Spring 5-1-2018

Examining the Potential of the "CSI Effect" to Create False Expectations in Jurors in Regard to Expert Testimony

Sarah Stewart

Examining the Potential of the "*CSI* Effect" to Create False Expectations in Jurors in Regard to Expert Testimony

A Capstone Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Renée Crown University Honors Program at
Syracuse University

Sarah Stewart

Candidate for Bachelor of Science in Forensic Science and Psychology
and Renée Crown University Honors
Spring 2018

Honors Capstone Project in Forensic Science

Capstone Project Advisor: _____
Michael B. Sponsler,
Professor of Chemistry, Syracuse University
Director of Curriculum for Forensic and
National Security Sciences Institute

Capstone Project Reader: _____
Jonathan Adelman
Research Assistant Professor

Honors Director: _____
Chris Johnson, Interim Director

Abstract

The "*CSI* Effect" has been generally defined as the effect that watching forensic shows, such as the wildly popular, 15-season long television show *CSI*, has on the general public's perception of forensic evidence presented at criminal trials. A major concern expert witnesses have is that the existence of the "*CSI* Effect" can affect the outcomes of the trials, over the strength of the case itself. Whether or not the defendant is guilty should not rest on how well the forensic evidence presented lived up to the jury's expectations, and as such, the potential existence of this effect has been a source of major concern for those in the Forensic field. However, research studies have yet to yield results that lend weight to the existence of the "*CSI* Effect". It's important to note that these studies are primarily published in law journals, and reflect lawyers' views of how the existence of the "*CSI* Effect" may be affecting their ability to "win" their respective cases. This study takes different approach; instead of polling general groups, perceptions of forensic evidence that 18-24 year olds hold are compared to the perceptions of those 50 and older. The results are mixed. Those 50 and older watch more television in terms of hours per week than do those 18-24, yet those 50 and older have less of an idea of that value a type of evidence may hold. Those 18-24 are more likely to base the value of forensic evidence on the case type. One conclusion can be reached – the factors affecting potential jurors' perception of evidence are not as straightforward as watching too many crime shows.

Executive Summary

The "*CSI* Effect" is the concern that the attention that crime television programs, such as *CSI*, to forensic evidence has caused juries to impractically expect definitive DNA and other trace evidence at every criminal trial (Cohan, 2008). According to Mann (2008), the realism present in current crime shows has molded the public's impression of criminal investigations. This has caused major concern within the forensics community, as they fear that those who watch "*CSI*" and related television shows have absorbed a distorted reality of forensic science - distorted in the sense that jurors now expect evidence at a level that cannot be provided, tests that cannot logically be run, and cases that mimic what they see on TV. Television is one of the most influential mediums due to its continuous projecting of real-life images.

A major concern about these higher expectations is the concern that when these expectations are not met, jurors will then allow the defendant to be found not guilty specifically based on the alignment with what is seen on TV, instead of allowing the evidence to speak for itself. If the "*CSI* Effect" does exist, then it needs to be acknowledged, and potentially prevented in some way. From Mann (2008), "Prosecutors who bear surprising negative verdicts, credit the primetime success of *CSI* with causing jurors to have heightened expectations of what they will see when they enter a courtroom.

The belief in the existence of the "*CSI* Effect" is a strongly held one in the forensics community – but at the moment its' existence is not backed by any data. Many studies have been run, but they find little to no difference in the jury's decision in the presented hypothetical cases. In this paper, we will not evaluate how the forensic evidence may change the decision a jury comes to, but instead examine how different categories of evidence are regarded in terms of significance in different types of criminal cases. Data from two ends of demographic age groups

was collected and compared: the perceptions of forensic evidence of 18-24 year olds who watch an average of 2-5 hours of television per week, against the perceptions of forensic evidence from respondents 50 or older who watch an average of 10 or more hours per week of television.

These groups were then provided hypothetical situations in which they were asked how they would find the defendant (guilty or not guilty) based on the specific forensic evidence provided. The results found that those 50 and older tended to be more unsure of the weight of the evidence provided than those 18-24 years old were. However, the indecisions seemed to be situationally based. The group of respondents 50 and older tended to have a majority response of "I would probably find the defendant guilty" when asked questions about biological evidence. The group of respondents 18-24 years old has this same lean in regards to biological evidence. Both groups had one specific exception to this – when biological evidence was the forensic evidence presented in a rape or sexual assault case. The majority of those 18-24 then became more sure of the guilt of the defendant – moving past "probably" to "I would find the defendant guilty". 22 respondents in this age group (68.75%) answered that with this pairing of case type and forensic evidence they would find the defendant guilty. This was the only time the majority was definite in guilt or lack thereof of the defendant. Those 50 and older maintained the majority response of "I would probably find the defendant guilty" that they had in other questions in regards to biological evidence. 21 of the respondents in this age group (63.63%) would probably find the defendant guilty, a percentage similar to the response breakdown in other case types with biological evidence as the presented evidence.

This change in the 18-24 year old's perception of biological evidence when it is brought up in a rape or criminal sexual conduct case provides an opening to a different conclusion – that even if the "*CSI* Effect" exists and affects jurors' interpretations of expert testimony, it might not

be the only thing having an effect on it. Future studies should be field tests, not lab tests as previous studies have been. Lab tests remove variables that could have just as much of an effect upon jurors' perceptions of expert testimony such as the vocabulary used by the witness in regards to reliability, the appearance of the defendant, and the presentation of the two sides of the case at hand by the lawyers involved.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary ..... **v**

Acknowledgements ..... **ix**

Introduction **1**
The "CSI Effect" *1*

Background **2**
Juries *2*
Expert Witnesses *3*
Frye vs. Daubert Standards *5*

Method **6**
Participants *6*
Stimulus Materials and Procedure *6*
Section Two: Television Watching Habits *7*
Section Three: Jury Service *8*
Section Four: Evidence Expectations *9*
Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations *12*

Results **14**
Section One: Demographics *14*
Table 1. Demographic Data from Respondents 18-24 14
Table 2. Demographic Data from Respondents 50 and older 15
Section Two: Television Watching Habits *15*
Table 3. Television Habits of Respondents 18-24 16
Table 4. Television Habits of Respondents 50 and older 17
Section Three: Jury Service *18*
Table 5. Jury Service 18
Section Four: Evidence Expectations *18*
Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations *18*

Discussion **19**
Section One: Demographics *19*
Section Two: Television Habits *19*
Section Three: Jury Service *20*
Section Four: Evidence Expectations *21*
Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations *21*

Works Cited **25**

Survey Data and Questions ..... **a**
Section One: Demographics ..... *a*
Section Two: Television Watching Habits ..... *a*
Section Three: Jury Service ..... *a*
Section Four: Evidence Expectations ..... *b*
Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations ..... *e*

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Sponsler, my Capstone Advisor, Professor Adelman, my Reader, and Karen Hall, my Capstone Coordinator for the support and comments they have provided through this process. I would also like to thank the professors here at SU who have taught me over the last four years. It has been a long and hard process but I wouldn't trade it for anything.

