

AN EXPLORATION OF BARRIERS TO RESPONDING TO JURY SUMMONS

TECHNICAL REPORT TO THE
WASHINGTON STATE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

June 24, 2021 (Revised)

Peter A. Collins, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice,
Criminology & Forensics
Seattle University
901 12th Avenue
Post Office Box 222000
Seattle, Washington 98122-1090
Phone: 206-296-5474
Email: collinsp@seattleu.edu

Brooke Miller Gialopsos, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice,
Criminology & Forensics
Seattle University
901 12th Avenue
Post Office Box 222000
Seattle, Washington 98122-1090
Phone: 206-296-5478
Email: bgialopsos@seattleu.edu

*The authors would like to thank the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts, Judge Steve Rosen, Cynthia Delostrinos, Chris Gaddis, and King, Pierce, and Snohomish County Court Administrators. Additionally, the findings reported here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts or Seattle University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Study Highlights | 4 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Background | 7 |
| Jury Summons Overview | 7 |
| The Impact of COVID-19 on Jury Service | 7 |
| The Current Study | 8 |
| Current Survey | 9 |
| Findings | 11 |
| Main Descriptive Findings - Highlights | 11 |
| Descriptive Analysis | 13 |
| Descriptive Analysis by County | 21 |
| Race | 22 |
| Gender | 22 |
| Sexual Orientation | 23 |
| Employment Status | 24 |
| Children and Other Dependents | 25 |
| Relationship Status | 26 |
| Combined Household Income | 26 |
| Education | 27 |
| Qualitative Responses Analysis | 28 |
| Barriers to Jury Service | 28 |
| Solutions to Barriers to Jury Service | 31 |
| Suggestions for Improving Jury Service | 34 |
| Conclusions | 36 |
| References | 38 |
| Appendix A: Description of Categories Created from Qualitative Responses | 39 |
| Appendix B: Survey Instrument | 46 |
| Appendix C: Additional Bivariate Descriptive Analyses for King County | 48 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recent survey results have shown that jury pools in many Washington State court jurisdictions may not be entirely reflective of the communities from which they are drawn (Collins & Miller Gialopsos, 2021; Collins & Hickman, 2017). These results have come at a time that is unparalleled within our collective experience, as humanity continues to grapple with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Like with many other systems of government, the court systems in Washington State have been significantly impacted during COVID-19 lockdowns. With both traditional and virtual systems of juror processing in place in King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties, the current study sought to expand on these earlier efforts by surveying jury summons respondents to shed light on two important questions: 1) to answer whether jury pool demographics have changed significantly since moving to a virtual rather than a traditional in-person process; and, 2) what barriers potential jurors face in participating in the court process, as well as possible solutions to remedy these barriers. Data were collected through a short digital survey that potential jurors were given the opportunity to answer in King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties from January 29th, 2021, to May 28th, 2021.

There were several important findings regarding the use of online/virtual jury summons response, selection, and service, many of which are described in the following bullet points. Additionally, there are important methodological findings that came to light regarding how the survey was administered, changes to existing questions (such as race and gender), and the addition of new questions. These changes have some impacts on comparability to past survey data as well as give rise to considerations for future survey efforts. For example, we believe that some of the differences in demographic categories that we are seeing from the current survey compared to the most recent and comparable 2017 jury survey may be reflective of the use of an online/virtual jury service format, the expansion of answer categories for the race and gender variables (e.g., reducing proportions of those reporting in a binary category, such as male or female, when another selection that better reflects their identity is offered), and varying response rates depending on whether a court was able to provide an online/virtual option and a digital link to the survey instrument.

A central question of this survey was answered by asking potential jurors whether they have previously or currently experienced any significant barriers that work to prevent them from fulfilling their civic duty to respond and participate in jury service. While we have plenty of anecdotal evidence from individuals working closely with jurors, until this point, we had not systematically collected empirical data regarding barriers directly from potential jurors. In this project, we asked respondents to identify barriers and provide comments regarding their experience, including soliciting feedback regarding potential solutions and suggestions for ameliorating barriers. Some key findings from the open-ended questions are highlighted below and complete analyses are included in the qualitative responses section below.

There are several noteworthy findings originating from the survey responses, including that over 80% of the survey respondents experienced some form of online/virtual service and that less than 1% reported any technological issues in doing so.¹ There are other technological areas that were identified as potential points of improvement; however, this finding is important in light of

¹ We recognize, though, that if they did have technological issues or limitations reporting to online/virtual jury service that they may also have had trouble accessing our survey and providing that feedback.

our collective experiences in balancing the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and the criminal and civil case loads in the courts. There is much to add, and we discuss these, and many other findings, in more detail below.

Study Highlights

- A majority of respondents reported an online/virtual experience: n = 3,071 (80.8%).
- White respondents were overrepresented (+9.0%) in King County during the study period (survey 78.8% White and CVAP baseline 69.8% White), marking an increase from the previous jury survey and a total difference of +6.1%.
- The majority of respondents indicated their race and ethnicity as White (76.8%) and non-Hispanic (91.6%).
- The average age of the respondents was about 50 years old (median age = 51; modal age = 57).
- Women were slightly overrepresented, and men were underrepresented in comparison to baseline survey and Census figures. These findings are likely due to methodological differences in allowing for more answer categories beyond binary sex/gender, as those combined additional categories were all overrepresented when compared to the initial survey results from 2017.
- The majority of respondents indicated a heterosexual orientation (82.1%), and this proportion held similarly across King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties.
- The majority of respondents in each county were employed full-time, followed by retirees, and then those employed part-time. There are some consistent findings regarding the presence of barriers within employment categories. For example, the majority of respondents within the “homemaker” category reported the presence of barriers to service.
- About 37% of those who reported having a dependent at home also reported experiencing a barrier to reporting to jury duty. The majority (61%) of respondents reported being married at the time of taking the survey.
- A majority of respondents (58.1%, n = 1,827) reported an annual household income above \$100k, which is over the median income level for each county (King: \$95k; Snohomish: \$86k; Pierce: \$72k).
- A majority of the entire sample of respondents had a bachelor’s degree or higher (66%); again, well over the county and state averages (King County residents: 54%; Statewide: 37%).
- The most frequently reported category of **barriers** was “responsibility-related” (82.6%) and included work/employer issues (53.4%) and financial hardships (20.1%). The next

most frequently reported category was “care-related” barriers (35.9%) and contained childcare (25.5%). Other frequently reported barriers were “courthouse-related” issues (16.1%) like transportation problems (8.2%), as well as barriers that were “health/ability-related” in nature (13.8%), primarily physical and/or mental health issues (11.0%).

- In terms of the suggested **solutions** for the barriers identified by respondents, the top recommendations were: improve financial compensation by the county or state (21.3%); provide for or reimburse childcare (16.8%); allow potential jurors to have a voice in all scheduling related decisions (14.2%); and, employer-related improvements, involving increasing pay, time-off, and support (13.0%).
- Of respondents who did not report barriers, many offered **suggestions** to improve the jury service experience, such as: more and/or better information, communication, and updates (21%); changes to the jury questionnaire (14.9%); and, keeping online/virtual components and/or service after COVID-19 (14.4%).

INTRODUCTION

In 2016-2017, the Minority and Justice Commission conducted a year-long juror demographic survey in which jury pool data were collected from 33 courts across the state. The findings of the survey were presented to the Supreme Court at a Symposium on Jury Diversity, and the researchers found that the majority of the courts did not have jury pools that were racially reflective of the demographics of their population (Collins & Hickman, 2017). Sponsored by the Gender and Justice Commission, additional analyses were recently conducted and published that indicated that there are also disparities when it comes to BIPOC, women of color, and people who are LGBTQ (Collins & Miller Gialopsos, 2021). Results from these early efforts revealed that jury pools (those people who report to jury duty after receiving a summons) in almost all Washington Courts did not match up to baseline demographic Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) data within the same court jurisdictions.

These efforts were valuable in providing evidence that jury pools in Washington State are indeed not reflective of baseline demographics within the same communities that they are drawn from. Although there has been a great deal of discussion and anecdotal evidence produced within and among those working within Washington court and legal systems, as well as some research in other states and jurisdictions, the question as to *why* these disparities exist has yet to be fully explored. Additionally, the above results also have come at a time that is unparalleled within our collective experience, as the world grapples with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Like with many other systems of government, the court systems in Washington State have been significantly impacted during COVID-19 lockdowns ([Washington Courts Response](#); [Court Order](#)). Due to the need to continue to process cases within the system and while observing social distancing measures, several courts leveraged technological tools, mainly digital conferencing software provided by Zoom Video Communications, Inc., to hold virtual jury orientation, selection, and service, as well as virtual trials.

With both traditional and digital systems of juror processing in place in King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties, the current study seeks to expand on these earlier efforts by surveying jury summons respondents to shed light on two important questions: 1) to answer whether jury pool demographics have changed significantly since moving to a virtual rather than traditional in-person process; and, 2) what barriers potential jurors face in participating in the court process, as well as possible solutions to remedy these barriers. Data were collected through a short digital survey that potential jurors were given the opportunity to answer. The current survey and data collection effort detailed below builds on our previous work by updating and expanding the demographic questions while also including additional open-ended questions related to potential barriers to current jury service, past service, and potential solutions. Below, we present some of the previous study's highlights, some background information on the jury summons process as practiced in Washington State, as well as some insight from the empirical literature in regard to barriers to jury service.

BACKGROUND

Jury Summons Overview

In 2020, we were contracted by the Washington State Gender and Justice Commission to examine whether disparities exist in jury service pools for specific subpopulations in Washington State. Findings indicated that people of color, especially Black, Native, and Asian Americans, as well as Hispanic/Latinx Americans, were underrepresented in nearly all Washington jury pools. Likewise, women of color were underrepresented in all courts. While the results regarding sexual orientation were much more limited due to data constraints, differences by race and sexual orientation also showed underrepresentation among all racial categories, including White and multi-race groups, and the LGBTQ+ population in King County. Our work revealed that there were clear patterns across all courts, which suggested that marginalized groups, in particular women of color, experience significant hurdles to participate in the jury process. Populations who hold multiple minority affiliations, such as those who identify as LGBTQ+, gender, and persons of color experience even more obstacles to participate.

