

Appendix 1

BME population, BME summoned and serving jurors in each court

The three courts where BME jurors were significantly under-represented and the one court where they were significantly over-represented are highlighted in red with an asterisk (*).

Table A1.1. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in London Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Harrow	37.4	38.2	27.9
Southwark	33.5	33.8	29.4
Blackfriars	33.2	29.2	24.4
Isleworth	32.5	28.4	25
Snaresbrook	30.4	26.4	26.1
Wood Green	29.5	33.1	30.6
Middlesex	28.9	35.0	29.7
Central Criminal Court	27.0	27.2	23.1
Inner London	23.4	20.2	21.1
Croydon	17.7	24.6	23.9
Woolwich	15.6	13.6	14.3
Kingston on Thames	12.5	12.5	10

Table A1.2. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in South Eastern Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Luton	12.0	14.5	11.3
Reading	10.0	10.7	9.4
Aylesbury	9.3	7.7	0.0
St Albans	6.4	3.9	12.5
Peterborough	5.1	3.7	0.0
Oxford	5.0	0.0	0.0
Guilford	4.7	7.8	8.6
Cambridge	4.4	1.9	0.0
Hove	4.2	3.2	4.5
Maidstone	4.1	1.6	2.0
Basildon	3.7	4.4	4.3
Southend-on-Sea	3.0	0.0	0.0
Chelmsford	2.8	2.4	0.0
Canterbury	2.5	3.7	2.6
Lewes	2.4	0.0	0.0
Chichester	2.0	0.0	0.0
Norwich	1.6	0.0	0.0
King's Lynn	1.3	0.0	0.0

Table A.1.3. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in Midlands Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Birmingham	22.3	22.0	14.7 *
Leicester	14.8	20.2	18.6
Wolverhampton	13.7	10.9	10.8
Coventry	13.2	15.0	17.7
Nottingham	6.5	0.0	0.0
Derby	5.8	0.0	0.0
Warwick	4.8	5.4	0.0
Stoke	3.3	1.8	2.2
Shrewsbury	3.0	0.0	0.0
Worcester	2.0	1.1	1.4
Stafford	1.9	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1.5	3.1	2.2
Hereford	0.9	0.0	0.0

Table A1.4. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in North East Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Bradford	14.2	16.1	7.3
Leeds	6.3	3.6	0.0 *
Sheffield	6.3	0.0	0.0
Newcastle	2.9	0.7	1.0
Teeside	2.5	3.5	0.0
Kingston upon Hull	1.9	3.0	0.0
Doncaster	1.8	0.0	0.0
Great Grimsby	1.8	7.1 *	5.0
Durham	1.4	0.0	0.0
York	1.4	0.0	0.0

Table A1.5. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in Northern Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Manchester Minshull Street	10.6	11.6	11.9
Burnley	9.8	0.0	0.0
Manchester Crown Square	9.3	1.8 *	1.2 *
Bolton	6.2	3.4	2.6
Preston	6.0	7.4	5.4
Liverpool	2.9	6.1	4.3
Barrow	0.7	0.0	0.0
Carlisle	0.7	0.0	0.0

Table A1.6. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in Wales & Chester Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Cardiff	4.7	4.0	2.9
Newport (South Wales)	2.2	0.0	0.0
Warrington	1.8	0.0	0.0
Swansea	1.7	1.0	1.6
Chester	1.6	0.0	0.0
Knutsford	1.6	4.6	3.9
Merthyr Tydfil	1.1	0.0	0.0
Caernafon	1.1	0.0	0.0
Carmarthen	1.0	0.0	0.0
Mold	1.0	0.0	0.0

Table A1.6. BME population, summoned and serving jurors in Western Region

Crown Court	% BME in population	% BME summoned	% BME serving
Southampton	4.8	2.0	2.6
Bristol	4.5	2.5	0.0
Portsmouth	2.9	1.7	2.4
Swindon	2.9	0.0	0.0
Gloucester	2.8	0.0	0.0
Winchester	2.8	0.0	0.0
Bournemouth	2.4	3.9	3,4
Plymouth	1.4	0.0	0.0
Newport IOW	1.3	0.0	0.0
Exeter	1.2	0.0	0.0
Taunton	1.2	0.0	0.0
Truro	1.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix 2

Probability of BME juror being on jury panels in each Crown Court

Probability was calculated of 1 or more BME jurors being selected in a random selection of a jury panel of 15, based on BME population in each catchment area. The equation for 1 or more is: $1 - p(\text{White British})$. Asterisks(*) indicate satellite courts.

