21 European countries and it is coordinated by the Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca sul Cambiamento Politico (CIRCaP) of the University of Siena. The project started on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005 and will be concluded in the summer 2009. The major aim of this research-program is to study the changes in scope, nature and characteristics of citizenship presently underway as an effect of the process of deepening and enlargement of the European Union. It will focus on how integration and decentralization processes, at both the national and European level, are affecting three major dimensions of citizenship:



identity, representation, and practice of good governance. From this primary question, three further sets of questions stem: (1) How does a particular kind of political structuring shapes citizenship? In a complex system, how do different identities coexist? (2) What sense of obligation is the EU citizenship developing? How do coexisting identities affect the relationship between elites and mass? (3) What are the citizens expecting from the EU as a level of government? To answer these questions, INTUNE will address the problems of citizenship under the threefold approach of identity, representation and evaluation of government performance, by looking at the dynamics between elites, media and public opinion. INTUNE will carry out, in four years, two waves of parallel mass and elite surveys, together with content analysis of media, in 15 European countries.

The INTUNE project is explicitly aimed at integrating sound scientific comparative research with the dissemination, demonstration of the results to a wider context and with training activities. Among the instruments used to integrate basic and policy-research, the Project will use Deliberative Polling (DP). In this connection, INTUNE will carry out two deliberative polling experiences at the local (city) level, respectively in Turin in 2007 and in Hungary in 2008. We expect to produce a local community deliberative polling protocol, to be offered as an instrument to implement similar experiences in other localities; a detailed report analyzing the data emerging from the experience; a video (and DVD) of the experience to be used for dissemination activities.

The *European Citizens' Consultations* are the first-ever pan-European debate involving citizens from all 27 Member States to discuss the future of the European Union across the boundaries of geography and language. Citizens exchange opinions, develop together their ideas on the future direction of Europe, and communicate their perspectives to policy-makers. Simultaneous and interlinked events across Europe allow every citizen to make his or her voice heard. The consultations and their follow-up aim at inspiring European as well as national institutions and decision-makers as they prepare to take decisions on the next phase of Europe's development.

The European Citizens' Consultations are composed of a series of events connected to each other in a carefully implemented overall process: the Agenda-Setting Event was the kick-off event, and it took place in Brussels on the 7th and 8th of October 2006. 200 citizens from all 25 Member States have discussed the overall question of "what Europe do we want?" and thereby set the agenda for the following debates at national level. In November 2006, two groups of 40 citizens meet in Berlin (Germany) and Budapest (Hungary) to assess which kind of information the participants of the national consultations require to lead a fruitful discussion. These are mostly internal events. From February to March 2007, 27 national consultations will take place at Member State level to discuss



the overarching question “what is needed to achieve the Europe we want?”. Each consultation has four other consultations in other Member States happening at the same time. They exchange their results and enable a European dialogue across locations. The 27 national reports serve as the basis for a European-level synthesis during the Final Consultation in May 2007, highlighting the common ground and the areas of divergence between the national outcomes. A comprehensive follow-up process is kicked off, which actively communicates the outcomes to policy-makers and provides feedback to citizens.

This experiment is also seen as a useful preliminary step toward the implementation of a Europe-wide deliberative polling experiment, aimed at experiencing the problems involved in the creation of a “European public sphere.”

### **THE RATIONALE FOR A DELIBERATIVE CITIZENS’ CONSULTATION**

The stalemate in the constitutional project precipitated by the votes in France and the Netherlands sparked, once again, the debate on the so-called “democratic deficit” of the European system of multilevel governance. Different school of thoughts and views of the European process crossed swords on whether we really need a constitution, what its purposes and what is the best way to achieve it. As it is often the case, these debates touch upon many other issues, all somehow related to the so-called European democratic deficit, the combination of still deeply nationalized political parties, weak representation at the European level and lack of a genuine European public sphere (Eriksen, Fossum and Menéndez, 2004: 6), and, in so doing, rises more general issues about democracy and accountability in modern democratic states (see Moravcsik, 2006; Fossum, 2004; Sbragia, 2006). The discussion starts with the question whether a Constitution is really needed for Europe, but quickly moves beyond that, to invest the full gamut of issues related to the democratic deficit. For some commentators, the failure of the Constitutional project shows the limits of the democratic conception of Europe hold by the proponents of the Constitution rather than a clear gap in the democratic accountability of Europe. Moravcsik, to mention one of the most articulate proponents of this view, argued that the European constitutional project has failed, as an attempt to revamp the legitimacy of European institutions, because it rested on shaky empirical premises. Moravcsik singled out three as crucial: “First, greater institutional opportunity for participation generates greater public participation. Second, greater participation generates more informed deliberation and decision-making. Third, more informed or intensive decision-making generates greater trust and a deeper sense of common identity and legitimacy.” (Moravcsik, 2006: 222).



