#### ASPEN PUBLISHERS

## 2008 Cumulative Supplement JURY SELECTION

Third Edition

V. HALE STARR MARK McCORMICK



#### **ASPEN PUBLISHERS**

# JURY SELECTION Third Edition

#### V. Hale Starr

Ph.D. Communication Research, University of Iowa

#### Mark McCormick

Former Justice, Supreme Court of Iowa Member, Iowa Bar

### **2008 Cumulative Supplement**

With contributions from:
David Bright
Rob Conklin
Lara Dolnik
David Rifkind
Ryan Scully

Melissa Hill-Anderson



This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other professional assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought.

—From a Declaration of Principles jointly adopted by a Committee of the American Bar Association and a Committee of Publishers and Associations

© 2008 V. Hale Starr & Mark McCormick Aspen Publishers. All Rights Reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission to reproduce content should be directed to the Aspen Publishers website at www.aspenpublishers.com, or a letter of intent should be faxed to the permissions department at 212-771-0803.

Printed in the United States of America

1234567890

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Starr, V. Hale.

Jury selection / V. Hale Starr, Mark McCormick-3rd ed.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-0-7355-1572-7

ISBN 978-0-7355-7519-6 (supplement)

1. Jury selection-United States. I. McCormick, Mark. II. Title.

KF8979. S73 2000 347.73'752—dc21

00-063954

#### **About Wolters Kluwer Law & Business**

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business is a leading provider of research information and workflow solutions in key specialty areas. The strengths of the individual brands of Aspen Publishers, CCH, Kluwer Law International and Loislaw are aligned within Wolters Kluwer Law & Business to provide comprehensive, in-depth solutions and expertauthored content for the legal, professional and education markets.

CCH was founded in 1913 and has served more than four generations of business professionals and their clients. The CCH products in the Wolters Kluwer Law & Business group are highly regarded electronic and print resources for legal, securities, antitrust and trade regulation, government contracting, banking, pension, payroll, employment and labor, and healthcare reimbursement and compliance professionals.

Aspen Publishers is a leading information provider for attorneys, business professionals and law students. Written by preeminent authorities, Aspen products offer analytical and practical information in a range of specialty practice areas from securities law and intellectual property to mergers and acquisitions and pension/benefits. Aspen's trusted legal education resources provide professors and students with high-quality, up-to-date and effective resources for successful instruction and study in all areas of the law.

Kluwer Law International supplies the global business community with comprehensive English-language international legal information. Legal practitioners, corporate counsel and business executives around the world rely on the Kluwer Law International journals, loose-leafs, books and electronic products for authoritative information in many areas of international legal practice.

**Loislaw** is a premier provider of digitized legal content to small law firm practitioners of various specializations. Loislaw provides attorneys with the ability to quickly and efficiently find the necessary legal information they need, when and where they need it, by facilitating access to primary law as well as state-specific law, records, forms and treatises.

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, a unit of Wolters Kluwer, is headquartered in New York and Riverwoods, Illinois. Wolters Kluwer is a leading multinational publisher and information services company.

#### ASPEN PUBLISHERS SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE

This Aspen Publishers product is updated on a periodic basis with supplements to reflect important changes in the subject matter. If you purchased this product directly from Aspen Publishers, we have already recorded your subscription for the update service.

If, however, you purchased this product from a bookstore and wish to receive future updates and revised or related volumes billed separately with a 30-day examination review, please contact our Customer Service Department at 1-800-234-1660 or send your name, company name (if applicable), address, and the title of the product to:

ASPEN PUBLISHERS 7201 McKinney Circle Frederick, MD 21704

#### **Important Aspen Publishers Contact Information**

- To order any Aspen Publishers title, go to www.aspenpublishers .com or call 1-800-638-8437.
- To reinstate your manual update service, call 1-800-638-8437.
- To contact Customer Care, e-mail customer.care@ aspenpublishers.com, call 1-800-234-1660, fax 1-800-901-9075, or mail correspondence to Order Department, Aspen Publishers, PO Box 990, Frederick, MD 21705.
- To review your account history or pay an invoice online, visit www.aspenpublishers.com/payinvoices.



#### ABOUT THE AUTHORS

V. Hale Starr, Ph.D., a pioneer in the field of trial consulting, is founder and Senior Analyst of Starr Litigation Services, Inc. Her knowledge of the American juror has made her one of the most sought-after trial consultants in the nation. Dr. Starr has assisted in more than 3,000 trials in her career and is in great demand as a speaker and faculty member at workshops and seminars sponsored by national bar and faculty associations, law schools, and corporations.

