Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal

Volume 2 | Issue 1 Article 8

11-2022

Guilty by Reason of Vanity?: The Relationship Between Jurors' Socioeconomic Status and Trial Outcome

Zoë Sweaney
Lindenwood University

Guilty by Reason of Vanity?:

The Relationship Between Jurors' Socioeconomic Status and Trial Outcome

Zoë Sweaney

Department of Psychology, Sociology, and Public Health, Lindenwood University

Author's Note

Zoë Sweaney https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-7198-2342

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Zoë Sweaney, 209 S Kingshighway, St. Charles, MO, 63301. Email: zs715@lindenwood.edu

Abstract

The following paper summarizes the implications, processes, and preliminary findings from a research study conducted by an undergraduate psychology student at Lindenwood University. The study experimentally investigated the relationship between a juror's socioeconomic status (SES) and the likelihood that they would choose to convict a randomly selected defendant. It was hypothesized that a participant of a higher SES would be more likely to convict a defendant than would a participant of a lower SES. To investigate the validity of this hypothesis, participants (N=13) posing as jurors completed an online survey in which they were tasked with evaluating the details of 5 different court cases that had been erased of any identifiable and/or demographic information about the defendant (and victim(s), if applicable) before being asked to submit their final verdict on the case (guilty or not guilty). Data collected from this activity was inputted into the statistical analysis software program IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 28), alongside the jurors' measures of SES, which had been totaled based on participants' responses to a series of demographic questions, in order to calculate the Pearson's *r* correlation statistic for the two variables. SES scores and frequency of jury conviction were found to be positively correlated ($r(11) = .04$, $p = .44$), but the findings were not of any statistical significance. Explanations for the study's lacking statistical power and recommendations for improving the statistical power of future research is discussed.

Keywords: jury, juror, SES, defendant, conviction, trial

The Relationship Between Jurors' Socioeconomic Status and Trial Outcome

Wrongful convictions are a violation of the social contract between the state and its citizens, defined by U.S. law as a miscarriage of justice. Yet in the same country, according to the National Registry of Exonerations' annual report in 2019, between 2-10% of convicted prisoners are innocent (Walsh et al., 2017). As the world's leader in incarceration, with a prison population 500 times that of what it was four decades ago (Bureau of Justice Statistics), this means that there are anywhere from 46,000 to 230,000 innocent people in U.S. prisons. Mass incarceration is a systemic issue, and wrongful convictions can be viewed as part of a structural problem as well—official misconduct accounts for 31% of wrongfully convicted murder exonerations (Clarke, 2020). Wrongful convictions can also occur on a micro-level, resulting from a variety of factors, such as eyewitness misidentification, misapplication of forensic evidence, and juror bias. The following paper is a study of the last item — specifically the relationship between jurors' SES and trial outcome.

Jury behavior research is not a new concept, and there is an abundance of existing research on jury behavior, including juror bias. The intended audience of that research, however, is typically limited to practicing lawyers who would be interested in knowing what jurors are influenced by and how they can best be persuaded. In these contexts, "juror bias" refers to the life experiences that all jurors bring to court and how those experiences affect their perception of what is a just verdict. For a lawyer, jury behavior research can be helpful in learning how to identify and understand the combined biases of a jury, which then allows them to more effectively present their case in a manner that counteracts or avoids the wide range of biases that a full jury presents. Some of these biases, however, are relevant enough that they can disqualify an individual for serving as a juror on a specific case. For the purposes of this study, however,

the interest was in identifying factors or unconscious biases that are not screened for during jury selection that might be predictive of a juror's final decision — before they have heard arguments from either legal team or even stepped into the courtroom. Is it possible that some people are just more inclined to side with the prosecution than others, regardless of any case details? If so, what variables might influence this inclination? Is it possible that a juror's SES background could be predictive of this willingness to be persuaded of a defendant's guilt? The relationship between SES and crime has long been studied, so it only makes sense for us to have a clear understanding of the relationship between SES and attitudes towards crime.

