Deliberative democracy has long challenged the standing of pre-political preferences in democratic theory. Deliberation is supposed to change minds, with the construction of political positions as part of political discourse. Accordingly, preference transformation has been the gold standard indicating deliberation.

But is this really a good measure? We already know that deliberative “pathologies” potentially infect discourse in ways that contradict normative ideals, but also yield transformation. And it is possible that preferences remain unchanged, for good reasons. An alternative approach builds on deliberation as a process of reasoning and sense-making that produces broad agreement on the nature of the issue — characterised by Dryzek and Niemeyer (2006) as a metaconsensus. This metaconsensus does not require strict consensus; only that any preference disagreement is equally reflected among values/beliefs (subjective agreement). The approach is demonstrated using data collected from sixteen case studies.
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