Recognized as America's leading litigation research firm, Starr Litigation Services, Inc., applies social science research techniques in the study of trial strategy, witness credibility, juror persuasion, and juror understanding.

Mark McCormick (LL.B., Georgetown University; LL.M., University of Virginia) is an Iowa attorney who practices primarily in litigation. He served 14 years as a justice of the Supreme Court of Iowa. He previously served as both a district court judge and an assistant county attorney. He lectures frequently, has written several law review articles, has been on the National Judicial College faculty, and is currently chair of the Iowa State Bar Association Jury Instruction Committee.

#### About the Contributors to This Supplement

David A. Bright (M. Psychol. (Forensics), MAPS), has a master's degree in forensic psychology from the University of New South Wales (UNSW). He commenced a Ph.D. at the UNSW in 2000, investigating the influence of gruesome evidence on juror decision making. David has worked as a psychologist/forensic psychologist in a variety of settings, including mental health, police, corrections, and private practice. He is a member of the American Psychology and Law Society and is the NSW President of the Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law.

Rob Conklin is Director of Research for Starr Litigation Services. His duties include design, development, facilitation, and results preparation for Starr research studies, as well as research and writing for pertinent topics in litigation and communication. He has a bachelor's degree in English from Boston University, where he was a Trustee Scholar. His contributions include the research and writing behind Starr Litigation Service's review of generational differences in jurors. Mr. Conklin is a graduate of Boston University, where he was admitted as a Trustee's Scholar and participated in the Varied Lecture Series for that program. Before joining STARR, Mr. Conklin's research experience included work at the Human Gene Therapy Research Institute, performing viral gene therapy research and development for potential cancer treatments. Mr. Conklin currently conducts research design, data analysis, in-court consultation, and jury selection. He has written extensively on the topics of applying notions of heroic motive to large companies; employment law as seen through the eyes of juries; generational differences among jurors; and the emergence of Generation Y in the jury room.

Lara Dolnik has a first class honors degree in psychology as well as a law degree from the Australian National University. She has taught psychology and law—including research, design and statistics, social psychology, and developmental psychology at Sydney University and the University of New South Wales. She lectures in both Australia and the United States. Lara has published in the areas of trial strategy, social psychology, group processes, the psychology of the courtroom, and is an editor for the *International Journal of Forensic Psychology*.

David Rifkind received his J.D. from Columbia Law School, where he was a Harlan Fisk Stone Scholar and business editor of the *Columbia Business Law Review*. He clerked for the Honorable Mitchell H. Cohen in the Federal District Court for New Jersey, Camden Vicinage. Mr. Rifkind has an extensive background in litigation and negotiation, both as an associate at two major law firms—Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom and Morgan, Lewis and Bockius—and as an in-house attorney at two major corporations—General Electric and Exide Corporation.

Ryan Scully attended Villanova Law School and Fairfield University. He worked for General Electric Company's Corporate Environmental Programs from 2001 to 2004, where he was responsible for developing several technologically based programs for GE CEP, such as electronic litigation management and tracking tools. Melissa R. Hill-Anderson is a Research Analyst for Starr Litigation Services. She received her B.A. in political science from Iowa State University, where her studies focused on

foreign policy and international theory. She is a member of the Alpha Sigma Pi political science honor society. Ms. Hill-Anderson has extensive experience in survey design, data analysis, and report construction in legal and market research. Her duties at Starr include theme development analysis, questionnaire design, and data analysis.

#### Acknowledgments

Writing a book such as this is not possible without assistance. Much of the new information discussed in the third edition of Jury Selection and its supplements has been designed, tested, and revised by Starr Litigation Services, Inc., research assistants and analysts. Special thanks go to Heather Mertz, and Danielle Mitchell, who supplied research and content for many areas of this update.