Despite the limitations of its target audience, there is a plethora of existing research on the relationship between the SES of the defendant and the jury's final verdict and sentencing recommendations that suggests a positive relationship between the SES of the defendant and perceived guilt. For example, a 2013 research study examining the effect of immigration status, ethnicity, and SES of defendants on juror bias found that undocumented Mexican defendants of a low SES were not only found guilty more often than their wealthier, European American peers, but they were also considered to be more culpable for their crimes and given more severe sentences (Espinoza et al., 2015). Similar results had been produced by a mock trial study examining European American bias towards Mexican Americans (Willis-Esqueda et al., 2008). Both studies used subtle bias theories, such as aversive racism, to explain these discrepancies and recommended that further research be conducted to address these biases in specific contexts. Another study involving simulated jurors judging a defendant's guilt while manipulating the defendants SES and racial identity found that defendants of a higher SES were typically found to be less guilty and recommended for shorter sentences than defendants of a lower SES, regardless of defendants' race (Gleason & Harris, 1975). One of the few existing studies that considered

both juror and defendant attributes in its design suggests that there is a relationship between trial outcome and the amount of discrepancy between juror and defendant occupational status, with high discrepancy being predictive of a conviction (Adler, 1973). In other words, if the defendant is of a low SES, then a juror with a high SES is much more likely to find the defendant guilty than a juror with a SES that is a closer match to that of the defendant's.

After reviewing the existing literature, I made a note of the lack of research that isolated SES as a variable, as well as the lack of research concerned with attributes of the juror and their effect on final verdicts — almost all existing research studies were multi-variable and concerned with the qualities of the defendant, not the juror(s). Despite the limited existing research isolating SES as a variable, the research that does exist is supportive of a positive relationship between SES of the juror and a guilty verdict. Thus, I hypothesized that in my own study, there would be a statistically significant positive relationship between juror SES and conviction frequency (i.e., the higher a "juror's" socioeconomic index score, the more convictions they will have made).

In line with the theory that high SES is a positive predictor of a guilty verdict, high SES is also one of the many demographic traits that are considered to characterize political conservatism, a philosophy that focuses on maintaining law and order (Reed & Reed, 1977). People who identify with this philosophy consider incarceration to be a vital and functioning part of our justice system and are therefore more likely to support convictions and harsh sentences, regardless of the defendant's identity or quantity/quality of prosecuting evidence. Additionally, I considered the bail bond system and other fee-based components of the U.S. justice system and predicted that people from lower SES backgrounds would be more hesitant to convict a defendant of a crime than people from higher SES backgrounds, simply because the latter group would be more likely to be desensitized to the harsh reality of our justice system. Participants

were presented with details from hypothetical court cases to deliberate on and submit a verdict for, which was correlated with their calculated socioeconomic index score during data analysis.

Method

Participants

At the conclusion of data collection, 16 participants had taken my survey, but I was only able to preserve and analyze the complete data profile of 13 of those participants (2 participants failed to complete the entire survey and 1 participant requested the withdrawal of their data at the completion of the survey). I had a majority female participant pool, with 9 of my participants identifying as a woman, 3 participants identifying as a man, and 1 participant identifying as non-binary. The majority of my participant pool also identified as White or European American, with only 2 participants identifying with a race/ethnicity not listed in the survey and just 1 participant identifying as Hispanic and/or Latino. In contrast with its lack of gender and racial diversity, my participant pool actually represented a fairly wide range of ages, with the majority of participants either falling in the 18-24 or 55-64 age range. To my surprise, young to middle-aged adults were the most underrepresented in my sample population, and I even ended up with more participants in the 65+ age range than I did both the 25-34 and 35-44 age ranges combined.

