

INDEX

- ABA *Jury Principles*, 79, 139, 214
 Abramson, Jeffrey, 96, 156
 African Americans. *See also* *Batson v. Kentucky*
 peremptory challenges to, 76–77, 80–82, 84
 in capital cases, 87–88
 rates of, 89
 AJS. *See* American Judicature Society
 Allen charge, 155–56, 191, 193–94, 254–55
 Allen v. *United States*, 155
 alternate jurors, 79
 American Judicature Society (AJS), 186–87
 appeals courts, appeals process and
 jury instructions in, 137
 post-verdict interviews about, 228–30
 Arthur Andersen LLP v. *United States*, 113–14,
 136–37
 Asch, Solomon E., 56
 attorneys
 post-verdict interviews by, of jurors, 218–20
 during *voir dire*, 45–48
 for cause challenges, 44–45
 for juror bias, 46–50
 audio or video of jury instructions, 132–33

 badges, for jurors, 69–74
 Ballard v. *United States*, 183
 Batson, James, 91
 Batson v. *Kentucky*, 76–77, 80–82, 105
 Marshall, Thurgood (Justice), concurrence,
 101
 variations by state, 103–05
 Behind Closed Doors (American Judicature
 Society), 186–87
 Bennett, Mark W., 86, 134, 238
 bias. *See also* implicit bias
 explicit, by lawyers, 87
 of judges, during *voir dire*, 52
 of jurors, 2
 implicit bias, 65
 judge's assessment of, 49–50
 through *voir dire*, 2, 65
 Bill C-75, Canada (2019), 100–01
 Binnall, James M., 107, 108–09, 253
 Blackmun, Harry A. (Justice), 105
 Blagojevich, Rod, 125, 193, 194, 223–24

 Boatright, Robert G., 15, 18–19, 31, 32, 33, 250
 Boushie, Colten, 100–01
 Brandeis, Louis D. (Justice), 72
 Brennan, William J., Jr. (Justice), 105
 Broeder, Dale W., 92, 94, 96, 97, 102
 Burnett, D. Graham, 22, 25, 27–28, 59–60, 117,
 118, 132, 256
 Burns, Charles, 144–45, 240
 Butler, Paul, 196

 Canada
 Bill C-75, 100–01
 peremptory challenges in, 100–01
 capital cases, peremptory challenges to African
 American jurors in, 87–88
 Chakravarti, Sonali, 155, 254
 civic duty, summons as, 18
 civil trials
 peremptory challenges in, 78–79
 post-verdict interviews and, 226–27
 about appeals process, 228–30
 Code of Civil Procedure, California, 104
 Comiskey, Marie, 135
 Constitution, U.S.
 Double Jeopardy Clause, 195–96
 Due Process Clause, 44
 Equal Protection Clause, 21–22
 peremptory challenges and, 80
 fair-cross-section requirements for jury
 representation, 17
 Fifth Amendment, 195–96
 Fourteenth Amendment, 44
 Seventh Amendment, 44
 Sixth Amendment, 44
 convicted felons, as jurors, 108–09
 courthouse, as setting. *See also* federal courts
 summons to, 13–14
 juror treatment after, 22–24
 Jury Assembly Room, 14, 23
 racial bias in, 22–23
 respect towards jurors as part of, 34–37
 courtrooms. *See also* federal courts
 summons process and
 decision-making in, 29–30
 from Jury Assembly Room to, 29

