



[Gherghina, S.](#) , Soare, S. and Jacquet, V. (2023) Political parties and deliberation: from challenges to opportunities. *Acta Politica*, 58, pp. 487-494. (doi: [10.1057/s41269-023-00294-7](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41269-023-00294-7))

This is the author version of the work. You are advised to consult the publisher version if you wish to cite from it:

<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41269-023-00294-7>

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/295036/>

Deposited on: 24 March 2023

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Political Parties and Deliberation: From Challenges to Opportunities

Sergiu Gherghina
Department of Politics and International Relations
University of Glasgow

Sorina Soare
Department of Political Science
University of Florence

Vincent Jacquet
Institut de Science Politique Louvain Europe
Université de Namur

Abstract

This special issue contributes to the burgeoning literature that connects political parties and deliberative practices. It answers two related research questions: why do parties engage in deliberation? and what are the ways in which the deliberative practices can address the challenges faced by political parties in responding to a changing internal and external environment? Its articles cover both theoretical concepts and practical aspects that emerged in different political settings. The results illustrate how different forms of deliberation can contribute to reshaping parties as instruments to represent the people by allowing them to express their demands in a non-mediated form. As such, deliberation in party politics – within and outside party organization – can positively contribute to citizens' attitudes towards politics and to democratic life.

Keywords: political parties, deliberation, democracy, organization, attitudes.

In the last decades extensive research sought to identify to what extent and under what circumstances deliberation can address the difficulties and challenges of representative democracies (Cohen, 1989; Chambers, 2003; Smith, 2009; Fishkin, 2011; Parkinson and Mansbridge, 2012; Bächtiger *et al.*, 2018). The latter have witnessed over time increased levels of distrust in politicians and institutions of representation, voter apathy, limited political interest, misinformation and disinformation, political violence, or polarization (Diamond, 2015; Dalton, 2017; Levitsky and Ziblatt, 2018; Przeworski, 2019). Rooted in the ancient Athenian democracy, deliberative practices have recently flourished around the world across all areas of governance from local to national politics, from communities to organisations, from the Global South to the Global North. The “deliberative wave” gained momentum in parallel with the diffused implementation of practices aiming to make political decision-making talk-centric rather than voter-centric (Elstub and McLaverty, 2014; OECD, 2020). These procedures were intended to empower citizens and to make them engage in inclusive mutual processes of reason-giving with the politicians (Bächtiger and Parkinson, 2019). They provide ordinary citizens the possibility to

deliberate and participate in public decision-making, engage with stakeholders, co-create solutions to the societal needs, achieve consensus, and improve the quality of democracy (Dryzek, 2000; Bächtiger *et al.*, 2018; OECD, 2020).

The repertoire of deliberative practices reflects the relationship between political institutions and citizens. Political parties are institutions that lie at the core of representative democracy for roughly one century (Schattschneider, 1942; Stokes, 1999; Diamond and Gunther, 2002; Dalton, 2019). One key role that parties play in contemporary democracies was that of “channels of expression (...) an instrument, or an agency, for representing the people by expressing their demands” (Sartori, 2005, p. 24). Through the process of political representation, political parties guaranteed those channels that articulated, communicated, and implemented the demands of the sovereign people (Sartori, 2005; Mair, 2013). The critical attitudes of citizens towards representative democracy involved also important changes for political parties: fading membership, lower trust in parties, weaker capacity to mobilise voters, and new competitors openly challenged the equilibria of the traditional party systems (Dalton and Wattenberg, 2000; Vries and Hobolt, 2020; Gherghina and Soare, 2021; Chiaramonte and Emanuele, 2022; van Haute and Ribeiro, 2022). Part of the explanation was connected to broad cultural, social, economic, political, and technological developments that have progressively frayed their capacity to convey the will of their electoral bases (Mair, 2013; Hutter and Kriesi, 2019; Ignazi, 2020). On this ground, some questions emerged about parties’ ability to fulfil the intermediating role between society and state and about their fit for post-industrial and postmodern society (Ignazi, 2020). Other explanations focused on the organisational changes and the power relations between the basic organizational units and the top leadership (Poguntke and Webb, 2005; Gherghina, 2014; Pilet and Cross, 2014; Scarrow, Webb and Poguntke, 2017; Rahat and Kenig, 2018).