When looking at the potential barriers identified in the literature, empirical research, and anecdotal accounts, they can be roughly grouped into: 1) failure to be included in jury lists; 2) failure to receive summons in the mail; and, 3) failure to appear when summoned. The first category is focused on the construction of jury lists and also includes the disqualifications of individuals due to felony convictions and other eligibility requirements (e.g., citizenship, the ability to communicate in English, identification requirements). Failure to receive summons can be due to transiency, unstable housing, homelessness, and housing discrimination. In terms of failure to appear, the barriers are virtually endless, but typically involve feeling unable or unwilling to participate for reasons such as financial hardships, work obligations, caring for children and/or dependents, physical and/or mental health issues, scheduling issues and/or prior obligations, uncertainty or misinformation regarding jury service, and distrust in the criminal justice system, process, and personnel. Please see Collins and Miller Gialopsos (2021) for a more in-depth exploration of potential barriers to jury service.

The Impact of COVID-19 on Jury Service

It is a gross understatement to say that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted all aspects of our lives including the functioning of our criminal justice system. The temporary shutdown of courts across the country and subsequent changes to the jury process have created a host of issues for courts, many of which will be felt for years to come. All courts are tasked with balancing the health and safety of prospective jurors, court personnel, and litigants while also avoiding backlogs, procedural delays, violations of fundamental rights, and miscarriages of justice (see Draper, 2021; Wilson, 2020).

Courts responded to the pandemic in a variety of different ways (see [Washington's guidelines for resuming jury trials](#)). While both in-person and virtual juries provided challenges and benefits for certain parties (see Draper, 2021), the constitutionality, fairness, and ethics of these COVID-related changes, as well as their impact on verdicts and defendants remain unknown at this point. While an in-depth exploration of these issues is beyond the scope of this report, it is

pertinent to highlight that the pandemic has created unique hardships and new barriers for some, but not all, jurors. Further, the platform for jury service (in-person vs. online) can directly impact their feelings of safety, anxiety, and anger. This is key as it could affect their ability to do their job. For instance, deliberations might become hurried instead of thoughtful and thorough, which may harm the defendant, victims, society, and the justice system (Draper, 2021).

And of particular importance for this report is how the pandemic is impacting the demographic makeup of those who respond to jury summons and the composition of the jury pool. It was speculated that in many places, juries would be whiter and more conservative (Draper, 2021). This could have substantive implications for verdicts and could fuel potential claims that the jury composition infringed upon the defendant's constitutional rights. This current project explores some of these COVID-induced changes to the jury process across three counties in Washington State, as well as the demographic makeup of those who respond to jury summons, the barriers they face, and the solutions that they believe could mitigate or eliminate barriers to jury service.

THE CURRENT STUDY

The purpose of the current study is twofold. First, in light of the significant impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, we seek to answer whether jury pool demographics have changed significantly since moving to a virtual rather than traditional in-person process. Second, to build on the previous jury summons demographic study, we will examine what barriers potential jurors face in participating in jury service. In order to answer these questions, we conducted a digital-only survey of individuals who responded to a jury summons between January 29th, 2021 through May 28th, 2021. Potential jurors were given a QR code or digital link to complete a digital survey through Qualtrics (survey questions included in Appendix B). Three courts participated in the current study, King, Pierce, and Snohomish County Superior Courts, with the majority of responses coming from King County.

We understand and are conscious of issues surrounding identity (i.e., racial, sexual, gender, and gender identity) and related harm that marginalized groups face due to racism, bias, and discrimination within the criminal justice system and in society. We want to be clear that the sub-categorizations used in this research are imperfect and may not capture all combinations of self-reported identity or orientation, and as a result, the analysis here may not properly reflect the true nature of personal identity within these populations. In order to be as inclusive as possible in the design of our survey questions and answer choices for the closed-ended questions, we made an effort to follow some best practices. To guide us in this process, we referenced materials and examples from the U.S. Census Bureau to assist with the wording of the questions measuring both race and ethnicity. In terms of gender identity and sexual orientation, we utilized several suggestions including those from the [Consortium of Higher Education Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Resource Professionals](#). Also, we alphabetized answer options to avoid prioritizing or giving more focus to dominant groups. Likewise, we intentionally did not use the phrase "other" when soliciting additional answer options, as that can contribute to feelings of exclusion and stigma. Therefore, we asked respondents to provide a category or identity not listed.

Prior to the launch of the survey, Seattle University's Institutional Review Board determined the study to be exempt from IRB review in accordance with federal regulation criteria. It is important to note that the survey was completely voluntary. Survey responses were anonymous and confidential, no personal identifying information, including IP addresses, were collected, and all analyses are presented in the aggregate to protect the identities of the respondents.

Current Survey

Due to the larger number of completed surveys and availability of data, we use King County here as our example for the survey process. Over the study period, King County sent out 129,300 jury summons. Of those sent out, 12,944 (10%) responded and were entered into the jury pool, from which jury panels were formed (depending on demand). At the panel stage, along with other materials, potential jurors were given a digital link to the demographic and barriers survey. From the link, the potential respondent would read the following:

Welcome!

The Washington State Minority and Justice Commission is inviting you to participate in a research study that aims to identify the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on jury service and what barriers potential jurors face in participating in jury service. We hope to use this information to identify service gaps and to help guide future policy changes.

This short online survey will ask you to provide some very basic demographic information as well as your experience with jury service. This survey should only take about 5 minutes to complete. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may stop at any time without any consequences.

We will not collect any direct identifiers, like your name or IP address, for this study, but we will be asking for your age, gender, race/ethnicity, and some other basic demographic information. This information is necessary for us to identify whether different communities experience any barriers to participating in jury service.

Your answers on this survey will be confidential and completely anonymous. Only the research team will have access to the survey answers, and we do not have the ability to attribute answers to any individual. If we share our findings in publications or presentations, the results will be presented in aggregate only.

Financial support for this research is provided to the researchers by the Washington State Minority and Justice Commission. If you have any questions about this research, contact Dr. Peter A. Collins at 206-296-5474 / collinsp@seattleu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, contact the Seattle University Institutional Review Board at 206-296-2585 / irb@seattleu.edu

If you agree to participate, please continue to the survey.

Respondents who agreed to participate were asked both demographic and experiential data through answering 19 survey questions (see Appendix B for all questions included on the survey). A total (all three counties) of N = 4,610 respondents entered into and began or answered the survey at least partially and a total N = 3,814 completed through the end of the survey. King County

represented the largest contributor, with $n = 3,344$, followed by Snohomish ($n = 405$, 10.7%) and Pierce ($n = 48$, 1.3%). The higher response rate in King County was due to some important factors: 1) King County was able to pivot to a virtual/hybrid trial format; 2) King County has the largest volume of cases, the most judges and courtrooms, and requires the most jurors; 3) King County was also able to access a large offsite convention center to facilitate COVID-era socially-distanced trials. Additionally, both King and Snohomish Counties' juror management systems allowed them the ability to provide a digital link to the survey, which aided in higher response rates.

Noting these differences and the resulting impact to response rates is important for a couple of reasons. First, our response rates in the first demographic jury survey from 2017 were significantly better at around 80% (and higher depending on the court). That survey was administered on paper during the jurors' initial appearance at their particular courthouse. Second, we not only provided a live link, but we also provided a QR code that potential jurors could scan with their phone, which would then take them to the survey site. The QR methodology was not utilized to the extent we initially thought, likely due to the low numbers of in-person appearances/QR scans, technological gaps, and simple lack of interest. For these reasons, we suggest a careful review application of mixed print and digital survey methodology that will better fit each participating court for future iterations of the demographic study.

For all of those who did respond to the survey, $n = 3,433$ (90%) completed their session in 4 minutes and 36 seconds, on average. For the entire sample, the median time to completion was 3 minutes and 36 seconds. Although the survey is purposive and, therefore, a non-probability sample of the general CVAP population within each county, we do know the total number of potential jurors who received the survey prompt within each county. Thus, we provide margins of error for each court assuming 99% confidence ($p < .01$): 1) the King County Superior Court sample's margin of error is about +/- 2%; 2) the Snohomish County Superior Court sample's margin of error is about +/- 5%; and, 3) the Pierce County Superior Court sample's margin of error is about +/- 18%.

FINDINGS

We present findings in three sections. First, we present the descriptive tables for each of the main survey questions. In the second section, we present bivariate and other focused analyses focused specifically on race and gender representation by county. Last, we present analyses on the qualitative responses. Additional data and analyses for King County are presented in the Appendix C below.

Main Descriptive Findings - Highlights

The following highlights have been taken from the univariate descriptive analyses covering the main survey questions. These figures represent only those surveys that were identified as being completed. For more detailed information on each question listed, please see the full analyses, below.

- King County reported the largest number of returned and completed surveys: King (n = 3,344, 88.1%), followed by Snohomish (n = 405, 10.7%) and Pierce (n = 48, 1.3%).
- A majority of respondents reported an online/virtual experience: n = 3,071 (80.8%).
- About a third of the respondents (n = 1,268, 33.5%) reported this was the first time they *received* a summons.
- Nearly half of the respondents (n = 1,881, 49.8%) reported this was their first time *responding* to a summons.
- About three-quarters (n = 2,811, 74.2%) of respondents reported that they had never been selected to sit on a jury.
- Nearly one-third of the respondents reported some form of a barrier to their service (completed surveys: n = 1,088, 28.7%; including incomplete surveys that provided response to this question: n = 1,162, 29.6%).
- Nearly one-third of the respondents (n = 1,194, 31.5%) reported having a child or other dependent under their care.
- A majority of the respondents reported being married or in some form of a domestic partnership (n = 2,615, 68.9%).
- Nearly three-quarters of the respondents reported having a college degree (n = 3,378, 73.5%) (associate degree and up).
- Women respondents made up the largest gender category (n = 1,939, 51.3%), followed by men (n = 1,668, 44.1%), and then by a number of smaller categories including non-binary, transgender, agender, and multiple category answers (n = 123, 3.4%).

- A majority of respondents reported their sexual identity as heterosexual (n = 3,108, 82.7%); the remaining categories include asexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer, prefer not to answer, and more.
- The average age of the respondents was about 50 years old (median age = 51; modal age = 57).
- The majority of respondents indicated their race and ethnicity as White (76.8%) and non-Hispanic (91.6%).
- The majority of respondents were employed full-time (n = 2,067, 54.6%), followed by retirees (n = 657, 17.4%).
- Nearly one-third (n = 1,092, 28.9%) of respondents who reported earnings indicated a combined annual household income of over \$150,000.

Descriptive Analysis

The following descriptive analyses cover the main survey questions. These figures represent only those surveys that were identified as being completed. For more detailed information on each question listed, please see the full analyses, below.

Table 1. Respondent Reporting County (n = 3,797).

| County | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|
| King | 3344 | 87.7 | 88.1 |
| Snohomish | 405 | 10.6 | 10.7 |
| Pierce | 48 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Total | 3797 | 99.6 | 100 |
| Missing | 17 | 0.4 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: n/a.