- Criminal Justice Act, England and Wales (1988), 99, 221
- criminal trials
 peremptory challenges in, 78–79, 84
 post-verdict interviews and, 227–28
 about appeals process, 228–30
- Curtis, Dennis, 29
- Dahmer, Jeffrey, 231
- Dann, B. Michael, 67, 117, 128, 134, 192, 198
- deferrals, from jury duty, 33
- deliberations, by jury, 10–11
Allen charge, 155–56, 191, 193–94, 254–55
Allen v. United States, 155
 diverse juries as benefit to, 181–84
 Ballard v. United States, 183
 decision-making influenced by, 181
 by gender, 182–83
 Peters v. Kiff, 184
 Taylor v. Louisiana, 183
 Double Jeopardy Clause, 195–96
 elements of, 150–52
 evidence-driven, 151–52, 186–87
 in filmed deliberations
 Enter the Jury Room, 167–68
 Inside the Jury Room, 164, 168–69, 170–71, 175–76, 193, 201–05
 isolation of jury in, 159–60
 in films
 12 Angry Men, 1–2, 151, 159–60
 foreperson in, 158, 163–65
 hung jury from, 168, 193, 194
 isolation of jurors, 157–58
 in films and popular culture, 159–60
 group identification as result of, 162–63
 in jury room, 159–63
 through sequestration, 161–63
 state-by-state approaches to, 161
 judge's role in, 184–94
 at beginning of deliberations, 185–88
 dialogue with jury, during impasse in deliberation, 190–94
 through jury instructions, 156
 in jury questions, 188–90
 transformation view of, 150
 juror oath as influence on, 200
 between jurors, with alternative viewpoints, 175–77
 jury instructions as part of, 165–75
 Behind Closed Doors (AJS), 186–87
 disadvantages of, 166–69
 equality of all jurors through, 169–71
 on foreperson's role, 185–86
 on implicit biases, strategies for, 173–75
 instructions as constraints on deliberations, 165–66
 judge's role in, 156
 on nullification, 194–98
 for self-policing of jurors, 171–72
 for social media use, restrictions on, 172–73
 on styles of deliberation, 151–52, 186–87
 nullification, 194–205
 Fully Informed Jury Association, 196
 in *Inside the Jury Room*, 201–05
 judge–jury relationship and, 198–200
 jury instructions on, 194–98
 traditional view of, 156–57
 transformation view of, 200–05
 overview of, 205–08
 secrecy of, 152, 159–63
 traditional view of, 149, 152–57
 limitations of, 154–57
 nullification in, 156–57
 transformation view of, 149–50, 157–59
 foreperson's role in, 163–65
 implicit biases in, 150
 judge's role in, 150
 nullification in, 200–05
 unanimity requirements, 149–50
 unanimity requirement, 177–81
 equality of jurors under, 178
 jury polling and, 177, 179–80
 transformation view of, 149–50
United States v. Dougherty, 197, 199
United States v. Spock, 195
 verdict-driven, 151–52, 186–87
- Democracy in America* (Tocqueville), 3, 60, 256–57
- Diamond, Shari Seidman, 21, 54, 91, 97, 102, 119, 132, 134, 242, 246, 247, 248
- diversity, of juries
 benefits of, 89–90
 for communities, 90–91
 for criminal defendants, 90–91
 jury deliberations influenced by, 181–84
 Ballard v. United States, 183
 decision-making influenced by, 181
 gender and, 182–83
 Peters v. Kiff, 184
 Taylor v. Louisiana, 183
 peremptory challenges as hindrance to, 88–91
- Double Jeopardy Clause, in Fifth Amendment, 195–96
- Due Process Clause, 44
- Duren v. Missouri*, 16–17
- Elek, Jennifer K., 174
- Ellsworth, Phoebe C., 89–90
- England and Wales
 Criminal Justice Act, 99, 221
 jury instructions in
 jury bundles, 131–32

