

Gus J. Solomon Inn of Court, Group 4 (February, 2008) Jury Pool Diversity: Fact or Fiction

Results of Multnomah County Jury Survey- Farmer Trial (March 8, 2002)

**Lisa Deneen Ph.D.
Department of Sociology
Portland State University**

F-1

March 8, 2002

Results of Multnomah County Jury Survey – Farmer Trial

Prepared by:
Lisa Deneen
Department of Sociology
Portland State University

Summary: I have completed my examination of the master list of jurors for the year 2002, the summons list for this trial, and the results of the survey completed by the jurors that showed up for duty. Due to the nature of this case, I examined cognizable groups in relation to the death penalty. These groups include: race, age, and education. In addition, the lists were examined for geographical representation.

Race: The attached table contains the expected and actual racial composition of the jury. According to the 2000 census, the racial composition of Multnomah county (based on those who reported only one race) is 5.3% Black, 5.7% Asian, 1% Native American, 76.5% white, 7.5% Hispanic, and 4% other (includes Pacific Islanders, Hawaiians). The composition of the individuals who reported for duty are 5.4% Black, 2.5% Asian, 2.9% Native American, 83.9% white, 3.3% Hispanic, and 1.7% other. The overrepresentation of whites and Native Americans, along with the under representation of Asians and Hispanics is statistically significant at a .05 level.

This may be of concern because minority citizens tend to have a different view of the criminal justice system than white citizens. Analysis of the honesty scales included in the survey with based on the race of the respondent, showed statistically significant differences in the perceived honesty of police, criminal defense lawyers, criminal defendants, prosecutors, and teenagers. In general defendants and teens were viewed as more honest, while police officers and prosecutors were seen as less honest by minority individuals.

One reason for under representation of the Asian and Hispanic groups is the possibility that a percentage of these individuals are non-citizens. In this jury, 2.9% were excused because they were not citizens. In addition, 28.4% of those summoned did not respond. Language may be a contributor to this, as the 2000 census reports that 23.2% of the Hispanic population and 17% of the Asian population consider themselves to speak English less than 'very well'.

Age: The attached table contains the expected and actual age of Multnomah County residents/ people who reported for jury duty. While it appears that the younger age groups (18-29) and older age groups (65-79) are under represented (combined – 6% and 5.7%, respectively), this difference was **not** statistically significant at a .05 or .10 level. Additionally, the under representation of those over 70 is to be expected, since one can be excused from service for being over the age of 70 (in this trial, 6.4% of those summoned were excused for this reason).

Education: I have attached a table that shows the expected and actual distribution of the educational attainment of Multnomah county citizens. Individuals with less than a high school education are under represented by 8.6%; while individuals with a college degree, specifically at the post baccalaureate level are over represented (7.9%). This difference is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Gender: Gender composition of the list was examined and found to be consistent with the gender ratio of Multnomah county.

Geographic Area & Income: An analysis of what part of the county those who reported for duty resided in showed that the areas of NE, Gresham, and outer East county are under represented, while SW, N, and SE are over represented. This difference is statistically significant at the .05 level. This may be due to income differences (financial hardship) in different areas of the county. Data at the county level was unavailable for income. A comparison was done of income reported at the state level and income reported by the potential jurors. Those in the lower income brackets are under represented, while those in the middle bracket are over represented. This difference is probably due to those with lower incomes being less able to afford taking time off from work. The percentage of individuals who asked to be excused for business and financial hardship reasons were 6.9% and 4.1% respectively.

Master List: A concern in the master list is the apparent staleness of the data contained within it. For example, the DMV source list contains 570,421 names, while the adult population of Multnomah county between the ages of 18-79 is 490,417. An examination of the master list showed that 6.4% of the jurors contained in the master list are not Multnomah county residents. Consistent with this finding is that 5.1% of individuals summoned were excused because they did not live within Multnomah county and 9.8% of the summons mailed out were undeliverable. While duplicate names were mentioned as a concern (due to the same person being listed with different variations of their name in DMV and voter records), only 1% of the sampled data contained duplicate names.