One of parties’ reactions to these developments is the use of resources to reinforce the connection with the public, i.e. party members and voters in general (van Haute and Gauja, 2015; Scarrow, Webb and Poguntke, 2017; Gherghina, Iancu and Soare, 2018). Many parties modified their internal decision-making process, adopted rules and mechanisms aiming to increase the intra-party democracy and coherence, finetuned their affiliation options, relied on technology to communicate with voters or manage their party organizations (Scarrow, 2015; Close and Gherghina, 2019; Ignazi, 2020; Barberà *et al.*, 2021). The reforms towards more direct involvement of people in the intra-party decision-making process included the increasing use of primaries, the adoption and implementation of internal referendums, and further means to reach unmediated

decisions (Scarrow, Webb and Poguntke, 2017; Wuttke, Jungherr and Schoen, 2019; Oross and Tap, 2021a).

Some parties took this unmediated engagement of the public one step further and introduced deliberative practices. This was especially visible in the movement-parties (Deseriis and Vittori, 2019; Gherghina and Stoiciu, 2020) but also in mainstream parties (Fishkin *et al.*, 2008). In the recent years, the empirical evidence suggests that there has been an accelerated diffusion of deliberation within the intra-party decision making processes or in relation to external processes that cuts across both established and newer parties (Barberà and Rodríguez-Teruel, 2020b, 2020a; Gad, 2020; Stoiciu and Gherghina, 2020; Vodová and Voda, 2020). Until recently, with several notable exceptions (Fishkin, 1991; Gutmann and Thompson, 1998; Teorell, 1999), the research on political parties ignored widely the topic of deliberation and the rich corpus of (deliberative) democratic theory largely neglected the topic of political parties. It is only recently that a dialogue has been launched between the two strands of literature with explicit interest in studying intra-party deliberative procedures systematically (Invernizzi-Accetti and Wolkenstein, 2017; Gherghina, Soare and Jacquet, 2020; Ignazi, 2020; Heidar and Jupskås, 2022; Junius and Matthieu, 2022).

On this ground, scholars have put forward different explanations – based mainly on single-case studies – for which parties may adopt deliberation and support democratic innovation. Several scholars see the diffusion of deliberative practices as opportunities to reinforce their legitimacy in a context of eroded electoral support and limited popular trust (Teorell, 1999; Fishkin *et al.*, 2008; Ignazi, 2020). By altering their traditional image of hierarchical organizations, it is possible to assume that reasoned discussions in party politics can fix the feeble linkages between parties and society, better justify decisions made by party members while simultaneously increasing their civic skills, autonomous thinking and political knowledge (Teorell, 1999; Fung, 2006; White and Ypi, 2011; Invernizzi-Accetti and Wolkenstein, 2017; Gherghina, Soare and Jacquet, 2020).

Different new parties implemented deliberative forms of intra-party democracy (Gad, 2020; Stoiciu and Gherghina, 2020; Vodová and Voda, 2020; Junius and Matthieu, 2022), while the established parties complemented their traditional processes and mechanisms of internal decision-making with it (Fishkin *et al.*, 2008; Barberà and Rodríguez-Teruel, 2020b). These diverse experiences of political parties with deliberation share the principle that the participants take part to open discussion on specific political issues with the aim to induce reflection in a non-

coercive fashion. They involve argumentative exchanges of experiences and views with the aim to build collective decision that other participants that do not share a specific point of view can still find meaningful and accept (Dryzek, 2000). Traditionally, political parties had similar arenas of discussion in their congresses or local branches, which were complemented by other arenas organized online or in person, open to different categories of members and even the citizenry (Gherghina, Soare and Jacquet, 2020; Oross and Tap, 2021b). In line with Ignazi's approach (2020, p. 15), what becomes salient is not so much the specific goal of the deliberation and the achievement of consensual (reasoned) decisions, but the process based on argumentation and discussion in the different layers of the party organization. The deliberation provides an opportunity to gather participants beyond the circle of the already active members / citizens and in the interactions with the practices of deliberation outside the party organization.