INDEX

- England and Wales (cont.)
 on social media use, 143
 jury selection in, 99–100
 peremptory challenges, elimination of, 99–100
 post-verdict interviews of jurors in, 220–21
 robes in, 70
 Equal Justice Initiative, 77, 94–95, 97
 Equal Protection Clause, 21–22
 peremptory challenges and, 80
 Erentzen, Caroline, 45, 47, 48–49, 85, 101
 ethnicity. *See also* race
 peremptory challenges by, 76–77
 evidence-driven jury deliberations, 151–52, 186–87
 excluded jurors, after peremptory challenges, 91–97
 disillusionment with jury system among, 96–97
 stigma as result of, 92
 of women, 93
 exclusions, from jury duty, 13–14
 by race, 16
 excuses
 for hardship, 109
 for jury summons, 24–26
 culture of excuses and, 24–25
 for high-profile trials, 26
United States v. Torres, 25–26
 explicit bias, by lawyers, 87
 failure to respond or appear, to jury summons, 15, 20, 32, 33
 federal courts, *voir dire* in, 48–49
 Federal Judicial Center program (FJC program), 66–67
 Fifth Amendment, Double Jeopardy Clause, 195–96
 FIJA. *See* Fully Informed Jury Association
 films. *See* popular culture; *specific films*
 FJC program. *See* Federal Judicial Center program
 Flowers, Curtis, 94
Flowers v. Mississippi, 103
 foreperson, of jury, 158, 163–65
 for cause challenges, 44–45
 peremptory challenges and, 83, 109–11
 race as influence on, 109
 types of, 110
United States v. Martinez-Salazar, 110, 111
Foster v. Chatman, 77, 84, 103
 Fourteenth Amendment, *voir dire* and, 44
 Fox, Matthew P., 167, 170
 Frampton, Thomas Ward, 109, 253
 Fully Informed Jury Association (FIJA), 196
 gender. *See also* women
 jury deliberations influenced by, 182–83
 peremptory challenges by, 76–77, 93
 General Rule 37 (Washington), 79, 103, 104
 Gertner, Nancy, 21
 Grosso, Catherine M., 82, 89, 106
 group identity
 from isolation of jurors, 162–63
 in Jury Assembly Room, 29
 group *voir dire*, 48, 55–57
 Grove, Trevor, 20, 23, 25, 59–60, 70, 123
 Hannaford-Agor, Paula, 36, 54, 129, 174, 215, 230, 231, 232, 233, 237–38
 Hans, Valerie P., 3, 85, 89, 96, 99, 155, 156, 181, 193, 194, 246, 247
 hardship excuses, from jury duty, 109
 Hastie, Reid, 151
 high-profile trials, excuses from, jury summons and, 26
 Holderman, James F., 72, 116, 136, 142, 172
 Horowitz, Irwin A., 254
 hung jury, 124, 168, 193, 194
 Iacobucci, Frank (Canadian Justice), 100–01
 idiosyncratic peremptory challenges, 97–98
 impaneling of jury, after *voir dire*, 61–62
 impartiality, of judges, 57–58
 implicit bias
 of jurors, through *voir dire*, 65
 in jury deliberations, 173–75
 peremptory challenges and
 in jurors, 76, 85–86
 in lawyers, 86–87
 over physical appearance, 86–87
Inside the Jury Room, 164, 168–69, 170–71, 175–76, 193
 nullification in, 201–05
 interviews, with jurors. *See also* post-verdict interview
 of jury experience, in polls and surveys, 3
 isolation, of jurors, during deliberation, 157–58
 in films and popular culture, 159–60
 group identification as result of, 162–63
 in jury room, 159–63
 through sequestration, 161–63
 state-by-state approaches to, 161
J. E. B. v. Alabama ex rel. T. B., 105
 judge–jury relationship
 jury instructions influenced by, 138–40
 as constraint, by judge, 140
 judge as authority figure, 123
 social media use and, 144–46
 traditional view of, 138
 nullification influenced by, 198–200
 during *voir dire*, 60–63, 138