## **JURY SELECTION**

## 2008 Cumulative Supplement

| Sections listed below appear only in the supplement and not in the main vol   | ите.             |
|---|------------------|
| About the Authors   | xvii             |
| PART I LEGAL ASPECTS OF JURY SELECTION  |                  |
| Chapter 1 THE RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY  | 3                |
| Post-Verdict Challenge re Juror Bias  | 4<br>4<br>4<br>7 |
| Chapter 2 STATUTES, RULES, AND CASE LAW ON JURY SELECTION   | 11               |
| CURRENT ISSUES AND DEVELOPMENTS IN JURY LAW   | 37               |
| § 3.11 Jury Competency  | 44               |
| <ul><li>[D] Impact of Publicity on Competency of the Jury</li><li>[E] Impact of Order of Verdicts: Does It Make</li></ul> | 52               |
| a Difference?   | 57               |
| [1] Order Effects Generally   | 57               |
| [2] Primacy and Recency Effects   | 58               |
| [3] Studying Order Effects  | 58               |
| Order Effects   | 58               |
| [i] The Need for Structure  | 59               |
| [ii] Fear of Invalidity   | 59               |

|         |                  | [iii] Need for Specific Conclusions                     | 60       |  |  |
|---------|------------------|---|----------|--|--|
|         |                  | [b] Order of Consideration Affects the                  |          |  |  |
|         |                  | Outcome of Meetings                                     | 60       |  |  |
|         |                  | [c] Order of Options in a Sequence and                  | 61       |  |  |
|         |                  | Comparisons[4] Courtroom Applications and Verdict Order | 61       |  |  |
|         |                  | [5] Practical Applications                              | 63       |  |  |
| § 3.11A | Inrv             | Consultants   | 65       |  |  |
| § 3.112 |                  | king with Trial Consultants: Protected from Discovery   | 66       |  |  |
| 3 3.12  | [A]              | Introduction  | 66       |  |  |
|         | [B]              | Attorney-Client Privilege                               | 66       |  |  |
|         | [C]              | Work Product Doctrine                                   | 67       |  |  |
| Chapter | r 3A             |   |          |  |  |
|         |                  | ONYMITY   | 73       |  |  |
| § 3A.01 | Intro            | duction   | 75       |  |  |
|         | [A]              | Background Basics on Anonymous Juries                   | 75       |  |  |
|         | [B]              | Reasons for and Against the Use of                      |          |  |  |
|         |                  | Anonymous Juries  | 77       |  |  |
|         | [C]              | Overview of Empirical Research on Juror                 |          |  |  |
|         | _                | Decision Making   | 79       |  |  |
| § 3A.02 |                  | itional Models of De-Individuation                      | 79       |  |  |
|         | [A]              | Research on Traditional Models of De-Individuation      | 80       |  |  |
|         |                  | [1] Obedience to Authority                              | 80<br>82 |  |  |
|         | [B]              | Critiques and Follow-Up Experiments                     | 83       |  |  |
|         | [C]              | Inconsistent Evidence                                   | 84       |  |  |
|         | [D]              | Applying the Research in a Courtroom Context            | 85       |  |  |
|         | [E]              | Implications from Traditional                           | 0.5      |  |  |
|         | رسا              | De-Individuation Research                               | 87       |  |  |
| § 3A.03 | Socia            | al Identity Models (SIDE) and Evidence of               | 0,1      |  |  |
| 3       | De-Individuation |   |          |  |  |
|         | [A]              | SIDE Explanations for Milgram Replications              | 89       |  |  |
|         | [B]              | SIDE Explanation for the Stanford                       |          |  |  |
|         |                  | Prison Experiment                                       | 90       |  |  |
|         | [C]              | SIDE Explanation for the Halloween Experiment           | 90       |  |  |
|         | [D]              | Additional Empirical Support for the SIDE Model         | 91       |  |  |
|         | [E]              | What Does This Mean in a Courtroom Context?             | 91       |  |  |
|         |                  | [1] Juror Expectations                                  | 92       |  |  |
|         |                  | [2] Death-qualified Panels and Priming—A Specific       |          |  |  |
|         |                  | Concern   | 95       |  |  |
| 80101   | [F]              | Implications from the SIDE Model and Research           | 96       |  |  |