Moravcsik argues that all these three assumptions are empirically dubious and this, in turn, explain the utter failure of the Constitutional project. Fishkin (2006) argued, on the contrary, that Moravcsik position tends to conflate deliberative and populist democracy and shows that, under appropriate conditions, citizen deliberation and informed discussion can increase support for Europe. To explore the conditions under which a genuine deliberative democracy is possible is at the core of the DCC experiment.

More specifically, the DCC experiment in Turin has been designed with three main scientific goals in mind. The first goal is to understand the impact that a greater or lesser personal distance from an issue has on public attitudes toward Europe. To examine the consequences on attitudes and support for European integration of the discussion and deliberation on issues at a different distance from participants, they will be discussing issues at different distance from them and by which they are, plausibly, differently engaged. Some participants, will explore issues at an high level of generality, the same level on which we expect most of the people get involved when talking and thinking about Europe. These groups will be discussing issues related to environment and energy, Family and social welfare, and Europe's global role and immigration.<sup>1</sup> Other participants will be discussing issues, still of European relevance, but closer to their interests and local concerns. Namely, these groups will be discussing two local issues: the right to vote in local election for immigrants from non-European countries and the High Speed Train Turin-Lyon.

The second goal is to contribute to better understand to what extent greater participation can foster the quality of citizens' deliberation. Some scholars have objected to the idea of wider public participation on European issues arguing that growing deliberation is at best irrelevant and, at worst, counterproductive, if not totally manipulative. According to them, discussion on issues far from the personal day-by-day interests of the people generate a manipulated deliberation and make it easier for groups with more intense and extreme positions to seize issues and to politicize the issue debates. To explore this problem, we have built a complex set of experiments, in which different groups of participants will be discussing issues of different contentiousness, complexity and generality. Some groups will discuss general European issues, those on which people are expected to have a more superficial level of information, but on which a greater consensus on how to address and cope with them might also be expected. These are the groups on which balanced and accurate

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the set of issues emerged as the most relevant for a group of approximately 200 citizens from the 25 member states gathered together in Brussels during the week-end of October 7-8, 2006 for the Agenda-setting event.



information is expected to make the greatest difference in the quality of debate. Other groups will discuss issues on which people have more intense feelings and settled opinions, because either they call into question their identity, as in the case of immigration, or because they affect them personally in their day-by-day life, as in the case of the High Speed Train for some areas of the Turin province. These are the groups on which information's impact on the quality of deliberation interact with their personal predisposition and the pre-existing quality of information. Comparing the change in attitudes produced by discussion on immigration and High Speed Train will allow us to shed some light on the differential impact of predisposition and the quality of pre-existing information on attitudes. Right to vote for immigrants is an issue on which information is scarce – and then informational inputs can be expected to make a difference – but that can quickly engage personal predisposition and prejudices. High Speed Train is an issue on which information is abundant, but often skewed, one way or the other. To explore whether informed and intense debate can take place not only when the level of information is raised – as it is often the case in deliberative polling – but also when it has to break an asymmetrical distribution of information will allow us to shed some light on the conditions under which deliberative democracy, as contrasted with populist deliberation, is possible. In this connection, a great effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and balance of information provided to the participants.<sup>2</sup>

The third scientific goal of this experiment is to assess the effect of the different components of the deliberative process on attitude change during the deliberative process. The experimental treatment represented by the deliberative process can be disentangled in different components that, each of them singularly and all of them jointly, can produce a change in attitudes. The disaggregating experiment we propose is intended to provide answers to these questions and initiate a discourse on how important, or not important, deliberating is to the formulation of political opinions in an increasingly polarized environment. The overall treatment might be considered in a number of ways. Temporally, there is the question of how much of the effect comes from the anticipatory, informal deliberations with friends, family, and coworkers, versus from the formal deliberative process. Operationally, there is the question of how much of the effect comes from reading the briefing materials, participating in small group discussions with peers, or interacting with policy