- judge as information source, 60
- judicial training for, 66–68
- juror oath, 61–62
- strategies for, 63
- judges. *See also* post-verdict interview
 - jury deliberations influenced by, 184–94
 - at beginning of deliberations, 185–88
 - dialogue with jury, during impasse in deliberation, 190–94
 - through jury instructions, 156
 - in jury questions, 188–90
 - transformation view of, 150
 - jury instructions by, 115–16
 - at end of trial, 120
 - judge as authority as influence on, 123
 - preliminary instructions, 120
 - reading of, 123–25
 - traditional view of, 116–18
 - transformation view of, 127–28
 - jury summons and, responses to, 20
 - post-verdict interviews and, 225–28
 - in transformation view, 217
 - robes as uniforms for, 70–71
 - training of, for judge–jury relationship, 66–68
 - during *voir dire*, role of, 41, 42–43, 45, 64
 - in federal courts, 50–51
 - Federal Judicial Center program, 66–67
 - for cause challenges and, 44–45
 - general remarks to jurors, 63–66
 - for juror bias, 49–50
 - juror impartiality influenced by, 57–58
 - jury-centric perspective, 67
 - personal bias as factor in, 52
 - through questions, 42–43, 45–46, 57–61
- The Juror*, 17, 24
- juror misconduct, 234–37
- jurors. *See also* deliberations; post-verdict interviews; summons; *specific topics*
 - alternate, 79
 - badges for, 69–74
 - behavior during jury instructions
 - comprehension of instructions, 128
 - judge as authority figure as influence on, 123
 - note-taking, 129–31
 - self-policing instructions for jury, 125–26
 - convicted felons as, 108–09
 - judges and, 4
 - positive experiences for, in polls and surveys, 3
 - as problem-solvers, 3
 - qualifications for, 98, 107–09
 - disabilities and, 107
 - new approaches to, 108–09
 - by state, 107–08
 - robes as uniforms for, 69–74
 - equality as goal of, 70
 - social media use by, 65
 - Tocqueville, Alexis de, on, 4–5, 256–57
- Jury Assembly Room, 14, 23
 - group identity in, 29
 - move to courtroom setting, 29
- jury box, 52–55, 114
 - jury instructions and, 120–23
 - jury observations from, 53–54
 - physical location of, 55
 - view of jury in, 54
- jury consultants, 142, 162
- jury deliberations. *See* deliberations
- jury instructions, 9–10. *See also* deliberations
 - in appeals courts, 137
 - Arthur Andersen LLP v. United States*, 113–14, 136–37
 - audio or video examples of, 132–33
 - in England and Wales, on social media use, 143
 - goal and purposes of, 114
 - hung jury, 124
 - individual written copies of, 129
 - by judge, 115–16
 - as authority figure, 123
 - at end of trial, 120
 - preliminary instructions, 120
 - reading of, 123–25
 - traditional view of, 116–18
 - transformation view of, 127–28
 - judge–jury relationship influenced by, 138–40
 - as constraint, by judge, 140
 - judge as authority figure, 123
 - as ongoing dialogue, 138
 - social media use and, 144–46
 - traditional view of, 138
- juror behavior during
 - comprehension of instructions, 128
 - equality of jurors, 125
 - judge as authority figure, 123
 - note-taking, 129–31
 - self-policing instructions, 125–26
- juror questions after, 133–38
 - advantages of, 137–38
 - disadvantages of, 135–37
- in jury box, 120–23
- language of
 - formality of, 123–24
 - by state, variations in, 119
- in notebooks, 131–32
 - jury bundles, in England, 131–32
 - with road map, 131–32
- nullifying jury, 124
- overview of, 147–48
- pattern, 115–16
- reading of, by judge, 123–25
- for self-policing, by jurors, 125–26