The vast majority of responses (87.7%) came from King County, followed by Snohomish (10.6%), and then Pierce (1.3%). Pierce County did not hold virtual trials during the study period and had limited trials due to COVID-19 contact restrictions.

Table 2. Online/Virtual or In-Person Indicator (n = 3,764).

| Answer | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|
| Online/virtual | 1108 | 29.1 | 29.4 |
| In-Person | 654 | 17.1 | 17.4 |
| Online-In-Person-Selected* | 66 | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Begin online/virtual In-Person Unknown** | 1936 | 50.8 | 51.4 |
| Total | 3764 | 98.7 | 100 |
| Missing | 50 | 1.3 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: Question detail: *It began online, but now I'm attending in-person because I was selected as a juror. **I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in-person if selected.

Table 3. Online/Virtual or In-Person Modality by County (n = 3,759).

| County | Online/virtual | In-Person | Online-In-Person-Selected* | Begin Online/virtual In-Person Unknown** | Total |
|-----------|----------------|------------|----------------------------|--|-------|
| King | 962 (29.1) | 397 (12.0) | 34 (1.0) | 1915 (57.9) | 3308 |
| Snohomish | 145 (36.0) | 207 (51.4) | 32 (7.9) | 19 (4.7) | 403 |
| Pierce | 0 (0.0) | 48 (100.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 48 |
| Total | 1107 (29.4) | 652 (17.3) | 66 (1.8) | 1934 (51.4) | 3759 |

Notes: Frequency (%); Question detail: *It began online, but now I'm attending in-person because I was selected as a juror. **I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in-person if selected.

Tables 2 and 3 provide frequencies and percentages for those respondents who attended in an online/virtual modality, in-person only, began online/virtual and switched to in-person, or the respondent began online/virtual but did not know if they were going to be required to show up in-person at some point in the future. As is clear from Table 2, the majority (over 80%) of respondents began their service in an online/virtual format, with a mix converting to in-person at some point in the selection process. King County accounted for the majority of online/virtual, with about 87-88% of jurors attending online. Snohomish County was next, with about 50% of those responding to summons through an online virtual format, while Pierce County did not offer online or virtual reporting.

Table 4. Number of Times Respondent Received Summons, Appeared, & Selected.

| Summons/Appeared Answers* | <u>Received Summons</u> | | <u>Responded to Summons</u> | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| | Frequency (%) | (Valid %) | Frequency (%) | (Valid %) |
| First Time | 1268 (33.2) | (33.5) | 1881 (49.3) | (49.8) |
| Second Time | 1101 (28.9) | (29.1) | 1118 (29.3) | (29.6) |
| Third Time | 767 (20.1) | (20.2) | 458 (12) | (12.1) |
| Fourth Time | 386 (10.1) | (10.2) | 200 (5.2) | (5.3) |
| Five + Times | 266 (7.0) | (7.0) | 119 (3.1) | (3.2) |
| Total | 3788 (99.3) | (100) | 3776 (99) | (100) |
| Missing | 26 (0.7) | | 38 (1.0) | |
| Total | 3814 (100) | | 3814 (100) | |

| Answer | <u>Number of Times Selected</u> | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | Frequency (%) | (Valid %) |
| 0 | 2811 (73.7) | (74.2) |
| 1 | 702 (18.4) | (18.5) |
| 2 | 176 (4.6) | (4.6) |
| 3 | 73 (1.9) | (1.9) |
| 4 | 16 (0.4) | (0.4) |
| 5 or more times | 9 (0.2) | (0.2) |
| Total | 3787 (99.3) | (100) |
| System | 27 (0.7) | |
| Total | 3814 (100) | |

Notes: Question detail: *This is the ____ I've received a jury duty notification in the mail.

Table 4 provides frequencies and percentages for three questions regarding past and present summons, attendance, and selection. About one-third of the respondents indicated that this was their first time ever receiving a summons for jury duty. About half of the respondents indicated that this was their first time responding to a summons. Last, the majority (74.2%) of respondents reported that they had never been selected as a juror on a case (including present summons).

Table 5. Barriers Question (n = 3,788).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|---------|-----------|------|---------|
| Yes | 1088 | 28.5 | 28.7 |
| No | 2700 | 70.8 | 71.3 |
| Total | 3788 | 99.3 | 100 |
| Missing | 26 | 0.7 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: Only surveys marked as completed are included here.
Non-completed survey qualitative answers to the barriers question are used in the analyses below, n = 1,162.

About a third (28.7%) of all respondents indicated that they had experienced a barrier impeding their participation at some point during past or during the current jury summons and selection process. Two-thirds of respondents reported no issues. Participants were given an opportunity to provide written feedback to this question, as well as two other questions regarding their ideas about possible solutions and suggestions. All of these qualitative answers are described in further detail below. Just under a third (31.5%) of the respondents reported having a child or other dependent under their care (Table 6). The majority of respondents reported being married (61%), while just over 18% reported being single (Table 7).

Table 6. Child and Dependent Care (n = 3,787).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|----------------------|-----------|------|---------|
| Yes | 1194 | 31.3 | 31.5 |
| No | 2531 | 66.4 | 66.8 |
| Prefer not to answer | 62 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Total | 3787 | 99.3 | 100 |
| Missing | 27 | 0.7 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: n/a.

Table 7. Relationship Status (n = 3,793).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|---|-----------|------|---------|
| Single, never married | 687 | 18 | 18.1 |
| Single, but cohabitating with a significant other | 240 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| Widowed | 89 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Divorced | 304 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Separated | 22 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Married | 2313 | 60.6 | 61.0 |
| In a domestic partnership or civil union | 62 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Prefer not to answer | 62 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| A category not listed: | 14 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Total | 3793 | 99.4 | 100 |
| Missing | 21 | 0.6 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: n/a.

The majority of respondents had some post-high school education, with just over 40% reporting having earned a bachelor’s degree, 20% reporting earning a master’s degree, and 6% reporting earning a doctorate. In all, nearly 90% of the respondents had either experienced some form of higher education or attained a range of degrees from an associate to a doctorate.

Table 8. Highest Level of Education Achieved (n = 3,789).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|----------------------------|-----------|------|---------|
| Some high school | 29 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| High school degree or GED | 212 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Trade school | 70 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Some college but no degree | 595 | 15.6 | 15.7 |
| Associate degree | 279 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Bachelor’s degree | 1521 | 39.9 | 40.1 |
| Master’s degree | 757 | 19.8 | 20.0 |
| Doctorate degree | 226 | 5.9 | 6.0 |
| A category not listed: | 55 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Prefer not to answer | 45 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Total | 3789 | 99.3 | 100 |
| Missing | 25 | 0.7 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: n/a.

For the gender question, the majority of respondents reported woman (51.3%), followed by man (44.1%). The next largest category was multiple response categories (2.1%), followed by those who preferred not to answer (1.3%), and those reporting within several additional options.

Table 9. Respondent Gender (n = 3,780).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|------------------------------|-----------|------|---------|
| Agender | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Gender queer or gender fluid | 7 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Man | 1668 | 43.7 | 44.1 |
| Non-binary | 12 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Questioning or unsure | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Transgender man | 5 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Transgender woman | 10 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Woman | 1939 | 50.8 | 51.3 |
| An identity not listed | 7 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Prefer not to answer | 50 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Multiple Responses | 78 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| Total | 3780 | 99.1 | 100 |
| Missing | 34 | 0.9 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |


Notes: n/a.

Table 10. Respondent Sexual Identity (n = 3,760).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|-------------------------|-----------|------|---------|
| Asexual | 87 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Bisexual | 111 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Gay | 87 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Heterosexual (straight) | 3108 | 81.5 | 82.7 |
| Lesbian | 36 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Pansexual | 15 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Queer | 28 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Questioning or unsure | 14 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| An identity not listed | 20 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Prefer not to answer | 188 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Multi-category Answer | 66 | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Total | 3760 | 98.6 | 100 |
| Missing | 54 | 1.4 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: n/a.

As for sexual identity (Table 10), the majority of respondents reported as heterosexual (81.5%), followed by categories including prefer not to answer, bisexual, gay, asexual, and multi-response answers, among other smaller categories. The average age of the respondents was about 50 years old (median age = 51; modal age = 57).



The majority of respondents indicated their race and ethnicity as White (76.8%) and non-Hispanic (91.6%), respectively. Respondents who indicated that they preferred not to answer (3%) and other non-White or BIPOC categories combined made up 23.2% of the total for race. Additional comparisons on race are provided in the next section.

Table 11. Respondent Race & Ethnicity (n = 3,814).

| Respondent Race | | | | Respondent Ethnicity | | | |
|--|----------|------|--------|--|----------|------|--------|
| Answer | <i>f</i> | % | Vld. % | Answer | <i>f</i> | % | Vld. % |
| African-American or Black | 87 | 2.3 | 2.3 | No, not Spanish, Hispanic, or Latinx | 3361 | 88.1 | 91.6 |
| American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Indigenous | 12 | 0.3 | 0.3 | Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano | 75 | 2 | 2 |
| Asian Indian | 52 | 1.4 | 1.4 | Yes, Puerto Rican | 10 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Cambodian | 8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | Yes, Cuban | 8 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Chinese | 74 | 1.9 | 2 | Yes, another Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin | 61 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Filipino | 81 | 2.1 | 2.1 | A category not listed | 29 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Guamanian or Chamorro | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | Prefer not to answer | 112 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Japanese | 37 | 1.0 | 1.0 | Multiple-Ethnic | 14 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Korean | 37 | 1.0 | 1.0 | Total | 3670 | 96.2 | 100 |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 10 | 0.3 | 0.3 | Missing | 144 | 3.8 | |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 11 | 0.3 | 0.3 | Total | 3814 | 100 | |
| Other Asian | 31 | 0.8 | 0.8 | | | | |
| Vietnamese | 26 | 0.7 | 0.7 | | | | |
| White | 2903 | 76.1 | 76.8 | | | | |
| A category not listed | 96 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | | | |
| Prefer not to answer | 115 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | | | |
| Multi-race | 199 | 5.2 | 5.3 | | | | |
| Total | 3781 | 99.1 | 100 | | | | |
| Missing | 33 | 0.9 | | | | | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | | | | | |

Notes: Recoded binary race (n = 3,660; does not include “prefer not to answer category”): White = 2,900 (79.2%); non-White = 760 (20.8%).