Table A2.1. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in London Region

Crown Court	Average no. of jurors serving per week	% BME in court catchment area	No. of BME jurors expected per week	Probability of 1 or more BME jurors selected for jury panel
Blackfriars	69	33.1	22	1.00
Central Criminal Court	116	26.9	31	0.99
Croydon	59	17.6	10	0.95
Harrow	54	37.4	20	1.00
Inner London	81	23.3	18	0.98
Isleworth	64	32.5	20	1.00
Kingston on Thames	78	12.4	9	0.86
Middlesex	49	28.9	14	0.99
Snaresbrook	118	30.4	35	1.00
Southwark	93	33.4	31	1.00
Wood Green	86	29.5	25	0.99
Woolwich	52	15.6	8	0.92

Table A2.2. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in South East Region

				panel	
Aylesbury	29	9.3	2		0.77
Basildon	45	3.7	1		0.43
Bury St Edmunds*	1	2.5	0		0.32
Cambridge	24	4.4	1		0.49
Canterbury	53	2.5	1		0.32
Chelmsford	59	2.7	1		0.34
Chichester	21	1.9	0		0.25
Guildford	39	4.6	1		0.51
Hove	39	4.1	1		0.47
Ipswich	32	3.1	0		0.38
Kings Lynn*	6	1.2	0		0.17
Lewes	36	2.3	0		0.29
Luton	45	12	5		0.85
Maidstone	61	4.1	2		0.47
Norwich	39	1.5	0		0.20
Oxford	34	4.9	1		0.53
Peterborough	21	5.1	1		0.54
Reading	49	10	4		0.79
Southend*	15	2.9	0		0.36
St Albans	47	6.4	3		0.63

Table A2.3. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in Midlands Region

Crown Court	Average no. of jurors serving per week	% BME in court catchment area	No. of BME jurors expected per week	Probability of 1 or more BME jurors selected for jury panel
Birmingham	96	22.2	21	0.98
Coventry	22	13.1	2	0.88
Derby	30	5.8	1	0.59
Wolverhampton	56	13.7	7	0.89
Leicester	45	14.8	6	0.91
Lincoln	28	1.4	0	0.19
Northampton	30	4.9	1	0.53
Nottingham	55	6.5	3	0.64
Shrewsbury	23	2.9	0	0.36
Stafford	36	1.9	0	0.25
Stoke on Trent	18	3.2	0	0.39
Warwick	27	4.7	1	0.51
Worcester	32	1.9	0	0.25
Hereford*	22	0.8	0	0.11
Redditch*	1	4.5	0	0.50

Table A2.4. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in Western Region

Crown Court	Average no. of jurors serving per week	% BME in court catchment area	No. of BME jurors expected per week	Probability of 1 or more BME jurors selected for jury panel
Barnstaple*	5	0.9	0	0.13
Bournemouth	37	2.3	0	0.29
Bristol	62	4.5	2	0.50
Dorchester	9	1.3	0	0.18
Exeter	33	1.2	0	0.17
Gloucester	20	2.8	0	0.35
Newport IOW	19	1.3	0	0.18
Plymouth	22	1.3	0	0.18
Portsmouth	53	2.9	1	0.36
Salisbury	9	1.4	0	0.19
Southampton	34	4.7	1	0.51
Swindon	23	2.8	0	0.35
Taunton	20	1.2	0	0.17
Truro	17	1	0	0.14
Winchester	53	2.8	1	0.35

Table A2.5. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in North East Region

Crown Court	Average no. of jurors serving per week	% BME in court catchment area	No. of BME jurors expected per week	Probability of 1 or more BME jurors selected for jury panel
Bradford	45	14.2	6	0.90
Doncaster	14	1.8	0	0.24
Durham	17	1.4	0	0.19
Grimsby	19	1.8	0	0.24
Kingston on Hull	31	1.9	0	0.25
Leeds	61	6.3	3	0.62
Newcastle	51	2.8	1	0.35
Sheffield	51	6.3	3	0.62
Teesside	46	2.5	1	0.32
York	20	1.4	0	0.19

Table A.2.6. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in Northern Region