Introduction

The "CSI Effect"

"Since 2002, popular media has been disseminating serious concerns that the integrity of the criminal trial is being compromised by the effects of television drama...Specifically, it was widely alleged that *CSI*, one of the most widely watched programs on television, was affecting jury deliberations and outcomes." (Cole & Dioso-Villa, 2008)

"Whether the '*CSI* Effect' helps the prosecution or the defense, the commentators seem to agree on only one thing: that CSI is convincing the public that forensic science not only is science, but it is super science." (Schweitzer & Saks, 2007)

"Many are convinced that in this modern age of forensic science, the '*CSI* Effect'...gives jurors heightened and unrealistic expectations of how conclusively forensic evidence can determine a defendant's innocence or guilt." (Mann, 2005)

"...many legal practitioners, especially prosecutors, believe that those jurors who are frequently exposed to forensic programs will be more likely to acquit guilty defendants when such scientific evidence is not available..." (Kim et al, 2009)

The field of forensic science is broad and varied, with sub-disciplines ranging from core fields such as forensic chemistry, DNA analysis, firearm and tool mark analysis, toxicology, latent print analysis, forensic pathology, and digital forensics to more esoteric areas such as forensic psychology, forensic anthropology, and forensic botany. In spite of this diversity, there is a shared concern about the "*CSI* Effect", a phenomenon whose potential existence is of great concern to those involved in the legal system. According to Mann (2005), "Prosecutors argue the phenomenon causes juries to require a higher standard of evidence to convict; defense attorneys

claim is makes juries more likely to convict based on forensic evidence alone…".

Essentially, the guiding force behind this idea is that with the popularity of the original "*CSI*" show that debuted in 2000, and the ensuing spinoffs and new waves of crime shows every season, laypeople – and by extension jurors - are attuned to the amount of forensic evidence presented in each case shown in *CSI* and related shows, and thus expect the same degree of evidence when serving as a juror on a real-life case (Smith et al., 2011). Mann (2005) determined that eyewitness evidence was predominant in public perceptions of guilt and innocence. Per Mann, a news outlet cited the lack of forensic evidence in the Central Park jogger case of the 1990's to be one of the defense's strongest points of argument. While the *CSI* Effect is broadly accepted, research attempting to quantify it's impact has not found a strong effect. A study done by Shelton et al. in 2006 found that a significant portion of their sample, regardless of television habits, had high expectations that the prosecutor would present at least one example of forensic evidence in every criminal case. The lack of scientific backing has not stopped the "*CSI* Effect" from being discussed in legal circles though, and in *State v. Cooke,* the Supreme Court of Delaware actually explored the applicability and influence of this effect. Though the Court could not find scientific evidence to support the "*CSI* Effect", it was also unable to hide the Court's experience of heightened expectations in juries of forensic evidence (Smith et al., 2011).

Background

Juries

Juries are an integral piece of the American legal system. The United States legal system features three types of juries:

1. Criminal Grand Juries
2. Criminal Petit Juries

3. Civil Juries

Article III of the US Constitution is the first major US government document to mention trial by jury, specifically that "The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the state where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any state; the trial shall be at such place or places the Congress may by law have dictated." This policy was further ameliorated by the Sixth Amendment which states that "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed", and the Seventh Amendment which guaranteed a jury trial in civil cases.

Criminal grand juries determine whether or not there is enough available evidence (i.e., a strong enough probable cause) that a person has committed a crime. If the grand jury decides that there is not enough evidence to pursue prosecution, the case does not go to trial. Grand juries have anywhere between 16 and 23 members, and the proceedings are not open to the public. Additionally, the defendant is not allowed to appear before the grand jury.

Criminal petit juries, or trial juries, decide whether or not a defendant is guilty of violating the law in a specific instance. They are composed of 6 to 12 of the defendant's peers, and they deliberate in private. This is the type of jury that will be focused on for the remainder of this paper.

Expert Witnesses

An expert witness is defined as a person whose "…opinion by virtue of education, training, certification, skills, or experience is accepted by the judge as an expert." (Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 702). These witnesses are allowed to testify and present opinions in a court of law if:

1. The expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue.
2. The testimony is based on sufficient facts or data.
3. The testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods.
4. The expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

Expert witnesses can be called forth to testify in the courtroom by either the defense or the prosecution, and their testimony can be rebutted by other experts. Professor Samuel Gross posits that the use of expert testimony is an "essential paradox" in cases, as experts are called to testify about material beyond common understanding, but their testimony is judged by those without this expert understanding.

Three kinds of expert witnesses appear in criminal cases:

1. Testifying Experts
2. Educating Witnesses
3. Reporting Witnesses

Testifying experts are experts who testify based on their knowledge to assist the trier of fact. Educating witnesses teach the jury about the underlying scientific theory and instrument implementing theory. Their job is to provide their opinion on the validity of a theory and reliability of the instruments used. Reporting witnesses are persons who conducted the test in question. The witness describes the test and the results, and will provide their opinion on whether the test procedures were used and if the equipment was in working order.

Expert witnesses would present all forensic evidence that has been ruled admissible for each trial in question. Due to the rule against hearsay, only the person who ran the test on the evidence in question can testify over said piece of evidence. When the Expert Witness is being

questioned by the prosecution and the defense, one of the first questions that they will be asked is the exact procedure used in the test that was run. Both sides will need to know about all of the safety procedures in place as well as the reliability of the test.

Frye vs. Daubert Standards

It is also important to know how the pieces of forensic evidence are considered to be admissible in court. Before forensic evidence can be judged by a jury, it must be approved for admission by the judge for the specific case. This is done by following one of two standards;

1. Frye Standard
2. Daubert Standard

The Frye standard comes from the 1923 case *Frye vs. United States*. In this case, the court held that expert testimony must be based on scientific methods that are sufficiently established and accepted. In a court that uses the Frye Standard, any scientific evidence that the prosecution or the defense would like to have presented to the court during the trial must be "generally accepted" by a "meaningful segment" of the relevant scientific community. California, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington still follow the Frye Standard at present time (Kaufman, 2016).

In the remaining states, the Frye Standard has been superseded by the Daubert Standard in an effort to resolve the questions raised by the Frye Standard's vague phrasings. The Daubert Standard is essentially the Frye Standard with further specifications. First and foremost, the judge is the "gatekeeper". The trial judge is the only person with the power to determine whether or not the scientific expert testimony stems from scientific knowledge (as opposed to pseudoscientific). The trial judge must also determine if the expert testimony is relevant to the "task at hand" – the case. They must also find it "more likely than not" that the experts methods

are reliable and properly applied to the facts at hand. It also must be proven that conclusions are the product of sound methodology. To determine if the methodology is sound, it must be determined if the theory or technique employed by the expert to reach their conclusion is generally accepted by the scientific community, if the methods have been subjected to peer review and publication, if the methods could be tested, if the rate of error is "acceptable", and if the research conducted by the witness was conducted with an intention to provide the proposed testimony, or if it was conducted independently of the relevant litigation.