Respondents reported a range of employment statuses; however, those who were employed full-time made up the largest category (54.6%), followed by retirees (17.4%), part-time employment (7.0%), and those who reported being self-employed (4.9%). The average

unemployment rate for Washington State of over the study period was about 5.5%. For King/Snohomish Counties the rate was 5.4% and for Pierce it was 5.5% (Historical resident labor force and employment, seasonally adjusted, Employment Security Department/LMEA; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics).

Table 12. Respondent Employment Status (n = 3,784).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % |
|--|-----------|------|---------|
| Employed full-time (40 or more hours per week) | 2067 | 54.2 | 54.6 |
| Employed part-time (up to 35 hours per week) | 265 | 6.9 | 7.0 |
| Furloughed due to COVID-19 | 22 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Military - Active Duty | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Homemaker | 90 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Retired | 657 | 17.2 | 17.4 |
| Self-employed | 186 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Student | 51 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Unable to work | 18 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Unemployed and currently looking for work | 109 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Unemployed and not currently looking for work | 44 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| A category not listed | 39 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Prefer not to answer | 29 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Multiple Selections | 206 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| Total | 3784 | 99.2 | 100 |
| Missing | 30 | 0.8 | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | |

Notes: 0.0% due to rounding.




Figure 2 and Table 13 provide information on respondents’ annual household income level. According to the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis and the U.S. Census, annual household income varies from county to county, with King County reporting the highest median income at about \$95,009, followed by Snohomish at \$86,691, and Pierce at \$72,113. Of those respondents who provided an answer (n = 3,143), findings indicate that a majority of respondents (58.1%, n = 1,827) reported an annual household income over the median clearance for each county.

Table 13. Respondent Income Category (n = 3,777).

| Answer | Frequency | % | Valid % | Resp % [†] |
|------------------------|-----------|------|---------|---------------------|
| Less than \$10,000 | 47 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| \$10,000 - \$19,999 | 42 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| \$20,000 - \$29,999 | 83 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.6 |
| \$30,000 - \$39,999 | 123 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.9 |
| \$40,000 - \$49,999 | 138 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.4 |
| \$50,000 - \$59,999 | 146 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.6 |
| \$60,000 - \$69,999 | 179 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.7 |
| \$70,000 - \$79,999* | 200 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 6.4 |
| \$80,000 - \$89,999** | 169 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 5.4 |
| \$90,000 - \$99,999*** | 189 | 5 | 5 | 6.0 |
| \$100,000 - \$149,999 | 735 | 19.3 | 19.5 | 23.4 |
| More than \$150,000 | 1092 | 28.6 | 28.9 | 34.7 |
| Prefer not to answer | 634 | 16.6 | 16.8 | |
| Total | 3777 | 99 | 100 | |
| Missing | 37 | 1 | | |
| Total | 3814 | 100 | | |
| Total Responded | 3143 | | | 100.0 |

Notes: [†]Resp %: percentages calculated does not include those who chose not to answer the question and missing responses. *Pierce County Median Household Income: \$72,113 (2019, U.S. Census). **Snohomish County Median Household Income: \$86,691 (2019, U.S. Census). ***King County Median Household Income: \$95,009 (2018, King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis, link). Total reporting above median (\$100k to more than \$150k): 58.1%, n = 1,827; including and below largest (King Co Median) category: 41.9%, n = 1,316.

Descriptive Analyses by County

The following comparisons are drawn from data collected from potential jurors who first reported for jury duty and who completed a survey within the survey time period. Due to lower sample sizes in both Pierce and Snohomish Counties, results should be interpreted with some caution.

- White respondents were overrepresented (+9.0%) in King County during the study period survey (78.8% White and CVAP baseline 69.8% White), marking an increase from the previous jury survey and a total change of +6.1%.
- Women were slightly overrepresented, and men were underrepresented in comparison to baseline survey and Census figures. These findings are likely due to methodological differences in allowing for more answer categories beyond binary sex/gender, as those combined additional categories were all overrepresented when compared to the initial survey results.
- The majority of respondents indicated a heterosexual orientation (82.1%), and this proportion held similarly across King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties.
- The majority of respondents in each county were employed full-time, followed by retirees, and then those employed part-time. There are some consistent findings regarding the presence of barriers within employment categories. For example, the majority of respondents within the “homemaker” category reported the presence of barriers.
- About 37% of those who reported having a dependent at home also reported experiencing a barrier to reporting to jury duty.
- The majority (61%) of respondents reported being married at the time of taking this survey.
- A significant number (n = 1,825, 48.4%) of respondents reported a combined annual household income of more than \$100,000.
- Nearly three-quarters of the entire sample of respondents had a college degree (73.4%).

Race

A simple comparison of a binary (White/non-White) race by county and Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) census benchmarks was conducted. Respondents reporting for jury service in King County were majority White. When compared to the baseline CVAP data, non-White respondents were under-represented by about 9.0%. The difference between the current survey and the previous benchmarking effort conducted in 2017, which revealed that minority populations were under-represented by about 2.9%, is a total increase from baseline 2017 of 6.1%. This finding could be an artifact of survey modality and low survey response rates, disproportionate hardships from the COVID-19 pandemic on BIPOC and economically strained communities, and additional inequities regarding access to justice in communities of color.

Table 14. Percent White/non-White: Survey & CVAP (2019).

| County | Survey | | 2019 CVAP | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|
| | % White | %nonW | % White | %nonW | %Diff |
| King | 78.83 | 21.17 | 69.81 | 30.19 | 9.02 |
| Pierce* | 78.72 | 21.28 | 73.32 | 26.68 | 5.40 |
| Snohomish* | 82.69 | 17.31 | 78.07 | 21.93 | 4.62 |
| | Baseline (2017)** | | Present Study | | |
| King | +2.88% | | +9.02% | | |
| | | | +6.14% | | |

Notes: *Low sample size, interpret with some caution. **Average difference in minority representation in King County (Superior Seattle/Kent & District) from 2017 benchmarked study.

Gender

Attempting to benchmark gender presents some challenges because there are no CVAP gender benchmarks, so gender breakdowns by county have to be developed using the most recent Census figures (Annual County and Resident Population Estimates by Selected Age Groups and Sex: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019). Additionally, in the previous jury demographic study, the measure for gender identity and sexual orientation was combined, which created issues when trying to compare and contrast different identity categorizations. For the current survey, we separated out gender and sexual identity into two separate questions and expanded the possible answer categories with guidance from national resources on best practices (see page 8 of this report for more details). The following comparisons are limited by lack of baseline data and changes to answer categories; therefore, as with any study, the findings here should be considered with some caution. This survey process is iterative, and as the survey questions evolve and we collect more data, the estimates will become more reliable.

Table 15. Gender Comparisons Baseline (2017) Survey & Census.

| County | Men <i>f</i> (%) | Women <i>f</i> (%) | Other <i>f</i> (%) | Total |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|
| King | 1481 (44.53) | 1698 (51.05) | 147 (4.42) | 3326 |
| Pierce | 23 (47.92) | 24 (50.00) | 1 (2.08) | 48 |
| Snohomish | 162 (40.50) | 213 (53.25) | 25 (6.25) | 400 |
| Total | 1666 (44.14) | 1935 (51.27) | 173 (4.58) | 3774 |

| <u>Baseline (2017) Survey Comparison*</u> | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|
| | Men % | Women % | Other % |
| King | -3.26 | -0.01 | 3.27 |
| Pierce | -1.91 | 0.67 | 1.24 |
| Snohomish | -9.39 | 3.90 | 5.49 |

| <u>Census Gender by County Comparison**</u> | | |
|---|-------|---------|
| | Men % | Women % |
| King | -5.56 | 1.14 |
| Pierce | -1.61 | -0.47 |
| Snohomish | -9.36 | 3.11 |

Notes: *Positive values indicate overrepresentation, negative values indicate underrepresentation. **Census had only a binary gender variable available.

In Table 15, we present findings based on gender, by county, and compare the current survey findings with the baseline demographic survey data and with 2019 Census figures. The majority of survey respondents’ self-reported gender was female/woman (51.05%). Both of the previous survey and the census report female/woman right around 50%, with some counties (such as King County) reporting slightly lower (49.92%) and Pierce reporting slightly higher (50.47%). The increased categorical percentage from the Census figures to both the baseline demographic survey and to the present survey are very likely due to the inclusion of non-binary gender categories. Using the figures collected during the first jury demographic survey as a comparison, current figures for male/man categories indicate underrepresentation in all courts. For female/woman, there was a mix of results; King County was virtually unchanged in this category, which we believe lends some additional credibility to the accuracy of the current survey results for King County. The “other” category represented collapsed non-binary selections. When compared to the baseline jury survey findings, the current findings indicate overrepresentation in each of the three counties surveyed. Again, this is likely an artifact of increased measurement validity and we argue that the current figures are likely more accurate than those created within the first survey effort. We believe this lends some confidence in the changes that were made to disentangle the original gender and sexual identity measure and to include a wider range of answer categories.

Sexual Orientation

There are no truly reliable sources of sexual orientation figures aside from the first iteration of the jury demographic survey. Additionally, because the previous version combined gender and sexual orientation, we lack the ability to compare across survey findings. The findings regarding

sexual orientation presented here are a first step towards creating a better baseline for future monitoring and research. According to these findings, the majority of respondents indicated a heterosexual orientation (82.10%), and this proportion held similarly across King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties, with King County reporting the largest number of non-hetero normative respondents (n = 427, 12.91%, does not include “prefer not to answer” category).

Table 16. Sexual Orientation by County (n = 3,754).

| Orientation | King | % | Pierce* | % | Snohomish* | % | Total | % |
|----------------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Asexual | 79 | (2.39) | 1 | (2.13) | 7 | (1.75) | 87 | (2.32) |
| Bisexual | 105 | (3.18) | 3 | (6.38) | 3 | (0.75) | 111 | (2.96) |
| Gay | 84 | (2.54) | 1 | (2.13) | 2 | (0.50) | 87 | (2.32) |
| Heterosexual (straight) | 2715 | (82.10) | 40 | (85.11) | 347 | (86.75) | 3102 | (82.63) |
| Lesbian | 33 | (1.00) | 0 | (0.00) | 3 | (0.75) | 36 | (0.96) |
| Pansexual | 14 | (0.42) | 0 | (0.00) | 1 | (0.25) | 15 | (0.40) |
| Queer | 27 | (0.82) | 1 | (2.13) | 0 | (0.00) | 28 | (0.75) |
| Questioning or unsure | 14 | (0.42) | 0 | (0.00) | 0 | (0.00) | 14 | (0.37) |
| An identity not listed | 16 | (0.48) | 0 | (0.00) | 4 | (1.00) | 20 | (0.53) |
| Prefer not to answer | 165 | (4.99) | 1 | (2.13) | 22 | (5.50) | 188 | (5.01) |
| Multi- category | 55 | (1.66) | 0 | (0.00) | 11 | (2.75) | 66 | (1.76) |
| Answer | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 3307 | (100.0) | 47 | (100.0) | 400 | (100.0) | 3754 | (100.0) |

Notes: Percentages are within County and sum down the column. *Low sample size, interpret with some caution.