| Chapter  |  | CT OF TECHNOLOGY ON JURY                                       |            |  |
|----------|--|--|------------|--|
|          |  | N  | 99         |  |
| § 3B.01  | Introduction                                   |  |            |  |
| § 3B.02  |  | of Technology in Juror Selection                               | 101<br>102 |  |
| 3 22.02  | [A]  | "Mocking" and "Googling"                                       | 102        |  |
|          | []   | [1] Mock Exercises   | 103        |  |
|          |  | [2] "Googling" and Other Internet Juror Research               | 103        |  |
|          |  | [3] Other Technological Aspects to                             |            |  |
|          |  | Juror Selection  | 104        |  |
|          | [B]  | Using Technology in the Courtroom—Potential Pitfalls           | 105        |  |
|          | [C]  | Cognitive Learning   | 106        |  |
|          | [D]  | Visual Problems in the United States                           | 112        |  |
|          |  | [1] Nearsightedness (Myopia)                                   | 113        |  |
|          |  | [2] Farsightedness (Hyperopia)                                 | 113        |  |
|          |  | [3] Loss of Lens Flexibility (Presbyopia)                      | 114        |  |
|          |  | [4] Color-Blindness (Monochromacy, Dichromacy,                 |            |  |
|          |  | and Anomalous Trichromacy)                                     | 115        |  |
|          |  | [5] Monochromacy   | 116        |  |
|          |  | [6] Dichromacy and Anomalous Trichromacy                       | 116        |  |
|          | [E]  | Hearing Impairment   | 117        |  |
|          | [F]  | Orientation: Paper Versus Video                                | 118        |  |
|          | [G]  | Preliminary Jury Instructions on Use of                        | 110        |  |
|          | m  | Technology   | 118        |  |
|          | [H]  | Presentation Devices in the Courtroom                          | 119        |  |
|          | [I]  | The Electronic Courtroom and the Computerization of            | 100        |  |
| \$ 2D 02 | Turor  | Court Clerks   | 122<br>127 |  |
| § 3B.03  | [A]  | Use and Abuse of Technology  Juror Use of Extraneous Materials | 129        |  |
|          | [B]  | The Possible Future  | 133        |  |
|          | [D]  | The Possible Putate  | 133        |  |
| PART     | П  | PRE-TRIAL PREPARATION  |            |  |
| Chapte   | r 4  |  |            |  |
| -        |  | OF VENUE   | 137        |  |
| Chapte   | r 5  |  |            |  |
|          |  | S STUDY AND COMMUNITY  |            |  |
|          |  | ASSESSMENT   | 139        |  |
| § 5.0    | § 5.0 The Research Plan for Complex Litigation |  |            |  |
| § 5.0A   | Why a Written Study? 14                        |  |            |  |

| § 5.0B      | The Theme Development Study                       | 142  |
|-------------|---|------|
| 30.02       | [A] Goals and Timing                              | 142  |
|             | [B] Determining the Research Questions            | 143  |
|             | [C] Competing Case Theories                       | 143  |
|             | [D] Data Analysis                                 | 144  |
|             | [E] Research Method                               | 144  |
|             | [F] Design Plan                                   | 145  |
|             | [G] Conducting the Study                          | 146  |
|             | [H] Design Schedule for a Theme Development Study | 146  |
|             | [I] Results                                       | 147  |
| § 5.13      | Total Control Control                             | 152  |
| 8 3.13      | The Focus Group                                   | 155  |
|             |   | 155  |
|             | [B] Criticisms of the Focus Group                 |      |
|             | [C] The Voir Dire Exercise                        | 158  |
|             | [D] Strategic Consulting                          | 159  |
|             | [1] Staffing                                      | 159  |
|             | [2] Voir Dire Design                              | 160  |
|             | [3] SJQ Analysis and Juror Ratings                | 160  |
| 0.7.11      | [4] Trial Tracking                                | 161  |
| § 5.14      | New Trend in Consulting: Internet Focus Groups    | 162  |
|             | [A] Introduction                                  | 162  |
|             | [B] Methodology                                   | 163  |
|             | [C] Advantages and Criticisms                     | 163  |
|             |   |      |
| Chapte      | r 6   |      |
| <b>DEMO</b> | GRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF                               |      |
| THE J       | URY PANEL   | 167  |
|             |   | 1.77 |
| § 6.05      | The Juror Profile: How to Build, How to Use       | 167  |
|             | [A] Introduction                                  | 167  |
|             | [B] What to Look for, What to Find                | 168  |
|             | [C] Other Elements                                | 169  |
|             | [D] Developing the Profile                        | 170  |
|             | [1] Statistical Juror Analysis                    | 170  |
|             | [2] Subjective Comparison of Past Profiling       | 171  |
|             | [3] Experiential Profiling                        | 172  |
|             |   |      |
| Chapte      |   |      |
| TRIAL       | SIMULATIONS, SUMMARY TRIAL,                       |      |
|             | S GROUPS, AND OTHER AIDS                          | 173  |
| § 7.06      | The Summary Trial                                 | 173  |