Crown Court	Average no. of jurors serving per week	% BME in court catchment area	No. of BME jurors expected per week	Probability of 1 or more BME jurors selected for jury panel
Barrow*	2	0.7	0	0.10
Bolton	36	6.2	2	0.62
Burnley	28	9.8	2	0.79
Carlisle	32	0.7	0	0.10
Lancaster*	10	1.8	0	0.24
Liverpool	104	2.8	2	0.35
Manchester CS	65	9.2	5	0.76
Manchester MS	85	10.5	8	0.81
Preston	64	6	3	0.60

Table A2.7. Probability of BME jurors being on jury panels in Wales & Chester Region

Crown Court	Average no. of jurors serving per week	% BME in court catchment area	No. of BME jurors expected per week	Probability of 1 or more BME jurors selected for jury panel
Cardiff	60	4.7	2	0.51
Chester	29	1.6	0	0.21
Merthyr Tydfil	26	1	0	0.14
Newport S Wales	27	2.2	0	0.28
Swansea	62	1.7	1	0.23
Warrington	23	1.7	0	0.23
Caernarfon*	14	1	0	0.14
Carmarthen*	8	0.9	0	0.13
Dolgellau*	1	0.6	0	0.09
Haverfordwest*	0	0.8	0	0.11
Knutsford*	15	1.5	0	0.20
Mold*	21	1	0	0.14
Welshpool*	0	0.9	0	0.13

Appendix 3

Analysis output of interaction between BME population, rental housing and summons response

The proportion of non-returns was modelled as a binary response variable with a probability of a non-return calculated for each court. A fixed effects model was assumed, where probabilities were independent for each court. All models were implemented using WinBUGS. This allowed examination of whether certain courts had significantly higher levels of non-return, by assessing whether the 95% credible interval for each court was higher than the population mean (around 15.1%).

Table A3.1. Logit model of summonses returned on the basis of proportion BME, proportion renting and their interaction

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Error	Z	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Prop. Renting	3.516	.429	8.192	.000	2.674	4.357
Prop. BME	3.083	.478	6.455	.000	2.147	4.019
Interaction	-4.466	1.107	-4.033	.000	-6.636	-2.296
Constant	-3.160	.140	-22.500	.000	-3.300	-3.020

Appendix 4

BME population levels in Ethnicity Concentration Courts

Table A4.1. BME Population Levels in Ethnicity Concentration Courts		
Ethnicity Concentration Courts	Overall %BME population in juror catchment area	BME population concentrations in postcode districts in catchment area
Burnley	9.8	27% (BB9)
Aylesbury	9.3	29% (HP12) 25% (HP11) 20% (HP13)
Manchester Crown Square	9.2	40% (M8) 39% (M12) 52% (M13) 30% (M14) 49% (M16) 22% (M18) 18% (OL1) 18% (OL4) 25% (OL8)
Nottingham	6.5	28% (NG7) 21% (NG1) 13% (NG2)
Bolton	6.2	24% (B3) 17% (B1)
Sheffield	6.3	37% (S3) 43% (S4) 22% (S7) 26% (S8)
Leeds	6.3	33% (WF13) 29% (WF17) 13% (LS17) 22% (LS12)
Preston	6.0	36% (BB1) 22% (PR1)
Derby	5.8	38.5% (DE23)
Oxford	4.9	14% (OX4) 11% (OX3) 11% (OX1)
Cardiff	4.7	22% (CF11) 29% (CF10)
Bristol	4.5	20% (BS5)
Liverpool	2.8	18% (L7) 22% (L8)

Appendix 5

Logit regression outputs for serving and non-serving jurors

Table A5.1. Multilevel binary logistic regression output: likelihood of serving having been summoned, based on a range of predictor variables

