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1. Introduction

I explore the inclusiveness of a citizens’ jury, convened in Ireland in November 2003. ‘Inclusiveness’ in this sense is distinct from ‘political inclusion’, and here it is prior. Formally organised public deliberation can only facilitate political inclusion when it has passed some threshold level of inclusiveness.

Political inclusion can be broadly understood as the achievement of the representation or participation of all social groups and categories, in state institutions and decision-making. I understand this to involve political participation, occupying positions, and influencing public policy.

The inclusiveness of a deliberative forum requires that it, firstly, is comprised of all categories in a balanced way, and secondly, that these participate on equal terms in deliberation. The background is typically opinion-polling methods - so the categories include demographic groupings in the (adult) population: age, gender, education, ethnicity, and so on, while balanced representation involves a representative sample.

Critics question the inclusiveness of deliberation, considered as a neutral medium for the resolution of claims, and correspondingly, from the point of view of its predicted real world dynamics. In their view, the groups and categories in need of political inclusion will only be disadvantaged by deliberation.

I report on the participation in deliberation of women and the lesser educated in four small groups to which jurors were assigned. I empirically address the claim in
Mansbridge (1983, 1991), Sanders (1997) and Young (1989, 1996, 2000), that these categories are likely to participate less in deliberative settings than men and the better educated.

I don’t mean to imply that participating ‘on equal terms’ and participating ‘to an equal extent’ are equivalent. The expression ‘on equal terms’ covers both ‘equal respect’ and ‘contributing an equal amount’ (on the assumption that this affects the outcome). The claim that women and the lesser educated will not be accorded equal respect, can be made independently of the claim that they will participate less (Sanders 1997). I acknowledge that this is a separate claim but do not address it here.

In addition, I consider the potential problem of differential non-response and attrition in the course of recruitment. In doing so I measure the inclusiveness of the jury’s composition, while in measuring participation I explore the inclusiveness of its deliberation.

The results were broadly positive, though there were negative findings. Selection bias did occur, though with respect to gender, the difference is not so large to say that it is unlikely to have occurred by chance. Overall, women and those without high levels of education did not participate to a significantly lesser extent than men and the better educated - though men did participate significantly more in one of the groups.
2. Theoretical Context

2.1 Deliberation, Participation, and Consultation

Citizens' juries, based on the analogy of jury-trial duty, are one of several kinds of formally organised deliberative forums. These come as general types, and as more singular events. The former include citizens' juries, planning cells, consensus conferences, scenario workshops, and deliberative polling. Examples of the latter include the America Speaks Citizen Summit, and participatory forums on public health policy in Oregon, community policing in Chicago, and municipal budgeting in Brazil.

These forums are inspired by ancient Athenian and town meeting visions of direct democracy, and often use sampling methods to recruit citizen panels of manageable size for interpersonal deliberation. Participants in their tens or hundreds, and even in their thousands, are brought together at a single site over a day or several days, sometimes with experts and political leaders. They are typically given balanced briefing materials in advance. They engage in intensive discussion and debate on political issues - or on planning, environment or consumer questions. Participants reach a group ‘verdict’ or set of recommendations to which the state commissioning body can be required to respond (in the case of UK citizens' juries for instance), or even be required to implement (municipal budgeting). Alternatively, the purpose of the event may be to enable members of the public to inform themselves and to refine

---

1 James Fishkin has registered ‘Deliberative Poll’ and ‘Deliberative Polling’ as trademarks.
their views - though here re-survey attitudes can be aggregated to determine a group shift attributable to deliberation (as in deliberative polling for example)

Deliberative forums are potentially one of a variety of types of public consultation in current use. The accompanying discourse puts a high premium on political and administrative responsiveness. Public decisions, implicitly, are to be made in close alignment to the wishes and self-declared needs of citizens and service-users. It is hoped that effective consultation will increase the public's sense of trust and ownership of public institutions (Coote and Lenaghan 1997; King, Feltey & Susel 1998), and contribute to democratic renewal.

A special feature of deliberative forums is the potential to combine elements of direct democracy with opinion-polling sampling techniques and the use of major broadcast media. A representative ‘microcosm’ of the broader public can meet for interpersonal deliberation, and the event can be covered by local or national media. Their conclusions are a barometer of what the public would think were it to engage more seriously with the issues. An additional benefit would be the increased interest in politics and perceived efficacy among participants (Fishkin 1991, 1995, 1996, Fishkin, Luskin & Jowell 2000).
2.2 Deliberative Democracy

Deliberative democracy is a popular and much discussed contemporary view of the normative value and requirements of democracy. It has come to theoretically underpin much of the work in real world deliberative forum experimentation. In its simplest articulation, a deliberative democracy is “an association whose affairs are governed by the public deliberation of its members” (Cohen 1997, 67). The idea of deliberative democracy involves the claim that “legitimate lawmaking issues from the public deliberation of citizens” (Bohman and Rehg 1997, 1).

