

ICPSR 3689

Evaluation of Hung Juries in Bronx County, New York, Los Angeles County, California, Maricopa County, Arizona, and Washington, DC, 2000-2001

Paula L. Hannaford-Agor Valerie P. Hans Nicole L. Mott G. Thomas Munsterman National Center for State Courts

User Guide

First ICPSR Version October 2003





Terms of Use

Bibliographic Citation:

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Hannaford-Agor, Paula L., Valerie P. Hans, Nicole L. Mott, and G. Thomas Munsterman. EVALUATION OF HUNG JURIES IN BRONX COUNTY, NEW YORK, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA, AND WASHINGTON, DC, 2000-2001 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2003.

Request for Information on Use of ICPSR Resources:

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

Data Disclaimer:

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

Responsible Use Statement:

In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

Redistribution:

ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.

Table of Contents

Summary	Pag	
General Study OverviewPurpose of the Study		
Methods. Study Design. Sources of Information. Sample. Response Rates. Date(s) of Data Collection.		3 5 5 6
Summary of Contents. Description of Variables. Presence of Common Scales Unit of Observation. Geographic Unit. Extent of Processing. Extent of Collection. Data Collection Notes. File Specifications.		6 7 7 7 7 7
PublicationsRelated PublicationsFinal Reports and Other Publications		7
NIJ Data Resources Program		8 8
Data Completeness Report(s)		11

Summary

This study was undertaken for the purpose of providing an empirical picture of hung juries. Researchers were able to secure the cooperation of four courts: (1) Bronx County Supreme Court in New York, (2) Los Angeles County Superior Court in California, (3) Maricopa County Superior Court in Arizona, and (4) District of Columbia Superior Court in Washington, DC. The four sites were responsible for distributing and collecting questionnaire packets to all courtrooms hearing non-capital felony jury cases. Each packet contained a case data form requesting information about case characteristics (Part 1) and outcomes (Part 2), as well as survey questionnaires for the judges (Part 3), attorneys (Part 4), and jurors (Part 5). The case data form requested type of charge, sentence range, jury's decision, demographic information about the defendant(s) and the victim(s), voir dire (jury selection process), trial evidence and procedures, and jury deliberations. The judge questionnaire probed for evaluation of the evidence, case complexity, attorney skill, likelihood that the jury would hang, reaction to the verdict, opinions regarding the hung jury rate in the jurisdiction, and experience on the bench. The attorney questionnaire requested information assessing the voir dire, case complexity, attorney skill, evaluation of the evidence, reaction to the verdict, opinions regarding the hung jury rate in the jurisdiction, and experience in legal practice. If the jury hung, attorneys also provided their views about why the jury was unable to reach a verdict. Finally, the juror questionnaire requested responses regarding case complexity, attorney skill, evaluation of the evidence, formation of opinions, dynamics of the deliberations including the first and final votes, juror participation, conflict, reaction to the verdict, opinions about applicable law, assessment of criminal justice in the community, and demographic information.

General Study Overview

Title: Evaluation of Hung Juries in Bronx County, New York, Los Angeles

County, California, Maricopa County, Arizona, and Washington, DC,

2000-2001

Principal Investigator(s): Paula L. Hannaford-Agor, Valerie P. Hans, Nicole L. Mott, G.

Thomas Munsterman

Investigator(s) Affiliation: National Center for State Courts

Grant Number: 98-IJ-CX-0048

Purpose of the Study: In the mid to late 1990s, the criminal justice community developed an

intense interest in the phenomenon of jury deadlock, more commonly known as a "hung jury." Several factors prompted this interest. A number of communities, especially in California, were reporting that more and more criminal jury trials were routinely resulting in mistrials due to jury deadlock. Other urban areas including the District of Columbia and Manhattan, New York, began reporting similar trends regarding hung jury rates. These increasing numbers raised significant concerns about the monetary costs associated with retrying cases as well as the emotional toll on victims and witnesses and potential public safety costs associated with criminal defendants serving less time in prison due to the failure of the jury to convict. Despite new of proposals designed to reduce the number of hung juries, no government agency or research institution has ever determined a "normal" hung jury rate or standards for an acceptable range of hung jury rates. Consequently, it is difficult to compare current hung jury rates to a baseline. Although there is much speculation about the factors that contribute to jury deadlock (evidentiary problems such as witness credibility, jury misunderstanding of evidence or substantive law, racial conflict, jury nullification), very little empirical research exists to verify these claims. This study was undertaken for the purpose of providing an empirical

picture of hung juries.