Method

In order to explore jurors' perceptions of evidence, a survey based on Corinna Kruse's 2010 survey was used to obtain a convenience sample of data. Kruse is a senior lecturer at Linköping University, whose research focuses on knowledge within the empirical fields of genetic research, forensics, and crime scene technicians' training, per her faculty biography.

Participants

A total of 127 people filled out the electronic survey. A convenience sample was obtained by sharing the link to the survey on four different Facebook pages. The participants were not compensated in any fashion for their time spent on the survey. Of the 127 participants, the data of 5 participants were removed due to the lack of completion of the survey beyond the demographic section, meaning their responses yielded no relevant information. The data of another 14 respondents were removed due to the respondents' ages falling outside the required demographic ranges of 18-24 and 50+.

Stimulus Materials and Procedure

There were five parts to this survey: Demographics, Television Habits, Jury Service, Evidence Expectations, and Hypothetical Jury Scenarios. All questions on the survey were

mandatory, and the respondent was prevented from moving to the next section if they had not completed all questions in the current section. The respondents could choose to end the survey early by simply closing the window. Potential respondents and respondents were given as little detail as possible about the specific subject matter of the research, and what sort of information the survey was looking for, to help ensure that the respondent answered questions truthfully based on knowledge about forensics and trials that they themselves knew, without any added bias, or the urge to get more information on potentially relevant topics prior to completing the survey. Participants were only told that the survey was for student capstone research, and that it would take them approximately 15 minutes.

Section Two: Television Watching Habits

Crime shows were roughly divided into five categories:

1. Documentary Style
2. Forensic Oriented
3. Drama
4. Reality
5. Law Process Oriented

Documentary style shows are shows that took a more natural, documentary approach to the story. While the information and actions may be edited to add Drama and therefore ensure viewership, the root of the show is non-fiction. Some examples would be Making a Murder and Killing Fields.

Forensic oriented shows are shows cited at the root of the "*CSI* Effect". Shows that may demonstrate real evidence collection methods and analysis methods, but at their root do not have

the budget constraints of an actual lab, and thus can solve their mysteries in 50 minutes or less. Insights into the personal lives of characters are present, but on average make up 25% or less of each episode's run time. An example would be "*CSI*" and its' spinoffs, but shows like *NCIS* or *Dexter* could also be included in this category. According to the Nielson Company, *CSI* was consistently among the top ten shows in any given week, and per BBC news, *CSI: Miami* was rated the most popular television show in the world in 2005.

Shows in the "Drama" category are shows that do involve a crime in every episode, but the characters personal lives are closer to 50% of an episode's run time. Examples would be *Mysteries of Laura* and *Rizzoli & Isles*.

The difference between reality and documentary is the intent behind it. Documentary shows are produced with the intent to educate, and often have an underlying call to action. Think of *Making a Murderer* – it highlighted the issues with the trial that had already taken place, and many people began calling for an appeal of Stephen Avery. "Reality" shows, such as *Dr. G: Medical Examiner* or *Snapped* don't have the same call to action. Their appeal is more of that of simple entertainment.

The "Law Process Oriented" shows portray the solving of a crime within the episode and focus primarily on the courtroom aspects of solving a crime (the prosecution, the defense, testifying, etc - aspects not as prevalent in other categories of crime TV shows. Examples of these shows would be *Law & Order* and its spinoffs, as well as *Perry Mason*.

Section Three: Jury Service

The aim of Section Three of the survey was to gather data on respondents' history of jury service, and examine if they felt that the forensic evidence presented in the trials they served on met or did not meet their expectations.

Section Four: Evidence Expectations

This section was designed to elicit what the respondents felt was an "average" expectation of evidence presented in several broad categories of criminal cases. These same categories were also presented in Section Five.

1. Murder or Attempted Murder
2. Physical Assault (of any kind)
3. Rape or Criminal Sexual Conduct
4. Breaking and Entering
5. Theft
6. Crime Involving a Gun

The evidence presented in conjunction with the case types both in this section and Section Five was also separated in to several basic categories.

1. Eyewitness Testimony (from the victim or a witness)
2. Circumstantial Evidence
3. Fingerprint Evidence
4. Ballistics or other firearm evidence
5. Biological Evidence (DNA, semen, blood, sweat, etc.)
6. Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc.)
7. Pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Eyewitness testimony includes victim testimony, though to compare potential jurors views of eyewitness testimony to victim testimony, in the questions in the following sections, the two types of evidence were separated. This testimony is simply witnesses recounting what they saw

or experienced. When taking the stand, they would not be considered “expert witnesses” by definition.

Circumstantial evidence is evidence that demonstrates that the defendant was at the scene of the crime, but does not prove that the defendant was at the scene of the crime at the exact time the crime occurred. For example, we all shed hair as we go about our days. If a piece of your hair were to be found at a crime scene, all that piece of hair shows is that at some point you were at the scene – but that point could have been two hours before the crime took place, or two days before the crime took place. The vast majority of evidence is actually considered circumstantial, based on the specific circumstances. A fingerprint on a window at a scene could be circumstantial, but a fingerprint taken from tape put over the mouth of the victim might not be.

Fingerprint evidence is perhaps one of the most straight forward pieces of evidence. When you touch anything, you leave behind fingerprints due to the natural oils that occur on the palms of your hands and on your fingers. Some are easier to see or retrieve than others, and some last longer than others. At this point, there has been no evidence that any one person has the same set of fingerprints as any other person – even identical twins have different fingerprints. This makes fingerprints and DNA evidence two of the most reliable and valid forms of forensic evidence, but only if they can be matched to a person. If the correct person’s prints (or DNA) are not in the corresponding database, little to nothing can be done in regards to those pieces of evidence.

Ballistic evidence includes the identification of firearms, ammunition, bullets, and cartridge cases.

Biological evidence includes semen, blood, sweat, and hair among other things – pretty much any part that someone could leave behind that contains DNA. Biological evidence can be found in many forms depending on the nature of a case.

Toxicology evidence examines the contents of a persons blood, and occasionally stomach. Is there poison found? What kind of poison? How much? How did that poison make its way into the victim? Or, did the car crash come about because the driver had a blood alcohol level above the legal limit?

Pattern evidence is just that – patterns, such as that of the sole of a shoe or tire treads that can help demonstrate who was at the scene. Often, evidence such as this is not at the forefront of a case. Decent prints can be difficult to obtain, and unique prints are incredibly unusual. Think about Converse sneakers. Every Converse sneaker has the same sole pattern, with few exceptions, and they're a very common shoe. Finding out that the perpetrator of a crime wore Converse does little to nothing – the array of potential suspects likely wouldn't be any smaller than it was to begin with.