Deliberative democrats unite in arguing that the democratic process should not be one of simply responding to the raw preferences of voters. In particular, its legitimacy is tied to processes of unconstrained deliberative communication, involving a geographically and temporally dispersed public. The purpose of these would be to shape appropriately reasoned and impartial judgements, to which the democratic process should instead be responsive (Benhabib 1996, Cohen 1997, Elster 1997, Habermas 1992, 1996a, 1996b, 1997a, 1997b, Sunstein 1991). Theorists further claim that interpersonal deliberation may, in practical terms, constrain participants to reason in light of what all can accept (Benhabib 1996, Elster 1997). The deliberative ideal requires the multiplication of real world exchanges and forums in which deliberation on matters of public concern may occur.
2.3 The Exclusiveness of Deliberation

According to the critics (Sanders 1997, and Young 1989, 1996, 2000), deliberation is not neutral with respect to who will control the floor. Young suggests that the model of deliberation derives from specific institutional contexts of the modern west - scientific debate, modern parliaments, and courts. Parliaments and courts in particular are agonistic, and privilege speech that is assertive and confrontational over speech that is tentative, exploratory, or conciliatory (Young 1996, 123). The norms of deliberation value speech that is formal and general, that is framed in terms of generalities and principles, and that is dispassionate and disembodied. These differences of speech privilege “correlate with other differences of social privilege” (ibid, 123). In particular, the critics argue, they are biased towards the greater participation and influence of educated white middle-class men. Both Sanders and Young (referring to Mansbridge 1983, 1991) cite studies indicating that women, black people, the working-class, and poorer people - tend to be dominated by higher status men in town meetings and jury-trial deliberations.


Here I report the jury issue, describe the process by which the jury members were selected, and outline the day’s events. I then report on opinion-change and explore the jury’s inclusiveness. I leave some analysis that is not central to the theoretical concern explored here to a further publication - in particular the fuller use of the Election Survey panel as a control group, and additional non-participant observer data.
3.1 The Issue

A panel of 56 randomly selected Dublin voters convened at 10am on Sunday 9 November 2003, in a centrally located hotel. It met to consider two issues:

1. Is there a role for household waste incineration in an integrated waste management strategy for Ireland?
2. If so, should an incineration plant for Dublin household waste be built in the Ringsend area?

3.2 Jury Selection

The Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) were commissioned to recruit a jury, with the intention that the social and demographic characteristics of jurors should closely match those of Dublin voters overall. Jurors were selected from a larger panel that had participated in two waves of an Irish National Election Study, conducted by the ESRI and political scientists at Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin. The postal survey was first carried out in summer 2002, and respondents were asked to complete a follow-up in summer 2003. Jurors were recruited from respondents to the 2003 survey. A further follow-up containing the key jury opinion items was carried out in summer 2004. The sampling design is outlined in Appendix 1.

Out of 499 Dublin respondents to the 2002 survey, 221 responded to the follow-up. In the anticipation of rejections, all 221 were invited by the ESRI to participate in the
citizens' jury. Those who indicated a willingness to attend were contacted several times for confirmation of their continuing availability in the weeks immediately prior to the event. Invitations were additionally sent to a small number of randomly selected Ringsend residents to ensure that they would be represented more strongly than they would by simple random assignment. In the end 7 of the 56 jurors came from Ringsend.

3.3 The Event

Members of the jury received briefing materials on both side of the issue of waste incineration before they convened. On arrival they completed a short questionnaire, facilitated by interviewers from the ESRI.

In the morning members of the jury assembled to hear evidence and argument on the issue of waste incineration. This included evidence from politicians and interested parties speaking on both sides of the issue, as well as scientific experts from overseas with direct experience of incineration. The Minister for the Environment and the Dublin City Manager were both invited to present their case in favour, but they declined the invitation. Two professional barristers, one for each side, were appointed to question the ‘witnesses’ before the jury in plenary session.

In the afternoon the jury broke up into four small groups, each with a facilitator, to meet informally and to discuss whether the witnesses should to be asked further questions. Witnesses were then recalled to answer these. After a short break jurors broke up into their small groups for a second time, with facilitators. Each group
discussed the issue and was encouraged to try and come to a common view, together with reasons for coming to that view. They chose a spokesperson or spokespersons to report their views and reasoning to the full jury. They had been informed that they were permitted to present conflicting views but in no case was this necessary.