Employment Status

In Table 17, we present employment status by county. Similar to the univariate descriptive analysis, the majority of respondents in each county were employed full-time, followed by retirees, and then employed part-time. Additional analyses were conducted to investigate employment status and whether respondents indicated barriers to their service. Possibly of interest, there was one pattern that emerged where the percentage of respondents within the “homemaker” employment category, who reported a barrier, did so a majority of the time (King County: 64%; Snohomish County: 60%).

Table 17. Employment Status by County (n = 3,778).

| Employment Status | King | % | Pierce* | % | Snohomish* | % | Total | % |
|--|------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Employed full-time (40 or more hours per week) | 1818 | (54.63) | 30 | (62.50) | 216 | (53.73) | 2064 | (54.63) |
| Employed part-time (up to 35 hours per week) | 236 | (7.09) | 2 | (4.17) | 26 | (6.47) | 264 | (6.99) |
| Furloughed due to COVID-19 | 21 | (0.63) | 0 | (0.00) | 1 | (0.25) | 22 | (0.58) |
| Military - Active Duty | 1 | (0.03) | 0 | (0.00) | 0 | (0.00) | 1 | (0.03) |
| Homemaker | 78 | (2.34) | 2 | (4.17) | 10 | (2.49) | 90 | (2.38) |
| Retired | 547 | (16.44) | 8 | (16.67) | 102 | (25.37) | 657 | (17.39) |
| Self-employed | 178 | (5.35) | 1 | (2.08) | 7 | (1.74) | 186 | (4.92) |
| Student | 48 | (1.44) | 0 | (0.00) | 3 | (0.75) | 51 | (1.35) |
| Unable to work | 18 | (0.54) | 0 | (0.00) | 0 | (0.00) | 18 | (0.48) |
| Unemployed and currently looking for work | 97 | (2.91) | 2 | (4.17) | 10 | (2.49) | 109 | (2.89) |
| Unemployed and not currently looking for work | 37 | (1.11) | 1 | (2.08) | 6 | (1.49) | 44 | (1.16) |
| A category not listed | 34 | (1.02) | 0 | (0.00) | 5 | (1.24) | 39 | (1.03) |
| Prefer not to answer | 24 | (0.72) | 0 | (0.00) | 5 | (1.24) | 29 | (0.77) |
| Multiple Selections | 191 | (5.74) | 2 | (4.17) | 11 | (2.74) | 204 | (5.40) |
| Total | 3328 | (100.0) | 48 | (100.0) | 402 | (100.0) | 3778 | (100.0) |

Notes: Percentages are within County and sum down the column. *Low sample size, interpret with some caution.

Children and Other Dependents

A total of about a third of all respondents reported having a child or dependent at home. About 37% of those who reported having a dependent at home also reported experiencing a barrier to reporting to jury duty.

Table 18. Child or Dependent Care by County (n = 3,781).

| Child/Dependent | King | % | Pierce* | % | Snohomish* | % | Total | % |
|----------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 1071 | (32.12) | 15 | (31.25) | 106 | (26.57) | 1192 | (31.53) |
| No | 2210 | (66.29) | 33 | (68.75) | 285 | (71.43) | 2528 | (66.86) |
| Prefer not to answer | 53 | (1.59) | 0 | (0.00) | 8 | (2.01) | 61 | (1.61) |
| Total | 3334 | (100.0) | 48 | (100.0) | 399 | (100.0) | 3781 | (100.0) |

Notes: *Low sample size, interpret with some caution.

Relationship Status

The majority (61%) of respondents reported being married at the time of taking this survey.

Table 19. Relationship Statue by County (n = 3,787).

| Relationship Status | King | % | Pierce* | % | Snohomish* | % | Total | % |
|---|------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Single, never married | 621 | (18.60) | 11 | (22.92) | 53 | (13.22) | 685 | (18.09) |
| Single, but cohabitating with a significant other | 219 | (6.56) | 6 | (12.50) | 15 | (3.74) | 240 | (6.34) |
| Widowed | 73 | (2.19) | 1 | (2.08) | 15 | (3.74) | 89 | (2.35) |
| Divorced | 258 | (7.73) | 4 | (8.33) | 41 | (10.22) | 303 | (8.00) |
| Separated | 21 | (0.63) | 0 | (0.00) | 1 | (0.25) | 22 | (0.58) |
| Married | 2025 | (60.67) | 26 | (54.17) | 260 | (64.84) | 2311 | (61.02) |
| In a domestic partnership or civil union | 56 | (1.68) | 0 | (0.00) | 6 | (1.50) | 62 | (1.64) |
| Prefer not to answer | 52 | (1.56) | 0 | (0.00) | 9 | (2.24) | 61 | (1.61) |
| A category not listed: | 13 | (0.39) | 0 | (0.00) | 1 | (0.25) | 14 | (0.37) |
| Total | 3338 | (100.0) | 48 | (100.0) | 401 | (100.0) | 3787 | (100.0) |

Notes: *Low sample size, interpret with some caution.

Combined Household Income

As reported in the basic descriptives for the entire sample, a significant number of respondents reported a combined annual household income of more than \$100,000. According to the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis, the median household income in King County in 2018 was \$95,009.

Table 20. Combined Annual Household Income by County (n = 3,771).

| Income | King | % | Pierce* | % | Snohomish* | % | Total | % |
|-----------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Less than \$10,000 | 41 | (1.23) | 0 | (0.00) | 6 | (1.50) | 47 | (1.25) |
| \$10,000 - \$19,999 | 34 | (1.02) | 1 | (2.08) | 7 | (1.75) | 42 | (1.11) |
| \$20,000 - \$29,999 | 77 | (2.32) | 0 | (0.00) | 6 | (1.50) | 83 | (2.20) |
| \$30,000 - \$39,999 | 102 | (3.07) | 4 | (8.33) | 16 | (4.01) | 122 | (3.24) |
| \$40,000 - \$49,999 | 120 | (3.61) | 0 | (0.00) | 18 | (4.51) | 138 | (3.66) |
| \$50,000 - \$59,999 | 123 | (3.70) | 3 | (6.25) | 19 | (4.76) | 145 | (3.85) |
| \$60,000 - \$69,999 | 151 | (4.54) | 5 | (10.42) | 23 | (5.76) | 179 | (4.75) |
| \$70,000 - \$79,999 | 173 | (5.20) | 7 | (14.58) | 20 | (5.01) | 200 | (5.30) |
| \$80,000 - \$89,999 | 155 | (4.66) | 3 | (6.25) | 11 | (2.76) | 169 | (4.48) |
| \$90,000 - \$99,999 | 162 | (4.87) | 4 | (8.33) | 23 | (5.76) | 189 | (5.01) |
| \$100,000 - \$149,999 | 634 | (19.07) | 9 | (18.75) | 91 | (22.81) | 734 | (19.46) |
| More than \$150,000 | 995 | (29.93) | 9 | (18.75) | 87 | (21.80) | 1091 | (28.93) |
| Prefer not to answer | 557 | (16.76) | 3 | (6.25) | 72 | (18.05) | 632 | (16.76) |
| Total | 3324 | (100.0) | 48 | (100.0) | 399 | (100.0) | 3771 | (100.0) |

Notes: *Low sample size, interpret with some caution.

Education

As highlighted in the main descriptive analysis section above, nearly three-quarters of the entire sample of respondents had a college degree (73.44% associate and above; 66.06% bachelor's and above). According to the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis (2018), 54.1% of King County residents have a bachelor's degree or higher, while 37% of all Washington residents hold at least a bachelor's degree.

Table 21. Highest Education Attained by County (n = 3,787).

| Education Attainment | King | % | Pierce* | % | Snohomish* | % | Total | % |
|-------------------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Some high school | 29 | (0.87) | 0 | (0.00) | 0 | (0.00) | 29 | (0.77) |
| High school degree or GED | 177 | (5.31) | 3 | (6.25) | 31 | (7.75) | 211 | (5.58) |
| Trade school | 53 | (1.59) | 3 | (6.25) | 14 | (3.50) | 70 | (1.85) |
| Some college but no degree | 508 | (15.23) | 14 | (29.17) | 73 | (18.25) | 595 | (15.72) |
| Associate degree | 232 | (6.95) | 3 | (6.25) | 44 | (11.00) | 279 | (7.37) |
| Bachelor's degree | 1348 | (40.41) | 18 | (37.50) | 153 | (38.25) | 1519 | (40.14) |
| Master's degree | 693 | (20.77) | 6 | (12.50) | 56 | (14.00) | 755 | (19.95) |
| Doctorate degree | 209 | (6.26) | 1 | (2.08) | 16 | (4.00) | 226 | (5.97) |
| A category not listed: | 49 | (1.47) | 0 | (0.00) | 6 | (1.50) | 55 | (1.45) |
| Prefer not to answer | 38 | (1.14) | 0 | (0.00) | 7 | (1.75) | 45 | (1.19) |
| Total | 3336 | (100.0) | 48 | (100.0) | 400 | (100.0) | 3784 | (100.0) |

Notes: *Low sample size, interpret with some caution.

Qualitative Responses Analysis

In this last section of data analysis, the responses to three open-ended survey questions are examined. These questions are listed below and appear in Appendix B. Respondents were first asked whether or not they have experienced any barriers to jury service:

1. If they answered *yes* to the initial barriers question, they were then prompted to: “Please describe the barriers that you experienced.”
2. After having the opportunity to provide feedback after number one, above, they were asked to: “Please describe any possible solutions that could help you overcome those barriers to improve your response to your jury summons and/or serve on a jury.”
3. If they answered *no* to the initial barriers question, they were then asked: “Do you have any suggestions for improving the jury service experience?”

A thematic analysis was conducted of the qualitative responses to these three open-ended questions. Utilizing a deductive approach, we relied on the prior barriers to jury service and potential solutions identified in the literature (see Collins & Miller Gialopsos, 2021) as a framework for this analysis. These served as labels during the coding process. However, anything that was not previously conceived by the literature was added. Using a semantic approach to analysis, responses were carefully read, and the explicit words provided by respondents were analyzed. We avoided making assumptions and, instead, relied solely on the content provided. Similar themes were grouped together into categories. Please note that respondents could list multiple barriers, solutions, and suggestions; therefore, some cross-category totals exceed 100%.