Methods

Study Design: Originally, researchers envisioned their project as a two-phase

process. In the first phase, researchers proposed to conduct a broad-based survey of hung jury rates in state and federal courts while the second phase would consist of an in-depth examination of jury behavior in ten jurisdictions to compare case and jury characteristics in felony trials that resulted in a verdict to those that resulted in jury deadlock. The first phase turned out to be critically important to the project. Ultimately, researchers were able to collect and compile statistics about hung juries from state courts and from prosecutors' offices in 30 jurisdictions and from all federal courts. However, in doing

so, they discovered an important source of variation across

jurisdictions -- the definition of a "hung jury." In some jurisdictions, a jury was counted as "hung" if it failed to reach a verdict on any charge or on any defendant. In other jurisdictions, a hung jury was only counted if it hung on the most serious charge. Some only counted a hung jury if it hung on all counts or on all defendants. Obviously, these disparate definitions had a significant effect on hung jury rates and made it very difficult to compare rates across jurisdictions. The research team wanted to be be able to capture this degree of detail in the second phase of the study. The second phase of the study (comprising the data in this collection) was intended to compare various characteristics of jury trials that resulted in deadlock to those that resulted in verdicts across at least ten jurisdictions. However, some courts declined to participate due to concerns about the administrative burden of data collection on their staff. A more significant issue, however, was judicial sensitivity to the inviolability of jury deliberations, especially in felony jury trials. In spite of various procedures that researchers put in place to protect the confidentiality of the data, many courts were concerned that the information collected from jurors might provide a basis for convicted defendants to appeal the verdict. Researchers were able to secure the cooperation of only four courts: (1) Bronx County Supreme Court in New York, (2) Los Angeles County Superior Court in California, (3) Maricopa County Superior Court in Arizona, and (4) District of Columbia Superior Court in Washington, DC. The four sites were responsible for distributing and collecting questionnaire packets in all courtrooms hearing non-capital felony jury cases. Misdemeanor cases were excluded because hung juries in serious felony trials are typically of greater concern to justice system policymakers. Capital cases were also excluded because of the severity of the sanction and the potential that confidential juror questionnaire data might be requested to support an appeal from a conviction. The data collection protocol and questionnaire materials underwent a pretest in Los Angeles in July 1999. Fifty trial packages containing questionnaires and case data forms were distributed to judges in non-capital felony trials. The research staff obtained data on 16 completed trials including two hung jury trials. In December 1999, the project Advisory Committee offered its recommendations for modifications to the survey instruments and data collection protocols. Based on these recommendations, the surveys were revised to more accurately capture the nuances of measuring hung jury rates. In addition, one of the questionnaires that was to be administered to jurors was revised to avoid responses that would provide grounds for a defendant's inquiry into the validity of the verdict. Finally, data collection protocols were refined to increase the return rate of survey packets. Each packet contained a case data form requesting information about case characteristics (Part 1) and outcomes (Part 2) as well as instructions and questionnaires for the judge (Part 3), attorneys (Part 4), and jurors (Part 5). Judges and key court personnel were briefed on the project and instructed as to how the packet distribution was to occur. Packets were sent from the jury assembly room to the courtrooms with the panel for voir dire (jury selection