Conclusions: The system employed by the county to construct the juror lists appears to appropriately sample/contain a representative population of the residents of Multnomah county. As mentioned above, the only noticeable concern with the process is the staleness of the source data utilized. The differences that appear in terms of race, education, age, geographic area and income appear to be due to "self-selection" bias. Those with less education (who tend to have less income) are more likely to asked to be excused and possibly not report for duty because of the hardship that missing two-three weeks of work would cause them. In addition, minorities tend to be distrustful of the criminal justice system and certain groups may be excluded due to citizenship and language. Youth tend to be slightly under represented due to their lower level of voter participation. Youth are also more likely to asked to be excused because of student status (2.6%). The fact that 48.4% of the jurors were excused with a simple phone call to the court may be of concern.

Race	County census	jury panel	difference
black	5.3%	5.4%	0.1%
asian	5.7%	2.5%	-3.2%
native american	1.0%	2.9%	1.9%
white	76.5%	83.9%	7.4%
hispanic	7.5%	3.3%	-4.2%
other	4.0%	1.7%	-2.3%
	100.0%	99.7%	
Note -- one juror did not respond.			
Sex			
male	49.8%	50.0%	0.2%
female	50.2%	50.0%	-0.2%
Age			
18-19	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%
20	1.9%	0.8%	-1.1%
21	1.8%	1.2%	-0.6%
22-24	6.4%	5.0%	-1.4%
25-29	12.1%	9.1%	-3.0%
30-34	11.5%	13.3%	1.8%
35-39	11.0%	12.9%	1.9%
40-44	11.0%	11.6%	0.6%
45-49	11.0%	13.2%	2.2%
50-54	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%
55-59	6.0%	9.1%	3.1%
60-61	1.8%	2.5%	0.7%
62-64	2.4%	4.1%	1.7%
65-66	1.4%	1.2%	-0.2%
67-69	2.1%	1.6%	-0.5%
70-79	6.8%	1.6%	-5.20%
	100.0%	100.0%	

Education				
	County census	Jury panel		
8th grade & less	4.9%	0.8%	8th grade & less	
9th-12th, nd	8.2%	0.8%	9th	
		1.2%	10th	
		1.7%	11th	
	13.1%	4.5%		-8.6%
12th	23.7%	26.0%		2.3%
total	36.8%	30.5%		-6.3%
some college, nd	25.7%	12.9%	college -1	
associates degree	6.4%	14.5%	college -2	
		6.4%	college -3	
total	32.1%	33.8%		1.7%
bachelors degree	20.3%	17.0%		-3.3%
masters/ph.d/prof	10.8%	18.7%		7.9%
	100.0%	100.0%		
Marital Status*				
Men-single, nm	37.3%	24.0%	single, nm	
		8.3%	partnered, nm	
	37.3%	32.3%		-5.0%
married	47.8%	53.6%	married	5.8%
separated	1.7%	1.7%	separated	0.0%
widowed	2.2%	1.7%	widowed	-0.5%
divorced	11.0%	10.7%	divorced	-0.3%
	100.0%	100.0%		
Women - single, nm	30.0%	24.8%	single, nm	
		13.2%	partnered, nm	
	30.0%	38.0%		8.0%
married	43.4%	41.3%	married	-2.1%
separated	2.6%	2.5%	separated	-0.1%
widowed	9.0%	1.7%	widowed	-7.3%
divorced	15.0%	15.7%	divorced	0.7%
	100.0%	99.2%		

	Oregon	Jury panel	
Income			
less than 10,0	9.5%	1.7%	less 5,000
		6.6%	5-10,000
	9.5%	8.3%	
10-14,999	6.8%		
15-19,999	7.3%	17.8%	10001-25,000
20-24,999	7.6%	18.6%	25001-40,000
25-29,999	6.6%		
30-34,999	7.4%		
35-39,999	5.7%		
	41.4%	36.4%	
40-44,999	6.3%	25.6%	40001-60,000
45-49,999	5.5%		
50-59,999	8.6%		
	20.4%	25.6%	
60-74,999	10.2%	19.0%	60001-100,000
75-99,999	9.0%		
	19.2%	19.0%	
over 100,000	9.5%	9.9%	over 100,000
	100.0%	99.2%	

* note - 2 jurors did not respond.