All participants were required to meet the same eligibility criteria the U.S. federal government requires all jurors to meet before they were able to participate in the study: at least 18 years of age, U.S. citizen, literate and fluent in the English language, and no felony on record. I used this same exclusion criterion when identifying potential participants so that the characteristics of my study sample would accurately mimic those of the population. I knew that my eligibility criteria narrowed my potential participant pool by a large margin, so when determining how I would recruit participants for my study, it was important that I kept in mind

my target audience and the ways that they are best advertised to. I chose to use Facebook and Instagram to connect with potential participants, so that I could reach a wide range of individuals who met my inclusion criteria and also varied in SES. This was the key determining factor in my decision to use social media for participant recruitment because I knew that if the majority of my participants were recruited locally or from the same organization/institution, it is less likely that there would be enough variation in SES, which would impede my ability to determine the direction and strength of its relationship to the dependent variable. For these reasons, I used my personal accounts on Facebook and Instagram to share the participant recruitment script that I had developed with hundreds of eligible individuals. I did not have the initial success I was anticipating with participant recruitment through Facebook and Instagram, so I also shared the survey link on the subreddit *r/SampleSize* about two weeks after the survey was first published, which resulted in a very minimal boost in engagements. Plausible explanations for the size and demographic characteristics of my sample population, their possible effect(s) on participant data, and suggestions for ways to expand and diversify participant pools in future research are all addressed in the discussion section of this paper.

Materials & Procedure

To evaluate my initial hypothesis, that jurors of a higher SES are more likely to find a defendant guilty than jurors of a lower SES, I published a Qualtrics survey that participants could complete anonymously. The first section of the survey included the information sheet and informed consent documents, which briefed participants about the purpose of the study that they were about to participate in and what would be asked of them throughout their participation. After reading the information sheet, the informed consent document prompted participants to affirm that they had read and understood the information presented to them and were voluntarily

choosing to partake in this study. This confirmation of informed consent allowed participants to move on to the next section of the study, where they were introduced to the five court cases (Appendix A) that they would be asked to evaluate.

In my development of the court cases, it was my aim to create strong cases for both the defense and prosecution so that one side was not clearly telling the "truth" or following a more logical line of thinking than the other, forcing participants to think more critically about their decision, specifically their confidence in convicting a defendant. To maintain this balance between the defense and prosecution, each of the five court cases I created for the survey had three pieces of evidence in support of the prosecution and three pieces of evidence in support of the defense. The survey presented the cases in the same singular order each time, requiring participants to submit their decision on the current case before moving onto the next. Attempts were made to randomize the order cases were presented to participants to avoid the risk of order bias, but ultimately technical difficulties made this impractical (the possible effect of order bias on participant data is further considered in the discussion section). Details of the court cases had been erased of any identifiable information about the defendant to control for extraneous variables, such as personal prejudices towards gender or race, and isolate my independent variable. The cases also ranged in severity from petty theft and insurance fraud to aggravated assault and murder to avoid triggering crime-specific biases amongst participants. Participants were given 2 min to read over and study each court case before the survey auto advanced to the next page where they were prompted to disclose whether they had found the defendant guilty or not guilty.

During this portion of the survey, participants were deceived as to why they were being asked to complete this task. To motivate participants to give serious consideration to the case

details and think critically about their role as a juror before submitting their final decision, I told participants that they were being asked to reevaluate actual court cases whose verdicts had very recently been affirmed or negated by new DNA evidence. I informed the participants that the purpose of this study was to find out how their decisions might differ from the original jury's decision if all identifiable demographic characteristics about a defendant were removed from the case. Participants were deceived in this manner so that they would be under the impression that science had already determined the defendant to be guilty or not guilty and that they, as participants, were being evaluated on their ability to correctly identify the correct verdict for each case.

After participants submitted all five verdicts, they were directed to begin the final portion of the survey in which they responded to a variety of demographic questions, including questions about level of education attained and household income, which I then used to assess the participants' SES (Appendix B). Unfortunately, social scientists and economists have yet been able to reach a consensus about universal indicators of SES, especially because of the abundance of cross-cultural variation, which made it difficult to have full confidence in however I chose to operationally define SES. After conducting a brief literature review of the development, implementation, and success rates of some of the most popular socioeconomic index equations with a faculty professor, we concluded that a true, comprehensive measure of SES could not be calculated without a tenfold increase in the survey's length, complexity, and privacy risk. In order to increase the survey's appeal to potential participants, I elected to develop a simplified measure of SES, in which I isolated the two components of SES that I thought were the most relevant to the measurement of my dependent variable. Because I believed that level of attained education and average household income were the components of SES that were the most