process). Once the jury was selected, court personnel distributed the packets to the judge and/or court clerk. If the case proceeded through to jury deliberations and was not prematurely ended by a plea agreement, dismissal, or mistrial for some reason other than the jury's inability to arrive at a unanimous verdict, the judge was asked to complete the judge survey. In addition, either the clerk or the judge was to complete a questionnaire on the general case information using a case data survey form. Once the jury retired to deliberate, court personnel distributed the judge and attorney questionnaires. The judges and attorneys were asked to complete the questionnaires in two stages, answering some questions prior to the jury decision and the remaining questions after the jury rendered its verdict or the case was declared a mistrial. The court personnel distributed the final set of questionnaires to the jurors after the verdict was announced or a mistrial declared. To protect confidentiality, respondents were provided blank envelopes in which to place the completed questionnaire. Court staff collected the completed questionnaires and gave these to the designated court liaison for each site, who forwarded the cases on to the project staff for data entry and analysis. Because the study design included collection of information from key trial participants, including jurors, a protocol was developed that balanced the importance of confidentiality and the defendant's Sixth Amendment rights. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) regulations required that the research team maintain the confidentiality of study data and prohibit their use in adjudicatory proceedings. The purpose of these regulations is to protect the safety and privacy of study participants (in this instance the judges, attorneys, and jurors). However, the Sixth Amendment right of criminal plaintiffs to a fair and impartial jury supersedes any NIJ regulations. To protect jurors' privacy in the event of these competing demands, the research team revised certain survey questions, following the pilot test phase, to eliminate questions that would provide a prima facie basis for an appeal (e.g., timing of opinion formation). They also stripped any identifying case information from the questionnaires and destroyed the hard copies after the data were entered into the database housed at the National Center for State Courts.

Sources of Information:

A court clerk and/or judge completed the survey information used in Part 1 and collected the administrative records data used in Part 2. Self-enumerated survey questionnaires were administered to judges in Part 3, to attorneys in Part 4, and to jurors in Part 5.

Sample:

The sites were selected through convenience sampling. Site selection was based on several criteria. First, each site had to have a sufficiently high volume of felony jury trials to permit data collection within a reasonable period of time. Second, court personnel had to be willing to cooperate with data collection, including the court's agreement to adhere to privacy and confidentiality protocols. Finally, institutional characteristics were considered. Two sites were included because of reported concerns about hung jury rates (Los Angeles and Washington, DC). Arizona was chosen to examine the potential impact

of an innovative procedure that permits judges to allow further evidence and arguments when a jury reports that it is deadlocked. Researchers approached the New York State Office of Court Administration for suggestions on high-volume courts in New York City, and they were helpful in securing the cooperation of the Bronx County Supreme Court.

Response Rates:

The response rate for Parts 1 and 2 was 89 percent. For Part 3, the response rate was 91 percent. The response rate for Part 4 was 69 percent for defense attorneys and 72 percent for prosecuting attorneys. The response rate for Part 5 was 80 percent.

Date of Collection:

Data were collected in Los Angeles from June 2000 through October 2000. Maricopa County began data collection in November of 2000 and ended in October 2001. Data from Bronx County were collected from February through August 2001, and data from Washington, DC, were collected from April through August 2001.

Summary of Contents

Description of Variables:

Part 1, Case Data, variables include the race and gender of victim(s) and defendant(s), size of panel from which the jury was selected, length of the voir dire process, who conducted the voir dire, reason a juror was struck, number of jurors struck by prosecution and by defendant, length of trial, number of prosecution witnesses, prosecution expert witnesses, prosecution exhibits, defense witnesses, defense expert witnesses, and defense exhibits, whether juror notebooks were provided, total number of questions submitted by jurors to witnesses, length of deliberation, number of deliberating jurors, and how the foreperson was selected. Variables for Part 2, Count Sheet Data, include case type, sentence, and total number of convictions, acquittals, and hung juries. Part 3, Judge Survey Data, variables include evaluation of the evidence, case complexity, attorney skill, likelihood that the jury would hang, reaction to the verdict, opinion regarding the hung jury rate in the jurisdiction, and experience on the bench. Part 4, Attorney Survey Data, variables include assessment of voir dire, case complexity, attorney skill, evaluation of the evidence, reaction to the verdict, opinions regarding the hung jury rate in the jurisdiction, and experience in legal practice. If the jury hung, attorneys also provided their views about why the jury was unable to reach a verdict. The age and gender of each attorney is also present in the file. Variables for Part 5, Juror Survey Data, include the complexity of the trial, whether all evidence was presented, and degree of ease with which the jury understood the evidence, experts, and judge's instructions. Other variables focused on the importance of police testimony, how believable the police, victims, and defendants were, the skill of the prosecutor and defense attorney, the strength of the prosecution's and defense's case, ease in deciding a verdict, whether the first vote or final vote was for a conviction, guilty verdict, or