INDEX

- jury instructions (cont.)
 on social media use, during trial, 140–44
 in England and Wales, 143
 judge–jury relationship as influence on, 144–46
 reform strategies for, 141–42
 reinforcement and repetition of, 142–44
 timing of instructions for, 142
 by state
 language changes for, 119
 variations in, 117
 supplements to, 139
 timing of, 120, 126–27
 for social media use, 142
 during trial, 139
 traditional view of, 113, 116–20
 judge’s role in, 116–18
 limitations of, 118–20
 transformation view of, 114, 120–21
 judge’s role in, 127–28
 jury process, in United States. *See also* deliberations; jury instructions; post-verdict interview; summons; traditional view; transformation view; *voir dire*
 in Canada, 99–101
 in England and Wales, 99–100
 global influence of, 246–47
 global legacy of, 244–57
 holistic approach to, 4, 5
 in popular culture, 17
 reform of, 248–49
 as symbol of US judicial system, 247–48
 transformation view of, 3–4, 245–46
 The Jury Project (New York), 35–36
 jury room, isolation of jurors in, 159–63
The Jurymen’s Tale (Grove), 59–60
- Kalven, Harry, 156, 193
 Kane, John L., 185–86
 Kassan, Saul M., 44, 82, 83, 139, 161, 192
 Kaye, Judith, 19, 23
 The Jury Project (New York), 35
 Kendall, Virginia, 65, 146
 Kennedy, Anthony (Justice), 90
 Kennelly, Matthew, 144
 Kerr, Norbert L., 47
 Knapp, Whitman, 25–26
 Kutnjak Ivković, Sanja, 246, 247
- Lam v. Cheng*, 236
 language, of jury instructions
 formality of, 123–24
 by state, variations in, 119
 lawyers. *See* attorneys
 Lempert, Richard, 226, 230
 Levine, James P., 83
- Liebeck, Stella, 226–27
Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2, 233–34
- Marshall, Thurgood (Justice), 86, 101, 105
 Matsumoto, James, 194
McCray v. New York, 105
 McDonald, Laquan, 177
McDonald’s coffee cup case, 226–27
 McMahon, Colleen, 35
 Mikva, Abner, 134, 253
 misconduct. *See* juror misconduct
 Mize, Gregory E., 49, 129
 Munsterman, G. Thomas, 36, 54, 129, 130, 215, 230, 231, 232, 233, 237–38
 Murphy, Beth, 119, 132, 134
- notebooks, jury instructions in, 131–32
 jury bundles, in England, 131–32
 note-taking, by jurors, 129–31
 nullification, 124, 194–205
 Fully Informed Jury Association, 196
 in *Inside the Jury Room*, 201–05
 judge–jury relationship and, 198–200
 jury instructions on, 194–98
 traditional view of, 156–57
 transformation view of, 200–05
- oaths, 61
 by jurors, 61–62
 during jury deliberations, 200
 O’Brien, Barbara, 82, 89, 106
 Offit, Anna, 253
 Oliver, John, 13, 90
 Olczak, Paul V., 47
 oral questions, during *voir dire*, 49–50, 55–57
 orientation films, for prospective juries, 38–39, 65–66, 174
- pattern jury instructions, 115–16
Peña-Rodriguez v. Colorado, 235–36
 Pennington, Nancy, 151
 Penrod, Steven D., 151
 preemptory challenges, by lawyers
 against African Americans, 76–77, 80–82, 84
 in capital cases, 87–88
 rates of, 89
 allowable number of, 78–79
 alternatives to elimination of
 Batson test and, 101, 102–03
 through legal responses, by state, 103–05
 Racial Justice Act (North Carolina), 106
 reduction of challenges, 102–03
 under state Codes of Civil Procedure, 104
Batson v. Kentucky, 76–77, 80–82, 105
 Marshall, Thurgood (Justice),
 concurrency, 101
 variations to, by states, 103–05