predicative of attitudes towards crime and punishment — specifically one's natural inclination to side with the prosecutor or non-guilty party — and would therefore have the biggest impact on the measurement of my dependent variable, I used measurements of both to operationally define SES in my study. I also asked other demographic questions to keep the identity of my independent variable disguised until the survey was over. This allowed me the opportunity to make note of any patterns I saw amongst other demographic variables and their relationship to the juror's final decision, so that I could provide a more comprehensive description of my sample.

Completion of the demographic portion of the survey brought participants to a debriefing letter, informing them of their deception during the survey and revealing to them the true intentions behind my study. Participants were given the option to withdraw their data from consideration once being informed of this deception, or they could approve of their data's usage and exit the survey.

Complete participant data that was not withdrawn from consideration by the participant (applicable to 13 out of 16 participants) were then prepared for data analysis. The number of guilty verdicts each juror voted for was totaled and then submitted for correlational analysis in IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 28) as the dependent variable alongside its corresponding quasi-independent variable (SES of the juror). This score was calculated for each individual participant based on their responses to the questions in the demographic portion of the survey inquiring about participants' level of attained education and average household income. I assigned scores to all possible responses, correlating larger numbers with responses that are indicative of a higher SES and smaller numbers with responses that are indicative of a lower SES. For example, participants were instructed to identify the income range that was the most accurate description

of their average household income, with the lowest range ($0-$24,999) assigned a corresponding score of zero and the highest range ($250,000+) assigned a corresponding score of ten. This same process was repeated with questions about attained education, with a score of zero on one end of the spectrum to represent little to no formal education, and a score of nine on the other end to indicate completion of a Doctoral program. Participants' scores for average household income and level of attained education were combined and represented each participants' socioeconomic index score (a measure of SES), which served as my independent variable. IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 28) was used to calculate the Pearson's *r* correlation statistic for the data set by measuring the frequency of guilty verdicts in each juror against their SES score to determine the direction and strength of this relationship (which I hypothesized to be positive and statistically significant).

Results

An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used for all statistical tests conducted. Statistical analysis (Appendix C) revealed that amongst my sample population, the correlation between SES of the juror and trial outcome was not of statistical significance, despite expressing a slight positive trend, $r(11) = .04$, $p = .44$. As predicted in my initial hypothesis, my data analysis did reflect an increased tendency amongst jurors of a higher SES background to convict a defendant in comparison to that of their peers of a lower SES background, but the correlation coefficient's corresponding *p*-value indicates that this relationship is not statistically significant enough to report. Interested to see if one of the study's two measured components of SES had a stronger correlation to trial outcome than the other, I isolated both components (level of education attained and average household income) as independent variables and calculated separate Pearson's *r* correlation statistics for the relationship between education and trial outcome ($r(11)$

= .02, p = .47) and the relationship between income and trial outcome ($r(11)$ = .05, p = .43. While the three different measures of SES were relatively supportive of a weak, positive relationship between juror SES and verdict frequency, I found it important to note which measure of SES was most strongly correlated to verdict frequency (income as an isolated variable) and which measure of SES had the weakest relationship to verdict frequency (education as an isolated variable). The possible applications of this finding for future research in operationally defining SES are discussed in the following section.

While the above statistical analyses evaluating the relationship between my independent and dependent variable should be regarded as this study's key finding, statistical and descriptive analyses uncovered other relevant patterns in my data that were not addressed in my initial hypothesis. Another Pearson's r correlational analysis found age of the juror to be more strongly related to verdict frequency than any of the three measures of SES ($r(11)$ = -.2, p = .26), despite still failing to meet standards for statistical significance. Aside from the strength of the relationship, I was also surprised by its direction, which indicated that younger jurors were more likely to convict a defendant than older jurors, a conclusion opposite that of what I was expecting. Correlational analyses were not conducted for the other two demographic variables (race/ethnicity and gender identity), as age was the only demographic variable that produced variation amongst my sample population of enough significance for a pattern to be visible.

