

QUANTIFYING PARTICIPATION WHILE EXAMINING SITUATIONAL  
AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES IN A JURY DELIBERATION

Richard C. Casteel

A Thesis Submitted to the  
University of North Carolina Wilmington in Partial Fulfillment  
Of The Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

University of North Carolina Wilmington

2006

Approved by

Advisory Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Bryan Myers

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. James Johnson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Len Lecci  
Chair

Accepted by

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean, Graduate School

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES .....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Majority and Minority Influence on Group Decision Making.....	3
Faction and Informational Influence .....	4
Willingness to Influence .....	8
Social Loafing .....	8
State/Trait Differences.....	10
Personality Traits.....	10
Extraversion .....	12
Conscientiousness.....	13
Methodological Separation of Extraversion and Conscientiousness.....	13
Bias .....	14
Assessing Juror Bias.....	15
PJAQ.....	16
Certainty of Decision.....	17
Research Hypothesis.....	18
STUDY 1 .....	19
METHODS .....	19
Participants.....	19

Measures .....	19
Materials .....	19
Procedure .....	20
RESULTS .....	20
DISCUSSION .....	21
STUDY 2 .....	22
METHODS .....	22
Participants.....	22
Measures .....	23
Materials .....	25
Verdict confidence manipulation .....	28
Participation measure .....	28
Procedure .....	29
Computer-mediated deliberations .....	30
RESULTS .....	31
Demographics .....	31
Verdict confidence manipulation .....	31
Moderate certainty condition .....	32
Polarization .....	33
Participation rates .....	33
Examining part. as a function of bias, condition, and conscientiousness.....	34
Exploring extraversion.....	38
Exit survey .....	38

Exit Survey, Participation Rates, and Personality.....	42
DISCUSSION .....	51
Examining part. as a function of certainty, conscientiousness, and bias.....	51
Participation rates .....	54
Bias and the interpretation of evidence .....	59
Valid mock juror scenario.....	59
Exit survey .....	63
Willingness to influence .....	65
Exploring extraversion.....	66
Limitations .....	67
CONCLUSIONS.....	69
LITERATURE CITED.....	70
APPENDIX.....	79

## ABSTRACT

The current research quantified individual participation in a jury deliberation in an attempt to predict rates of involvement as a function of situational and personality characteristics. Measured level of juror bias and conscientiousness resulted in accurate predictions for rates of participation. Furthermore, the study supports previous juror research. The methodology for quantifying and controlling factors in a deliberation are highlighted. Implications for a willingness to influence are discussed as well.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Len Lecci for his direction and suggestions during the creation, execution, and interpretation of this thesis project. I would also like to thank all the members of his lab who worked on the project. I would like to thank my committee for their suggestions to improve the project.

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total number of posts and number of words per post for the simulated jurors and the corresponding averages for all of the participants.....	35
2. Mean ratings (out of 7) for each of the exit survey questions and subscales with significant differences between the subscales.....	40
3. Pearson correlation between mean participant ratings and dependent measures of participation.....	43
4. Pearson correlation between mean participant ratings and dependent measures of participation.....	44
5. Pearson correlation between mean participant ratings and dependent measures of participation.....	45
6. Pearson correlation between participant ratings and dependent measures of participation.....	46
7. Pearson correlations between participant ratings and independent measures.....	47
8. Pearson correlations between participant ratings and independent measures.....	48
9. Pearson correlations between participant ratings and independent measures.....	49
10. Pearson correlations between participant ratings and independent measures.....	50

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Average words per post as standardized conscientiousness and bias vary in the moderate and high certainty conditions.....	37