Contributions and Content of the Special Issue

In spite of this burgeoning literature that connects political parties and deliberative practices, we know little about why and how political parties use deliberative practices. This special issue adds to the existing studies by answering two research questions: why do parties engage in deliberation? and what are the ways in which the deliberative practices can address the challenges faced by political parties in responding to a changing internal and external environment? Understanding the approach of political parties towards deliberation is important for three reasons. First, it reveals the multi-faceted purpose of deliberation, which goes beyond its use for intra-party democracy. The special issue illustrates that political parties can support and engage in deliberation that targets the broader public – and not only their members – for a variety of reasons that range from augmenting their electoral support to the legitimation of policy issues. Second, the studies in this special issue present different instances in which deliberative democracy can complement the mechanisms of representative democracy. So far, existing research focused on the views of citizens regarding the complementarity between these two models of democracy (Gherghina and Geissel, 2020; Talukder and Pilet, 2021). The special issues shows that political parties are not as reluctant or incompatible with deliberation as considered for several decades. As such, these studies bring evidence about how deliberation can be used to improve the functioning of political parties and their performances in representative democracies.

The five articles cover both both theoretical concepts and practical aspects that emerged in different political settings. The special issue starts with a theoretical contribution, which is followed by four empirical articles that use specific case studies to bring in-depth analysis on specific aspects linked to spaces for deliberation in which political parties are central. This happens at an individual level (as in the Agora case), in the interaction with other parties (as in Hungary and Romania) or with regard to party elites' perceptions (the French-speaking Belgian parliamentarians at federal or regional level).

The first article identifies the reasons for which parties use deliberative democracy by putting together three strands of literature: intra-party democracy, parliamentary activity, and the connections with the citizenry (Gherghina and Jacquet, 2022). It provides an innovative conceptual framework that distinguishes between the issues of deliberation (people and policies) and the goals (strategic objectives and normative goals) for which deliberation is initiated. Their framework has broad applicability beyond specific deliberative procedures and provide an extremely useful visualisation of the relationships between actors and arenas of deliberation. The analytical framework can be “put to work” both in the literature on party politics and the normative theory of deliberative democracy by allowing a more fine-grained analysis of the interactions between issues and goals. It also opens the door for further research to uncover distinct conceptualizations of deliberation systematically, efficiently and consistently.

The second article draws on a thick description of the organization of the Agora party in Brussels treated as an extreme case of party promoting deliberative practices (Junius *et al.*, 2021). It sheds light on the tensions between a party's deliberative ideals and its representative means. Drawing on an in-depth desk research complemented by 20 semi-structured interviews with a broad range of party members, this study shows that Agora deals with the competing demands of radicalism and pragmatism, together with pressure for deliberative inclusion and representative efficiency. In direct response to these competing demands, the party adopted a strongly decentralized stratarchical party organization in which the main policy-making powers are attributed to randomly selected citizens, without formal ties to the party. Each party supporter has an equal say in the party's internal decision-making process.

In the context of increasing practices of deliberation in Belgium, the third article focuses on parliamentarians as relevant political actors and the embodiment of representative democracy. It investigates how they conceptualize, evaluate, and apprehend deliberative mini-publics (Rangoni, Bedock and Talukder, 2021). This study complements the literature on

explaining citizens' opinions about deliberative mini-publics and contributes to the existing evidence on the discourses of legislators about deliberation. Based on 91 interviews, their analysis identifies two argumentative frames structuring parliamentarians' discourses: competence and vision of political representation. The findings illustrate the existence of a gap between the (normative) positive vision of deliberation and the ways in which the legislators perceive deliberative mini-publics. This perception associates the mini-publics to a power-sharing instrument challenging the primacy of elections rather than as a process centred on the quality of deliberation.

The last two articles focus on the post-communist context and the ways in which deliberative practices interact with party politics. They reflect on the experiences of participatory budgeting, which are processes of co-governance where citizens can participate in deciding the allocation of public expenditure in a community. In their work, Oross and Kiss (2021) look at the politicians' reasons behind the use of participatory budgeting in Budapest. The 27 semi-structured interviews conducted with Hungarian politicians show that there is a widespread acceptance of the normative arguments for promoting citizens' participation in policy-making. The participatory budgeting is associated with an opportunity for increased linkages with the electorate, with newly elected local politicians interested in increasing their local support and promoting new experiments. However, there is a relevant contradiction between this acceptance of deliberation and politicians' critical assessment of citizens as incapable of reaching logical budget decisions. With a similar focus, the final article analyzes how participants in participatory budgeting perceive the collective empowerment provided by this practice (Gherghina, Tap and Soare, 2022). The study focuses on the critical case of Cluj-Napoca and uses 25 semi-structured interviews. Their findings pinpoint to a diffused acknowledgement of the potential for collective empowerment, together with the identification of design issues and resource allocation as weakening elements of the empowerment potential.

