

Name of class/Subject: **Online Deliberation: Perspectives from Discourse Analysis**

Name of tutor: Dr Marthinus Stander Conradie prof.
wizytujący z Free State University, RPA

Format: Lecture/conversational/workshop

Hours: 30

ECTS: 2

Opis:



Short description: what is this seminar about?

Consider the contemporary proliferation of online spaces that provide us with opportunities to comment on politics: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, online newspapers and many more. In fact, most newspapers host online comment sections where you can discuss news stories and debate politics with other members of the target audience. Most of these online sites not only allow us to share opinions, but to comment on other people's opinions, and therefore to collaboratively create meaning through debate. We can agree, disagree, and contest the meaning of current political events and its implications for our future. In academic terms, we refer to this exchange of ideas as *democratic deliberation*. However, while this kind of exchange might sound productive and idyllic, problems abound. These opportunities for discussion pose difficult questions: What actually happens in these online platforms? Do we really share ideas constructively? Do we work together to understand political developments and think about how to achieve a more socially just future? In fact, what actually counts as a *constructive exchange of ideas*? This seminar is designed to help us think through such questions, and we focus specifically on conducting a discourse analysis of democratic deliberation. We will consider competing models of deliberation and engage questions around the discursively practices that are considered conducive to productive debate.

Readings:

Adams, B.E. 2014. Reason-giving in deliberative forums. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 10(2): 1-27.

Conradie, M. and Brokensha, S. 2018. A discourse analysis of audience deliberation in online forums on face-relevant news. *Acta Academica*. 50(1): 1-27.

Curato, N., Niemeyer, S. and Dryzek, J.S. 2013. Appreciative and contestatory inquiry in deliberative forums: can group hugs be dangerous? *Critical Policy Studies* 7(1): 1-17.

Friberg-Fernros, H. and Schaffer, J.K. 2014. The consensus paradox: Does deliberative agreement impede rational discourse? *Political Studies* 62(1): 99-116.



Proposed Schedule of readings and discussion topics

Session	What you must read:	Discussion topics:
1	Introduction	<p>I will introduce myself and explain precisely what this seminar is all about. But I would also like to learn about you. This will be an informal discussion, but please prepare to answer these questions:</p> <p>Why did you decide to take this seminar?</p> <p>What do you hope to gain from this seminar?</p>
2	Adams (2014)	<p>Adams' (2014) article responds to several ideas from existing research. What are these ideas?</p> <p>What does Adams (2014) have to say about deliberation? Specifically, how does Adams (2014) think about the relationship between deliberation and reason-giving?</p> <p>According to Adams (2014) what are conclusions, evidence, and</p>

		<p>warrants?</p> <p>In your opinion, is Adams' (2014) framework useful for analysing and conducting argumentation online?</p>
3	Adams (2014)	<p>Is deliberation (and reason giving as one component of deliberation) necessarily aimed towards reaching consensus?</p> <p>If deliberation and reason giving are not necessarily geared towards achieving consensus, what other benefits might be derived from engaging in deliberation?</p>
4	Adams (2014)	<p>According to Adams (2014), what role does warrants play in reason-giving, and how does reason-giving feature in democratic deliberation?</p>
5	Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014)	<p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: stagnation?</p> <p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: forgetfulness?</p> <p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: conformism?</p>
6	Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014)	<p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: stagnation?</p> <p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: forgetfulness?</p> <p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers</p>

			of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: conformism?
7	Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014)		<p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: stagnation?</p> <p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: forgetfulness?</p> <p>How does the following concept help us to understand the dangers of attaining agreement in democratic deliberation: conformism?</p>
8	Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014)		Conclusion: During this session, we will discuss the conclusions suggested by Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014), focusing on whether we consider them relevant.
9	Adams (2014) Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014)		Consolidation: We will devote this session to summarise what we have covered so far in this seminar, to answer questions and to discuss whether we find the texts we have discussed useful/relevant to our own concerns.
10	Curato, Niemeyer and Dryzek (2013)		What are the benefits and dangers of appreciative enquiry?
11	Conradie and Brokensha (2018)		During this session, I will provide an overview of my own research into online deliberation.
12	Conradie and Brokensha (2018)		During this session, I will invite you to critique this study.
13	Student presentations		During this session, students will present examples of online deliberation and explain how these can be analysed using Adams' (2014) model or a different theorist from the texts we have discussed.

14	Adams (2014) Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014) Curato, Niemeyer and Dryzek (2013)	During this session, we will resolve any remaining questions you might have about the texts we discussed so far. We will also discuss the degree to which the texts we have discussed so far are relevant to your experiences in the Polish context.
15	Adams (2014) Friberg-Fernros and Schaffer (2014) Curato, Niemeyer and Dryzek (2013)	During this final session, we will reflect on the seminar and consider its bearing on future research.