From these groups of evidence, biological and fingerprint evidence would be considered the most reliable, and the most accurate. Only identical twins have the same set of DNA, and at this point no one has been found to have the same set of fingerprints as another person. Toxicology is also quite reliable as evidence, but in the actual application to a criminal case varies situation by situation. Toxicology might be useful in determining the defendant's culpability in the sense of whether or not they are charged with manslaughter or murder, but a defendant's blood alcohol level lends nothing when determining who fired a weapon. Ballistics as a field is considered to be reliable, as we have the ability to match striations on a bullet to a gun that it was fired from, but this matching is subjective. One expert witness can say that the bullet came from the defendant's gun, but another can say it is not. These competing testimonies would both be admissible in court as part of the same trial.

The weight of pattern evidence can be variable. It's not particularly inaccurate, just rarely

used. When it is used, it might not necessarily eliminate suspects. Think about how many thousands of cars have the same tires, and therefore the same tire patterns. Pattern evidence can be useful, but only if good, distinct patterns were left behind at the scene, and were then photographed, and the pattern is incredibly unique.

Eyewitness testimony's reliability is debatable. Memory is incredibly malleable, and when leading questions are asked, memory can be changed, or witnesses can be more sure of details they originally weren't sure about before. A 60 Minutes episode about Ronald Cotton and Eyewitness Testimony highlights this wonderfully. The reliability of eyewitness testimony depends on the situation as a whole, and the fashion it was collected in. It can be very reliable, or completely wrong. Circumstantial evidence can also be variable in a similar fashion. Just about all evidence can be circumstantial in different situations. Biological evidence is reliable, but when it comes from a hair found at a crime scene, it is circumstantial because the hair does not prove that the defendant was at the crime scene during the specific window that the crime took place – only in the general span of time.

The first question asked what types of evidence the respondent expected to be present in the average criminal case, and each question following was phrased in exactly the same way, with each, more specific category, swapped in in place of "average criminal case".

Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations

For the final section, the respondents were told to picture themselves as jury members, and were given the following instructions:

"What follows are multiple hypothetical situations in which you, as a jury member, must use the information in the question to determine how you would charge the hypothetical defendant.

Below are the instructions given to every juror serving on the jury of a federal case.

'There are three basic rules about a criminal case that you must keep in mind.

1. The defendant is presumed innocent until proven guilty. The indictment against the defendant brought by the government is only an accusation, nothing more. It is not proof of guilt or anything else. The defendant therefore starts out with a clean slate.

2. The burden of proof is on the government until the very end of the case. The defendant has no burden to prove their innocence or to present any evidence, or to testify. Since the defendant has the right to remain silent and may choose whether to testify, you cannot legally put any weight on a defendant's choice not to testify. It is not evidence.

3. The government must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. [The judge] will give you further instructions on this point later, but bear in mind that the level of proof required is high.'"

When the types of evidence in the hypothetical situations are presented, based upon the general reliability of the broad categories of evidence discussed in Section Four, answers for types of evidence should err on the following choices:

1. Eyewitness Testimony – Unsure
2. Circumstantial – Unsure
3. Fingerprint – Guilty
4. Ballistics – Guilty
5. Biological – Guilty

6. Toxicology – Unsure
7. Pattern – Unsure

Exceptions to these answers do exist – toxicology would not likely be presented for several of the types of cases listed, but those questions were still included in the survey for the purpose of continuity. As you can see, several categories of evidence don't lean towards determining guilty or not guilty, because their actual reliability and validity can be very situationally based. Departures from these average answers are where it can be determined if potential jurors view types of evidence inaccurately.

Results

Section One: Demographics

62 people between the ages of 18 and 24 participated in the survey. 32 of them completed the survey. 44 respondents were 50 or older. 33 of them completed the survey. Both sets of respondents were primarily female (18-24: 5 male, 57 female; 50 and older: 12 male, 30 female, 2 declined to answer). Politically, those in the age group of 18-24 predominantly identified as Democrats (10 Republicans, 38 Democrats, 1 Third Party, 13 Independent) and those 50 and older were more Independent-leaning (12 Republicans, 12 Democrats, 0 Third Party, 20 Independent).

Table 1. Demographic Data from Respondents 18-24

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	5	8.064%
Female	57	91.935%
Non-binary/Gender Fluid	0	0.00%
Prefer not to answer	0	0.00%
Political Orientation		

Republican	10	16.129%
Democrat	38	61.29%
Third Party	1	1.61%
Independent	13	20.967%

Table 2. Demographic Data from Respondents 50 and older

Variables	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Gender		
Male	12	27.27%
Female	30	68.182%
Non-binary/Gender Fluid	0	0.00%
Prefer not to answer	2	4.45%
Political Orientation		
Republican	12	27.27%
Democrat	12	27.27%
Third Party	0	0.00%
Independent	20	45.45%

Section Two: Television Watching Habits

There was quite a difference present in the amount of time each age range spent watching television. The majority of those 50 and older felt that they watched 10 or more hours of television on average per week, while those in the 18-24 range felt they watched between 2 and 5 hours of television per week. Both age groups spent approximately the same amount of time watching crime shows per week - between 0 and 2 hours per week. An important differentiation between the two groups lies in their perceived accuracy of the crime shows. Those between 18 and 24 felt that crime shows were occasionally accurate, but more inaccurate than not. Those 50

and older felt that crime shows were accurate and inaccurate in approximately equal amounts. This is an important difference to take note of, as many cite one of the reasons the "*CSI* Effect" has come to be as being due to audiences believing the shows they watch are more realistic than they actually are. The evidence that those 50 and older may believe more of what they see in fictional crime shows allows for the possibility that later on, their expectations of evidence will align more with what is presented on television shows, leading them to be disappointed when, when serving on a jury, the evidence does not live up to their expectations.

In both age groups, shows that belonged to the "Forensic Oriented" category were the most watched. Additionally, for the respondents in both categories who only watched one type of crime show, Forensic Oriented TV shows were the genre they tended to watch.

Table 3. Television Habits of Respondents 18-24

Variable	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Hours of TV per week		
0-2	12	19.35%
2-5	18	29.03%
5-7	16	25.81%
7-10	7	11.29%
10 or more	9	14.516%
Hours of crime shows per week		
Never	15	24.19%
0-2	31	50.00%

2-5	15	24.19%
5-7	2	3.2254%
7-10	0	0.00%
10 or more	0	0.00%

Table 4. Television Habits of Respondents 50 and older

Variable	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Hours of TV per week		
0-2	1	2.273%
2-5	5	11.36%
5-7	10	22.73%
7-10	10	22.73%
10 or more	18	40.91%
Hours of crime shows per week		
Never	10	22.73%
0-2	15	34.091%
2-5	11	25.00%
5-7	4	9.091%
7-10	2	4.54%

10 or more	2	4.54%

Section Three: Jury Service

None of the 18-24 year old respondents had served on a jury, and only four respondents in this category had been called in to serve, and then not selected. Nineteen of the respondents 50 and older had served, and had served anywhere from within the past year, to 20 or more years previously.