- for cause challenges, 83
 - types of, 110
 - United States v. Martinez-Salazar*, 110, 111
- defense of, 83–84
- elimination of, 101, 102–03
- Equal Justice Initiative and, 94
- by ethnicity, 76–77
- excluded jurors after, 91–97
 - disillusionment with jury system among, 96–97
 - stigma for, 92
 - women as, 93
- explicit bias and, by lawyers, 87
- for cause challenges
 - maintenance of, 109–11
 - race as influence on, 109
- by gender, 76–77, 93
 - J. E. B. v. Alabama* ex rel. *T. B.*, 105
- idiosyncratic, 97–98
- implicit bias and
 - in jurors, 76, 85–86
 - in lawyers, 86–87
 - over physical appearance, 86–87
- international approaches to, 98–101
 - in Canada, 100–01
 - in England and Wales, 99–100
- jury diversity adversely affected by, 88–91
- limitations on, 76–77, 106
- maintenance of, 109–11
- methodology for, 78–82
 - for alternate jurors, 79
 - in civil trials, 78–79
 - in criminal trials, 78–79
 - strike-and-replace method, 79
 - struck method, 79
- purpose of, 77–78
- qualifications, role of, 107–09
- by race, 76–77
 - in capital cases, 87–88
 - Flowers v. Mississippi*, 103
 - for cause challenges based on, 109
 - Foster v. Chatman*, 77, 84, 103
 - McCray v. New York*, 105
 - Strauder v. West Virginia*, 92
 - in Supreme Court case law, 76–77, 80–82
 - under Equal Protection Clause, 80
 - Swain v. Alabama*, 92
 - traditional view of, 76, 82–88
 - in criminal trials, 84
 - in legal strategies, 83–84
 - limitations on, 85–88
 - transformation view, 77, 88
 - during *voir dire*, 2
- Peters v. Kiff*, 184
- petit jury, 41
- polling of jurors, under unanimity requirement, 177, 179–80
- popular culture
 - jury deliberations in
 - Inside the Jury Room*, 164, 168–69, 170–71, 175–76, 193
 - isolation of jury, 159–60
 - 12 Angry Men*, 1–2, 151, 159–60
 - jury process in, 17
- Posner, Richard A., 136–37
- post-verdict interviews, with jurors, 2
 - ABA Jury Principles*, 214
 - about appeals process, 228–30
 - about juror experience, 216–17, 237–42
 - appreciation of jurors in, 214–15
 - with attorneys, 218–20
 - in civil cases, 226–27
 - about appeals process, 228–30
 - in criminal cases, 227–28
 - about appeals process, 228–30
 - in England and Wales, 220–21
 - judge's role in, 225–28
 - exit questionnaire, 237–38
 - in transformation view, 217
 - for juror misconduct, 234–37
 - juror questions as part of, 217–18
 - with media, 221–24
 - overview of, 242–43
 - post-jury life influenced by, 215–16
 - scope of, 210–11
 - stress-coping strategies as element of, 230–34
 - traditional view of, 209–10, 211–13
 - limitations of, 212–13
 - transformation view of, 210, 213–14
 - judge's role in, 217
- Powell, Lewis F., Jr. (Justice), 105
- Powers v. Ohio*, 90
- questions
 - after jury instructions, by jurors, 133–38
 - advantages of, 132–34
 - disadvantages of, 135–37
 - in post-verdict interviews, from jurors, 217–18
 - during *voir dire*
 - by judges, 42–43, 57–61
 - by lawyers, 45–46
 - oral, 49–50, 55–57
 - revisions of, 63–66
- race
 - exclusions from jury duty and, 16
 - peremptory challenges by, 76–77
 - in capital cases, 87–88
 - Flowers v. Mississippi*, 103
 - for cause challenges based on, 109
 - Foster v. Chatman*, 77, 84, 103
 - McCray v. New York*, 105

INDEX

- Racial Justice Act, North Carolina, 106
 Reed, Chrishala, 94, 95, 96–97
 Reed, Leroy, 156, 201–05. *See also Inside the Jury Room*
 reform
 of jury process, 248–49
 of jury summons process
 by state, 19
 transformative process as element of, 30–34, 36–37
 registered voters lists, jury summons from, 16–17
 limitations of, 21
 Resnik, Judith, 29
 Roach, Kent, 251
 robes
 in England and Wales, 70
 for judges, 70–71
 for jurors, 69–74
 equality as goal of, 70
 Rose, Mary, 21, 54, 85, 91, 119, 132, 134

