Online Appendix Materials for:

Unequal Jury Representation and Its Consequences

Shamena Anwar
RAND Corporation

Patrick Bayer
Duke University

Randi Hjalmarsson
University of Gothenburg

This PDF file includes:
Appendix A. Data Appendix
Appendix B. Supplementary Tables ST1-ST8

Appendix A. Data Appendix

A1. Data Description and Sample Creation

We received two data sets from the Harris County Clerk's Office: a defendant data set and a jury data set. The defendant data includes information on every felony case a jury made a decision on (verdict and/or sentencing) between May 31, 2005 and March 29, 2012. The defendant data included information on the name, date of birth, gender, zip code of residence, and criminal history of the defendant, as well as the case number, offense category and degree, verdict, sentence, date of filing and disposition. The defendant's race was provided, but their ethnicity was not; we used the defendant's name to code whether they were Hispanic or not.[1] To find information on the start and end dates of the defendant's jury trial, and whether convicted defendants chose either a jury or a judge to sentence them, we used the defendant's name and case number to look up that information in the online Harris County Criminal Records system.[2]

We organized the data at the defendant-jury level, so that a defendant with multiple charges that went to the same jury was coded as one observation. We only kept cases where a jury verdict was listed, and then dropped the subset of these cases where the jury only did the sentencing (after the defendant had already pled guilty), leaving us with 2,365 cases. There are three types of case categories that remain: (1) cases where the jury made the decision to convict, but a judge did the sentencing; (2) cases where the jury made the decision to convict and did the sentencing; and (3) cases where the jury made the decision to acquit. For the cases in the last category, we do not observe who the defendant chose to do the sentencing if the jury had convicted them. However, we treat cases in this category as the jury sentencing the defendant to a sentence of zero years.

The juror demographic data set has the following information for each of the approximately 309,000 jurors that were empaneled for a jury trial between May 31, 2005 and March 14, 2012: case number, panel identification number, panel status (i.e., on the seated jury, struck, or dismissed), the juror's position in the panel, gender, birth date, and zip code of residence, as well as the date and time they were assigned to the panel, and the date and time they were released from the panel.[3] Using the juror's zip code, we merge census data on the juror's neighborhood, including the racial composition, median income, population size, high school graduation rate, share with income below poverty, and share foreign born.

Samples for Descriptive Analyses of Jury Pool and Defendant Representation in Section 2

Section 2 of the paper presents a separate descriptive analysis of zip code representation in the jury pool and defendant populations and thus does not require a match of these two data sets. These analyses are thus based on the full datasets outlined above, with a few sample restrictions as described here related to the validity of the zip code variable in each dataset. Specifically,

---

[1] To determine whether a defendant was Hispanic, we first identified the list of the 600 most popular Hispanic surnames using census data. If a defendant's surname was on that list, we classified them as Hispanic. However, after doing this we found there were still many defendants that were coded as "white" that had distinctively Hispanic names. We thus went through the white defendants and manually coded them as Hispanic based on whether their name sounded Hispanic. For defendants that were subsequently incarcerated, one can manually look up these defendants in the Department of Corrections records where Hispanic status is coded. We did this for a random sample of the cases we manually coded (where the defendant was subsequently incarcerated) and found that our manual classifications were always correct. We also pulled out defendants that were classified as white but had distinctively Arab sounding names and coded them as "other".

[2] See http://www.hcdistrictclerk.com/Edocs/Public/search.aspx.

[3] Not all jury pools that were empaneled for a trial actually tried a case. Sometimes the case they were empaneled for was delayed and the entire panel was dismissed.

we exclude jurors and defendants with missing zip code information, zip codes not matched to the 2000 Census, and zip codes outside Harris County. This yields an analysis sample of 299,945 jury pool members and 1,754 defendants from 129 zip codes from which we calculate jury and defendant representation ratios.