---

<sup>2</sup> The briefing material to be distributed to the participants has been prepared by experts in these different areas. Then, this material has been discussed with a stakeholders' committee, whose members insured the representative ness of all positions and interests involved. In the case of the High Speed Train, a further step has been carried out, to insure the quality of the material. All members of the committee has been personally interviewed to gather their views of the problem and these interviews has been used to recheck the briefing document before the final reading of the stakeholders' committee.



experts in plenary sessions. Processually, there is the question of how much comes from talking versus thinking versus learning. What exactly is making the difference, to what degree, and in what way? In our experiment, we have been disaggregating these different elements, in order to offer an answer to these questions and to start to reflect on how important it is deliberation in order to form political opinions in a polarized context. We believe these results will shed light on the debate stimulated by Moravcsik. What might make deliberative forms of participation distinctive? Is it the small group discussion? The information in briefing materials? The engagement with experts? How is it possible to create deliberative participation as opposed to populist forms of mass consultation? Disaggregating the treatment in the Deliberative Poll will help us advance toward answering these questions.

Given these tasks, the experimental design is as shown in Figure 1.

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

To allow for the assessment of the different deliberative stages on attitude change, a questionnaire will be submitted to different groups in different stages, according to a research design showed in Figure 1. Group A (approximately 75 persons, divided up in 5 groups) will receive the questionnaire at the arrival, before discussing the first issue. Group B will be administered the questionnaire after the group discussion and before the plenary. Group C will be administered the questionnaire after the plenary session. Finally, the group D and E, the control groups, will not be administered any questionnaire in this stage. All participants will then compile the final questionnaire, at the end of the two days deliberative polling. The questionnaire will be administered by INTUNE and local staff.

To assess for the impact of the greater or lesser distance from the issue, we have embedded in our experiment different groups. One group, of approximately 40 participants, will be made from Italians coming from other regions. They will take part in all the deliberations and discussions as the other participants but they will be discussing more general European issues, as related to environment, family and social welfare and Europe in the global context. This group is crucial to explore the extent to which the greater or lesser distance from the issue, together with the quality of the deliberation, make possible the formation of genuine and informed opinions. Another group is made of people from the Val di Susa area (that is part of the Turin province<sup>9</sup>) whose opinions on one of the two local issues (the High Speed Train) is expected to be more intense than for the others. For this reason, this group will be slightly oversampled (n=30). Moreover, to control for the effect on attitudes of the size of this group, the Val di Susa participants will be differently



distributed among the local groups. In the set D, Val di Susa people will be over-represented, in set of five persons per group, while the remaining participants from the Val di Susa will be randomly assigned to groups A, B and C, in proportion to their actual size in the population (about 2% of the total population of the province).

### ***THE DELIBERATIVE CITIZENS CONSULTATION EXPERIMENT IN TURIN***

To design and implement the DCC experiment in Turin to be held in March 2007 is a challenging task, both scientifically and organizationally. This is one of the first Deliberative experiments ever held in Italy and one of the largest. Given the set of topics chosen, we can reasonably expect to raise attention at both the local and the national level among the general public, experts, policy experts and politicians. Given the complexity of the tasks, a task force of INTUNE scholars with the advisory help of Luigi Bobbio, James Fishkin and Robert Luskin, has designed the DCC in Turin. In the next section we will briefly present the design of the experiment, touching upon the timing, sampling, recruitment, management, selection of issues, agenda and time schedule of the experiment.

#### ***Issues to be discussed***

As mentioned before, the DCC will be discussing different themes for different groups.