The defendant who received the smallest number of guilty convictions was Defendant 1, who was accused of insurance fraud, and the defendant who received the largest number of guilty convictions was Defendant 5, who was accused of first-degree assault. While this data appears to be supportive of a positive relationship between severity of the accused crime and likelihood of conviction, it could also be indicative of order bias amongst participants. Other

threats to the internal and external validity are discussed in the following section, as well as recommendations for future research in avoiding those same threats.

Discussion

Despite its inadvertent discovery of the many relevant findings shared above, the data produced by my study design did not perform well enough on a significance test for me to claim that it was supportive of my initial hypothesis that juror SES and trial outcome are positively related. I believe this to be a reflection, however, of poor study design and execution, rather than indicative of a true lack of correlation between the two variables. All statistical analyses conducted produced fairly large *p*-values, indicating that my study design lacked statistical power, reducing its ability to detect a true correlation and increasing its susceptibility to distortion by systematic and random error. Statistical power is mainly determined by significance level, sample size, and effect size; suggestions for improving the latter two statistics follow.

Because my participant recruitment tactics were not anywhere near successful in reaching my initial recruitment goal of 50 participants, and I was unable to collect data from a wide, diverse sample population that was representative of the true population, I was not surprised by the performance of the data on significance tests. The same study design conducted with a larger sample population would automatically have more statistical power than the data from my participants, solely because it would have produced more data. Size was not the only problem with my sample population, however, as the large majority of my participants were White or European American females. In order to ensure the external validity of results and maximize participant variation in SES, future research should be conducted with a much large sample size.

Increasing the study's effect size, or the effect of the independent variable on the measured dependent variable, would also increase its statistical power. While SES is only a

quasi-independent variable, and I am unable to manipulate it in experimentation, I am able to manipulate how it is measured. If a more accurate operational definition of SES as it relates to upbringing were to be developed, it would likely have a positive impact on the effect size of the study. As I discussed in my literature review, however, no one measure or equation has been established as a universally accurate calculation of SES, so finding the perfect operational definition will require a lot of experimentation. For example, although I used a combination measure of education and income in my official statistical analysis, I did discover that income appeared to be more strongly related to trial outcome than education was, suggesting that future research may benefit from isolating income as the key component of SES as it relates to the dependent variable.

References

Adler, F. (1973). Socioeconomic factors influencing jury verdicts. *New York University Review of Law and Social Change*, *3*, 1-10. https://socialchangenyu.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Freda-Adler_RLSC_3.1.pdf

Clarke, M. (2020, June). Racism and wrongful convictions. *Criminal Legal News.* https://www.criminallegalnews.org/news/2020/may/15/racism-and-wrongful-convictions/.

Cullen, J. (2018, July 20). *The history of mass incarceration*. Brennan Center for Justice. https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/history-mass-incarceration.

Espinoza, R., Willis-Esqueda, C., Toscano, S., & Coons, J. (2015). The impact of ethnicity, immigration status, and socioeconomic status on juror decision making. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *13*(3), 197-216. https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2014.984044

Gleason, J. M., & Harris, V. A. (1975). Race, socioeconomic status, and perceived similarity as determinants of judgements by simulated jurors. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *3*(2), 175-180. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1975.3.2.175

Reed, J. P., & Reed, R. S. (1977). Liberalism-conservatism as an indicator of jury product and process. *Law and Human Behavior*, *1*(1), 81-86. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01044778

Walsh, K., Hussemann, J., Flynn A., Yahner, J., & Golian, L. (2017). Estimating the prevalence of wrongful convictions. *Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.* https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251115.pdf

Willis-Esqueda, C., Espinoza, R., & Culhane, S. (2008). The effects of ethnicity, SES, and crime status on juror decision making: A cross-cultural examination of European American and

Mexican American mock jurors. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *30*(2), 181-199. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0739986308315319