 Salerno, Jessica M., 248
 Sand, Leonard B., 68, 130, 139, 164
 Schuller, Regina A., 45, 47, 48–49, 85, 101
 secrecy, of jury deliberations, 152, 159–63
 self-policing, by jurors
 during jury deliberations, 171–72
 jury instructions for, 125–26
 sequestration of jurors, 161–63
 Seventh Amendment, 44
 Shkreli, Martin, 110–11
 show-cause warrants, 15
 social media, use of
 by jurors, 65
 during jury deliberations, 172–73
 in jury instructions, restrictions on, 140–44
 in England and Wales, 143
 judge–jury relationship as influence on, 144–46
 reform strategies for, 141–42
 reinforcement and repetition of, 142–44
 timing of instructions for, 142
 Solano, Modesto, 167–68
 Sommers, Samuel R., 89–90, 182
 Sporkin, Stanley, 134, 253
 St. Eve, Amy, 54, 144–46, 240–41
 Stanley, Gerald, 100–01
 Stevens, John Paul (Justice), 69, 105
Strauder v. West Virginia, 92
 stress, coping strategies through post-verdict interviews, 230–34
 strike-and-replace method, 79
 struck method, 79
 summons, to jury duty
 as civic duty, 18
 to courthouse, 13–14
 juror treatment in, 22–24
 Jury Assembly Room, 14, 23
 racial bias in, 22–23
 respect towards jurors in, 34–37
 courtroom setting
 decision-making in, 29–30
 from Jury Assembly Room to, 29
 deferrals, 33
 design of summons, 31, 33–34
Duren v. Missouri, 16–17
 exclusions from, 13–14
 by race, 16
 excuse mechanisms, 24–26
 culture of excuses, 24–25
 for high-profile trials, 26
 United States v. Torres, 25–26
 under fair-cross-section requirement, under Constitution, 17
 as formal document, 15, 20
 goal and purpose of, 15–16
 information for citizens as element of, 37–39
 through orientation films, 38–39
 state-by-state differences in, 39
 judge's response to, 20
 Jury Assembly Room, 14, 23
 to courtroom setting, 29
 group identity in, 29
 The Jury Project (New York), 35
 Jury Selection Task Force (Connecticut), 33–34
 limitations of, 21–22
 under Equal Protection Clause, 21–22
 with registered voters lists, 21
 structural impediments as factor for, 22
 mechanisms for, 15–17
 for failure to respond or appear, 15, 20, 32, 33
 prospective juror lists, 16–17
 for qualifications, 15–16
 show-cause warrants, 15
 by state, 15
 by race, exclusions by, 16
 reform strategies
 design of summons, 31, 33–34
 by state, for selection process, 19
 transformative process as element of, 30–34, 36–37
 from registered voters' lists, 16–17
 limitations with, 21
 responses to, 17–18
 barriers to, 20
 mechanisms for failure to respond or appear, 15, 32, 33
 negative, 13, 18
 positive, 13–14, 18
 as responsibility, 28