A first group will be discussing more general, European Topics, around three issues: Environment and Energy, Social welfare and family and Europe Global role, borders and immigration. These issues have been previously selected by a group of approximately 200 citizens coming from the 25 member states in October 2007. The discussion will be based on briefing material illustrating the main topics related to the three issues. Namely:

- Environment: waste management and recycling, nuclear power, renewable energies, energy independence, environmental technologies, influence of lobby groups, coordination of national energy policies, crossborder impact of environmental degradation, joint research and clean production.
- Family and Social Welfare : The social and economic conditions for Europe's families,, Demographic change , A more 'inclusive' workforce, Support for families, Equal opportunities, child care,
- Global Role, Outside Borders and Immigration: EU as a world power, joint global policies, peace making and democratization, European armed forces, common defence policy, energy imports,



legal and illegal immigration, common immigration policy, controls at Europe's external borders, support for counties at EU borders, development aid, positive aspects of immigration, immigration and demographic change.

A second set of groups will be discussing the High Speed Train linking Turin and Lion and the right to vote for immigrants.

- The High Speed Train is couched into the broader issue of transportation, mobility issues in Europe and it is, in itself, a priority of the European Union, according to the project TEN-T (Trans European Networks), aiming at improving the network of communications among the European countries. The debate on the HST is also couched in environmental terms for the highly intrusive impact it might have in the geographical areas in which it will run.

- The right to vote for legal immigrant involves crucial issues of citizenship, immigration, coexistence among different social groups and competition for access to welfare services with obvious consequences at both the local, national and European level.

These local issues are of differential degree of politicization, both for their nature and for the distribution of public attitudes. Moreover, the distance from the issues on the participants will be different. For the inhabitants of the Turin metropolitan area (approximately half of the 2 million inhabitants of the Turin province) the right to vote for immigrants is more topical than for those living in the surrounding areas. The HST is highly topical for the inhabitants of the Val di Susa (approximately 2% of the members of the province), while it is perceived as a net asset for the Turin metropolitan area. For those groups that will be discussing the local issues, the two issues will be discussed sequentially. The right to vote will be discussed first, and the HST next.

### ***Sampling and Recruitment***

300 persons from the Turin province will take part in the DCC experiment, together with about 40 Italians living in other regions, for a total of about 340 people. The recruitment at both the local and national level will be organized by TNS INFRATEST SpA (Via Bolama 11/3 – 13 20126 MILAN), a survey firm of the TNS Opinion/EOS Gallup group, partner of the INTUNE Project. The group of Italian participants from regions other than Piemonte, they will be randomly selected, according to a grid of selection criteria (such as gender, age, socio-economic status, geographical area and attitudes toward Europe), to insure an adequate variety of opinions, along the lines of focus groups recruitment. To select this sample size, approximately 200 people will be randomly selected via RDD and submitted to a CATI-questionnaire of approximately 20 minutes. The 300 participants



from the Turin area will be selected as part of a telephone survey in which approximately 1,600 people will be interviewed with CATI for a 20-minutes interview. The inhabitants in the Val di Susa area (approximately 2-3% of the total population in the Turin area) will be slightly over sampled to bring them at approximately 10% of the total sample.

This questionnaire will contain some questions identical to those asked to the INTUNE questionnaire that will go into the field in March 2007 in Italy and other 15 countries and some questions especially devoted to the issues dealt with in the DCC.

The random nature of the participating sample is a crucial ingredient for the success of the experiment. To make it possible, we adopted the following strategies: (a) a monetary incentives (ranging between €80-€120). (b) To raise media attention and show as attachment to the briefing material we send to potential participants all newspapers clips announcing or reporting about the event. (c) To organize a nice Saturday evening event with local authorities. (d) To keep participants' interest and attention high with periodical calls.

The participants to the event will receive, at home, the briefing material and other informative material prepared by the experts and revised by the stakeholders committee.

### ***Moderators***

A crucial contribution to foster a smooth group discussion and a constructive deliberative environment is entrusted to the moderators. With approximately 340 people participating and groups of 15 persons each, we need about 20-25 moderators, plus a moderator for the plenary. The personnel for this role has been selected by will be selected by TNS among focus groups' moderators and experts in city negotiations. The moderators are recruited by AvventuraUrbana, and they will be directed by Iolanda Romano. They will be trained in the conduction of the discussion and a thorough rehearsal on the topics discussed in the DCC. A group of INTUNE researchers, together with Robert Luskin and James Fishkin will lead a final training session in the days before the event. The moderator for the plenary sessions will be persons coming from the TV or the printed media. They should be able to elicit interesting questions and to probe further any relevant issue, but, at the same time, one that gives no hint of her/his opinions.

