

How citizens can influence democratic decision-making? How to include them into direct shaping of the public sphere? How to make their voice not only audible, but also significant? The theory of deliberative democracy is providing answer to the question of how to conduct a dialogue, which substantially changes public life. This rooted in political philosophy concept provides the normative criteria of transformation of public discourse towards the wide inclusion of the citizens.

The project *Deliberation as Public Legitimacy. Jane J. Mansbridge's Theory of Democracy* aims at demonstrating, that deliberation constitutes public legitimacy of democratic decision-making processes. However, depending on its form, in order to provide proper justifications, it has to take into account diverse discursive competences of participating individuals. The argumentation for this standpoint will be presented in accordance to the development of the theory of deliberative democracy in Jane J. Mansbridge's perspective, who is one of the most significant researcher of this approach and the author of most fundamental assumptions of the theory, and whose scientific accomplishments remain relatively unknown in Poland. One of the key tasks of this project on the basis of systematizing the theory is then a detailed analysis of Mansbridge's views in the light of own original proposition of normative schemes of deliberation.

The aim of the process of deliberation is to provide adequate public justifications constituting legitimacy functions of this particular form of participatory democracy. But the fact, that either types of statements shaping the discourse and kinds of interests, being its direct subject, can essentially differ, creates a necessity of formulating criteria enabling the classification of certain sort of the process of deliberation to the normative special model.

This project allows to assume the normative frames of deliberation, thus it helps in systematization and interpretation of theory's development, and demonstrates that theory of deliberative democracy provides a heteronomous model of justifying democratic decision-making processes. Moreover, widespread deliberation can play a part in solving existing social conflicts by both structuring the nature of conflicting interests and providing consensual outcomes. The analysis of this specific form of public discourse can be perceived then as a means to crucial ends through promotion of equality of individuals understood in terms of mutual equal respect.

Within the scope of this project, there are established four normative schemes of deliberation meeting the assumptions in different stages of the theory as presented by Jane J. Mansbridge. The criteria of systematization the processes of deliberation in frames of investigated approaches are allowing to articulate essential differences between particular types of discourse. The classical scheme rooted in the idea of public reason determines criteria of argumentation over common interest of citizens, under conditions of face-to-face contact and absolute equality. The narrative scheme allows, by including non-deliberative, therefore not related to articulated public rights elements transgressing the argumentative discourse, to transform the identity of deliberating individuals. Simultaneously, the postulate of the absolute equality transforms in direction of equalizing the chances of less privileged participants. The reflexive scheme, through the inclusion of citizens' self-interests helps to develop a critical analysis of public policy and marks the boundaries of deliberative negotiations. The systemic scheme specifies the conditions of deliberation between citizens and institutions, as well as between institutions themselves.

The analysis of specific models and the structuration of schemes in accordance with normative schemes allows in consequence to ask the question, whether the theory of deliberative democracy still provides singular, consistent model of democracy, or due to the diversity of its functions and advanced degree of its development, it rather ought to be understood as a class of separate models of justifications legitimizing democratic decision-making processes.