Barriers to Jury Service

One of the close-ended survey questions asked “Have you ever experienced any barriers that impact your ability to attend jury service? Examples include but are not limited to: lack of child or dependent care, lack of transportation, or work-related issues.” Respondents who indicated “yes” were then asked: “Please describe the barriers that you experienced.” Out of the 3,797 total survey respondents, 1,162 indicated that they had endured a barrier. Among these respondents, 1,104 (or 95%) provided a written response that identified barriers affecting their ability to participate in jury service. These responses were categorized into five groups of barriers: 1) responsibility-related , 2) care-related , 3) courthouse-related , 4) health/ability-related , and 5) process-related . These appear in Table 22 below. More in-depth descriptions of these barriers are provided in Appendix A.

The most frequently selected category of barriers was **responsibility-related barriers** (82.60%). These included work-related issues (53.44%), financial hardships (20.11%), being in or away for college (6.34%), personal travel (2.26%), and military deployment (0.45%). When looking at **care-related barriers** (35.87%), the primary response was childcare (25.54%), followed by caring for other dependents (4.89%), family issues (2.81%), breastfeeding (1.36%), and overseeing either homeschooling or COVID-19 induced remote learning.

Courthouse-related barriers constituted 16.12% of those identified by respondents. Transportation and/or commuting issues were the bulk of this category (8.15%). The COVID-19 category involved issues with the pandemic, masks, vaccinations, social distancing, being high-risk or having high-risk family members, etc. (6.52%). Other barriers were parking-related (0.82%), safety (0.36%), and weather (0.27%).

Healthy and/or ability-related barriers represented 13.76% of responses. Physical and mental health of self and/or family members was the most frequently cited (11.05%), followed by pregnancy and/or maternity barriers (almost 2%), issues related to old age (0.36%), language barriers (.27%), and religion (0.09%).

The final category, **process-related barriers**, was 5.44% of all responses. Within this category was moved away (2.54%), the duration of the process, wait times, and/or trial (1.72%), and technology and/or internet issues (0.73%). A handful of respondents mentioned other issues due to lack of citizenship (0.18%), frustration with prior trials ending in a settlement (0.18), and issues with the instructions or directions provided to them (0.09%).

Table 22. Barriers Identified by Respondents (n = 1,104).

| | % | <i>f</i> |
|---|---------------|-----------------|
| CARE-RELATED BARRIERS | | |
| Childcare | 25.54% | 282 |
| Breastfeeding | 1.36% | 15 |
| Care for other dependents | 4.89% | 54 |
| Homeschooling/remote learning of children | 1.27% | 14 |
| Family or personal issues | 2.81% | 31 |
| Total within the category | 35.87% | 396 |
| HEALTH/ABILITY-RELATED BARRIERS | | |
| Physical/mental health | 11.05% | 122 |
| Maternity/pregnancy | 1.99% | 22 |
| Age | 0.36% | 4 |
| Language | 0.27% | 3 |
| Religion | 0.09% | 1 |
| Total within the category | 13.76% | 152 |
| RESPONSIBILITY-RELATED BARRIERS | | |
| Financial | 20.11% | 222 |
| Work/employer | 53.44% | 590 |
| School | 6.34% | 70 |
| Military | 0.45% | 5 |
| Travel | 2.26% | 25 |
| Total within the category | 82.60% | 912 |
| COURTHOUSE-RELATED BARRIERS | | |
| Safety/security | 0.36% | 4 |
| COVID-related | 6.52% | 72 |
| Parking | 0.82% | 9 |
| Transportation | 8.15% | 90 |
| Weather | 0.27% | 3 |
| Total within the category | 16.12% | 178 |
| PROCESS-RELATED BARRIERS | | |
| Technology/internet | 0.73% | 8 |
| Duration of process/trial | 1.72% | 19 |
| Settlement | 0.18% | 2 |
| Citizenship | 0.18% | 2 |
| Instructions/directions | 0.09% | 1 |
| Moved out of town | 2.54% | 28 |
| Total within the category | 5.44% | 60 |

Notes: Respondents were able to identify multiple barriers; therefore, totals exceed 100%.

Solutions to Barriers to Jury Service

Individuals who responded that they had experienced barriers that impacted their ability to attend jury service (n = 1,162) were also asked to: “Please describe any possible solutions that could help you overcome those barriers to improve your response to your jury summons and/or serve on a jury.” In response to this question, 897 of the survey respondents who reported barriers (or 77.19%) provided possible solutions to the barriers they had encountered. These appear in Table 23 below. Please recall that respondents could identify as many barriers as they wanted; therefore, totals exceed 100%. In all, six categories of solutions were created: 1) process-related, 2) compensation-related, 3) care-related, 4) courthouse-related, and 5) qualification-related solutions. The sixth category, other solutions, was largely driven by “don’t know” or “not applicable” responses as well as unhelpful and/or inappropriate remarks. A few respondents however, identified issues with police, lawyers, plea bargains, bias, and discrimination and gave related recommendations. More in-depth descriptions of these solutions can be found in Appendix A.

Reported by over half of respondents, **process-related solutions** (50.63%) included allowing potential jurors to have a say in the days, times, season (e.g., teachers available over summer), location, method of communication (e.g., email seems to be preferred for many), format of service (i.e., in-person or virtual). Over 14% of respondents indicated one or more of these scheduling or rescheduling solutions. Keeping the online or virtual format post-COVID was reported by over 10% of respondents. Over 7% recommended increasing the duration of postponements or delays of service, approximately 6% identified shorter times, terms, waits, and/or selection process, slightly over 4% mentioned earlier notification to allow for planning purposes, and almost 4% recommended part-time, part-day, evening, or weekend jury service. About 3% of respondents indicated that the courts should provide more complete and honest information regarding various parts/stages of the process and over 1% suggested improvements to technology and/or internet.

The second most popular category, **compensation-related solutions** (34.66%), was fairly straightforward with over 21% recommending increasing financial compensation by being paid a living wage, one’s regular salary, or an increase to the compensation provided by the county or state. Over 13% commented on changes to their jobs, including requiring employees to fully pay employees for jury service, changing company procedures and/or adding vacation time/PTO, and altering the climate and/or perceptions of how employers view jury service.

Care-related solutions (22.63%) primarily revolved around free, on-site childcare for jurors with trained, background-checked staff or access to other childcare locations that provide drop-in service either free or through vouchers provided by the court (17%). Over 4% included health-related accommodations like the ability to eat and/or take medication on a regular schedule, as well as assistance with being unable to sit for long periods of time, mentally deal with trial/process, and/or provide commercial driver/wheelchair accessibility. Less than 1% provided suggestions such as secure, private rooms for nursing mothers to feed their babies, pump, and sanitarily store milk. Likewise, less than 1% said they had a need for arranging in-home care for sick/injured/dying family members.

In terms of **courthouse-related solutions** (16.28%), over 8% of respondents commented on COVID-19 induced problems (e.g., lack of childcare/remote learning for kids, no longer employed, stress about being high-risk, possible exposure, etc.) that may dissipate after the pandemic is further contained. Possible solutions included waiting out the pandemic, requiring and/or providing vaccinations, and delaying any in-person portions of jury service and/or only allowing virtual jury service. Additionally, over 6% of respondents provided ideas to alleviate transportation, commuting, and parking problems. These included compensation for or providing prospective jurors with bus tickets, shuttles to courthouse, reimbursement for mileage, public transportation, and/or parking, as well as general improvements to public transportation. Less frequent solutions were comfort-related and involved frequent breaks and/or more opportunities to stand and for movement, food and drink, improved chairs, waiting areas, and other amenities. Finally, although only mentioned by a small percentage of respondents, there were recommendations to improve the safety of the courthouse and surrounding areas.

Finally, **qualifications-related solutions** (9.69%) took the form of altering the requirements to allow retired and/or unemployed individuals to be utilized first (3.57%), temporarily or permanently excluding teachers, professors, students, and parents with school-aged children (3.34%), allow individuals to opt-out of service due to bias or unwillingness to serve (1.12%), and either expand the lists that are used for jury selection and/or increase voter registration efforts (0.78%). Solutions that were less frequently identified were providing an interpreter and large screen that transcribes conversations for hearing/sight impairments (0.33%), prioritizing those who want to serve by creating an opt-in system, which would allow volunteers to participate (0.33%), and abolishing the identification and/or citizenship requirement (0.22%).

Table 23. Solutions to Barriers Identified by Respondents (n = 897).

| | % | f |
|---|---------------|------------|
| CARE-RELATED SOLUTIONS | | |
| Provide or reimburse childcare | 16.83% | 151 |
| Better nursing accommodations | 0.89% | 8 |
| Provide or reimburse dependent, in-home care/treatment | 0.78% | 7 |
| Provide health accommodations or improved accessibility | 4.13% | 37 |
| Total within the category | 22.63% | 203 |
| COMPENSATION-RELATED SOLUTIONS | | |
| Increase financial compensation | 21.29% | 191 |
| Changes to employer (PTO, vacation, policies, job) | 13.04% | 117 |
| Unionize | 0.11% | 1 |
| Provide better incentives | 0.22% | 2 |
| Total within the category | 34.66% | 311 |

Table 23. Continued from Previous Page.

| COURTHOUSE-RELATED SOLUTIONS | | |
|---|---------------|------------|
| Improve safety/security | 0.56% | 5 |
| COVID-related | 8.14% | 73 |
| Provide or reimburse transportation/parking/shuttle/commuting | 6.13% | 55 |
| More breaks/movement | 0.78% | 7 |
| Better environment and food | 0.67% | 6 |
| Total within the category | 16.28% | 146 |
| PROCESS-RELATED SOLUTIONS | | |
| Keep virtual | 10.15% | 91 |
| Technology/internet improvements | 1.34% | 12 |
| Changes to reporting process | 0.89% | 8 |
| Shorter times, terms, waits, selection process | 5.69% | 51 |
| Earlier notifications | 4.13% | 37 |
| Longer postponements | 7.25% | 65 |
| Reschedule/select day, time, season, location, method, format | 14.16% | 127 |
| Consideration of non-Christian religious holidays | 0.11% | 1 |
| Better information and more transparency | 3.01% | 27 |
| Implement part-time or half-day service, night or weekend court | 3.90% | 35 |
| Total within the category | 50.63% | 454 |
| QUALIFICATIONS-RELATED SOLUTIONS | | |
| Exclude students/teachers/parents with young kids | 3.34% | 30 |
| Abolish identification and/or US citizen requirements | 0.22% | 2 |
| Utilize retired and/or unemployed individuals | 3.57% | 32 |
| Create opt-in/volunteer system | 0.33% | 3 |
| Use interpreter or large screen with transcription | 0.33% | 3 |
| Allow individuals to opt-out | 1.12% | 10 |
| Expand lists or improve voter registration | 0.78% | 7 |
| Total within the category | 9.69% | 87 |
| OTHER SOLUTIONS | | |
| Improve issues, distrust, and bias in larger CJ system | 0.56% | 5 |
| Unhelpful or rude responses | 1.23% | 11 |
| Not applicable or don't know | 19.40% | 174 |
| Total within the category | 21.19% | 190 |

Notes: Respondents were able to identify multiple solutions; therefore, totals exceed 100%.