Table 5. Jury Service

	18-24		**50 and older**	
Have you ever served on a jury?	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Yes	0	0.00%	19	43.182%
No	58	87.097%	12	27.273%
Called in, but didn't serve	4	6.452%	13	29.545%

Section Four: Evidence Expectations

In general, respondents expected a minimum of three different types of forensic evidence to be presented, with eyewitness testimony expected by almost every respondent. Many respondents expected around 5 types of forensic evidence to be present no matter the case type, but there was a large amount of variety present in the combination of categories of forensic evidence expected.

Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations

Overall, the respondents 50 and older tended to be less sure of the weight and/or

relevance of different types of evidence. For a higher percentage of questions in this sectin of the survey, the majority of those 50 and older selected the "I am not sure what I would do." choice. The respondents of ages 18-24 picked this option fewer times, therefore having more confidence in what they felt the weight and/or relevance of the presented forensic evidence. The full results from this section can be found on page e of the "Survey Data and Questions" section.

Discussion

Section One: Demographics

The main use of this section was to sort the data into the two age categories. With the uneven distribution of gender identification and political orientation, were the data to be examined any other way, it could not be considered statistically significant, as the number of respondents in each data category would not be an accurate sample of the population as a whole.

Section Two: Television Habits

The final question of section two asked about what general genre of crime shows the respondents watched. The airing of the first episode of "*CSI*" brought an advent of crime show popularity that had likely not been seen before. It came at the perfect time – rising TV ownership, the rise of recording devices like TiVo that allowed viewers to never miss an episode, and soon, the rise of streaming services – Netflix, Hulu and more.

CSI has a strong focus on forensic evidence specifically, and the role of forensic evidence in the solving of crimes. It logically follows, that were the CSI effect to exist, forensically-oriented shows would have the greatest effect on the expectations of real-life jurors. The jurors who watch *CSI* would likely have the strongest opinions on the values of evidence, and could view evidence as more reliable, and therefore carrying more weight in regards to guilt, than those who did not watch *CSI.*

To weigh the effects of crime shows on the expectations of jurors, I felt it was necessary to divide crime shows up by type. It seems logical that potential jurors who watch primarily forensically oriented would have different expectations of the forensic evidence that should be presented than a viewer who watches crime shows that have more drama in them. The level of depth one type of show would go into in regards to forensic evidence is very different than the level a different genre might go into, and thus one kind of show would affect juries more than another.

These data appear to lay the base to proving the existence of the *CSI* effect. It shows that there is a possibility that there is a distinct section of the population that has more faith in the accuracy of crime shows than another group. This lends strength to the argument that believing crime shows are more accurate than they are in reality is lending jurors to have higher expectations – expectations in line to what is demonstrated as true in the TV shows.

Section Three: Jury Service

The third section was intended to be an active, direct examination of the possibility of the *CSI* effect affecting the expectations of jurors. However, of the 18-24 age demographic, none of the respondents had ever served on a jury, and only four respondents had ever been called to serve, and simply not selected. In the 50 and older age demographic, 19 of the respondents had served on a jury. The general consensus was that the amount of forensic evidence presented in the case the respondent served on a jury for generally matched with their expectations, but as the respondents had served in juries in varying amounts of years previously, and I was unable to compare their answers to that of the 18-24 age group, in the grand scheme of things, the expectation of evidence matching up with what was presented does not necessarily lend itself to be a significant finding.

Section Four: Evidence Expectations

In an actual legal setting, these broad types of criminal cases would be more specifically divided: 1st degree murder, manslaughter, felony theft, etc. I left these in broad type categories so that the survey was more accessible to the general population. This section also introduced the broad categories of forensic evidence, categories based directly off of Corinna Kruse's 2010 survey.

Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations

Overall, those 50 and older tend to appear to be more skeptical, or have less of an idea of the value, of different pieces on forensic evidence. The majorities of both groups never reach distinct determinations of guilt or innocence, instead remaining around the "probably" responses. This is not entirely unexpected – with the general types presented, opportunities for exceptions to occur are more likely. It is important to note that much more often the majority of those 50 and older tends to stay centered around the "Unsure" mark.

A major exception to this is seen in question 48. The majority of the respondents ages 18-24 said that they would find the defendant guilty in a rape or sexual criminal conduct case where the evidence presented was biological evidence. This is the only question in the entirety of the final section of the survey where a distinct determination is made – guilty. The majority of those 50 and older, when given the same question that they "…[were] not sure what [they] would do." Other questions on pattern evidence and eyewitness evidence show that we may view those types of evidence as slightly more accurately than they may be over all, But It is question 48 that is perhaps the most telling in the final results.

Question 48 deserves special consideration. Its results demonstrate that the "*CSI* Effect" may not be as straight forward as is often thought. What made the presentation of biological evidence carry so much more weight in that specific scenario presented? The reliability of testing

methods for DNA is not higher when it is from a rape or attempted rape case than it would be for any other type of case. Per Shelton et al. (2006), Multiple studies have found that in rape cases, jurors have a tendency to ignore the evidence provided, and instead make their decisions based upon what were termed "extraneous factors". This provides an opening to acknowledge all of the other variables that could affect a juror's view of the evidence provided by expert testimony. Shelton et al. (2006) found that in a mediated society, one's perception of more abstract topics such as "crime", "criminals", and "justice" vary based upon demographic categories and life experience.

An article in the New England Law Review, entitled "Devil in a White Coat" (DiFonzio et al., 2006) brought up the premise of "white coat syndrome" – the idea that jurors unknowingly agree with experts based upon the expert's field of expertise. People can be strongly swayed by another person's confidence, or lack thereof. (Liviatan et al., 2008) No matter how strong the evidence an expert witness is presenting may be, if the witness is sweaty, shaky, and nervous, both they and the evidence will automatically lose credibility. This also works the opposite way – weak evidence but a strong confident witness will make the evidence look stronger.

Additionally, a concern raised by the NAS report (2009) was the lack of standardization of vocabulary in the forensic sciences. Findings can be overstated by the expert witness unintentionally, and with no real consequences for the person testifying, but potential consequences for the defendant from this overstatement. Additionally, things such as variations in funding in each county or state could provide the same results that forensic professionals are concerned that television shows have. Someone could serve on a jury in a well-funded county, or simply luck into a case with a large amount of forensic evidence. They could also just as easily be in a poorly funded county, or on the jury for a case with little forensic evidence. This change

is exactly the concern raised by watching television shows, but it could just as easily be caused by the vast differences that are present all over the field of forensic science. This subject is worth further exploration. The idea of its existence is prevalent within the forensic science community for a reason. A statistical metaphor is perhaps the best way to demonstrate the current situation.

When examining if something, like the addition of a training, or in this case, the addition of crime shows has an effect on something else (such as jurors perception of expert witness' testimony) one creates a null hypothesis, and an alternative hypothesis. The null hypothesis is that there is no change with the implementation of the independent variable. The alternative hypothesis says that there is a change. The alternative hypothesis cannot be tested, but the null hypothesis can, and is therefore then accepted or rejected. At this point, it simply seems that we cannot reject the null hypothesis, but that doesn't necessarily mean that the alternative hypothesis is wrong. In this case, it doesn't necessarily mean that the "*CSI* Effect" doesn't exist, just that we cannot yet prove that it does.