|                    | HADOW JURY VERSUS                                  | 177 |
|--------------------|--|-----|
| THE M              | IONITORING JURY                                    | 177 |
| § 7A.01            | Defining Shadow Juries and Monitoring Juries       | 179 |
| § 7A.02            | The Procedure                                      | 180 |
| § 7A.03            | Problems of Using a Shadow Jury                    | 182 |
|                    | [A] Problem with "Matching"                        | 182 |
|                    | [B] Observability                                  | 183 |
|                    | Overcome by Monitoring Juries                      | 184 |
|                    | [D] Power  | 186 |
|                    | [E] Cost   | 186 |
| § 7A.04            | Conclusion   | 187 |
|                    | r 7B RIAL PUBLICITY: CHALLENGES URY SELECTION      | 189 |
|                    | Introduction                                       | 191 |
| § 7B.01<br>§ 7B.02 | Research on Pre-Trial Publicity                    |     |
| § 7B.02            | Possible Remedies                                  | 194 |
| 8 / 10.05          | [A] Change of Venue                                |     |
|                    | [B] Judicial Admonitions                           |     |
|                    | [C] Empirical Research on Voir Dire as a Mechanism | 1,0 |
|                    | to Counter Pre-Trial Publicity                     | 196 |
|                    | [1] The Impact of the Information-Gathering        |     |
|                    | Component of Voir Dire on                          |     |
|                    | the Effects of Pre-Trial Publicity                 | 196 |
|                    | [2] The Impact of the Educational Component        |     |
|                    | of Voir Dire on the Effects of                     |     |
|                    | Pre-Trial Publicity                                | 199 |
|                    | [3] Hurdles That Voir Dire Needs to Overcome       |     |
| § 7B.04            | Conclusion   | 202 |
| PART               |  |     |
| Chapte<br>INTRO    | DDUCTION TO VOIR DIRE                              | 207 |
| § 8.01A            | Major Criticisms of Voir Dire                      | 208 |
| § 8.02             | Purpose of Voir Dire                               |     |
|                    | [A] Discovering Juror Attitudes and Background     |     |
|                    | [1] Generational Differences in Jurors             |     |

|                |        | [a]<br>[b] | Introduction                                  | 215<br>217 |
|----------------|--------|------------|---|------------|
|                |        | [c]        | Generation X                                  | 236        |
|                | -      | [d]        | Generation Y                                  | 248        |
| § 8.07         | Explor | ing for Ju | uror-Accepted Motives                         | 260        |
| Chapte<br>MECH |        | S OF V     | OIR DIRE                                      | 267        |
| Chapte         | r 10   |            |   |            |
|                |        | TECH       | NIQUES  | 269        |
|                |        |            |   | 260        |
| § 10.01        |        | -          | Voir Dire                                     | 269        |
|                | [D]    |            | g Topics and Issues that Should be            | 260        |
|                | 1721   |            | in Voir Dire                                  | 269        |
|                | [E]    |            | Juror Attitudes                               | 269        |
|                | [F]    |            | Compendium                                    | 271        |
|                |        | [1]        | Accents                                       | 271        |
|                |        | [1A]       | Attorneys                                     | 272<br>273 |
|                |        | [2]        | Big Business                                  |            |
|                |        | [3]        | Business Misconduct                           | 273        |
|                |        | [3A]       | Celebrity Cases                               | 274        |
|                |        | [4]        | Child Abuse                                   | 276        |
|                |        | [5]        | Child Molaston                                | 277        |
|                |        | [5A]       | Child Molesters                               | 280        |
|                |        | [6]        | Church and Jury Duty: Religious Conscientious | 201        |
|                |        | [7]        | Objector                                      | 281        |
|                |        | [7]        | Computer Use                                  | 282        |
|                |        | [8]        | Conspiracy                                    | 285        |
|                |        | [9]        | Corporate CEOs                                | 286        |
|                |        | [10]       | Corporate Employees                           | 286        |
|                |        | [11]       | Corporate Executives                          | 287        |
|                |        | [12]       | Corporate Records                             | 288        |
|                |        | [13]       | Corporate Self-Regulation                     | 288        |
|                |        | [14]       | Corporations                                  | 289        |
|                |        | [15]       | Crime   | 289        |
|                |        | [15A]      | Death Penalty                                 | 291        |
|                |        | [16]       | Divorce                                       | 292        |
|                |        | [17]       | Doctors                                       | 293        |
|                |        | [17A]      | Electronic Devices (Cellular Phones)          | 294        |
|                |        | [18]       | Environment                                   | 295        |
|                |        | 1 1 × /\ 1 | BYDER LECTIMONY                               | 7110       |

