

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

***JURORS' PERCEPTIONS OF
THE INFLUENCE OF
EXTRA-EVIDENTIAL FACTORS
ON THEIR DECISION MAKING.***

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology
at Massey University.

Catherine Helen Priest

1997

ABSTRACT

One of the major assumptions underlying the jury system is that juries' verdicts are based exclusively on the evidence presented in court. However, many have challenged this assumption and claim that a number of extra-evidential factors influence jurors' decision making. The present research was designed to investigate jurors' perceptions of the influence of various extra-evidential factors related to the defendant, the lawyers and the judge on their decision making, and to examine possible relationships between jurors' perceptions of the trial participants and their evaluations of the defendant, and the lawyers and their cases. Structured interviews were conducted with sixty-nine respondents who had served on a jury within the last three years, and the data collected was statistically analysed using a .05 level of statistical significance. The results indicated that respondents perceived that some of the extra-evidential factors investigated had influenced their decision making, and relationships were also found between some of these factors and respondents' evaluations. The implications of the results are limited by various methodological considerations, particularly relating to the sample and the nature of the data, but the results do suggest that extra-evidential factors may influence jurors' decision making, and that this is an area worthy of further investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank those people who gave their time to participate in this study, without whom this research would not have been possible.

Thank you very much to Joan Barnes for her supervision and her persistence when difficulties were encountered during the development of this research.

I would also like to thank Professor Stuart McCutcheon for his assistance in the initial stages of this research, and the Honourable Justice Hugh Williams for his support and advice.

Special thanks to my friends for being there, especially Alex who kept me motivated during the latter stages of this project.

Finally, I would like to extend my deepest appreciation to my family and to Ben for their unwavering love, support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
 CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
History of the Trial by Jury.....	1
The Controversy Surrounding the Jury System	4
Evidential and Extra-evidential Factors.....	6
History of Jury Research and the University of Chicago Jury Project.....	7
 CHAPTER 2 APPROACHES TO JURY RESEARCH	
Experimental Research	12
Field Research.....	14
 CHAPTER 3 EXTRA-EVIDENTIAL FACTORS RELATED TO THE TRIAL PARTICIPANTS	
The Defendant.....	16
Physical Attractiveness	18
Physical Presentation	27
Social / Psychological Attractiveness	29
The Influence of Defendant Characteristics.....	37
Defendants' Behaviour.....	40
The Overall Impact of Extra-evidential Factors Related to the Defendant.....	46
Other Trial Participants.....	50
The Lawyers.....	50
The Judge	59
Conclusion	62

CHAPTER 4 *MOCK JURY RESEARCH*

Inadequate Sampling.....	63
The Issue of Role Playing.....	64
Inadequate Trial Simulations.....	65
Inappropriate Dependent Variables.....	67
The Omission of Integral Trial Elements.....	67

CHAPTER 5 *JURY RESEARCH IN NEW ZEALAND*..... 70

CHAPTER 6 *THE PRESENT STUDY*..... 72

CHAPTER 7 *METHODOLOGY*

Participant Recruitment.....	76
Participants.....	76
Instrument.....	79
Procedure.....	80
Data Analysis.....	81

CHAPTER 8 *SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVENESS*..... 82

CHAPTER 9 *RESULTS*

The Defendant.....	85
Respondents' Impressions of the Defendant.....	85
Physical Attractiveness of Defendants.....	86
Physical Presentation of Defendants.....	88
Attractiveness of Defendants' Lifestyles.....	90
Defendants' Failure to Testify.....	93
Defendants' Behaviour.....	94
Respondents' Sentiments Towards Defendants.....	95
The Lawyers.....	98
Lawyers' Physical Attractiveness.....	99
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Defendant.....	101
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Judge.....	103
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards their Opponent.....	106
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Jury.....	109

Respondents' Liking of the Lawyers.....	114
Respondents' Comments about the Lawyers	118
The Judge.....	120
Apparent Favouritism.....	120
Summing up and Direction	120
Judges' Behaviour Towards the Defendant	121
Judge's Behaviour Towards the Lawyers.....	121
The Overall Contribution of Various Factors.....	125
The Liberation Hypothesis.....	127
The Effect of Deliberations.....	128

CHAPTER 10 DISCUSSION

The Defendant

Respondents' Impressions of the Defendant.....	129
Physical Attractiveness of Defendants.....	130
Physical Presentation of Defendants	133
Attractiveness of Defendants' Lifestyles	134
Defendants' Failure to Testify.....	136
Defendants' Behaviour.....	137
Respondents' Sentiments Towards Defendants	140

The Lawyers

Lawyers' Physical Attractiveness.....	142
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Defendant.....	143
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Judge	144
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards their Opponent	145
Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Jury.....	146
Respondents' Sentiments Towards the Lawyers.....	146