These articles provide fine-grained analyses of the interactions between parties, politicians, party members and/or citizens. The results illustrate how different forms of deliberation can contribute to reshaping parties as instruments to represent the people by allowing them to express their demands in a non-mediated form. They indicate why scholars and citizens should care about the changes in traditional party politics and how deliberation in party politics – within and outside party organization – can positively contribute to citizens' attitudes towards politics and to democratic life.

List of References

- Bächtiger, A. et al. (eds) (2018) *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bächtiger, A. and Parkinson, J. (2019) *Mapping and measuring deliberation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barberà, O. et al. (eds) (2021) *Digital Parties. The Challenges of Online Organisation and Participation*. Cham: Springer.
- Barberà, O. and Rodríguez-Teruel, J. (2020a) 'Democratic Innovations and their Consequences for Spanish Political Parties', *ConstDelib Working Paper Series*, 5, pp. 1–20.
- Barberà, O. and Rodríguez-Teruel, J. (2020b) 'The PSOE's deliberation and democratic innovations in turbulent times for the social democracy', *European Political Science*, (online first).
- Chambers, S. (2003) 'Deliberative Democratic Theory', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6, pp. 307–326.
- Chiaromonte, A. and Emanuele, V. (2022) *The Deinstitutionalization Of Western European Party Systems*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Close, C. and Gherghina, S. (2019) 'Rethinking intra-party cohesion: Towards a conceptual and analytical framework', *Party Politics*, 25(5), pp. 652–663.
- Cohen, J. (1989) 'Deliberation and democratic legitimacy', in Hamlin, A. and Pettit, P. (eds) *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 17–34.
- Dalton, R. J. (2017) *The Participation Gap. Social Status and Political Inequality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2019) *Citizen Politics. Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. 7th edn. Thousand Oaks: CQ Press.
- Dalton, R. J. and Wattenberg, M. P. (eds) (2000) *Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deseriis, M. and Vittori, D. (2019) 'The Impact of Online Participation Platforms on the Internal Democracy of Two Southern European Parties: Podemos and the Five Star Movement', *International Journal of Communication*, 13, pp. 5696–5714.
- Diamond, L. (2015) 'Facing Up to the Democratic Recession', *Journal of Democracy*, 26(1), pp. 141–155.
- Diamond, L. and Gunther, R. (eds) (2002) *Political Parties and Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins University Press.

Dryzek, J. S. (2000) *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elstub, S. and McLaverty, P. (eds) (2014) *Deliberative Democracy. Issues and Cases*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fishkin, J. S. (1991) *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fishkin, J. S. et al. (2008) 'Returning Deliberative Democracy to Athens: Deliberative Polling for Candidate Selection', *Paper presented at the annual APSA meeting*, pp. 1–20.

Fishkin, J. S. (2011) *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fung, A. (2006) 'Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance', *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), pp. 66–75.

Gad, N. (2020) 'A "new political culture": the challenges of deliberation in Alternativet', *European Political Science*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 19(2), pp. 190–199.

Gherghina, S. (2014) *Party Organization and Electoral Volatility in Central and Eastern Europe: Enhancing Voter Loyalty*. London: Routledge.

Gherghina, S. and Geissel, B. (2020) 'Support for direct and deliberative models of democracy in the UK: Understanding the difference', *Political Research Exchange*, 2(1), p. online first.

Gherghina, S., Iancu, A. and Soare, S. (eds) (2018) *Party Members and Their Importance in Non-EU Countries. A Comparative Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Gherghina, S. and Jacquet, V. (2022) 'Why political parties use deliberation: A framework for analysis', *Acta Politica*, (online first).

Gherghina, S. and Soare, S. (2021) 'Electoral performance beyond leaders? The organization of populist parties in postcommunist Europe', *Party Politics*, 27(1), pp. 58–68.

Gherghina, S., Soare, S. and Jacquet, V. (2020) 'Deliberative democracy and political parties: Functions and consequences', *European Political Science*, 19(2), pp. 200–211.

Gherghina, S. and Stoiciu, V. (2020) 'Selecting candidates through deliberation: The effects for Demos in Romania', *European Political Science*, 19(2), pp. 171–180.

Gherghina, S., Tap, P. and Soare, S. (2022) 'Participatory budgeting and the perception of collective empowerment: Institutional design and limited political interference', *Acta Politica*, (online first).

- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (1998) *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- van Haute, E. and Gauja, A. (2015) *Party Members and Activists*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- van Haute, E. and Ribeiro, P. F. (2022) 'Country or party? Variations in party membership around the globe', *European Political Science Review*, 14(3), pp. 281–295.
- Heidar, K. and Jupskås, A. R. (2022) 'Deliberative democracy in contemporary political parties: Longitudinal evidence from Norway', *Party Politics*, (online first).
- Hutter, S. and Kriesi, H. (2019) *European Party Politics in Times of Crisis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ignazi, P. (2020) 'The four knights of intra-party democracy: A rescue for party delegitimation', *Party Politics*, 26(1), pp. 9–20.
- Invernizzi-Accetti, C. and Wolkenstein, F. (2017) 'The Crisis of Party Democracy, Cognitive Mobilization, and the Case for Making Parties More Deliberative', *American Political Science Review*, 111(1), pp. 97–109.
- Junius, N. et al. (2021) 'Hacking the representative system through deliberation? The organization of the Agora party in Brussel', *Acta Politica*, (online first).
- Junius, N. and Matthieu, J. (2022) 'Who rules the deliberative party? Examining the Agora case in Belgium', *Party Politics*, (online first).
- Levitsky, S. and Ziblatt, D. (2018) *How Democracies Die: What History Reveals About Our Future*. New York: Crown.
- Mair, P. (2013) *Ruling the Void: The Hollowing Out of Western Democracy*. London: Verso Press.
- OECD (2020) *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Oross, D. and Kiss, G. (2021) 'More than just an experiment? Politicians arguments behind introducing participatory budgeting in Budapest', *Acta Politica*, (Online first).
- Oross, D. and Tap, P. (2021a) 'Moving online: Political parties and the internal use of digital tools in Hungary', *European Societies*, (online first).
- Oross, D. and Tap, P. (2021b) 'Using deliberation for partisan purposes: evidence from the Hungarian National Consultation', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 34(5), pp. 803–820.
- Parkinson, J. and Mansbridge, J. (eds) (2012) *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pilet, J.-B. and Cross, W. (eds) (2014) *The Selection of Political Party Leaders in Contemporary*

- Parliamentary Democracies*. London: Routledge.
- Poguntke, T. and Webb, P. (eds) (2005) *The Presidentialization of Politics: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Przeworski, A. (2019) *Crises of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahat, G. and Kenig, O. (2018) *From Party Politics to Personalized Politics? Party Change and Political Personalization in Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rangoni, S., Bedock, C. and Talukder, D. (2021) 'More competent thus more legitimate? MPs' discourses on deliberative mini-publics', *Acta Politica*, (online first), pp. 1–21.
- Sartori, G. (2005) *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Scarrow, S. (2015) *Beyond Party Members. Changing Approaches to Partisan Mobilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scarrow, S. E., Webb, P. D. and Poguntke, T. (eds) (2017) *Organizing Political Parties: Representation, Participation, and Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schattschneider, E. E. (1942) *Political Parties*. New York: Holt, Riehart, and Winston.
- Smith, G. (2009) *Democratic innovation: Designing institutions for citizen participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stoiciu, V. and Gherghina, S. (2020) 'Intra-Party Deliberation, Under-Represented Groups, and Candidate Selection: The Case of Demos in Romania', *Political Studies Review*, (online first).
- Stokes, S. C. (1999) 'Political parties and Democracy', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2(1), pp. 243–267.
- Talukder, D. and Pilet, J.-B. (2021) 'Explaining disadvantaged citizens' support for deliberative tools: Evidence from the Belgian case', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, (online first).
- Teorell, J. (1999) 'A Deliberative Defence of Intra-Party Democracy', *Party Politics*, 5(3), pp. 363–382.
- Vodová, P. and Voda, P. (2020) 'The effects of deliberation in Czech Pirate Party: the case of coalition formation in Brno (2018)', *European Political Science*, 19(2), pp. 181–189.
- Vries, C. E. De and Hobolt, S. B. (2020) *Political Entrepreneurs: The Rise of Challenger Parties in Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- White, J. and Ypi, L. (2011) 'On Partisan Political Justification', *American Political Science Review*, 105(2), pp. 381–396.

Wuttke, A., Jungherr, A. and Schoen, H. (2019) 'More than opinion expression: Secondary effects of intraparty referendums on party members', *Party Politics*, 25(6), pp. 817–827.