Appendix A

Qualtrics Survey Court Cases

Q3 During this portion of the survey, you will be asked to pose as an individual juror to reevaluate 5 past U.S. court cases whose verdicts have all been recently affirmed or negated by new DNA/forensic evidence. You may notice that all details regarding the identity of the defendants (and victims, if applicable) have been removed from the text. Researchers are interested in seeing how your decisions on the cases compare to the original jury decisions, if the identity of the defendant (and victim, if applicable) is unknown to you. Can you correctly identify the appropriate verdict for all 5 cases? You will be given two minutes to read and study the details of each case before you will be given the option to submit your final decision on the case (guilty or not guilty) and move on to the next question. You will repeat this process for all 5 cases.

End of Block: Juror tasks directions block

Start of Block: Juror tasks activity 1

Q4 Defendant 1 was accused by their insurance company of staging a robbery at their locally owned business in order to file a fraudulent insurance claim. Defendant 1 claims that according to the store manager who first discovered the robbery, over $7,000 worth of merchandise was stolen sometime between 8:00 PM and 6:00 AM on the night in question. At the time however, Defendant 1 was out of town on a family vacation and could not be reached until their return 4 days later, which would explain why the insurance claim was filed almost a week after the initial incident. The only security camera on the premise is located above the front door and only records activity occurring outside the building—Defendant 1 claims they installed this camera 3 months ago after the strip mall's parking lot was targeted by a series of car burglaries. The security footage was reviewed, but it had not recorded any suspicious activity or persons hanging around/entering the building the night of the incident. The only other entrance is located on the back side of the building. Defendant 1 claims that they possess the sole key to unlock the back door and employees only have copies of the key to the front door. Defendant 1, however, cannot confirm the back door key's whereabouts that night because they had lost it a week prior to their vacation, and they did not have a new copy made until well after the incident.

You have found Defendant 1...

- ○ Guilty (1)
- ○ Not guilty (2)

Q15 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: Juror tasks activity 1

Start of Block: Juror tasks activity 2

Q5 Defendant 2 was accused of murdering their next-door neighbor after other neighbors in the building reported that they had heard the two arguing the night before the neighbor was found deceased by their part-time caretaker. The cause of death was determined to be blunt force head trauma and based on the location and position their body was found in, forensic experts believed that the neighbor had hit their head on the corner of the dining room table in the process of falling to the ground. The neighbor has had a history of falling ever since a young cerebellar stroke 5 years ago, but a new form of physical therapy has recently made major improvements to their balance, and family members claim that they hadn't had a serious fall in over 6 months. The neighbors' caretaker told the police that their client had had a recent disagreement with Defendant 2 over a property in the adjacent condo building they were both interested in purchasing, and another neighbor testified that they had heard Defendant 2 aggressively banging on their neighbor's door before barging into the apartment just about an hour before the time of death. Defendant 2's spouse, however, claims that they were awake with Defendant 2 during the time of death and that neither of them left the condo until they heard the commotion next door the following morning.

You have found Defendant 2...

- ○ Guilty (1)
- ○ Not guilty (2)

Q16 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: Juror tasks activity 2

Start of Block: Juror tasks activity 3

Q6 Defendant 3, a driver for a ridesharing app, has been accused of petty theft after a rider claimed just over $800 was missing from their lost wallet after the driver returned it, almost 24 hours after the wallet was left in Defendant 3's car. The rider told police that they had been returning to their hotel after a night out in Las Vegas for a friend's birthday, and that they had been carrying the $825 in cash that they had won at a casino that night in said wallet. The rider claims that they weren't aware that they had left their wallet in the driver's car until the following day, and it took the driver another 12 hours to respond to the message the rider had sent through the app's messaging feature. Defendant 3 claimed that they had given a few more rides to other customers after dropping off the rider, and that they had eventually returned home early in the morning. Defendant 3 claimed they didn't even know a wallet had been left in their car until the next evening when they were getting ready to go to work for the night and opened the rideshare app. Defendant 3's alibi was corroborated by their spouse, but a review of the their customer ratings found at least two other similar complaints since they began driving for the company almost two years ago that had never been taken to court.