The Judge

Apparent Favouritism.....	148
Summing up and Direction	149
Judges' Behaviour Towards the Defendant	149
Judges' Behaviour Towards the Lawyers.....	150
The Overall Contribution of Various Factors.....	151
The Liberation Hypothesis.....	151

The Effect of Deliberations.....	152
Methodological Considerations.....	153
Suggestions for Future Research.....	155
Main Findings and Implications.....	156
Summary and Conclusion.....	158
REFERENCES.....	159

APPENDICES

A Advertisements.....	177
B Letter Accompanying the Information Sheet.....	178
C Information Sheet.....	179
D Defendant Characteristics.....	180
E Interview Questions.....	182
F Informed Consent Form.....	192
G Respondents' Additional Comments.....	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Respondents' Demographic Characteristics and History of Jury Service.....	77
2 Characteristics of the Trials in the Present Sample of Cases.....	79
3 Gender Distribution of the Present Sample (N=69) Compared with that of the Sample in Dunstan et al. (1995) (N=1608).	82
4 Age Distribution of the Present Sample (N=69) Compared with that of the Sample in Dunstan et al. (1995) (N=1608).	83
5 Ethnic Distribution of the Present Sample (N=69) Compared with that of the Sample in Dunstan et al. (1995) (N=1608).	83
6 Occupational Groups of the Present Sample (N=69) Compared with that of the Sample in Dunstan et al. (1995) (N=1608).....	84
7 Perceived Influence of Defendants' Physical Attractiveness on Respondents' Liking of Them.....	86
8 Defendants' Physical Attractiveness and Respondents' Liking of Them	87
9 Perceived Influence of Defendants' Physical Presentation on Respondents' Liking of Them	88
10 Defendants' Physical Presentation and Respondents' Liking of Them	89
11 Perceived Influence of the Attractiveness of Defendants' Lifestyles on Respondents' Liking of Them.....	90
12 Respondents' Perceptions of Defendants' Guilt or Innocence as a Function of Whether They Testified	93
13 Respondents' Liking of Defendants and Perceptions of Their Credibility	95
14 Perceived Influence of Respondents' Liking of Defendants on Their Evaluations of Defendants' Guilt or Innocence	96
15 Physical Attractiveness of Prosecuting Lawyers and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	99
16 Physical Attractiveness of Defence Lawyers and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations.....	100

Table	Page
17 Perceived Influence of Prosecuting Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Defendant on Respondents' Evaluations of the Defendant's Guilt or Innocence	102
18 Perceived Influence of Defence Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Defendant on Respondents' Evaluations of the Defendant's Guilt or Innocence.....	102
19 Prosecuting Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Judge and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	104
20 Defence Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Judge and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	105
21 Prosecuting Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Defence Lawyer and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations.....	107
22 Defence Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Prosecuting Lawyer and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations.....	109
23 Perceived Influence of Prosecuting Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Jury on Respondents' Evaluations of Their Cases	110
24 Prosecuting Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Jury and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	111
25 Perceived Influence of Defence Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Jury on Respondents' Evaluations of Their Cases.....	112
26 Defence Lawyers' Behaviour Towards the Jury and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	113
27 Perceived Influence of Respondents' Liking of Prosecuting Lawyers on Their Evaluation of Prosecuting Lawyers' Cases	114
28 Respondents' Liking of Prosecuting Lawyers' and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	115
29 Perceived Influence of Respondents' Liking of Defence Lawyers on Their Evaluation of Defence Lawyers' Cases	116
30 Respondents' Liking of Defence Lawyers' and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations.....	117
31 Judges' Behaviour Towards Prosecuting Lawyers' and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	122

Table	Page
32 Judges' Behaviour Towards Defence Lawyers and Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of Their Presentations	123
33 Perceived Contribution of Various Factors to Respondents' Perceptions of Defendants' Guilt or Innocence	125
34 Factor Perceived to Have Contributed the Most to Respondents' Perceptions of Defendants' Guilt or Innocence	126
35 Respondents' Perceptions of Defendants' Guilt or Innocence at the End of the Trial and Final Verdicts	128
D1 Most Serious Charge Faced by the Defendants in the Present Sample of Cases	180
D1 Characteristics of the Defendants in the Present Sample of Cases	181

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Perceived attractiveness of defendants' lifestyles and respondents' liking of them	91
2	Perceived attractiveness of defendants' lifestyles and respondents' perceptions of their guilt or innocence.....	92
3	Respondents liking of defendants and perceptions of their guilt or innocence at the end of the trial	97
4	Whether respondents felt sympathy for defendants and their perceptions of defendants' guilt or innocence	98
5	Respondents' liking of prosecuting lawyers and their perceptions of defendants' guilt or innocence.	115
6	Respondents' liking of defence lawyers and their perceptions of defendants' guilt or innocence	118