In a final session the full jury convened for discussion. This began with a report on the conclusions of each small group together with their reasons, after which there was an opportunity for moderated open discussion among the jury as a whole. Finally, the jury recorded its verdict. It was agreed that a letter, describing the event and outlining the jurors’ concerns, would be produced and sent to the Minister for the Environment and the City Manager.

Jurors completed the re-survey questionnaire, facilitated by ESRI interviewers. They were paid 100 euro to cover their expenses. The day ended with dinner and a prize-draw for a 2,500 euro holiday credit. Subsequently, some national print and radio media ran coverage of the event.

### 3.4 Opinion Change

The jurors found both against incineration in general and against an incinerator for Ringsend. They criticised in addition their perceived lack of involvement and exclusion from the process of policy-making and planning. In this context, notably, survey-resurvey items used to assess interest in politics and perceived efficacy registered little change. In contrast, in response to a further series of items used to determine juror’s feelings about the event and their involvement, overall jurors clearly
felt positive about their experience and about the jury as a means of public involvement in politics.

Opinions on survey-resurvey attitudinal items did change significantly over the course of the day. Table 1 outlines some key items, and compares the morning and evening means (on Likert scales) of the group as a whole, while reporting the level of statistical significance of paired comparisons (paired sample $t$-test).
### Table 1. Morning-Evening Opinion Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Morning Mean</th>
<th>Evening Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste incinerators are essential for effective waste management in Ireland</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.89*</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sig .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste incinerators harm the environment</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.74*</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sig .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste incinerators are a threat to the health of people living nearby</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sig .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A waste incinerator should be built in Ringsend to deal with part of Dublin’s household waste</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sig .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 strongly disagree  
  2 disagree  
  3 slightly disagree  
  4 neither agree nor disagree  
  5 slightly agree  
  6 agree  
  7 strongly agree
4. The Inclusiveness of the Jury

4.1 Selection Bias

I tabulate relative proportions within the categories of gender and education, at four time-points. The first relates to Dublin respondents to the original 2002 Irish National Election Survey. The second relates to Dublin respondents to the 2003 follow-up, invited to participate in the Citizens’ Jury. The third relates to those who responded positively to the invitation. Finally, the fourth relates to those who in the fact attended on the day.

Selection bias on demographics did occur. Women were less willing to attend, and less attended than had initially responded positively to the invitation. Precisely the reverse was the case for men. A parallel contrast occurred for those without a full Irish secondary education (the leaving certificate) or equivalent, compared to those having a post secondary qualification.

With respect to gender, the difference is not so large to say that it is unlikely to have occurred by chance. With respect to education, there is a significant difference between the sub-category distributions of those asked and those who attended.

I use a chi-square goodness of fit test. I use the proportions in the ‘Asked’ column as baseline proportions to generate expected frequencies to which to compare the observed frequencies, firstly, of those willing, and secondly, of those who attended. For education, the difference between the relative proportions among those asked, and the relative proportions among those who attended, is significant at $P = 0.007$. 

### Table 2. Selection Bias: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>INES 2002 %</th>
<th>Asked (INES 2003) %</th>
<th>Willing %</th>
<th>Jury %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ P = .559 \quad .235 \]

### Table 3. Selection Bias: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>INES 2002 %</th>
<th>Asked (INES 2003) %</th>
<th>Willing %</th>
<th>Jury %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Leaving</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Leaving</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ P = .156 \quad .007 \]
4.2 Participation

4.2.1 Data and Variables: Participation

In the afternoon the jury broke up into four small groups. The assignment of jurors to groups was done in the days immediately prior to the event. The pool included all those agreeing to participate who had not cancelled by the time of the final contact made with them. For the purpose of assigning the jurors the pool was divided into men and women, and into Ringsend and non-Ringsend residents. Ringsend residents were divided equally (roughly) between the four groups by random assignment. The same was done for men, and then for women.

The second of the small group sessions was devoted to moderated group discussion. Each juror had been assigned an identification number. This was clearly visible on a badge worn by the juror. A non-participant observer was assigned to each of the four small groups to record the sequence of contributions. A unit contribution encompasses the time from which a juror begins to speak on a particular occasion, to the time that he or she ends speaking and another juror begins. The coding consisted of entering the identification number of the speaker in a coding sheet, each time a speaker addressed the group. (The observer also coded each individual contribution according to its position on a 5-point scale of approval to disapproval, in relation to incineration in general, or the Ringsend incinerator specifically. This data will not be explored here.)