You have found Defendant 3...

- ○ Guilty (1)
- ○ Not guilty (2)

Q17 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: Juror tasks activity 3

Start of Block: Juror tasks activity 5

Q8 Defendant 5 has been charged with assault in the first degree after another patron at a local bar accused Defendant 5 of using a glass beer bottle to attack them from behind in the bar's parking lot .Just prior to the incident, the bartender and other patrons saw the patron's significant other approach Defendant 5, but the significant other claims that they were approached by Defendant 5 first who "immediately made a vulgar comment about [their] appearance." Upon returning from the bathroom, the significant other told the patron what happened. The patron claims that they calmly told Defendant 5 off for the supposed harassment before leaving, and was blindsided by Defendant 5 in the parking lot. Defendant 5's story, however, is that the patron's significant other beckoned them over while they were sitting alone at the bar. Defendant 5 claimed the two exchanged flirtations before the they excused themselves to return to their friends. Defendant 5 claimed that they were approached by the patron a few minutes later, requesting them to come out to the parking lot, unaware that they had just been flirting with this person's significant other. Defendant 5 followed the patron out where they were forced to defend

themselves with the half-empty beer bottle when the patron's significant other pulled a gun from the car's glove compartment. Further investigation found that there was in fact a 9mm semi-automatic pistol registered to the patron in the car's glove compartment, but the patron and their significant other both testified that neither one of them had touched the firearm during the altercation. All involved left the scene with very minimal injuries, but the patron claimed that Defendant 5 had intended to seriously maim them by swinging at the back of their head with a glass beer bottle.

You have found Defendant 5...

- ○ Guilty (1)
- ○ Not guilty (2)

Q19 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: Juror tasks activity 5

Appendix B

Qualtrics Survey Demographic/SES Questions

Start of Block: Demographic questionnaire block

Q9 Please select your gender identity below:

- ○ Male (1)
- ○ Female (2)
- ○ Non-binary (3)
- ○ Prefer not to say (4)
- ○ Prefer to self-describe (5) _____

Q10 How old are you?

- ○ 18-24 (1)
- ○ 25-34 (2)
- ○ 35-44 (3)
- ○ 45-54 (4)
- ○ 55-64 (5)
- ○ 65+ (6)

Q11 Which of the following best describes you?

- Asian or Pacific Islander (1)
- Black or African American (2)
- Hispanic or Latino (3)
- Native American or Alaskan Native (4)
- White or European American (5)
- Biracial or Multiracial (6)
- A race/ethnicity not listed here (7)

Q12 Please indicate the highest degree of education you have completed:

- No formal schooling (1)
- Some formal schooling, no diploma (2)
- 12th grade, no diploma (3)
- GED or alternative equivalent (4)
- High school graduate (5)
- Some college, no degree (6)
- Associate's degree (7)
- Bachelor's degree (8)
- Master's degree (9)
- Doctorate degree (10)

Q13 What is your approximate average household income?

- $0-$24,999 (1)
- $25,000-$49,999 (2)
- $50,000-$74,999 (3)
- $75,000-$99,999 (4)
- $100,000-$124,999 (5)
- $125,000-$149,999 (6)
- $150,000-$174,999 (7)
- $175,000-$199,999 (8)
- $200,000-$224,999 (9)
- $225,000-$249,999 (10)
- $250,000+ (11)

Q14 Which statement best describes your financial situation for the 2021 tax year (or will describe, if you have not filed your taxes yet)?

- ○ I claimed one dependent (1)
- ○ I claimed two or more dependents (2)
- ○ I was claimed as a dependent (3)
- ○ I was not claimed as a dependent, but I also did not provide more than one-half of my own financial support (4)
- ○ I was not claimed as a dependent and I did not claim any dependents (5)

End of Block: Demographic questionnaire block

Appendix C

SPSS Analysis

Correlations

		VerdictFrequency	SEI
VerdictFrequency	Pearson Correlation	1	.044
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.443
	N	13	13
SEI	Pearson Correlation	.044	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.443	
	N	13	13