undecided, how influential the juror thought they were during deliberations, perception of other jury members, whether there was any conflict on the jury, level of satisfaction with the deliberations, past experience with being on a jury, and whether they were the foreperson. Demographic variables include race, age, gender, religious beliefs, highest level of education, job status, and income for each juror.

Presence of Common

Scales:

Several Likert-type scales were used.

Unit of Observation: court cases

Geographic Unit: none

Extent of Processing: Missing data codes were standardized by the principal investigator and

ICPSR. ICPSR checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, converted the hardcopy documentation to a PDF file, and reformatted

the data and documentation.

Extent of Collection: This data collection contains five data files with a PDF user guide, a

codebook and data collection instruments in a separate PDF file, and

SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

Data Collection Notes: The user guide, codebook, and data collection instruments are

provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat

Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

File Specifications

Part No.	Part Name	File Structure	Case Count	Variable Count	LRECL	Records Per Case
1	Case Data	rectangular	351	68	129	1
2	Count Sheet Data	rectangular	379	20	43	1
3	Judge Survey Data	rectangular	358	27	54	1
4	Attorney Survey Data	rectangular	569	23	47	1
5	Juror Survey Data	rectangular	3,497	83	169	1

Publications

Related Publications: Hannaford, Paula L., Valerie P. Hans, and G. Thomas Munsterman.

"How Much Justice Hangs in the Balance? A New Look at Hung Jury

Rates." JUDICATURE 83,2 (September-October 1999), 59-67.

Hannaford-Agor, Paula L., and Valerie P. Hans. "Nullification at Work? A Glimpse From the National Center for State Courts Study of Hung Juries." CHICAGO-KENT LAW REVIEW 78,3 (2003) 1249-1277.

Hannaford-Agor, Paula L., Valerie P. Hans, Nicole L. Mott, and G. Thomas Munsterman. "Are Hung Juries a Problem?" NCJ 201096. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, September, 2002.

Hannaford-Agor, Paula L., Valerie P. Hans, Nicole L. Mott, and G. Thomas Munsterman. "Are Hung Juries a Problem?" (Executive Summary). NCJ 199372. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, September, 2002.

Hans, Valerie P., Paula L. Hannaford-Agor, Nicole L. Mott, and G. Thomas Munsterman. "The Hung Jury: The American Jury's Insights and Contemporary Understanding." CRIMINAL LAW BULLETIN 39,1 (January-February 2003), 33-50.

Final Reports and Other Publications:

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

http://www.ncjrs.org/

NIJ Data Resources Program

About the DRP:

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-647-

5000. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3689.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of	
	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
20.6% (14 of 68 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
8.8% (6 of 68 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Va	alues
5.9% (4 of 68 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Va	alues
8.8% (6 of 68 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Va	alues
10.3% (7 of 68 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing V	Values
STRCAUSE # JURORS STRUCK FOR CAUSE PEXHIBIT # OF PROSECUTION EXHIBITS GUIDANCE JURY GUIDED-CONDUCT DELIBERATIONS PWITNESS # OF PROSECUTION WITNESSES DWITNESS # OF DEFENSE WITNESSES DAYS LENGTH OF TRIAL (DAYS) DELJUROR # OF DELIBERATING JURORS 2.9% (2 of 68 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing DELHOURS LENGTH OF DELIBERATION (HOURS) DEXHIBIT # OF DEFENSE EXHIBITS 5.9% (4 of 68 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing	11.4% 12.8%
QANSWERD HOW MANY QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED CRIMHIST JURY AWARE-DEFENDANT'S CRIMINAL HISTORY DMINUTES LENGTH OF DELIBERATION (MINUTES) INDICATE TIMES JURY INDICATED HAVING DIFFICULTY 36.8% (25 of 68 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing VICTRACE 1ST VICTIM'S RACE VICTRELA 1ST VICTIM'S RELATIONSHIP TO DEFENDANT	22.5% 25.1% 33.9% 39.9% ag Values 42.2% 43.3%

Page 12 ICPSR 3689

Table 1 (continued)

Percent of Cases with Variable Name and Label

Missing Values

Variable Name and Label	Missing Values
VICTGEND 1ST VICTIM'S GENDER	43.6%
RESOLVE TIMES JUDGE SEND JURY BACK TO DELIBERAT	46.2%
TOTQUEST # JURY QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO WITNESSES	53.3%
ANSWERED JUROR QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY WITNESSES	58.7%
ASSIST JURY ASSISTANCE GIVEN-RESOLVE DIFFICULT	67.5%
VICTGND2 VICTIM #2 GENDER	85.5%
VICTRCE2 VICTIM #2 RACE	85.8%
VICTREL2 VICTIM #2 RELATIONSHIP TO DEFENDANT	87.5%
DEFTGEN2 DEFENDANT #2 GENDER	90.6%
DEFTRAC2 DEFENDANT #2 RACE	91.5%
DEFTREP2 DEFENDANT #2 LEGAL REPRESENTATION	91.7%
VICTGND3 VICTIM #3 GENDER	94.6%
VICTRAC3 VICTIM #3 RACE	94.6%
VICTREL3 VICTIM #3 RELATIONSHIP TO DEFENDANT	94.6%
VICTGND4 VICTIM #4 GENDER	96.6%
VICTRAC4 VICTIM #4 RACE	96.6%
VICTREL4 VICTIM #4 RELATIONSHIP TO DEFENDANT	97.4%
DEFTGEN3 DEFENDANT #3 GENDER	99.1%
DEFTRAC3 DEFENDANT #3 RACE	99.1%
DEFTREP3 DEFENDANT #3 LEGAL REPRESENTATION	99.1%
DEFTGEN4 DEFENDANT #4 GENDER	99.4%
DEFTRAC4 DEFENDANT #4 RACE	100.0%
DEFTREP4 DEFENDANT #4 LEGAL REPRESENTATION	100.0%
	=======================================

^{*}Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3689.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missin	
	of Cases with sing Values
15.0% (3 of 20 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
15.0% (3 of 20 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
10.0% (2 of 20 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 20 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 20 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 20 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
5.0% (1 of 20 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
COUNT2 COUNT 2	33.8%
55.0% (11 of 20 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Value	:s
SENTENC SENTENCE	57.5%
COUNT 3	61.5%
COUNT4 COUNT 4	77.6%
COUNT 5	84.2%
COUNT 6	89.2%
CT1LSSR1 COUNT 1 LESSER INCLUDED 1	92.3%
CT2LSSR1 COUNT 2 LESSER INCLUDED 1	97.1%
CT1LSSR2 COUNT 1 LESSER INCLUDED 2	98.4%
CT3LSSR1 COUNT 3 LESSER INCLUDED 1	98.9%
CT2LSSR2 COUNT 2 LESSER INCLUDED 2	99.5%
CT2LSSR3 COUNT 2 LESSER INCLUDED 3	99.7%
	:========