|            | [19]   | Fair Treatment                         | 298 |
|------------|--------|--|-----|
|            | [20]   | Financial Loss                         | 298 |
|            | [21]   | Fully Informed Jury Association (FIJA) | 299 |
|            | [22]   | Gender Differences                     | 300 |
|            | [22A]  | Global Warming                         | 301 |
|            | [23]   | Guns                                   | 304 |
|            | [24]   | Health Care                            | 307 |
|            | [24A]  | AIDS/HIV                               | 308 |
|            | [24B]  | Homosexuality                          | 309 |
|            | [24C]  | Immigration                            | 310 |
|            | [25]   | Jury Nullification                     | 311 |
|            | [26]   | Jury Verdicts                          | 311 |
|            | [26A]  | Kidnapped Children                     | 312 |
|            | [27]   | Lawsuits                               | 312 |
|            | [27A]  | Legalization of Marijuana              | 313 |
|            | [27B]  | Marriage                               | 314 |
|            | [27C]  | Medical Malpractice Damages            | 315 |
|            | [28]   | Morality                               | 315 |
|            | [28A]  | Movie Theater Attendance               | 316 |
|            | [28B]  | Natural Disasters                      | 316 |
|            | [28C]  | Paranormal Beliefs                     | 318 |
|            | [28D]  | Personal Electronics                   | 319 |
|            | [29]   | Plaintiffs                             | 320 |
|            | [30]   | Professional Honesty and Ethics        | 320 |
|            | [31]   | Punitive Damages                       | 322 |
|            | [31A]  | Rape                                   | 322 |
|            | [32]   | Religion                               | 322 |
|            | [32A]  | Restaurant Dining                      | 326 |
|            | [33]   | Sexual Abuse                           | 327 |
|            | [33A]  | Singles                                | 329 |
|            | [33B]  | Sports                                 | 329 |
|            | [33C]  | State of the Nation                    | 330 |
|            | [33D]  | Stress                                 | 330 |
|            | [34]   | Terrorism                              | 331 |
|            | [35]   | Terrorism and Civil Liberties          | 332 |
|            | [35A]  | Traditional Values                     | 335 |
|            | [35B]  | Trust in People                        | 335 |
|            | [35C]  | What We Can't Do Without               | 336 |
|            | [36]   | Work Abuse                             | 336 |
|            | [37]   | Workers vs. Managers                   | 337 |
| § 10.04 [F | Note T | aking/Juror Questions                  | 337 |

| DIRE: U                     | ATING STORY MODELING INTO VOIR ISING JURORS' BELIEF SYSTEMS               | 220        |
|-----------------------------|---|------------|
| IO THE                      | BEST ADVANTAGE  | 339        |
| § 10A.01                    | Introduction  | 341        |
| § 10A.02                    | The Story Model   | 342        |
|                             | [A] Story Construction  | 343        |
|                             | [1] Deciding Between Stories  | 345        |
|                             | [a] Coverage  | 346        |
|                             | [b] Coherence   | 347        |
|                             | [c] Uniqueness  | 349        |
|                             | [B] Learning Verdict Definitions  | 350        |
| alama wa                    | [C] Making a Decision   | 351        |
| § 10A.03                    | Connecting the Story Model and Voir Dire                                  | 351        |
| § 10A.04                    | Addressing Problems in Story Creation                                     | 352        |
| § 10A.05                    | General Voir Dire Tactics to Improve Story Creation                       | 355<br>356 |
| § 10A.06                    | Conclusion  | 330        |
| Chapter<br>SUPPLI<br>PART I | EMENTAL JUROR QUESTIONNAIRES  | 359        |
|                             | 16A<br>R AND NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION:<br>ASING THE SPECTRUM OF PERSUASION | 363        |
| § 16A.01                    | Introduction  | 365        |
| § 16A.02                    | Basics of the Psychology of Color   | 365        |
|                             | [A] Color and Persuasion  | 366        |
|                             | [B] Historical Perspective  | 366        |
|                             | [C] From Mysticism to Empiricism—Extraneous                               |            |
|                             | Variables   | 367        |
|                             | [1] Individual Differences  | 368        |
|                             | [2] Color, Culture, and Geography   | 369        |
| 8 1 C A D2                  | [3] Temporal Differences  | 370<br>371 |
| § 16A.03                    | Experimental Insight  |            |
|                             | [A] Color and Mood or Emotion   | 374        |
|                             | [C] Color and Personality: Messages Jurors Send                           | 375        |