Covariate	Level	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
		Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Constant		1.31	0.14	1.21	0.13	1.22	0.14	1.21	0.13
Gender	Male	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Female	-0.05	0.08	-0.06	0.08	-0.06	0.08	-0.05	0.08
Prior jury service	No	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Yes	-0.10	0.11	-0.08	0.11	-0.08	0.11	-0.11	0.11
Income	<10k	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	10k-19k	0.48	0.11	0.50	0.11	0.51	0.11	0.49	0.11
	20k-34k	0.72	0.12	0.75	0.12	0.78	0.12	0.74	0.12
	35k-49k	0.85	0.15	0.88	0.14	0.91	0.14	0.87	0.14
	50k-64k	1.08	0.20	1.13	0.20	1.17	0.20	1.10	0.20
	65k+	0.81	0.17	0.83	0.17	0.89	0.17	0.83	0.17
Employment	Full time	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Part time	-0.59	0.12	-0.57	0.12	-0.54	0.12	-0.57	0.12
	Self	-1.42	0.12	-1.41	0.12	-1.39	0.12	-1.41	0.12
	Retired	-1.52	0.12	-1.52	0.12	-1.46	0.12	-1.50	0.12
	Student	-0.54	0.23	-0.48	0.23	-0.46	0.23	-0.51	0.23
	Caring	-1.76	0.15	-1.74	0.15	-1.72	0.15	-1.74	0.15
	Seeking	-0.36	0.24	-0.36	0.24	-0.34	0.24	-0.34	0.24
	Other	-2.38	0.20	-2.35	0.19	-2.29	0.19	-2.35	0.19
Ethnicity	White	0.00	-	0.00	-				
	Mixed	-0.21	0.43	-0.30	0.43				
	Asian	-0.33	0.36	-0.48	0.16				
	Black	-0.69	0.21	-0.79	0.21				
	Other	-0.25	0.39	-0.61	0.36				
Religion	None	0.00	-			0.00	-		
	Christian	-0.07	0.09			-0.10	0.09		
	Buddhist	-0.64	0.58			-0.89	0.58		
	Hindu	0.46	0.47			-0.33	0.30		
	Jewish	-0.54	0.48			-0.52	0.48		
	Muslim	0.08	0.37			-0.61	0.22		
	Sikh	0.32	0.58			-0.27	0.46		
	Other	-0.16	0.67			-0.38	0.63		
First language	English	0.00	-					0.00	-
	Other	-0.86	0.18					-0.92	0.16
Court level variance		0.032	0.022	0.036	0.022	0.050	0.025	0.040	0.023

Table A5.2. Multilevel multinomial logistic regression output: likelihood of serving on date summoned vs. deferred, disqualified and excused on the basis of a range of predictor variables

Covariate	Levels	Deferred vs. Served at time summoned		Disqualified vs. Served at time summoned		Excused vs. Served at time summoned	
		Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE
Constant		-1.27	0.10	-2.87	0.16	-1.55	0.09
Gender	Male	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Female	0.05	0.08	-0.71	0.14	0.36	0.08
Prior appointment	No	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Yes	0.04	0.12	0.05	0.20	0.11	0.12
Ethnicity	White British	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	BME	-0.07	0.16	0.93	0.21	0.12	0.14
First language	English	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Other	0.29	0.25	0.95	0.28	0.70	0.21
Economically active	No	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	Yes	0.07	0.11	2.02	0.15	1.28	0.09
Income	<19k	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
	20k-34k	0.04	0.11	-0.34	0.18	-0.08	0.10
	35k+	0.23	0.10	-0.19	0.17	0.04	0.10

The following present Mlwin equations for multilevel multinomial logistic regression model of status. The model was fitted by Bayesian estimation using Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Vague priors were used, with a burn-in of 5000 iterations and chain of 50,000 iterations.

$$\text{resp}_{ijk} \sim \text{Multinomial}(x\text{cons}_{ijk}, \pi_{ijk})$$

$$\log(\pi_{1jk} / \pi_{4jk}) = \beta_{0k}x\text{cons}.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + 0.049(0.084)\text{female}.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + 0.036(0.121)\text{prior}.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + \\ -0.071(0.156)\text{BME}.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + 0.292(0.249)\text{Otherlang}.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + 0.073(0.108)\text{inactive}.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + \\ 0.040(0.107)20k35k.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk} + 0.230(0.102)35k+.\text{Deferred}4_{ijk}$$

$$\beta_{0k} = -1.268(0.096) + v_{0k}$$

$$\log(\pi_{2jk} / \pi_{4jk}) = \beta_{1k}x\text{cons}.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + -0.715(0.144)\text{female}.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + 0.048(0.201)\text{prior}.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + \\ 0.929(0.205)\text{BME}.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + 0.950(0.276)\text{Otherlang}.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + \\ 2.024(0.151)\text{inactive}.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + -0.344(0.177)20k35k.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk} + \\ -0.188(0.172)35k+.\text{Disqualified}4_{ijk}$$