^{*}Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Page 14 ICPSR 3689

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3689.P3

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=358)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
7.4% (2 of 27 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
11.1% (3 of 27 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing V	Values
22.2% (6 of 27 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing V	Values
14.8% (4 of 27 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing V	Values
14.8% (4 of 27 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing	Values
@URPRISE SURPRISED WITH THE JURY'S DECISION @PREDICT VERDICT YOU PREDICT THE JURY WILL RETUR @NDERSTD THINK JURY UNDERSTOOD ISSUES IN THE CAS @ENDERED BENCH TRIAL-VERDICT FOR PROSEC OR DEFEN	7.8% 8.1%
7.4% (2 of 27 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing @ATISFIE SATISFIED WITH THE JURY'S DECISION @EALEVID IMPORTANT-REAL/DEMONSTRATIVE EVIDENCE	10.3%
7.4% (2 of 27 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing	g Values
@XPWITNS IMPORTANT-EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY @YEWITNS HOW IMPORTANT WAS EYEWITNESS TESTIMONY	35.2% 35.8%
14.8% (4 of 27 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missin	ng Values
@ICTTEST HOW IMPORTANT WAS VICTIM'S TESTIMONY @EFTTEST HOW IMPORTANT WAS DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY @NFORMNT IMPORTANT-UNDERCOVER/INFORMANT TESTIMON @ODEFEND HOW IMPORTANT WAS CO-DEFENDANT TESTIMON	73.2% 83.0%

^{*}Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Page 16 ICPSR 3689

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This	report	corresponds	to	the	data	file:	DA3689.P4

Table 4: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missin	-
Variable Name and Label Percent	of Cases with ing Values
17.4% (4 of 23 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 23 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
34.8% (8 of 23 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
30.4% (7 of 23 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
8.7% (2 of 23 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
GENDER GENDER	7.9%
UNABLE # OF HUNG JURIES	9.3%
4.3% (1 of 23 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
PROBLEM HUNG JURIES IN YOUR JURISDICTION SERIOU	11.6%
4.3% (1 of 23 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
SURPRISE DID THE VERDICT SURPRISE YOU	22.3%
	=========
*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% mis	_
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are no	t reilected

^{*}Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.

Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.

Page 18 ICPSR 3689

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3689.P5

This report corresponds to the data file: DA368	19.P5
Table 5: Distribution of Variables by Percentage	_
Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=3497)	Missing Values
4.8% (4 of 83 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
9.6% (8 of 83 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing	Values
(00 /F of 02	
6.0% (5 of 83 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing	values
7.2% (6 of 83 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing	, Values
7.2% (0 OI 03 Valiables) have > 3% - 5% Missing	values
41.0% (34 of 83 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missi	ng Values
11.00 (31 Of 03 variables) have > 30 100 Missi	iig varacs
DSYMPATH HOW MUCH SYMPATHY FOR DEFENDANT	5.1%
LEANING WHEN DID YOU START LEANING TOWARD A SID	
FAVORWHO SIDE YOU FAVORED BEFORE DELIBERATIONS	5.3%
PERSNALY FOR YOU PERSONALLY TO DECIDE ON VERDICT	
FIRSTVOT WHEN WAS JURY'S FIRST VOTE	5.4%
POLEVDNC HOW IMPORTANT WAS POLICE TESTIMONY	5.9%
EXPRESSD SURPRISED BY OTHER JURORS' VOTES	6.1%
DIFJUDGE DIFFICULT TO JUDGE B/C RELIGIOUS BELIEF	6.2%
BELIEVBL HOW BELIEVABLE WERE THE POLICE	6.5%
OPENMIND JURY OPENMINDED TO EACH OTHER'S IDEAS	6.8%
UNREASON SOME UNREASONABLE PEOPLE ON JURY	7.3%
DOMINATE HOW MUCH DID ONE OR TWO JURORS DOMINATE	7.4%
SATVERDT HOW SATISFIED WERE YOU WITH THE DECISION	
REMINSTR TROUBLE RECALLING JUDGE'S INSTRUCTIONS	7.5%
INFLUENC INFLUENTIAL IN THE DELIBERATIONS	7.5%
REMEVID TROUBLE JURY HAD RECALLING EVIDENCE	7.6%
CLOSFRND HOW CLOSE AND FRIENDLY WERE THE JURORS	7.7%
CONVINCE TIME/EFFORT CONVINCING OTHERS TO AGREE	7.8%
PARTICIP YOUR PARTICIPATION IN JURY DELIBERATION	
CONFLICT HOW MUCH CONFLICT ON JURY	7.8%
POINTVU EACH JUROR'S VIEW THOROUGHLY CONSIDERED	
EASYRCH EASY/DIFFICULT-JURY TO REACH DECISION	7.9%
FAIRLAW HOW FAIR WAS THE LAW IN THIS CASE	8.0%
SECRET WAS FIRST VOTE SECRET	8.2%