Works Cited

Akass, K. (2009). CSI: Crime Scene Investigation. *Critical Studies in Television*, *4*(2), 125.

Baskin, D. R., & Sommers, I. B. (2010). Crime-show-viewing habits and public attitudes toward forensic evidence: The "CSI effect" revisited. *Justice System Journal*, *31*(1), 97-113.

Bergslien, E. (2006). Teaching To Avoid the" CSI Effect". Keeping the Science in Forensic Science. *Journal of Chemical Education*, *83*(5), 690.

Brickell, W. (2008). Is it the CSI effect or do we just distrust juries. *Crim. Just.*, *23*, 10.

Bull, S. (2015). Televisual forensics on the edge of chaos: postgenomic complexity in CSI: Crime Scene Investigation. *Screen*, *56*(1), 64-80.

Byers, M., & Johnson, V. M. (Eds.). (2009). The CSI effect: Television, crime, and governance.

Cohan, S. (2008). *CSI: Crime scene investigation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cole, S. A. (2015). A surfeit of science: The "CSI effect" and the media appropriation of the public understanding of science. *Public Understanding of Science*, *24*(2), 130-146.

Cooley, C. M. (2006). The CSI effect: Its impact and potential concerns. *New Eng. L. Rev.*, *41*, 471.

Davinger, B. H. (2012). More than Ethical Quandaries and Worldwide Conspiracies: Using Popular Non-Legal Culture to Understand Legal Culture. *JL & Soc. Deviance*, *4*, 150.

Federal Rules of Evidence. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://federalevidence.com/rules-of-evidence#Rule702

Ghoshray, S. (2006). Untangling the CSI effect in criminal jurisprudence: Circumstantial evidence, reasonable doubt, and jury manipulation. *New Eng. L. Rev.*, *41*, 533.

Godsey, M. A., & Alou, M. (2010). She Blinded Me with Science: Wrongful Convictions and the Reverse CSI-Effect. *Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev.*, *17*, 481.

Harriss, C. (2011). The evidence doesn't lie: Genre literacy and the CSI Effect. *Journal of Popular Film & Television*, *39*(1), 2-11.

Houck, M. M. (2006). CSI: reality. *Scientific American*, *295*(1), 84-89.

Littlefield, M. M. (2011). Historicizing CSI and its effect (s): The real and the representational in American scientific detective fiction and print news media, 1902–1935. *Crime, Media, Culture*, *7*(2), 133-148.

Liviatan, I., Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2008). Interpersonal similarity as a social distance dimension: Implications for perception of others' actions. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, *44*(5), 1256-1269.

Mancini, D. E. (2013). The" CSI effect" in an actual juror sample: Why crime show genre may matter. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *15*(3), 543.

Podlas, K. (2006). The CSI effect and other forensic fictions. *Loy. LA Ent. L. Rev.*, *27*, 87.

Shelton, D. E. (2010). Juror expectations for scientific evidence in criminal cases: Perceptions and reality about the CSI effect myth. *TM Cooley L. Rev.*, *27*, 1.

Smith, S. M., Stinson, V., & Patry, M. W. (2011). Fact of Fiction: The Myth and Reality of the CSI Effect. *Ct. Rev.*, *47*, 4.

Stephens, S. L. (2006). The CSI effect on real crime labs. *New Eng. L. Rev.*, *41*, 591.

Rath, A. (2011). Is the 'CSI Effect' influencing courtrooms. *National Public Radio*.

Thomas, A. P. (2006). The CSI effect: Fact or fiction. *Yale LJ Pocket Part*, *115*, 70.

Tyler, T. R. (2006). Is the CSI effect good science?. *Yale LJ Pocket Part*, *115*, 73.

Weaver, R., Salamonson, Y., Koch, J., & Porter, G. (2012). The CSI effect at university: forensic science students' television viewing and perceptions of ethical issues. *Australian Journal of forensic sciences*, *44*(4), 381-391.

Weissmann, E. (2009). Two Versions of the Victim: Uncovering Contradictions in CSI: Crime Scene Investigation Through Textual Analysis. *Journal of e-Media Studies*, *2*(1), 1-15.

Willing, R. (2004). CSI effect has juries wanting more evidence. *USA Today*, *5*, 31-51.

27, 2. A. (n.d.). States Slow to Adopt Daubert Evidence Rule. Retrieved from https://www.bna.com/states-slow-adopt-n57982070384/

Survey Data and Questions

Section One: Demographics

Data From 18-24 Year Olds

Q1 How old are you?

- **18-24 (62; 100%)**
- 50 and older

Q2 What is your gender?

- Male (5; 8.064%)
- **Female (57; 91.935%)**
- Non-binary/Gender Fluid
- Prefer not to answer

Q3 Political Orientation:

- Republican (10; 16.129%)
- **Democrat (38; 61.29%)**
- Third Party (1; 1.61%)
- Independent (13; 20.967%)

Data From Those 50 and Older

Q1 How old are you?

- 18-24
- **50 and older (44; 100%)**

Q2 What is your gender?

- Male (12; 27.27%)
- **Female (30; 68.81%)**
- Non-binary/Gender Fluid
- Prefer not to answer (2; 4.54%)

Q3 Political Orientation:

- Republican (12; 27.27%)
- Democrat (12; 27.27%)
- Third Party
- **Independent (20; 45.45%)**

Section Two: Television Watching Habits
Data From 18-24 Year Olds

Q4 Approximately how many hours of television do you watch per week? (Including streaming services such as Hulu, Netflix, etc.)

- 0-2 hours per week [12; 19.35%]
- **2-5 hours per week [18; 29.03%]**
- 5-7 hours per week [16; 25.81%]
- 7-10 hours per week [7; 11.29%]
- 10 or more hours per week [9; 14.51%]

Q5 Approximately how many hours a week do you watch shows that would be considered "crime shows"?

- I never watch crime shows [15; 24.19%]
- **0-2 hours per week [31; 50.00%]**
- 2-5 hours per week [15; 24.19%]
- 5-7 hours per week [2; 3.226%]
- 7-10 hours per week
- 10 or more hours per week

Q6 How "real" do you consider the type(s) of crime show(s) you watch to be?

- Completely inaccurate in every aspect [1; 1.61%]
- **Occasionally accurate, but more inaccurate than not [33; 53.23%]**
- Accurate and inaccurate in approximately equal amounts [17; 27.42%]
- Occasionally inaccurate, but more accurate than not [11; 17.74%]
- Completely accurate

Data From Those 50 and Older

Q4 Approximately how many hours of television do you watch per week? (Including streaming services such as Hulu, Netflix, etc.)