I calculate, for each juror, the sum total of contributions made by that juror in the course of their group discussion. This enters as data for the dependent variable. I present the results in 2x2 contingency tables (I do not compare mean number of
contributions in the sub-categories, because \( n \) is unsuitably low and the sub-sample distributions do not approximate normal distributions). The dependent variable data is ordered according to the following grouping categories:

- Number of individuals making the median number of contributions or less in their group
- Number of individuals making more than the median number of contributions in their group

Gender and education are the independent variables. Education comprises the grouping categories of those having a secondary education or less, and those having post-secondary education.

**4.2.2 Findings: Participation**

In the case of gender, in only one of the four groups (Group B) is there a significant relationship between the row and column variables. Here men made significantly more contributions, by a one-tailed test at \( P = 0.06 \). There is no significant effect for education. The chi-square test is unsuitable because many cells have expected frequencies less than five. Fisher’s exact test is instead used.
### GENDER

**Table 4. Group A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 7 9

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = 1.000$; 1-tailed $P = .671$

**Table 5. Group B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 6 10

Fishers Exact Test 2-tailed $P = .119$; (1-tailed): $P = .059$

**Table 6. Group C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 6 10

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = 1.000$; 1-tailed $P = .511$
#### Table 7. Group D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 36</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = .524$; 1-tailed $P = .405$
EDUCATION

Table 8. Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Up to secondary</th>
<th>Post-secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = .315$; 1-tailed $P = .214$

Table 9. Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Up to secondary</th>
<th>Post-secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = 1.000$; 1-tailed $P = .500$

Table 10. Group C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Up to secondary</th>
<th>Post-secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = .516$; 1-tailed $P = .242$
### Table 11. Group D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median or less</td>
<td>Up to secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the median</td>
<td>Post-secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishers Exact Test: 2-tailed $P = .500$; 1-tailed $P = .417$

It is also worth reporting here (see table 12) that out of six spokespersons chosen, three were female. Three of the four groups chose a female spokesperson, in one of which both a man and a woman were chosen. In the final group two men were chosen.

Among the spokespersons, the minimum level of education was the completion of secondary education - attained by one of the spokespersons chosen. Five of the six chosen possessed a post secondary qualification. (Note: of $n = 55$, 12 jurors had not completed secondary, 11 had completed secondary, and 32 had a post secondary qualification).
Table 12: Choice of Spokespersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Chosen</th>
<th>Their Gender</th>
<th>Their Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Post secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male / Male</td>
<td>Post secondary / secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female / Male</td>
<td>Post secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Post secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusion

Selection bias did occur - men and the better educated were over-represented on the jury. If close correspondence in demographic terms is needed for the verdict to be a proxy for considered opinion in the larger public (Fishkin 1991, 1995, 1996, Fishkin, Luskin & Jowell 2000), in this case selection-bias provides an opportunity for critics to challenge the legitimacy of the jury.

With respect to gender, the difference is not so large to say that it is unlikely to have occurred by chance. For education, in contrast, there is a significant difference between the sub-category distributions of those asked and those who attended. For this category the jury event clearly had differential appeal. It would have to be a concern if differential appeal or accessibility is found to be a general rule, though at this stage the research has yet to be done.

However, contrary to the predicted exclusiveness of deliberation, overall women and those without high levels of education did not participate to a significantly lesser extent than men and the better educated. Men participated significantly more in only one of the groups, while the effect for education was not significant.
Appendix 1: Sampling Design for the Irish Election Survey

A three-stage clustered sample design based on the electoral register was used. Electors are recorded in the electoral lists in so-called Polling Books. These polling books were reconstituted into area units known as District Electoral Divisions. There is a total of 3,400 ‘DEDs’ in Ireland. These are the most spatially disaggregated area units in Ireland for which census data are available and are the standard building blocks for the selection of Primary Sampling Units (‘PSUs’). Once the electoral register was re-built into the District Electoral Division structure a random sample of PSUs was selected. Each PSU was made up of a District Electoral Division or aggregate thereof using a minimum population threshold criterion.

A sample of households was then selected from within each PSU. This was done using a random start and selecting at an appropriate interval to yield a constant number of households per cluster.

At the third stage a target respondent was randomly sampled from within each household. This was done using a so-called ‘next birthday’ rule. The person from the household from among all aged 18 or over whose next birthday was closest was chosen. No substitution was allowed where that target respondent was unavailable or refused to participate.

In summer 2003 all of the 2663 participants in the 2002 survey were contacted by post, and asked to complete a four-page questionnaire. The follow-up yielded almost 1,200 cases where the original sample member completed and returned the
questionnaire, representing 45 per cent of the original sample. 4 per cent were completed but not usable because the questionnaire appeared to have been completed by a different person. The number of explicit refusals was small (only 13 cases). A further 3 per cent were returned by the national postal service because the named person had moved leaving no forwarding address. A small number (6 cases) were returned marked “Deceased”.
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