Constructing the Sample to Examine the Effect of Jury Composition on Trial Outcomes Used in Sections 3 and 4

Examining the impact of jury pool composition on trial outcomes required matching the defendant and jury pool data sets. Before conducting this match there were a few additional drops we made.[4] With respect to the defendant data set, we dropped 65 cases where the defendant was not a white, Black, or Hispanic individual. We also dropped all of the 172 capital cases as there was no real outcome variation among these cases; only one defendant was not convicted. With these sample restrictions there are 2,128 cases remaining that can be potentially matched to the jury data. With respect to the jury data, we dropped jury panels for which we could not identify a seated jury. As noted to us by the court clerk, the panel status variable is not fully reliable, as sometimes everyone in the pool is incorrectly listed as struck. We thus used the jury panel's assignment and release dates to help determine who on the seated jury was seated or not, and dropped panels where this determination could not be made.[5]

A key issue that limited the ability to match the jury data with the defendant data is that the case number attached to a jury panel was sometimes wrong; this problem was noted to us by the court clerk when the data was provided. The court clerk also provided us with 62 defendant-jury panel matches from the sample (the "test sample") that the office had manually matched and knew to be correct. This test sample allowed us to determine in what specific situations the case number attached to a jury panel would be incorrect, and to develop an algorithm that would allow the defendant data to be matched to the jury data. We detail the algorithm we developed in the next section. Our algorithm only allows us to match 1,316 of the 2,128 cases. However, we are very confident in the matches for those cases, as all cases in the test sample for which our algorithm could find a match were correct. As we show in Appendix Table ST1, the matched sample is relatively similar to the unmatched sample, except the matched sample has more female defendant and murder cases, as we more aggressively tried to match these cases.

This sample of 1,316 cases includes 329 cases where the jury makes the conviction decision and the judge makes the sentencing decision. Because in the majority of the cases the jury makes both decisions, and we want to look at both the conviction and sentencing stage simultaneously for our main outcome, we drop the 329 cases where the judge conducts the

[4] Note that the defendant and jury data sets we start with here are not the same as those used in Section 3, because we do not make the same zip code drops as were done there. Specifically, the only drop made based on zip code is that any panel where the jurors zip codes were missing were dropped—this was done at the end of the matching process and resulted in six cases being dropped.

[5] Any panel for which the panel status identified between 12-15 members as being on the seated jury was treated as correct, as this is the expected number of seated jurors for a trial (including alternates). For cases that did not fall into this category, we used the jury panel's assignment and release dates to help identify the seated jurors. Specifically, jurors that are seated should be released at a time that will be equal to the time at which the last juror in that panel is released. If the number of potential jurors that are released at the latest time is between 12-15, we identify these jurors as the seated jurors. We could not identify a seated jury in cases that did not fall into either of the above two categories. This could either be because there was no seated jury, or because the data does not allow us to identify it. Note that we are only identifying jurors that are seated versus not. For jurors that are not seated, we do not seek to distinguish between whether they were struck for cause, dismissed via peremptory challenge, or not reached.

sentencing and consider only those remaining cases where the jury makes both decisions. Finally, we omit 6 cases where the main variables of interests – i.e. zip code characteristics and representation ratios – cannot be created because the juror zip codes were missing for these cases.

Of these 981 cases that remain, about 75% are life-sentence eligible, either because of the severity of the current offenses or a combination of the current offense and criminal history. As noted in Section 1, all results presented in Sections 3 and 4 are run on the sample of 734 trials where a life sentence is a possible outcome.

A2. Matching Jury Pool and Defendant Trial Data Sets

This section details the reasons why it was difficult to match the defendant data to the jury data, and describes the matching algorithm we developed. The Harris County Clerk's office provided information regarding why some of the cases were difficult to match; they also manually matched 62 defendant cases to the correct jury panel and provided this to us. This test sample is what allowed us to better understand the specific reasons the cases were difficult to match, and allowed us to develop an algorithm whose accuracy could be checked. While the eventual algorithm we developed only allowed us to match 62% of our defendant sample, the accuracy of this matching method for the test sample was 100%.

The key difficulty in developing a crosswalk for the jury and defendant datasets was that the case number that was attached to a jury panel was sometimes incorrect. As noted by the court clerk, a jury panel would be pulled for a case that was supposed to go to trial that day. The jury panel would then be assigned the case number for that trial. However, sometimes that jury trial got delayed, or a plea deal was struck, and the jury panel ended up being assigned to a different case that went to trial that day. Unfortunately, the old case number remained linked to the jury panel. Thus matching cases and jury panels up on case number alone is not a sufficient matching method.

A second related issue is that because jury trials get delayed, there are sometimes multiple panels that are assigned to a given case number. The first few panels that were called for case A could have then been seated for another case, or dismissed completely. Again, one cannot just do a straight case number match between the data sets, as it would result in many different panels being assigned to a case, when only one actually saw the case.