- 0-2 hours per week [1; 2.273%]
- 2-5 hours per week [5; 11.36%]
- 5-7 hours per week [10; 22.73%]
- 7-10 hours per week [10; 22.73%]
- **10 or more hours per week [18; 40.91%]**

Q5 Approximately how many hours a week do you watch shows that would be considered "crime shows"?

- I never watch crime shows [10; 22.73%]
- **0-2 hours per week [15; 34.091%]**
- 2-5 hours per week [11; 25%]
- 5-7 hours per week [4; 9.091%]
- 7-10 hours per week [2; 4.54%]
- 10 or more hours per week [2; 4.54%]

Q6 How "real" do you consider the type(s) of crime show(s) you watch to be?

- Completely inaccurate in every aspect [1; 2.273%]
- Occasionally accurate, but more inaccurate than not [18; 40.91%]
- **Accurate and inaccurate in approximately equal amounts [23; 52.273%]**
- Occasionally inaccurate, but more accurate than not [2; 4.54%]
- Completely accurate

Q7 Please select all types of crime shows you watch:

- Documentary Style (Making a Murderer, The Keepers, etc) [25; 40.322%]
- **Forensic Oriented (*CSI*, *CSI* Spinoffs, NCIS, Dexter, Criminal Minds, etc) [41; 66.13%]**
- Drama (Body of Proof, Mysteries of Laura, Rosewood, Rizzoli & Isles, Blue Bloods, etc) [22; 35.48%]
- Reality (Forensic Files, 48 Hours, Dr. G: Medical Examiner, etc.) [14; 22.58%]
- Law Process Oriented (Law & Order, Bull, Conviction, Perry Mason, etc) [27; 43.55%]
- N/A

Q7 Please select all types of crime shows you watch:

- Documentary Style (Making a Murderer, The Keepers, etc) [7; 15.91%]
- **Forensic Oriented (*CSI*, CSI Spinoffs, NCIS, Dexter, Criminal Minds, etc) [24; 54.54%]**
- Drama (Body of Proof, Mysteries of Laura, Rosewood, Rizzoli & Isles, Blue Bloods, etc) [13; 29.54%]
- Reality (Forensic Files, 48 Hours, Dr. G: Medical Examiner, etc.) [8; 18.18%]
- Law Process Oriented (Law & Order, Bull, Conviction, Perry Mason, etc) [20; 45.45%]
- N/A

Section Three: Jury Service
Data From 18-24 Year Olds

Q8 Have you ever served on a jury?

- Yes
- **No [58; 93.55%]**
- I have been called in, but never selected to serve on the jury [4; 6.45%]

Q9 When did you serve on a jury?

- Within the past year
- Within the last 5 years
- 5-10 years ago
- 10-15 years ago
- 15-20 years ago
- 20 or more years ago
- **I have never served on a jury [62; 100%]**

Q10 How much forensic evidence was presented in the case you served on the jury for?

- More than expected
- Less than expected
- The amount I expected
- I did not have any expectations
- **Not applicable [62; 100%]**

Data From Those 50 and Older

Q8 Have you ever served on a jury?

- **Yes [19; 43.18%]**
- No [12; 27.27%]
- I have been called in, but never selected to serve on the jury [13; 29.54%]

Q9 When did you serve on a jury?

- Within the past year [2; 4.54%]
- Within the last 5 years [6; 13.63%]
- 5-10 years ago [6; 13.63%]
- 10-15 years ago [3; 6.81%]
- 15-20 years ago
- 20 or more years ago [3; 6.81%]
- **I have never served on a jury [24; 54.54%]**

Q10 How much forensic evidence was presented in the case you served on the jury for?

- More than expected [1; 2.27%]
- Less than expected [4; 9.09%]
- The amount I expected [4; 9.09%]
- I did not have any expectations [2; 4.54%]
- **Not applicable [33; 75%]**

Section Four: Evidence Expectations
Data From 18-24 Year Olds

Q11 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average criminal case? Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)

- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)
- No specific type of evidence is expected in the average criminal case

Q12 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average murder or attempted murder case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons,toxins,or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q13 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average

Data From Those 50 and Older

Q11 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average criminal case? Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)

- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)
- No specific type of evidence is expected in the average criminal case

Q12 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average murder or attempted murder case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons,toxins,or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q13 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average

physical assault (of any kind) case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q14 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average rape or criminal sexual conduct case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q15 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average breaking and entering case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence

physical assault (of any kind) case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q14 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average rape or criminal sexual conduct case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q15 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average breaking and entering case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence

- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol
- content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q16 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average theft case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q17 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average case where the crime involved a gun?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol
- content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q16 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average theft case?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Q17 What types of forensic evidence do you expect to be present in the average case where the crime involved a gun?

- Eyewitness testimony (from the victim or a witness)
- Circumstantial Evidence
- Fingerprint Evidence
- Ballistics or other firearm evidence
- Biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc)
- Toxicology Evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc)
- Pattern Evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads)

Section Five: Hypothetical Jury Situations
Data From 18 – 24 Year Olds

Q18 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. No forensic evidence, including the gun, is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [11; 34.375]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [12; 37.5%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [9; 28.125%]

Q19 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [11; 34.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [18: 56.25%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.135%]

Q20 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

Data From Those 50 and Older

Q18 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. No forensic evidence, including the gun, is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [11; 33.34%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [6; 18.18%]

Q19 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.061]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [13; 39.39%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.061]

Q20 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.5%]
  I would probably find the defendant guilty. [20; 62.5%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [4; 12.5%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q21 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [9; 28.125%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [17; 53.13%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [6; 18.75%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q22 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [9; 28.125%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [12; 37.5%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- I would find the defendant not

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [14; 42.42%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [17; 51.51%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q21 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [14; 42.42%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [13; 39.39%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.091%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q22 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [24; 72.72%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [7; 21.21%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

guilty. [1; 3.125%]

Q23 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc) . How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 50%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]

Q24 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [21; 65.63%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [5; 15.625%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q25 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or

Q23 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc) . How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not

- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [23; 69.69%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [6; 18.18%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q24 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.091%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [12; 36.36%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [17; 51.51%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q25 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or

not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [11; 34.375%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 4.375%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [5; 15.625%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q26 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [18; 56.25%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [7; 21.875%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q27 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [9; 28.125%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [13;**

not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.031%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [13; 39.39%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.09%]
  I would find the defendant not guilty. [10; 31.25%]

Q26 You are serving on the jury for a crime involving a gun. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [15; 45.45%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q27 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- **I am not sure what I would do. [13; 39.39%]**
- I would probably find the defendant

40.625%]

- I would find the defendant not guilty.

not guilty. [11; 33.34%]

- I would find the defendant not guilty. [9; 27.27%]

Q28 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [13; 40.625%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]

Q28 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [11; 33.34%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [17; 51.51%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty.[3; 9.09%]

Q29 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [7; 21.875%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [22; 68.75%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q29 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [19; 57.57%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 30.30%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]

I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q30 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

