

What are Citizens' Juries?



K. Purdam, CCSR University of Manchester

Feb 2012

CCSR/Social Statistics

kingsley.purdam@manchester.ac.uk

www.ccsr.ac.uk

- *“Through understanding the issues the jury made a fundamental shift from wanting to ‘punish’ those they believed responsible for the budget deficit to realising that the only way forward is ‘as one’” (PWC, Britain Thinks 2010, p9)*
- *Danish Pastries?*

Overview



- What are they and how do they work?
- What sort of policy areas have they been used in?
- How do you set one up and the resources required?
- How can the data be analysed?
- Where do they link with other methods?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses
- Resources

Background



- In the UK Citizens' Juries have involved volunteer members of the public (around 12-16 people), researchers and policy makers coming face to face to deliberate research, policy evidence and expert opinion over a three or four day period.
- In relation to a specific policy issue of public importance citizens are supported to pose questions to, and engage in debate with, policy makers and experts and then to reach a decision (verdict) and/or set of recommendations.
- Citizens' Juries are often used alongside other research and public consultation tools such as surveys.
- They fit alongside: surveys, citizen panels, focus groups, interview based studies and participant observation.
- The uniqueness of Citizens' Juries lies in involving citizens in developing their knowledge of a specific policy area, asking questions of expert witnesses, collective group discussions and deliberation and reaching a final decision.

Background

- Theory...links to deliberative democracy..citizens determining policy through participation and deliberation.
- Ideally in the deliberative process, citizens reach a set of shared meanings about the issues and about the recommendations.
- Citizens' Juries have been used in government research and policy development since the late 1990s in the UK. New Labour imported from USA. In part they were seen as a mechanism for connecting citizens directly into the research and policy making process and a step in the process of transforming public services. They have often been used with vulnerable and hard to reach groups.
- Recent examples of Citizens' Juries include: examining the cuts in public service spending, balancing work and family life, NHS care provision, the well being of young people and in relation to mental health service provision policy making.
- In this 'What Is' session we look at the methodology of Citizens' Juries and examine some recent examples of juries that have been held. We consider the role of the citizen, the strengths and weakness of the process for researching citizens' attitudes and how they may change, how the jury functions as a decision making tool for policy making and also how Citizens' Juries can be linked to other research methods.

Format



- 1-4 day highly structured and intensive programme
- Around 12-16 citizens recruited to 'reflect' the 'population'
- Pre and post surveys
- Set up like a court room... but more informal
- Expert witnesses present evidence, respond to questions
- Can request other experts and information
- Facilitator and Citizens friends
- Deliberations
- Reach a decision and/or set of recommendations

Examples and Policy Areas

- Local authorities
- Health bodies
- Government departments
- Schools
- Research organisations
- Charities
- Regulatory Bodies

Example reports of Citizens' Juries

- *Handouts*

Example Remits/Questions

- Mostly highly structured question(s) and defined before the jury begins.

Example 1. Action for Children (2009)

How can government act to increase the well-being and happiness of children and young people in the UK?

- (i) Should government do more to increase the happiness and well-being of children and young people in the UK?
- (ii) What actions by government would make the biggest difference?
- (iii) How would these actions change the way government spends money on children and young people?

Witnesses: Scottish Government Childrens Services, MP, NHS spokesperson, childrens services users, academic experts

Example 2. Andhra Pradesh Coalition (India), IDS (UK)

Food and Farming Futures for Andhra Pradesh, India

- (i) Consolidation of small farms and increase mechanisation
- (ii) An export-based cash crop model of organic production.
- (iii) Localised food systems

Witnesses: government spokespeople, agricultural experts, academic experts, leading charities in the field, journalist

Example 3. University of Glamorgan and Wales Gene Park
(2007)

Designer Babies: what choices should we be able to make?

- (i) Designing babies to prevent passing on genetic conditions?
- (ii) Designing babies to save siblings?
- (iii) Designing babies to choose their sex?
- (iv) The term 'designer babies' is not a useful phrase?