A third issue is that sometimes a defendant is on trial for multiple charges, where each charge has a different case number. The jury panel is only attached to one of those case numbers, even though they issued verdicts on all of the charges. However, sometimes a defendant will have some of the charges dismissed right before the jury trial, but the jury panel will still be attached to one of these dismissed charges. As this dismissed charge is not one where a jury rendered a verdict, there is no case number match in the defendant data set.

Below we discuss the specific matching algorithm we used:
1) **Only jury panels that had an identifiable seated jury were eligible to be matched.** Note that if a jury panel assigned to case A did not have any seated jurors, it implies that while it was originally assigned to case A, it was dismissed because case A ended up not going to trial that day. However, as we discussed above, it was sometimes difficult to tell if a jury had seated jurors. There is thus a possibility we are dropping some juries that in fact did have a seated jury, which eliminates some potential matches.

2) **If there was a case number match between a defendant and a jury panel, and the disposition date in the defendant data was within 6 days of the last release date for the matched jury panel, this was classified as a match.** Note that if the jury trial was pulled for case A on day X, and case A went to trial on day X, the match should be correct. This is because cases only get incorrectly matched when the original trial is delayed and the new panel seated for case A is also misclassified; however, if this were to happen, the dates for case A's trial would not match the jury panel start and release date. Because there is likely to be some margin of error on the date variables, we allowed the dates to be within 6 days of each other. [6,7] Note that often there were multiple panels associated with one case number. If we could not identify a unique panel whose release date was within six days of the disposition date, we did not classify it as a match.

3) **If a jury panel had a case number that corresponded to a dismissed charge for defendant A, we classified that panel as having tried the other charges for defendant A that did go to trial.** This matching process was conducted by first pulling a defendant's name that had not been matched by the previous process. We looked the defendant's name up in Harris County's online criminal records system and found all charges (which will have unique case numbers) that would have gone to trial at around the same time. We often found that some of the charges had been dismissed right before the case for the other charges went to trial. For each of these dismissed charges, we tried to match the associated case number to a jury panel. If we found a jury panel that had a matching case number, and the trial disposition and juror release dates were within 6 days, this was classified as a match. This was an extremely tedious matching process, and thus we only attempted to do this with defendant groups we wanted to increase the sample size for. These groups included cases with murder charges (as these were the most serious charges in our sample), and cases with female defendants (as we thought we might be able to conduct comparisons of female and male defendants).

To analyze how our match process performed we used the test sample provided by the county clerk which provided the correct defendant-jury panel matches for 62 defendant cases. Using our above described matching procedure, we could identify matches for 57 of the 62 cases. Comparing our identified matches with the correct matches the clerk provided indicated that our algorithm got all of these matches correct. Thus, the upside to our match algorithm is that all of the matches it makes seem to be correct. The downside is that there will be cases (five in the test sample) for which we cannot find a match. For the five test cases we couldn't match, we used the jury panel that was identified to be correct in the test sample.

Applying our matching algorithm to the full sample of 2,128 cases allowed us to match 1,316 cases. Note that a likely reason the fraction of cases we were able to match in the full sample was smaller than in the test sample is because we only used step 3 in our algorithm described above on a select sample of cases, although we performed this step for all cases in the test sample. Because we are unable to match a reasonable fraction of the defendant sample, it is important to examine how the unmatched sample compares to the matched sample. Table ST1 compares the defendant and case characteristics between the matched and the unmatched sample. The results reveal that the matched sample has more females and more murder cases.

---

[6] 93.4% of the resulting matched sample has a defendant disposition date that is within one day of the jury's last release date.

[7] If the original trial is cancelled (e.g. the defendant takes a plea deal), there is no possibility of a match, as the case number the jury was pulled for will correspond to a defendant that did not have a jury trial and is thus not in the defendant data set.

This is to be expected as we only tried step 3 in our algorithm on these cases, and thus they compose a higher fraction of the matched sample. The fact that the matched sample has roughly double the murder cases than the unmatched sample is likely the reason that we find the matched sample has a larger proportion of life-sentence eligible cases and first and second degree felonies, and that the average incarceration length is longer. This implies that if we had not tried to overmatch female defendant and murder cases, the ability to match a defendant to their jury panel would have been relatively random.