	Census Pop	Jury Panel	
Corbett	0.5%	0.4%	-0.1%
Troudale/Bridal Veil	3.0%	1.7%	-1.3%
Fairview/Wood Village	1.0%	0.4%	-0.6%
Gresham	13.0%	10.3%	-2.7%
SE	31.0%	33.5%	2.5%
SW	11.5%	16.1%	4.6%
NW	4.0%	2.9%	-1.1%
NE	25.0%	20.7%	-4.3%
N	10.0%	13.6%	3.6%
Lake Oswego*	1.0%	0.4%	-0.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	
*According to the			
Census Bureau, there			
is one tract of			
Lake Oswego within			
Multnomah County.			

Start Date	Panel ID	Panel Type	Panel Status	Comments
3/4/2002	902	Special	Completed	Rotd on: 2/4/20
3/5/2002	544	Regular	Completed	None
3/6/2002	542	Regular	Completed	None
3/7/2002	545	Regular	Completed	None
3/8/2002	550	Regular	Completed	None
3/11/2002	565	Regular	Completed	None
3/11/2002	905	Grand	Completed	GJ#1
3/11/2002	906	Gresham	Completed	None
3/12/2002	546	Regular	Completed	None
3/12/2002	904	Special	Deleted	case setover pe
3/13/2002	552	Regular	Completed	None
3/14/2002	549	Regular	Completed	None
3/15/2002	553	Regular	Completed	None
3/18/2002	563	Regular	Completed	None
3/18/2002	913	Grand	Deleted	None
3/18/2002	914	Gresham	Completed	None
3/19/2002	556	Regular	Completed	None
3/20/2002	551	Regular	Completed	None
3/21/2002	554	Regular	Completed	None
3/22/2002	559	Regular	Completed	None
3/25/2002	574	Regular	Completed	None
3/25/2002	920	Gresham	Completed	no jurors needed
3/25/2002	921	Grand	Completed	GJ #2
3/25/2002	922	Grand	Completed	GJ#3
3/26/2002	564	Regular	Completed	None
3/27/2002	566	Regular	Completed	None
3/28/2002	560	Regular	Completed	None
3/29/2002	558	Regular	Completed	None
4/1/2002	572	Regular	Completed	None
4/1/2002	933	Special	Recalled	Rotd on: 3/1/20

Find a Panel by panel ID

Panel Management Options

☐ Add New Panel

☐ Populate Panel

☐ Delete This Panel

☐ Change Panel Comments

☐ No Show Letters

☐ Print Panel Roster

☐ Panel Statistics Report

☐ Re Print Grand Attendance form

☐ Grand Jury Attendance

☐ Grand Panel Completed

☐ Undo Mark Grand Panel Completed

☐ Make Juror Available for Grand

☐ Grand Panel

☐ View Special Panels

☐ View New Special Info Page

☐ What is the trial date for this special

☐ Special Panel

☐ Transfer Special Panel

☐ Add Juror to Special Panel

☐ Add Juror to the Master Pool

☐ Refresh Panel List

☐ Excessive Mileage Report

Master Pool Statistics

Total: Text1

Assigned: Text2

Used: Text3

Statistics

☐ Display Statistics for Panel

☐ Where is this panel?

☐ Status of Panel

☐ Deferred

☐ Excused

☐ No Show

☐ Term finished

☐ 271

☐ 1432

☐ 552

☐ 245

☐ 454

☐ 177

☐ 41

☐ 8

☐ 108

☐ 1

☐ 88

☐ 82

☐ 16

☐ 153

☐ 182

☐ 111

☐ 1

☐ 68

☐ 37

☐ 69

☐ 303

☐ 1

☐ 12