- by state
 - mechanisms for, 15
 - reform of selection process, 19
- Taylor v. Louisiana*, 16–17
- traditional view of, 18–19, 244
- structural impediments to, 19
- transformation view of, 14, 27, 40
 - jury duty as extraordinary experience, 27–28
 - reform of summons process as part of, 30–34, 36–37
- Sundby, Scott E., 132, 154–55, 189
- Supreme Court, US, peremptory challenges
 - and, in case law, 76–77, 80–82
 - under Equal Protection Clause, 80
- Swain v. Alabama*, 92
- Taylor v. Louisiana*, 16–17, 71, 183
- Thomas, Suja A., 71–72, 248
- Tiersma, Peter, 119
- Tocqueville, Alexis de, 4–5, 60, 68, 256–57
- traditional view
 - of jury deliberations, 149, 152–57
 - limitations of, 154–57
 - nullification in, 156–57
 - of jury instructions, 113, 116–20
 - judge's role in, 116–18
 - limitations of, 118–20
 - of peremptory challenges, 76, 82–88
 - in criminal trials, 84
 - in legal strategies, 83–84
 - limitations on, 85–88
 - of post-verdict interviews, 209–10, 211–13
 - limitations of, 212–13
 - of summons process, 18–19, 244
 - structural impediments to, 19
 - of *voir dire*, 44–51
 - structural impediments to, 48–51
- transformation view
 - of jury deliberations, 149–50, 157–59
 - foreperson's role in, 163–65
 - implicit biases in, 150
 - judge's role in, 150
 - nullification in, 200–05
 - unanimity requirements, 149–50
 - of jury instructions, 114, 120–21
 - judge's role in, 127–28
 - of jury process, 3–4, 245–46
 - peremptory challenges as negative influence on, 88
 - of post-verdict interviews, 210, 213–14
 - judge's role in, 217
 - of summons process, 14, 27, 40
 - jury duty as extraordinary experience, 27–28
 - reform of summons process, 30–34, 36–37
 - of *voir dire*, 41–42
- Trial by Jury*, 17, 24, 59–60
- trials. *See* capital cases; civil trials; criminal trials; high-profile trials
- 12 Angry Men*, 1–2, 58–59
 - international adaptations of, 246–47
 - jury deliberations in, 151, 159
 - isolation of jurors, 159–60
- unanimity requirement, in jury deliberations, 177–81
 - equality of jurors under, 178
 - jury polling and, 177, 179–80
 - in transformation view, 149–50
- unconscious bias. *See* implicit bias
- United States (US). *See also* Constitution; Supreme Court
 - Code of Civil Procedure, in states, 104
 - Racial Justice Act (North Carolina), 106
 - United States v. Dougherty*, 197, 199, 255
 - United States v. Martinez-Salazar*, 110, 111
 - United States v. Spock*, 195
 - United States v. Thomas*, 234–35
 - United States v. Torres*, 25–26, 42–43, 57
 - US. *See* United States
- Van Dyke, Jason, 177
- verdict-driven jury deliberations, 151–52, 186–87
- video or audio of jury instructions, 132–33
- Vidmar, Neil, 45, 48–49, 89, 96, 99, 101, 155, 156, 181, 194
- voir dire*, 2
 - bias of jurors through, 2
 - implicit bias, 65
 - definition and scope of, 41
 - under Due Process Clause, 44
 - elements of, 42–43
 - as oral process, 49–50
 - in federal courts, 48–49
 - under Fourteenth Amendment, 44
 - goals and purposes of, 44–48, 51–52, 74–75
 - in group settings, 48, 55–57
 - impaneling of jury after, 61–62
 - judge–jury relationship and, 60–63, 138
 - judge as information source in, 60
 - judicial training for, 66–68
 - juror oath, 61–62
 - strategies for, 63
 - judge's role in, 41, 42–43, 45, 64
 - in federal courts, 50–51
 - Federal Judicial Center program, 66–67
 - for cause challenges and, 44–45
 - general remarks to jurors, 63–66
 - for juror bias, 49–50
 - juror impartiality influenced by, 57–58
 - personal bias as factor in, 52
 - through questions, 42–43, 57–61

INDEX

- voir dire* (cont.)
- jury box and, 52–55
 - jury observations from, 53–54
 - physical location of, 55
 - view of jury in, 54
 - jury tasks and, 64
 - lawyers' role in, 45–48
 - for cause challenges and, 44–45
 - for juror bias, 46–50
 - through questions, 45–46
 - number of jurors and, 41
 - peremptory challenges during, by lawyers, 2
 - petit jury, 41
 - purpose of, 41–42
 - questions as part of
 - by judges, 42–43, 57–61
 - by lawyers, 45–46
 - oral, 49–50, 55–57
 - revisions of, 63–66
 - reforms
 - badges for jurors, 69–74
 - robes for jurors, 69–74
 - training for judges, 66–68
 - under Seventh Amendment, 44
 - under Sixth Amendment, 44
 - socially desirable responses of jurors, 45–46, 48–49
 - traditional view of, 44–51
 - structural impediments to, 48–51
 - transformational view of, 41–42
 - United States v. Torres*, 42–43
 - written questionnaires, 49–50
- Whitehead, G. Marc, 36, 54, 130, 215, 230, 231, 232, 233, 237–38
- women, excluded from jury, after peremptory challenges, 93
- Wrightsmen, Lawrence S., 44, 82, 83, 139, 161, 192
- Zagel, James, 223
- Zeisel, Hans, 124, 156, 193, 200