Suggestions for Improving the Jury Service Experience

For that same close-ended survey question – “Have you ever experienced any barriers that impact your ability to attend jury service? Examples include but are not limited to: lack of child or dependent care, lack of transportation, or work-related issues.” – respondents who indicated “no” were then prompted to answer the following: “Do you have any suggestions for improving the jury service experience?” While 2,700 of the respondents (or roughly 71% of the total sample) indicated that they had not encountered barriers to jury service, 605 (or approximately 22%) of these provided suggestions for improving the jury service experience, in general (see Table 24, below).

Please recall that respondents could identify as many suggestions as they wanted; therefore, some totals may exceed 100%. Similar themes were grouped together and, in all, six categories of suggestions were created: 1) process-related (60.17%), 2) technology-related (22.82%), 3) courthouse-related (21%), 4) compensation-related (5.29%), and 5) care and health-related (4.30%). While the sixth category (other suggestions) was identified by over 36% of respondents, most of these were “not applicable” or “I don’t know” responses (32.89%), as well as unhelpful or rude responses (0.83%). The remaining responses were uncategorizable with no clear theme (2.31%). See Appendix A for an in-depth description of these responses.

Among these five primary thematic categories, over 60% of the respondents indicated some sort of **process-related suggestion**. Within this category, the most frequent suggestions were providing more and/or better information, communication, and updates (almost 21%), changes to the questionnaire (14.88%), providing more notice and in formats such as email (8.76%), the ability to schedule or reschedule the day, season, time, method, and/or location of jury service (6.28%), and having shorter periods of jury service and wait times or being more efficient with and respectful of jurors’ time (5.62%). Some respondents (2.31%) felt the random selection process needed to be reviewed while others advocated for a volunteer option (1%). Providing more flexible hours and/or part-time jury service (0.17%), as well as enforcing penalties for no-shows was mentioned (0.17%).

Technology-related suggestions (22.82%) were largely due to a desire to keep jury service process virtual/online moving forward in a post-pandemic world. Relatedly, providing Zoom training for potential jurors and all court personnel was mentioned (3.64%). Specifically, either live instructions or videos of how to work Zoom and log in, as well as some information on (and expectations for) modern tools/features (i.e., hand-raise function) and muting/unmuting. Respondents also commented on improving or changing the jury portal and website, correcting out-of-date, incorrect, or conflicting information (3.47%). A small percentage mentioned providing potential jurors with technology (0.83%) and a few said discontinuing with online/virtual jury process and/or service due to a lack of understanding, desire, or knowledge of Zoom or technology, in general (0.50%).

Table 24. Suggestions Identified by Respondents (n = 605).

| | % | f |
|--|---------------|------------|
| CARE/HEALTH-RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Provide or reimburse childcare | 0.83% | 5 |
| Provide health accommodations or improved accessibility | 3.47% | 21 |
| Total within the category | 4.30% | 26 |
| TECHNOLOGY-RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Keep virtual | 14.38% | 87 |
| Stop virtual | 0.50% | 3 |
| Provide zoom/tech training | 3.64% | 22 |
| Update/improve website | 3.47% | 21 |
| Provide access to tech | 0.83% | 5 |
| Total within the category | 22.82% | 138 |
| COMPENSATION-RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| More money, better compensation | 5.29% | 32 |
| COURTHOUSE-RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Safety/security improvements | 4.63% | 28 |
| COVID-related | 7.11% | 43 |
| Transportation, location, parking, distance changes/improvements | 6.28% | 38 |
| Comfort, food, more breaks | 2.98% | 18 |
| Total within the category | 21.00% | 127 |
| PROCESS-RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Changes to questionnaire | 14.88% | 90 |
| Changes to random selection process | 2.31% | 14 |
| Allow volunteer option | 1% | 6 |
| Earlier notifications | 8.76% | 53 |
| Shorter times, service, waits, selection process | 5.62% | 34 |
| Better info/updates and transparency | 20.99% | 127 |
| Flexible hours, part-time service | 0.17% | 1 |
| Reschedule/schedule day, time, season, method, location | 6.28% | 38 |
| Enforce penalties for non-response | 0.17% | 1 |
| Total within the category | 60.17% | 364 |
| OTHER SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Other random | 2.31% | 14 |
| Unhelpful or rude responses | 0.83% | 5 |
| Not applicable or don't know | 32.89% | 199 |
| Total within the category | 36.03% | 218 |

Notes: Respondents were able to identify multiple suggestions; therefore, totals exceed 100%.

For **courthouse-related suggestions**, respondents commented on many COVID-related problems that may alleviate themselves after the pandemic. Examples include requiring vaccinations, banning jury service in the pandemic, but also comments like ending mask and/or social distancing requirements (7.11%). Over 6% of respondents also offered suggestions about better compensation for or providing free transportation, shuttles, parking, public transportation, etc. Further recommendations involved improving security near the courthouse for the purposes of crime, protests, and encampments for unsheltered persons, but also suggestions to streamline security procedures at times or stages in the process (4.63%). Additionally, roughly 3% of respondents advocated for more comfortable chairs and waiting areas, amenities, snacks and food, as well as additional opportunities to stand, move about, stretch legs, and take hourly breaks.

Compensation-related suggestions were voiced by over 5% of the respondents. These included additional money for jury service in the forms of being paid a living wage, one's regular salary, or increased pay by the county or state. For **care and health-related suggestions** (4.3%), respondents mentioned improving accessibility and accommodations for health issues (3.47%), as well as providing onsite daycare or reimbursing for childcare (0.83%). To reiterate, these suggestions were made by respondents who indicated they have never encountered barriers to participating in jury service.

CONCLUSION

When looking at the qualitative responses, the top three barriers to jury service are consistent with the prior literature on this topic (see Collins & Miller Gialopsos, 2021). Specifically, issues with work and employers (53.44%), childcare (25.54%), and financial hardship (20.11%) were the most commonly cited barriers. This information coupled with the proposed solutions given by the respondents reveal that increased financial compensation, providing or reimbursing for childcare, and changing the rules around employers' handling of jury service need to be addressed. Other noteworthy recommendations include allowing potential jurors to have a more active voice in determining the date, time, location, and method of jury duty, providing better quality directions and information to potential jurors, and retaining online/virtual components of jury service after the pandemic. However, courts in Washington State should consider providing training videos and instructions well in advance that help potential jurors navigate Zoom and its functions. It also appears that utilizing email for communication purposes and/or allowing jurors to identify their preferred communication methods could be worthwhile.

Moving forward, we have a few methodological recommendations. First, the new categories that we created for race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation should remain unchanged in future demographic surveys. This will allow more accurate comparisons and help to paint a better, more complete picture of who is responding to jury summons in these counties. Second, creating a yearlong survey would help to eliminate any seasonal effects that could exist. Third, because the survey spanned different times and phases of the COVID-19 pandemic and crossed different re-opening and vaccination periods, it is hard to know whether or not the impacts are situational or substantive.

Finally, while we now have a glimpse into the barriers of some jurors who responded to their summons, we still know little to nothing about the barriers faced by those who do not respond when summoned for jury service. It is imperative that attention and resources be focused on this population. We recommend more qualitative research, specifically interviews with members of the community or, at the very least, focus groups in King or other interested counties as a starting point. By knowing the real reasons those individuals are unable or unwilling to serve, then we can begin to better manage these barriers.

REFERENCES

- Collins, P. A. & B. Miller Gialopsos. (2021). Answering the Call: An Analysis of Jury Pool Representation in Washington State. *Criminology, Criminal Justice, Law & Society*, 22(1), 36-49.
- Draper, B. M. (2021). And Justice for None: How COVID-19 is Crippling the Criminal Jury Right. *Boston College Law Review*, 62(9). Retrieved from: <https://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/bclr/vol62/iss9/1>
- Hickman, M. J. & P. A. Collins. (2017). "Results from Washington Survey of Jurors." Presentation for: The Washington State Minority and Justice Commission, Webinar May 19th, 2017; and, Symposium for the Washington State Supreme Court, May 24th, 2017.
- Wilson. M. D. (2020). The Pandemic Juror. *Washington & Lee Law Review Online*, 77(1). Retrieved from: <https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr-online/vol77/iss1/6>