Appendix B. Supplementary Tables

ST1: A Comparison of the Defendant Sample That Can be Matched to a Jury with the Defendant Sample That Cannot be Matched to a Jury

	Matched Sample	Unmatched Sample	p-value for difference
Defendant Characteristics			
Black Defendant	0.575	0.578	0.915
Hispanic Defendant	0.262	0.281	0.347
White Defendant	0.163	0.142	0.194
Female Defendant	0.082	0.043	0.001
Average Age of Defendant	34.6	34.4	0.617
Case Characteristics			
Total Charges	1.15	1.16	0.769
Life Sentence Eligible	0.714	0.670	0.034
1st Degree Felony	0.553	0.509	0.045
2nd Degree Felony	0.239	0.207	0.083
3rd Degree Felony	0.102	0.127	0.075
State Jail Felony	0.084	0.119	0.007
Any Drug Charge	0.132	0.183	0.001
Any Murder Charge	0.198	0.097	0.000
Any Robbery Charge	0.176	0.197	0.231
Any Other Violent Charge	0.116	0.123	0.634
Any Property Charge	0.110	0.121	0.459
Any Sex Charge	0.184	0.175	0.600
Any Weapons Charge	0.020	0.030	0.147
Criminal History			
Any Past 1st Degree Felonies	0.114	0.105	0.506
Any Past 2nd Degree Felonies	0.223	0.240	0.373
Any Past 3rd Degree Felonies	0.200	0.193	0.715
Any Past State Jail Felonies	0.141	0.169	0.087
Any Past Misdemeanors	0.530	0.505	0.268
Any Past Times in Prison	0.318	0.314	0.834
Any Past Times in Jail	0.510	0.493	0.439
Sentence Variables			
Judge does Sentencing	0.250	0.282	0.103
Any Conviction	0.913	0.898	0.253
Incarceration Length (years w/acquittal=0)	29.8	25.3	0.001
Observations	1316	812	

ST2: Summary Statistics for Life Sentence Eligible Cases

	All Cases	White Defendants	Black Defendants	Hispanic Defendants
Defendant Characteristics				
White Defendant	0.142			
Black Defendant	0.594			
Hispanic Defendant	0.264			
Female Defendant	0.060	0.115	0.057	0.036
Average Age at Filing	33.2	37.9	32.4	32.4
Case Characteristics				
More Than One Charge	0.124	0.135	0.110	0.149
1st Degree Felony	0.812	0.808	0.775	0.897
2nd Degree Felony	0.144	0.135	0.177	0.077
3rd Degree Felony	0.044	0.058	0.048	0.026
Any Drug Charge	0.097	0.029	0.117	0.088
Any Murder Charge	0.283	0.317	0.271	0.294
Any Robbery Charge	0.240	0.144	0.280	0.201
Any Other Violent Charge	0.086	0.058	0.112	0.041
Any Property Charge	0.076	0.096	0.078	0.062
Any Sex Charge	0.188	0.279	0.128	0.273
Any Weapons Charge	0.018	0	0.028	0.005
Criminal History				
Any Past 1st Degree Felonies	0.127	0.067	0.158	0.088
Any Past 2nd Degree Felonies	0.252	0.212	0.294	0.180
Any Past 3rd Degree Felonies	0.211	0.202	0.250	0.129
Any Past Times in Prison	0.339	0.279	0.397	0.242
Any Past Times in Jail	0.515	0.442	0.569	0.433
Outcome Variables				
Any Conviction	0.903	0.942	0.894	0.902
Convicted of a Life Sentence	0.147	0.192	0.131	0.160
Incarceration Length (years w/acquittals=0)	38.8	42.0	37.2	40.5
Observations	734	104	436	194

Note – This table presents summary statistics for the sample of defendants (overall and by race/ethnicity) eligible for a life sentence. The sample is restricted to those cases for which the jury and defendant data sets could be matched.