Witnesses: fertility expert, NHS services manager, HFEA spokesperson, parents with a genetic disorder, representatives from disability charities

Example 4. Democratic Structures – Local authorities (UK)

To inform the decision of a local authority as to whether to have an elected mayor or other form of governance.

Witnesses: Electoral services officer, local authority governance expert DCLG, political party officers, local councillors, academic experts, political journalist.

Example 5. Buckinghamshire Citizen's Jury Dementia Services **(DOH 2011)**

Which dementia services does the Jury believe should be prioritised over the next 18 months for development?

- (i) What are the most effective ways of providing information to people with dementia and those who care for others with dementia?
- (ii) What would be effective ways of encouraging individuals to seek help at an early stage of the disease?
- (iii) How can dementia patients best be supported in health and social care settings such as residential care homes and hospitals?

Witnesses: GPs, NHS health services manager, dementia services users, academic experts, leading charities in the field.

Example 6. Leicestershire Rural Partnership

To recommend ways of ensuring that appropriate, sustainable services are available to people in rural communities in Leicestershire.

- (i) Views on current initiatives that are taking place
- (ii) Proposals for new services and service delivery in the future
- (iii) Ways of increasing the involvement of members of the public

Witnesses: retail expert, academic expert, local authority planning officer, local authority services manager, local councillors, DCLG spokesperson, Post Office manager,

Example 7. Family and Work (DTI, 2004)

To develop policies that will support people juggling family and work commitments.

Witnesses: Confederation of British Industry, Boots plc and the Equal Opportunities Commission, academic expert.

<http://peopleandparticipation.net/display/CaseStudies/DTI+Citizens%27+Jury>

Example 8. Choices and trade-offs the public would make when cutting public sector spending (PWC) (2011)

To consider the choices and trade-offs the public would make when cutting public sector spending and to arrive at a set of Citizens' Criteria to guide decision making by the Coalition Government's Star Chamber. Consider options for:

- (i) For reducing/reshaping welfare
- (ii) For cutting departmental budgets
- (iii) To assess and help refine a range of different ideas for transformative solutions.

Witnesses?

Example Jury Schedules

Citizens' Jury Programme
Venue: McDonald Holland Hotel, Newport Road, Cardiff

	Saturday 4th Sept	Tuesday 7th Sept	Wednesday 8th Sept	Thursday 9th Sept
0930		Warm up	Warm up	Warm up
1000	Closed Session: Team Building (Jurors, Moderators, Management Group) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warm-up discussion • Team building • Agree ground rules and roles • Go through programme • 'Before' survey of knowledge and attitudes 	Session 1: Science and technology Interactive activities giving basic information about genetics and reproductive technologies Explanation of existing and future genetic and reproductive services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Harper (Institute of Medical Genetics) • Liz Corrigan (Bristol Centre for Reproductive Medicine) 	Session 3: Saviour siblings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Whitakers : BBC video • John Gillott (Genetic Interest Group) • Josephine Quintavalle (Comment on Reproductive Ethics) Q&A session followed by discussion	Session 5: Law and regulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ainsley Newson (London IDEAS Genetics Knowledge Park) • Suzi Leather (Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority) Q&A session followed by discussion
1200				Reflection (Jury, Mods only)
1230	LUNCH and FINISH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
115		Preparation for next session (Jury, Mods only)	Preparation for next session (Jury, Mods only)	Session 6: Conclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection and ordering of issues • Possible recommendations • Agree process to produce report
130		Session 2: Preventing inherited diseases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal testimony from Colin and Anne Harris • Joe Korner (Muscular Dystrophy Campaign) • Andrew Hubbard Q&A session followed by discussion	Session 4: Non-medical choices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal testimony from Alan Masterton • Tony Gilland (Institute of Ideas) • David King (Human Genetics Alert) Q&A session followed by discussion	
345		Reflection	Reflection	Reflection (and 'after' survey)
415			FINISH	FINISH