$$\beta_{1k} = -2.866(0.156) + v_{1k}$$

$$\log(\pi_{3jk} / \pi_{4jk}) = \beta_{2k}x\text{cons}.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + 0.363(0.083)\text{female}.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + 0.108(0.116)\text{prior}.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + \\ 0.115(0.143)\text{BME}.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + 0.704(0.209)\text{Otherlang}.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + 1.282(0.087)\text{inactive}.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + \\ -0.076(0.098)20k35k.\text{Excused}4_{ijk} + 0.036(0.098)35k+.\text{Excused}4_{ijk}$$

$$\beta_{2k} = -1.553(0.093) + v_{2k}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_{0k} \\ v_{1k} \\ v_{2k} \end{bmatrix} \sim N(0, \Omega_v) : \Omega_v = \begin{bmatrix} 0.070(0.030) & & \\ 0.018(0.028) & 0.087(0.044) & \\ 0.012(0.020) & 0.010(0.024) & 0.047(0.024) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{cov}(y_{sjk}, y_{ijk}) = -\pi_{sjk}\pi_{ijk}/x\text{cons}_{ijk} : s \neq i; \quad \pi_{sjk}(1 - \pi_{ijk})/x\text{cons}_{ijk} : s = i;$$

$$\text{Deviance}(MCMC) = 9282.806(12993 \text{ of } 12993 \text{ cases in use})$$

Appendix 6

Regression and probability outputs for juror decision-making

Juror and Defendant Ethnicity Effect

A binary logistic regression model was fitted with juror initial vote (not guilty vs. guilty) as a response variable. Two binary predictors, binary ethnicity of juror (White vs. BME), binary ethnicity of defendant (White vs. Black/Asian) and their interaction were fitted as predictors.

Table A6.1. Binary logistic regression output, modelling likelihood of finding defendants not guilty as opposed to guilty based on of juror ethnicity, defendant ethnicity and their interaction.

Predictor	B	S.E.	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)
BME juror	-1.422	.491	8.379	1	.004	.241
Black/Asian defendant	.349	.276	1.598	1	.206	1.418
BME juror X Black/Asian defendant	1.802	.618	8.509	1	.004	6.061
Constant	.424	.214	3.908	1	.048	1.528

Table A6.2. Probability (derived from model) of finding defendants guilty on the basis of juror and defendant ethnicity.

	p(guilty)
White Juror/White Defendant	0.40
White Juror/BME Defendant	0.32
BME Juror/BME Defendant	0.24
BME Juror/White Defendant	0.73

Deliberation effect

A binary multilevel logit model was fitted to look at the impact of juror ethnicity and defendant ethnicity on juror votes after deliberation (output in Table A9.1). A multilevel model was used to account for the fact that, following deliberation, jurors were nested within juries. The multilevel model accounts for this hierarchical structure by fitting a jury level random effect.

Table A6.3. Multilevel binary logistic regression output: likelihood of a not guilty vote following deliberation based on of juror ethnicity, defendant ethnicity and their interaction.

Predictor	Estimate	S.E.
BME juror	-0.76	0.46
Black/Asian defendant	0.52	0.39
Non-White juror X Black/Asian defendant	1.46	0.63
Constant	0.43	0.30
Jury level variance	0.44	0.23

Table A6.4. Probability (derived by simulation from model) of juror finding defendant guilty on the basis of juror and defendant ethnicity.

	p(guilty)
White Juror/White Defendant	0.39
White Juror/BME Defendant	0.28
BME Juror/BME Defendant	0.16
BME/White Defendant	0.59

Victim effect

A multilevel model was fitted to examine the impact of juror ethnicity and both defendant and victim ethnicity on juror votes after deliberation. The multilevel model accounts for the fact that jurors were nested within juries by fitting a jury level random effect. Four models were fitted in total, with increasing complexity.

Table A6.5. Multilevel binary logit model output regression output: likelihood of a not guilty vote following deliberation based on juror, defendant and victim ethnicity.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Predictor	Est.	S.E.	Est.	S.E.	Est.	S.E.	Est.	S.E.
BME juror	-0.76	0.46	0.38	0.56	-0.50	0.66	-0.87	0.74
Black/Asian defendant	0.52	0.39	-	-	0.59	0.40	0.18	0.55
Black/Asian victim	-	-	-0.32	0.44	-0.38	0.40	-0.74	0.58
BME juror X Black/Asian defendant	1.46	0.63	-	-	1.69	0.68	2.67	1.29
BME juror X Black/Asian victim	-	-	-0.44	0.68	-0.55	0.73	0.22	0.95
Black/Asian defendant X Black/Asian victim	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.68	0.75
BME juror X Black/Asian defendant X Black/Asian victim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.66	1.51
Constant	0.43	0.30	1.04	0.33	0.67	0.37	0.82	0.42
Jury level variance	0.44	0.23	0.70	0.32	0.46	0.25	0.37	0.22

Obtaining probability of a guilty vote from model 2 in Table A10.1 by simulation gives the estimates in Table A10.2.