ST3: The Relationship Between Case Characteristics and Zip Code Representation in Jury Pools

	Proportion of Jury Pool in Each Quartile of Representation Ratio:			
	Quartile 1	Quartile 2	Quartile 3	Quartile 4
Male Defendant	-0.00341	-0.00642	0.00329	0.00654
	(0.00936)	(0.00865)	(0.00866)	(0.00949)
Black Defendant	0.00807	-0.00164	-0.0105*	0.00403
	(0.00654)	(0.00605)	(0.00606)	(0.00664)
Hispanic Defendant	0.0111	-0.00737	-0.0117*	0.00796
	(0.00712)	(0.00658)	(0.00659)	(0.00722)
Age at Filing	0.000243	-0.000342*	0.000191	-0.0000919
	(0.000212)	(0.000196)	(0.000196)	(0.000215)
Number of Charges	-0.00407	0.000619	-0.00225	0.00570
	(0.00460)	(0.00426)	(0.00426)	(0.00467)
Any Drug Charge	0.0194*	-0.00883	-0.000697	-0.00989
	(0.0113)	(0.0105)	(0.0105)	(0.0115)
Any Murder Charge	0.00944	-0.0100	-0.00639	0.00696
	(0.0101)	(0.00935)	(0.00936)	(0.0103)
Any Robbery Charge	0.00658	-0.00605	-0.00636	0.00583
	(0.0101)	(0.00939)	(0.00939)	(0.0103)
Any Other Violent Charge	0.0225**	-0.0155	-0.000796	-0.00617
	(0.0107)	(0.00990)	(0.00991)	(0.0109)
Any Property Charge	-0.000196	0.000801	-0.0115	0.0109
	(0.0111)	(0.0103)	(0.0103)	(0.0113)
Any Sex Charge	0.000641	-0.00481	-0.00389	0.00806
	(0.0109)	(0.0101)	(0.0101)	(0.0111)
Any Weapons Charge	0.0123	-0.0169	0.00769	-0.00312
	(0.0172)	(0.0159)	(0.0159)	(0.0175)
1st Degree Felony	0.00115	-0.00161	-0.00249	0.00295
	(0.00727)	(0.00673)	(0.00673)	(0.00738)
Any Prior Felonies	0.00333	0.00171	-0.00604	0.000988
	(0.00524)	(0.00485)	(0.00485)	(0.00532)
Constant	0.233***	0.273***	0.258***	0.236***
	(0.0156)	(0.0144)	(0.0144)	(0.0158)
Observations	734	734	734	734
p-value for whether all coeff jointly equal zero	0.1855	0.7084	0.7699	0.5234
R-squared	0.025	0.015	0.014	0.018

Note: All regressions use OLS and standard errors are in parentheses. *,**, and *** indicate the coefficient is significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