Annex 1 Citizens' Jury Programme

	Saturday 4th Sept	Tuesday 7th Sept	Wednesday 8th Sept	Thursday 9th Sept
9:30		Warm up	Warm up	Warm up
10:00	Closed Session: Team Building (Jurors, Moderators, Organising Team) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warm-up discussion • Team building • Agree ground rules and roles • Go through programme • 'Before' survey of knowledge and attitudes 	Session 1: Science and technology Interactive activities giving basic information about genetics and reproductive technologies, with case studies and debate. Explanation of existing and future genetic and reproductive services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Harper (Institute of Medical Genetics) • Liz Corrigan (Bristol Centre for Reproductive Medicine) 	Session 3: Saviour siblings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Whitakers: BBC video • John Gillott (Genetic Interest Group) • Josephine Quintavalle (Comment on Reproductive Ethics) Q&A session followed by discussion	Session 5: Law and regulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ainsley Newson (London IDEAS Genetics Knowledge Park) • Suzi Leather (Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority) Q&A session followed by discussion
12:00			Reflection (Jury, Mods only)	Reflection (Jury, Mods only) including tentative conclusions
12:30	LUNCH and FINISH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
1:15		Preparation for next session (Jury, Mods only)	Preparation for next session (Jury, Mods only)	Session 6: Conclusions
1:30		Session 2: Preventing inherited diseases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal testimony from Colin and Anne Harris • Joe Korner (Muscular Dystrophy Campaign) • Andrew Hubbard Q&A session followed by discussion	Session 4: Non-medical choices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal testimony from Alan Masterton • Tony Gilland (Institute of Ideas) • David King (Human Genetics Alert) Q&A session followed by discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection and ordering of issues • Possible recommendations • Agree process to produce report
3:45		Reflection	Reflection	Reflection (and 'after' survey)
4:15		FINISH	FINISH	FINISH

Participants - Role of Citizen

- Critically engage with witnesses
- Direct questioning, can request other witnesses
- Scrutiny of evidence
- Deliberate with each other
- Work in small groups
- Recruitment process (Example letter attached)
- Representation, Responsibilities (themselves, family and friends, society more widely?)
- Contribute to the decision/recommendations

Participants - Role of Expert Witness

- Explain issues
- Summarise existing evidence
- Can provide their viewpoint/experience and advocate a position
- Respond to questions
- Example letter of invitation (attached)
- Example: http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/today/reports/politics/citizenjury_reading_20050908.shtml

Participants - Role of Facilitators and Citizens Friends

Facilitator

Support the citizens, lead them through the process

Moderate discussions and participation

Ensure fairness and dacorum

Guide the group deliberations

Support if needs be the questioning of the experts

Help frame decision/recommendations

Citizens Friends

- Source of evidence and objective expertise to aid understanding of complex issues

Commissioning Body

- Theoretically no involvement in the process
- But will have driven the research question and the framework
- Made some commitment to responding to the outcomes.
- Costs?

Data Collected and Use As evidence

- What sort of data? Flip chart notes, key themes, video recording, votes, secret votes, interactive comments
- Targeted outcomes – set questions
- Other outcomes? Citizen engagement, expert witness reflexivity



Informing other linked research

- Used as a follow up to a survey – Pollution Jury
- Framing research questions for a survey eg Britain Thinks Deficit Jury.
- Developing other public consultation tools

Advantages

- Direct citizen input
- Impartial and objective
- Interrogation of issues and experts/evidence
- Extended deliberation and highly focused
- Highly specified outcome - verdict
- A research process in itself
- Observe how attitudes are articulated and change.
- Development of concepts, measurement tools and links to other research methods.