Q30 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [8; 25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [21; 65.625%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [3; 9.375%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q31 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [11; 34.375%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [12; 37.5%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [7; 21.875%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.[1; 3.125%]

Q32 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 43.75%]**
- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [19; 57.57%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 30.30%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q31 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [9; 27.27%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [21; 63.63%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q32 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.15%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [21; 63.63%]**
- I would probably find the defendant

- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [13; 40.625%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q33 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [6; 18.75%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [17; 53.125%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [7; 21.875%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q34 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [18; 56.25%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 31.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]

Q35 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to

not guilty. [6; 18.18%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q33 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [7; 21.21%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [22; 66.67%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q34 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [13; 39.39%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 42.42%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q35 You are serving on the jury for a theft case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to

find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 31.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q36 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [6; 18.75%]
- I would probably find the defendant
- not guilty. [11; 34.375%]
- **I would find the defendant not guilty. [15; 46.875%]**

Q37 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 43.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [11; 34.375%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [18; 54.54%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [13; 39.39%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q36 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [8; 24.24%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [17; 51.51%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [8; 24.24%]

Q37 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 30.30%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [19; 57.7%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

[4; 12.12%]

Q38 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [6; 18.75%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [23; 71.875%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [3; 9.375%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q38 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [19; 57.57%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [12; 36.36%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q39 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [8; 25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [20; 62.5%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q39 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [23; 69.69%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [9; 27.27%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q40 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads).

Q40 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads).

How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1;
- 9.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [14; 43.75%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [12; 37.5%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q41 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc) . How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.75%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [6; 18.75%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [12; 37.5%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [13; 40.625%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q42 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant

How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.625%]
- 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [11; 33.34%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [15; 45.45%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [6; 18.18%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q41 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc) . How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [23; 69.69%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [5; 15.15%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q42 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant

guilty. [11; 34.375%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 43.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [5; 15.625%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q43 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [17; 53.125%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [11; 34.375%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.[1; 3.125%]

Q44 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [17; 53.125%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [8; 25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [5; 15.625%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

guilty. [9; 27.27%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [20; 60.6%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q43 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [17; 51.51%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [11; 33.34%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q44 You are serving on the jury for a breaking and entering case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [19; 57.57%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [12; 36.36%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q45 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 43.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [7; 21.875%]

Q46 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [18; 56.25%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [8; 25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]

Q47 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [18; 56.25%]**

Q45 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.06%%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [15; 45.45%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [14; 42.42%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]

Q46 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [18; 54.54%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [13; 39.39%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q47 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [11; 33.34%]

- I am not sure what I would do. [7; 56.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q48 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- **I would find the defendant guilty. [22; 68.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [6; 18.75%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [3; 9.375%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q49 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [8; 25%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [13; 40.625%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [7; 21.875%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [3; 3.125%]

- **I am not sure what I would do. [19; 57.57%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q48 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [8; 24.24%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [21; 63.63%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [4; 12.12%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant guilty.

Q49 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.15%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [23; 69.69%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q50 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [6; 18.75%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [9; 28.125%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q51 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [17; 53.125%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q52 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to

Q50 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [12; 36.36%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [17; 51.51%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q51 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [25; 75.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q52 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to

find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [7; 21.875%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q53 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [9; 28.125%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [5; 15.625%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q54 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [11; 34.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [13;**

find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant not guilty. [8; 25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [18; 54.54%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 30.3%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q53 You are serving on the jury for a rape or other criminal sexual conduct case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 48.48%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [13; 39.39%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q54 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [13; 39.39%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [14; 42.42%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

[**40.625%]**

Q55 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [18; 56.25%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [8; 25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.[2; 6.25%]

Q56 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [7; 21.875%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [7; 21.875%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q57 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood, sweat, etc.). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or

- I would find the defendant not guilty. [5; 15.15%]

Q55 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [15; 45.45%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [14; 42.42%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]

Q56 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [12; 36.36%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [19; 57.57%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q57 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood, sweat, etc.). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or

not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [19; 59.375%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q58 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [12; 37.5%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 43.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q59 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [11; 34.375%]

not guilty?

- I would probably find the defendant
- [6; 18.18%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [21; 63.63%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [6; 18.18%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q58 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence (such as shoe prints or tire treads). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [8; 24.24%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [19; 57.57%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [6; 18.18%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q59 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [10; 30.3%]

- **I am not sure what I would do. [15; 46.875%]**
- I am not sure what I would do.
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q60 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 43.75%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q61 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [21; 65.625%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [7; 21.875%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]

- **I am not sure what I would do. [21; 63.63%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q60 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [7; 21.21%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [21; 63.63%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%
  I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]

Q61 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is eyewitness testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [19; 57.57%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [9; 27.27%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.12%]

Q62 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [6; 18.74%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [15; 50.00%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [6; 18.75%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q63 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 31.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- **I would find the defendant not guilty. [11; 34.375%]**

Q64 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.

Q62 You are serving on the jury for a physical assault case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [13; 39.39%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q63 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. No forensic evidence is presented. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty.
- I am not sure what I would do. [13; 39.39%]
- **I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.12%]

Q64 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is circumstantial. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.

- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.375%]

Q65 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 50%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [10; 31.25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q66 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [10; 31.25%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [17; 53.125%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [4; 12.5%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]

- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.09%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [12; 36.36%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]

Q65 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is fingerprint evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [14; 42.42%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q66 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is biological evidence (DNA, semen, blood sweat, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [20; 60.6%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [9; 27.27%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
-

- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q67 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [3; 9.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [13; 40.625%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [12; 37.5%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.5%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q68 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.625%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [15; 46.875%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [8; 25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [3; 9375%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]

Q69 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q67 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is pattern evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [10; 30.30%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [19; 57.57%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q68 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is toxicology evidence (blood alcohol content, presence of poisons, toxins, or drugs in the blood, etc). How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [11; 33.33%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [20; 60.60%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.03%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q69 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is ballistic evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.15%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 48.48%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [8; 25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [1; 3.125%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty

Q70 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidences presented is eyewitness evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty.
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [17; 53.125%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [8; 25%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q71 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [11; 34.375%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [13; 40.625%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [6; 18.75%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.25%]
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

- I would find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.15%]
- **I would probably find the defendant guilty. [16; 48.48%]**
- I am not sure what I would do. [12; 36.36%]
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.
- I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q70 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidences presented is eyewitness evidence. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [5; 15.15%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [12; 36.36%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [14; 42.42%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty. [2; 6.06%]
8. I would find the defendant not guilty.

Q71 You are serving on the jury for a murder or attempted murder case. The incriminating evidence presented is victim testimony. How likely are you to find the defendant guilty or not guilty?

- I would find the defendant guilty. [4; 12.12%]
- I would probably find the defendant guilty. [13; 39.39%]
- **I am not sure what I would do. [16; 48.48%]**
- I would probably find the defendant not guilty.

- I would find the defendant not guilty.

- I would find the defendant not guilty