### ***Event Agenda***

The event will be hosted at the BasicVillage, Via Foggia 42 e C.so Regio Parco 39 Torino, (<http://www.basicvillage.com/html/home02.asp>), the old factory of the RobediKappa firm, and that



now has been recovered as an example of industrial archeology and transformed in a congress center.

The following is a tentative agenda of the DCC event:

*March 24 - SATURDAY MORNING*

Morning: Arrival of participants from other Italian regions

10.00-10.30: Arrival of participants

10.30-11.00 General meeting (30')

11.00-12.00 Small group discussion (theme 1)

12.00-12.15 Coffee break

12.15-13.30: Plenary with questions to the experts (theme 1)

13.30-14.30: Lunch

*March 24 - SATURDAY AFTERNOON*

14.45-16.00: Small group discussion (theme 1)

16.00-17.00: Small group discussion (theme 2)

17.00-17.15: Coffee break

17.15-19.00: Plenary with questions to the experts (theme 2)

19.00-20.00: Break

20.00: Dinner

*March 25 - SUNDAY MORNING*

9.00-10.30: Small group discussion (theme 2)

10.30-10.45: Coffee break

10.45-12.00: Plenary with questions to the experts (theme 2)

12.00-13.30: Small group discussion (theme 2)

13.30-14.30: Lunch

*MARCH 25 - SUNDAY AFTERNOON*

14.30-16.00: Final Plenary session

16.00-16.30: Final small groups session to fill the questionnaire and greetings.

The final small group could be one hour, even with filling out questionnaire. (also the other small group sessions could be one hour and forty five minutes, not counting some time for coffee breaks, etc to make it more humane)

We plan to have the experts the first time and the politicians the second time. One important thing to keep in mind is that both experts and politicians are not invited there to give long talks but to give short and sharp answers to the questions raised by the groups' discussion. The help of an authoritative and effective plenary moderator is here essential.



### *Time Schedule*

<i>Periodo</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Main outcome</i>
<b><i>T<sub>0</sub></i></b>	<b><i>March 24-25, 2007</i></b>	<b><i>Deliberative Polling</i></b>
T <sub>-1</sub>	March 12 , 2007	Briefing material shipped to participants
T <sub>-1</sub>	March 1, 2007	Media coverage begins
T <sub>-2</sub>	February 25, 2007	Survey and recruitment begins
T <sub>-3</sub>	February 20, 2007	Briefing material ready for the printing
T <sub>-3</sub>	February 15, 2007	Questionnaire Pre-testing
T <sub>-4</sub>	February 10, 2007	Questionnaire ready

### **ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

To organize the event a sponsoring board, a scientific advisory board and a stakeholder committee has been set up:

(a) Sponsoring Board.

This Board will insure that attention is raised about the event itself in both the local and national media and among local and national elites. The sponsoring board is composed by the members of the Coordinating Committee of Torino Internazionale, together with representative of the INTUNE Project.

(b) Scientific Advisory Committee. This committee is helping to prepare the briefing material. The Scientific Board is composed by Luigi Bobbio, Maurizio Cotta, James Fishkin, Pierangelo Isernia, Georgy Lengyel (Corvinus University in Budapest, in charge of organizing the INTUNE Hungarian DP event in 2008), Robert C. Luskin, Angelo Pichierri and Giovanna Zincone, with the support of Alberto Chiari, Guido Tintori and Noemi Podestà.

(c) Stakeholders Advisory Board.

This Board reflects the different interests involved in the issues. It check the Briefing materials to be prepared for distribution to participants for balance and accurateness, taking all the relevant sides of each issue into account. The list of participants is attached.



*Figura 1 – Experiment Design*

Groups	First Issue (Right to vote)			Second Issue (High Speed Train)
	<b>T1</b> Arrival	<b>T2</b> After group discussion	<b>T3</b> After Plenary	<b>T4</b> Final Questionnaire
Group A (75)	X			X
Group B (75)		X		X
Group C (75)			X	X
Group D (75)				X
Group E (36)				X

Groups A-D: people from the Torino province. Group E: people from other Italian regions

## **ANNEXES**

**Annex 1 – Draft Report HST**

**Annex 2 – Draft Report Right to vote**

**Annex 3 – List of participants stakeholders committe**

**Annex 4 – Questionnaire**