Page 20 ICPSR 3689

Table 5 (continued)

Variable	Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
птип	CIVEN ENOUGH TIME TO EXPRESS VOID VIEWS	0 2%
HOWVOTE	VOTE ON FIRST BALLOT, MOST SERIOUS CRIM	8.5%
SATDELIB	VOTE ON FIRST BALLOT, MOST SERIOUS CRIM SATISFIED WITH THE DELIBERATIONS	8.6%
DIFFVERD	CONSEQUENCES TO DEFENDANT W/CONVICTION	8.6%
	HOW CERTAIN WERE YOU ON THE FIRST VOTE	
POLICE	TRUST THE POLICE IN YOUR COMMUNITY	9.3%
	BEEN A JUROR BEFORE	9.3%
CRMSEVRE	CRIME SERIOUS PROBLEM IN YOUR COMMUNITY	9.5%
SCHOOL	HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION	9.7%
AMCOURTS	TRUST THE COURTS IN YOUR COMMUNITY	9.9%
13.3% (1	of 83 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missin	g Values
PRESIDE	WERE YOU THE FOREMAN/PRESIDING JUROR	10.2%
	HOW FAIR WAS THE LEGALLY CORRECT OUTCOM	
AGE	AGE	11.2%
	RACE/ETHNICITY	11.8%
ONEPERSN	VERDICT IF ONLY UP TO YOU	12.0%
	JOB STATUS	12.4%
UNDSDEXP	JURY TO UNDERSTAND EXPERTS DESCRIPTION OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS	14.2%
RELIGON	DESCRIPTION OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS	
GENDER		15.5%
INCOME	HOUSEHOLD INCOME	16.7%
APPROPRI	LENIENT/HARSH-CONSEQUENCES OF CONVICTIO	17.1%
9.6% (8	of 83 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing	Values
	FINAL VOTE - HOW DID YOU VOTE	22.3%
VOTEPROS	FIRST VOTE - # FOR CONVICTION	25.1%
OCCUPAT	OCCUPATIONAL CATAGORY	25.7%
NVCNGMD	NEVER CHANGED MIND	28.3%
VSYMPATH	HOW MUCH SYMPATHY FOR VICTIM	28.7%
VOTEPRO2	FINAL VOTE - # FOR CONVICTION	30.6%
VOTEDEFT	FIRST VOTE - # FOR NOT GUILTY	33.6%
VICTEVID	HOW BELIEVABLE WERE THE VICTIMS	39.4%
8.4% (7	of 83 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missin	g Values
MOTEDEE?	FINAL VOTE - # FOR NOT GUILTY	41.4%
AOIFDELZ	HOW DELTENADIE MAC MHE DECEMBAND	45 00
	HOW BELIEVABLE WAS THE DEFENDANT	45.9%
DEFTEVID	IF PREVIOUSLY A JUROR, CRIMINAL OR CIVI	

	=======================================
Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
VOTEUND2 FINAL VOTE - # UNDECIDED	74.3%
VOIEUNDZ FINAL VOIE - # UNDECIDED	74.36
DNTREMEM DON'T REMEMBER VOTES ON Q28	94.1%
DNTREME2 DON'T REMEMBER VOTES ON Q30	97.5%
=======================================	=======================================

^{*}Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Page 22 ICPSR 3689