Limitations

- Specificity of issue/decision
- Expertise required
- Framing of decision – pre-emptive evaluative framework? Who determines the criteria for assessment?
- Deliberation process neutrality (assertive speech correlates).
- Remit of the citizen participant – representative?
- Strong opinion shifts have been observed (experimental studies)

Limitations

- Data and generisability (selection bias)
- Lack of power – decisions not usually binding “sham listening exercises?”.
- How the decision and or recommendations are utilised – how much authority does it have? Indeterminate? But organisations usually commit to responding
- PR aspect/ladder of participation
- Costs

Example overview

- <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/8901412.stm>

For and Against...Critique

“The Citizens Jury process was one of the first, and yet most thorough, democratic processes created in the 20th century.” (Crosby and Hottinger 2011)

“...citizens’ jury deliberations do not involve a rational enquiry into the justification and selection of values. Juries function as mechanisms for democratising the selection of values only in the very limited sense that they expose small groups to exercises in attitude change...” (Price 2000).

“This is not sofa government, it's listening to the people” ?

A Tool Kit For Citizens' Juries

- Framing of the issue and agenda
- Recruitment of citizens and incentives
- Briefing packs
- Recruitment of witnesses
- Venue
- Costs
- Outcomes
- Options..juries on line, reconvening juries,

Reading and On-line Resources

Armour, A. (1995) 'The Citizens' Jury model of public participation: a critical evaluation', in Renn, O., Webler, T. and Wiedemann, P. (eds.) *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation* Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers

Barnes, M. (1999) *Building a Deliberative Democracy An evaluation of two Citizens Juries*, London, Institute for Public Policy Research. Barns, I. 1995, *Manufacturing Consensus: Reflections on the UK National Consensus Conference on Plant*

Coote, A. & Lenhaglan, J. (1997) *Citizens' Juries: From Theory to Practice*. IPPR, London.

Dunkerley, D. and Glasner, P. 1998 Empowering the public? Citizens juries and the new genetic technologies. *Critical Public Health* 8:181-192

Crosby, N. (1995). *Citizens Juries: One Solution for Difficult Environmental Questions*. In O. Renn, T. Webler and P. Wiedemann (Eds), *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation*, pp. 157-174. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Edmond, G. & Mercer, D. (1997) *Scientific literacy and the jury: reconsidering jury 'competence'*. *Public Understanding of Science* 6:327-359

Genetics Forum (1999) *Citizen Foresight: a tool to enhance democratic policy making*. Genetics Forum and University of East London.

Irwin A. (2001) *Constructing the scientific citizen: science and democracy in the biosciences* *Public Understanding of Science* 10:1-18

Kuper, R. 1996 *Citizens Juries: The Hertfordshire Experience*, Working Paper, University of Hertfordshire Business School, UK

- Maer, L. (2007) Citizens' Juries. House of Commons Library.
- MORI (1999) Public Consultation on Developments in the Biosciences, Office of Science and Technology & MORI, London. (download from <http://www.dti.gov.uk/ost/ostbusiness/puset/public.htm>)
- Pimbert, M.P. and Wakeford, T. (eds) (2001) Deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment. Special issue of PLA Notes 40, IIED. Co-published by The Commonwealth Foundation, ActionAid, DFID, Sida and IIED (download from http://www.iied.org/NR/agbioliv/pla_notes/pla_backissues/40.html).
- Pimbert, M. P. & Wakeford, T. (2002) Prajateerpu: A Citizens Jury / Scenario Workshop on Food and Farming Futures for Andhra Pradesh, India, IIED, London (download this and associated articles from <http://www.prajateerpu.org>).
- Price, D. (2000) Choices without reasons: citizens' juries and policy evaluation. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 2000;26:272–276
- Smith, G. & Wales, C. (2000) Citizen Juries and Deliberative Democracy, *Political Studies* 48:51-65. WIHSC 1997 Report of the Citizens Jury on Genetic Testing for Common Disorders, WIHSC, University of Glamorgan, Wales.
- Wakeford, T. (2002) Citizens Juries: a radical alternative for social research. *Social Research Update Issue 37* Summer 2002

What are Citizens' Juries? Questions and discussion?



K. Purdam, CCSR University of Manchester

Oct 2010

CCSR/Social Statistics

kingsley.purdam@manchester.ac.uk

www.ccsr.ac.uk

Print handout....