ST4: The Relationship Between Case Characteristics and Jury Pool Characteristics

	Avg. % White in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	Avg. % Black in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	Avg. % Hispanic in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	Avg. Age of Jury Pool	Proportion of Males in Jury Pool	Avg. Median Family Income in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	Avg. High School Graduation Rate in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	Avg % of Foreign Born Individuals in Jury Pool's Zip Codes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Male Defendant	0.124	0.291	-0.517	0.152	-0.00764	502.2	0.320	-0.157
	(0.564)	(0.401)	(0.385)	(0.272)	(0.0103)	(551.2)	(0.326)	(0.208)
Black Defendant	-0.400	0.274	0.222	-0.203	0.00227	-481.4	-0.182	-0.0666
	(0.395)	(0.281)	(0.269)	(0.191)	(0.00720)	(385.6)	(0.228)	(0.145)
Hispanic Defendant	-0.113	0.176	-0.0336	-0.0573	0.00297	-235.7	0.00300	-0.0981
	(0.429)	(0.305)	(0.293)	(0.207)	(0.00783)	(419.4)	(0.248)	(0.158)
Age at Filing	-0.0101	0.0125	0.000633	0.00452	0.000388*	-6.353	-0.00712	-0.00364
	(0.0128)	(0.00907)	(0.00871)	(0.00616)	(0.000233)	(12.47)	(0.00736)	(0.00470)
Number of Charges	-0.00208	-0.214	0.166	0.121	-0.000774	-8.851	0.0141	0.0673
	(0.278)	(0.197)	(0.189)	(0.134)	(0.00506)	(271.1)	(0.160)	(0.102)
Any Drug Charge	-0.911	0.248	0.630	0.513	0.0145	-687.6	-0.663*	0.451*
	(0.683)	(0.485)	(0.466)	(0.330)	(0.0125)	(667.0)	(0.394)	(0.251)
Any Murder Charge	-0.841	0.438	0.465	0.274	0.0167	-431.1	-0.600*	0.205
	(0.610)	(0.433)	(0.416)	(0.294)	(0.0111)	(595.6)	(0.352)	(0.224)
Any Robbery Charge	-0.493	0.203	0.271	0.462	0.0215*	32.75	-0.340	0.206
	(0.612)	(0.435)	(0.417)	(0.295)	(0.0112)	(597.8)	(0.353)	(0.225)
Any Other Violent Charge	-1.336**	0.519	0.837*	0.322	0.0128	-493.8	-0.892**	0.503**
	(0.646)	(0.459)	(0.440)	(0.312)	(0.0118)	(630.7)	(0.372)	(0.237)
Any Property Charge	-0.352	0.193	0.164	0.106	0.0242**	310.2	-0.263	0.0279
	(0.670)	(0.476)	(0.457)	(0.324)	(0.0122)	(654.9)	(0.387)	(0.247)
Any Sex Charge	-0.361	0.300	0.0385	0.154	0.00783	179.8	-0.156	0.154
	(0.659)	(0.469)	(0.450)	(0.318)	(0.0120)	(644.0)	(0.380)	(0.243)
Any Weapons Charge	0.574	-0.584	-0.123	0.362	0.00743	1483.1	0.189	0.355
	(1.039)	(0.738)	(0.708)	(0.501)	(0.0190)	(1014.8)	(0.599)	(0.382)
1st Degree Felony	0.0931	0.130	-0.131	-0.0221	-0.00874	28.42	0.0275	-0.152
	(0.439)	(0.312)	(0.299)	(0.212)	(0.00800)	(428.4)	(0.253)	(0.161)
Any Prior Felonies	0.0587	-0.0432	-0.00396	-0.0258	-0.00443	-101.9	-0.0214	-0.0324
	(0.316)	(0.225)	(0.216)	(0.153)	(0.00577)	(308.8)	(0.182)	(0.116)
Constant	54.59***	13.48***	25.16***	46.92***	0.469***	63072.3***	81.34***	17.95***
	(0.939)	(0.667)	(0.640)	(0.453)	(0.0171)	(916.9)	(0.542)	(0.345)
Observations	734	734	734	734	734	734	734	734
p-value: all coef jointly = 0	0.6753	0.8679	0.3523	0.8163	0.671	0.5285	0.2484	0.4542
R-squared	0.015	0.012	0.021	0.013	0.015	0.018	0.023	0.019

Note: All regressions use OLS and standard errors are in parentheses. *,**, and *** indicate the coefficient is significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

ST5: Relationship Between Jury Pool Representation and Trial Outcomes for Hispanic Defendants

	Sentence Length (years w/acquittals=0)		Convicted of a Life Sentence
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Proportion of Pool in Q1	12.93	1.836	0.0876
	(38.56)	(44.23)	(0.494)
Proportion of Pool in Q4	27.66	-15.38	-0.566
	(38.01)	(43.88)	(0.490)
Constant	19.85	43.40**	0.286
	(17.06)	(19.58)	(0.219)
Full Sample or Life Sent. Elig. (LSE)?	Full	LSE	LSE
Defendant Race	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic
Observations	264	194	194
R-Squared	0.002	0.001	0.010

Note: All regressions use OLS and standard errors are in parentheses. *,**, and *** indicate the coefficient is significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

ST6: Robustness of Relationship Between Jury Pool Representation and Trial Outcomes for Black Defendants

	Sentence Length (1)	Log of Sentence Length (2)	Sentence Length Topcoded at Age 90 (3)	Years Until Parole Eligible (4)	Median Sentence Length (5)	70th percentile of Sentence Length Distribution (6)	80th percentile of Sentence Length Distribution (7)
Proportion of Pool in Q1	3.229	-0.375	-2.129	0.414	35.54	-1.620	-50.17
	(29.13)	(1.283)	(18.79)	(9.483)	(32.78)	(66.00)	(91.56)
Proportion of Pool in Q4	92.06***	3.369***	52.13***	26.70***	132.7***	113.6*	170.9*
	(29.36)	(1.293)	(18.94)	(9.558)	(33.04)	(66.52)	(92.29)
Constant	12.64	2.272***	16.49**	6.126	-12.29	15.50	37.07
	(12.63)	(0.556)	(8.148)	(4.112)	(14.22)	(28.62)	(39.71)
Regression Method	OLS	OLS	OLS	OLS	quantile	quantile	quantile
Observations	436	436	436	436	436	436	436

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. *,**, and *** indicate the coefficient is significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

ST7: Which Jury Pool Characteristics Impact the Likelihood of Being Convicted of a Life Sentence?