Table A6.6. Probability (derived by simulation from model 2) of finding defendants guilty on the basis of juror and victim ethnicity.

	p(guilty)
White Juror/White Victim	0.29
White Juror/BME Victim	0.35
BME Juror/BME Victim	0.36
BME Juror/White Victim	0.23

Appendix 7 Juror summoning survey questionnaire

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please read the reverse of this page

For all the questions below, please tick the appropriate box

A Are you: Male Female

B Have you ever done jury service before? Yes No

C Are you employed? If **YES**, please tick one below: If **NO**, please tick one below:

Employee (full-time) <input type="checkbox"/>	Retired <input type="checkbox"/>
Employee (part-time) <input type="checkbox"/>	Student <input type="checkbox"/>
Self-Employed <input type="checkbox"/>	Looking after family <input type="checkbox"/>
	Looking for work <input type="checkbox"/>
	Other <input type="checkbox"/>

(please specify)

D What is your HOUSEHOLD'S total income per year? (i.e., before deductions such as tax)

Under £10,000 <input type="checkbox"/>	£20,000 - £34,999 <input type="checkbox"/>	£50,000 - £64,999 <input type="checkbox"/>
£10,000 - £19,999 <input type="checkbox"/>	£35,000 - £49,999 <input type="checkbox"/>	Over £65,000 <input type="checkbox"/>

E What is your ethnic group? (please tick one box only)

White	Mixed	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Other Ethnic Groups
British <input type="checkbox"/>	White and Black Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/>	Indian <input type="checkbox"/>	Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/>	Chinese <input type="checkbox"/>
Irish <input type="checkbox"/>	White and Black African <input type="checkbox"/>	Pakistani <input type="checkbox"/>	African <input type="checkbox"/>	Any other <input type="checkbox"/>
Any other <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(please specify)</i>	White and Asian <input type="checkbox"/>	Bangladeshi <input type="checkbox"/>	Any other Black background <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(please specify)</i>	<i>(please specify)</i>
	Any other mixed background <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(please specify)</i>	Any other Asian background <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(please specify)</i>		

F What is your religious affiliation? (please tick one box only)

None <input type="checkbox"/>	Christian <input type="checkbox"/>	Buddhist <input type="checkbox"/>	Hindu <input type="checkbox"/>
Jewish <input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim <input type="checkbox"/>	Sikh <input type="checkbox"/>	Any other <input type="checkbox"/>

(please specify)

G What is your first language? English Other *(please specify)*

Please return this form with pages 3 and 4 of the summons in the pre-paid envelope provided.

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

We are grateful for your co-operation in completing this additional form.

Your assistance is voluntary, and the information you provide will in no way affect your jury service.

This form is part of a project about jury service being conducted by the University of Birmingham. Any information you provide on this form will be treated by the project in the strictest confidence, and will not be shared with any other organisation or individual.

Thank you for completing this form. Your assistance is invaluable to us.

Please return this form with pages 3 and 4 of the summons in the pre-paid envelope provided.

Ministry of Justice Research Series No.2/07

Diversity and Fairness in the Jury System

This study examines whether the juror summoning process discriminates against Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, and whether juries discriminate against defendants based on ethnicity. It establishes whether a representative group of BME jurors are summoned for and serve at each Crown Court in England and Wales, and whether jurors are representative in terms of age, gender, employment, income and religion. It then examines whether a defendant's ethnicity affects verdicts of racially mixed juries, and whether juror decisions to convict or acquit are affected by a charge of racial aggravation, a victim's ethnicity or jury deliberations.

For further copies of this publication please contact the following address:

Ministry of Justice
Research Unit
Selborne House
54 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QW

Tel: 020 7210 8520

Fax: 020 7210 0693

E-mail: research@justice.gsi.gov.uk

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/research.htm>