	Dependent Variable = Convicted of a Life Sentence					
		White Defendants			Black Defendants	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Proportion of Jury Pool from Zip Codes > 76% White	-0.323	-0.314	-0.425	0.584*	0.346	0.305
	(0.877)	(1.075)	(1.059)	(0.347)	(0.406)	(0.414)
Average % Hispanic in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	0.00590	-0.00952	0.0508	-0.00157	0.0142	0.0201
	(0.0211)	(0.0395)	(0.0484)	(0.00815)	(0.0158)	(0.0195)
Average Age of Jury Pool	0.00801	0.0100	0.00404	0.00184	0.00253	0.00199
	(0.0212)	(0.0219)	(0.0217)	(0.00999)	(0.00999)	(0.0101)
Proportion Male in Jury Pool	-0.153	-0.126	-0.361	0.145	0.111	0.106
	(0.620)	(0.652)	(0.651)	(0.257)	(0.257)	(0.258)
Average Median Income in Jury Pool's Zip Codes		0.00000248	0.00000642		0.00000851	0.00000848
		(0.0000252)	(0.0000249)		(0.00000992)	(0.00000993)
Average % High School Graduates in Jury Pool's Zip Codes		-0.0239	-0.00796		0.0147	0.0175
		(0.0568)	(0.0564)		(0.0236)	(0.0242)
Average % Foreign Born in Jury Pool's Zip Codes			-0.109**			-0.0106
			(0.0523)			(0.0208)
Constant	-0.177	1.879	1.199	-0.137	-2.215	-2.361
	(1.252)	(4.632)	(4.565)	(0.578)	(2.034)	(2.055)
Observations	104	104	104	436	436	436
R-squared	0.007	0.009	0.052	0.011	0.019	0.019

Note – All regressions use OLS and standard errors are in parentheses. *,**, and *** indicate the coefficient is significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

ST8: Impact of Alternative Jury Pool Race Measures on Trial Outcomes

	White Defendants				Black Defendants			
	Sentence Length	Sentence Length	Convicted of a Life Sentence	Convicted of a Life Sentence	Sentence Length	Sentence Length	Convicted of a Life Sentence	Convicted of a Life Sentence
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Proportion of Jury Pool from Zip Codes > 76% White	-34.67	-27.9	-0.323	-0.425	46.12	8.72	0.584*	0.305
	(76.44)	(92.6)	(0.877)	(1.06)	(32.73)	(38.98)	(0.347)	(0.414)
Proportion of Jury Pool from Zip Codes <4% Black	-26.27	-9.121	-0.118	-0.011	23.06	-16.85	0.288	-0.050
	(64.01)	(80.76)	(0.735)	(0.923)	(28.68)	(33.54)	(0.305)	(0.357)
Avg. % Black in Jury Pool's Zip Codes >14.4%	6.816	7.746	0.091	0.146	-5.432*	-2.104	-0.0692**	-0.0379
	(6.940)	(9.853)	(0.080)	(0.112)	(3.058)	(4.077)	(0.0325)	(0.0433)
Avg. % Black in Jury Pool's Zip Codes	0.946	0.079	0.012	0.023	-1.539**	-1.7000	-0.0179***	-0.0216
	(1.485)	(3.173)	(.017)	(0.036)	(0.630)	(1.334)	(0.0067)	(.0142)
Observations	104	104	104	104	436	436	436	436
Control for jury pool age, proportion male, and zip code % Hispanic?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Control for jury pool zip code income, education, and foreign born?	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes

Note: All coefficients presented were estimated from separate OLS regressions, where the outcome variable is given by the column header, the measure of percent of Black (or White) individuals in the jury pool zip code is given by the row, and the additional controls included are noted in the last two rows of the table. Only the coefficient on the core race variable is presented in the table. Standard errors are in parentheses. *,**, and *** indicate the coefficient is significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.