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF CATEGORIES CREATED FROM QUALITATIVE RESPONSES

Descriptions of Barriers Identified by Respondents

| BARRIERS | CATEGORIES | EXAMPLES |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Care and/or Dependent-Related Barriers | Childcare | <i>Babies or young children/grandchildren; Transportation for older kids to/from schools, activities, other appointments.</i> |
| | Breastfeeding | <i>Including pumping breastmilk, worries about sanitary conditions and/or storage.</i> |
| | Care for other dependents | <i>Doctor’s appointments, treatments, in-home care, hospice.</i> |
| | Homeschooling or remote learning | <i>Parents and/or grandparents tasked with educational responsibilities (some of which was COVID-induced).</i> |
| | Family or personal issues/emergencies | <i>Deaths and funerals; House burned down.</i> |
| Health and/or Ability-Related Barriers | Physical and/or mental health issues | <i>Personal or family member having illness, injury, medical and/or mental health issues.</i> |
| | Maternity and/or pregnancy | <i>Recent delivery, upcoming due date, placed on bed rest, not feeling well.</i> |
| | Age | <i>Mentioned being older and/or slowing down due to age.</i> |
| | Language | <i>English not first language, which poses issues with complex/new/technical terms (understanding and communicating) or when others speak too quickly.</i> |
| | Religion | <i>Celebrating non-Christian religious holidays.</i> |
| Responsibility-Related Barriers | Financial | <i>Sole breadwinner, living paycheck to paycheck, can’t afford loss of income and/or to pay for jury related expenses.</i> |
| | Worker/employer | <i>Financial and non-financial hardships to self, family, employer, and/or other co-workers, pressure not to take off (many were doctors, nurses, teachers, professors); Self-employed and/or contract work.</i> |
| | School | <i>Away at college/university and couldn’t attend and/or the impact it would have on their coursework and/or grades.</i> |
| | Military | <i>Deployed overseas or on tour.</i> |
| | Travel | <i>Specifically personal travel, pre-planned vacation, or being out of town.</i> |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Courthouse-Related Barriers | Safety and/or security | <i>Feeling unsafe or scared due to protests and dangerous activity in 2020, crime, encampments of unsheltered persons, as well as COVID-related safety and fear.</i> |
| | COVID | <i>Issues with the pandemic, masks, vaccinations, social distancing, being high-risk or having high-risk family members, not agreeing with county responses, etc.</i> |
| | Parking | <i>Referencing the difficulty and/or cost of having to park (typically downtown), or difficulty walking from parking area.</i> |
| | Transportation | <i>No or unreliable transportation, issues with commuting, public transportation issues and complaints.</i> |
| | Weather | <i>Local weather issues near courthouse, such as snow and/or rain issues and/or cancellations.</i> |
| Process-Related Barriers | Technology and/or internet issues | <i>Not being tech savvy, having inadequate or limited internet service, etc.</i> |
| | Duration of process, trial, and/or wait times | <i>Length of process and/or trial if selected is too long; Having to be available for days before knowing if selected for jury duty.</i> |
| | Settlement | <i>Cases ended in settlement after days/weeks.</i> |
| | Citizenship | <i>Was not a citizen at the time.</i> |
| | Instructions and/or directions | <i>Difficulty understanding instructions about jury service process.</i> |
| | Moved out of town | <i>No longer lives at the address on file, living out of county, state, and/or country (some indicated they had changed their address on file).</i> |

Descriptions of Solutions Identified by Respondents

| SOLUTIONS | CATEGORIES | EXAMPLES |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Care-Related Solutions | Childcare | <i>Provide free, on-site childcare for jurors with trained, background-checked staff; Access to other locations that provide drop-in service (either free or vouchers).</i> |
| | Nursing accommodations | <i>Provide secure, private rooms for nursing mothers to feed their babies, pump, and store milk (in sanitary conditions).</i> |
| | Dependent, in-home care/treatment | <i>Arrange in-home care for sick/injured/dying family member.</i> |
| | General health, accessibility, accommodations | <i>Ability to eat, take medication on a regular schedule; Allowing choice to sit or stand, provide better chairs, some sort of assistance to help them mentally deal with trial/process, provide commercial driver/wheelchair accessibility.</i> |
| Compensation-Related Solutions | Financial compensation | <i>Being paid a living wage, regular salary, or increased pay by the state or county.</i> |
| | Employer changes | <i>Require employees to fully pay employees for jury duty; Change climate/perceptions of how employers view/treat jury duty; Change employers' procedures and/or add vacation time, PTO, etc.</i> |
| | Unionization | <i>Being in a union solved employer issue.</i> |
| | Better incentives | <i>Include transportation, lunch/food, etc.</i> |
| Courthouse-Related Solutions | Safety and/or security | <i>Improve or increase security downtown, courthouse, nearby area (crime, protests, encampments for unsheltered persons); Improve COVID policies, require and/or provide vaccinations for jurors, halt jury service until the pandemic is over and/or numbers decline.</i> |
| | COVID | <i>These solutions seem like they would occur naturally with time and/or when the pandemic is over (e.g., the lack of childcare/remote learning for kids, public transportation during pandemic, sitting inside with others whose vaccination status is unknown).</i> |
| | Transportation or parking improvements | <i>Provide or fully reimburse for bus tickets and/or parking, compensate for distance and commute; General improvements to public transportation; Provide shuttles to courthouse from various popular locations.</i> |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | More breaks and/or movement | <i>Give more frequent and/or longer opportunities to stand, move about, stretch legs; Provide hourly breaks.</i> |
| | Better environment and/or food | <i>Improve the quality of chairs, waiting areas, amenities, as well as provide healthy snacks/food.</i> |
| Process-Related Solutions | Keep virtual | <i>Keep some or all parts of the jury summons and service process virtual after the pandemic, as it is easier, more flexible, and more respectful of jurors' time.</i> |
| | Technology and/or internet improvements | <i>Provide temporary Wi-Fi and/or internet.</i> |
| | Change reporting process | <i>Make it more efficient, easier to get questions asked and/or interact with court personnel; Changes to the definition and/or interpretation of "hardships."</i> |
| | Shorter times, terms, waits, selection process | <i>Change the process or system in order to save and respect jurors' time; Reduce waiting periods, the juror service term, the overall selection process, time between parts or stages.</i> |
| | Earlier notifications | <i>Send out emails sooner and/or notify them of the exact dates of trials/service sooner.</i> |
| | Longer postponements | <i>Increase the duration of postponements or delays of service.</i> |
| | Juror voice in selection or rescheduling certain aspects | <i>Allow potential jurors to have a say in the days, times, season (teachers are only available over summer), location, method of communication (preference for email), format of service (in-person or virtual), etc.</i> |
| | Consideration of religious holidays | <i>Be mindful of non-Christian religious holidays and celebrations.</i> |
| | Better information and transparency | <i>Provide more complete and honest information regarding various parts/stages of the process; Increase the notifications and updates; Be realistic and transparent when communicating with jurors.</i> |
| | More flexible service | <i>Implement part-time or half-day service and/or create night or weekend court, which would alleviate many of the childcare and/or work issues (by allowing people to work at least part day and earn some money). Specifically, aligning with local, public school hours was recommended.</i> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Qualifications-Related Solutions | Exclude students, teachers, and parents with young kids | <i>Change who is eligible for jury service and exclude students, teachers, professors, and parents with children who are not yet in school.</i> |
| | Change other requirements | <i>Abolish identification and/or citizenship requirement.</i> |
| | Utilize retired and/or unemployed individuals | <i>Give greater preference or more consideration to retired and/or unemployed perspective jurors.</i> |
| | Create opt-in system | <i>Create a volunteer system that would prioritize those who want to serve.</i> |
| | Use interpreter and transcription | <i>Provide interpreter, large screen that transcribes conversations for hearing/sight impairments.</i> |
| | Allow individuals to opt-out | <i>Allow those who are too biased, uninterested in civic duty, and/or frustrated with jury service being a requirement and/or carrying a penalty.</i> |
| | Expand lists | <i>Expand jury source lists and/or find ways to include more individuals as potential jurors (e.g., increase voter registration efforts). These comments were tied to frustrations with frequently being asked to serve, as well as skepticism or distrust with the selection process.</i> |
| Other Solutions | Improve criminal justice system | <i>Suggestions about the need to fix issues like distrust and bias in policing, increasing plea bargains, provide training on implicit bias.</i> |
| | Unhelpful or rude responses | <i>No real solutions given (just profanity or used as a platform to vent).</i> |
| | Don't know or not applicable | <i>No real solutions given.</i> |

Descriptions of Other Suggestions Identified by Respondents

| SUGGESTIONS | CATEGORIES | EXAMPLES |
|---|--|---|
| Care-Related Suggestions | Childcare | <i>Provide free, on-site childcare for jurors with trained, background-checked staff; Access to other locations that provide drop-in service (either free or vouchers).</i> |
| | Health accommodations and/or accessibility | <i>Ability to eat, take medication on a regular schedule, have better accommodations for disabilities and health issues.</i> |
| Technology-Related Suggestions | Keep virtual | <i>Continue with some or all parts remaining virtual, as it is easier and more flexible for jurors.</i> |
| | Stop virtual | <i>Discontinue with virtual jury service and/or selection process due to lack of understanding, desire, knowledge of Zoom or technology.</i> |
| | Provide Zoom and/or technology training | <i>Provide instructions or video of how to work Zoom and log in (for jurors and court personnel); Provide or require knowledge and understanding of modern tools/features (i.e., hand-raise function), muting/unmuting.</i> |
| | Update and/or improve website | <i>Changes/improvements to jury portal and website, including what you can do or find; Remove out-of-date, incorrect, or conflicting information on website.</i> |
| | Provide access to technology | <i>Provide temporary access to or reimbursement for Wi-Fi and technological devices.</i> |
| Compensation-Related Suggestions | More money and/or better compensation | <i>Pay a living wage, jurors' regular salary, or increase pay by the state and/or county.</i> |
| Courthouse-Related Suggestions | Safety and/or security | <i>Improve or increase security downtown, courthouse, nearby area (crime, protests, encampments for unsheltered persons); Streamline security process at times; Require vaccinations for jurors and/or halt jury service for a period of time.</i> |
| | COVID | <i>These suggestions seem like they would occur naturally with time and/or when the pandemic is over (e.g., the lack of childcare/remote learning for kids, public transportation during pandemic, sitting inside with others whose vaccination status is unknown).</i> |
| | Transportation or parking improvements | <i>Provide or fully reimburse for bus tickets and/or parking, compensate for distance and commute; General improvements to public transportation; Provide shuttles to courthouse from various</i> |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <i>popular locations; Limit walking between places and/or parts of the process.</i> |
| | Comfort improvements, provide food, more breaks | <i>Improve chairs, waiting areas, amenities; Provide snacks/food; Give more opportunities to stand, move about, stretch legs, take breaks.</i> |
| Process-Related Suggestions | Changes to questionnaire | <i>Correct mistakes, confusion, discrepancies, glitches on questionnaires; Have someone available to address questions about questionnaires, process, qualifications, etc.</i> |
| | Changes to random selection process | <i>Create better algorithms or coding to ensure the process randomly selects jurors.</i> |
| | Allow volunteer option | <i>Prioritize those who want to serve by creating an opt-in/opt-out system.</i> |
| | Earlier notifications | <i>Send out emails sooner, use email more, and/or notify them of the exact dates of trials/service sooner; Provide endorsement by the court, which would help with conversations with employers.</i> |
| | Shorter times, service, waits, selection process | <i>Change the process or system in order to save and respect jurors' time; Reduce waiting periods, the juror service term, the overall selection process, time between parts or stages.</i> |
| | Better information and transparency | <i>Provide more complete and honest information regarding various parts/stages of the process.</i> |
| | More flexible service | <i>Provide more flexible service hours or part-day service, which would alleviate many of the childcare and/or work issues. Align with local, public school hours.</i> |
| | Juror voice in selection or rescheduling certain aspects | <i>Allow potential jurors to have a say in the days, times, season (teachers are only available over summer), location, method of communication (preference for email), format of service (in-person or virtual), etc.</i> |
| | Enforce penalties | <i>Enforce existing penalties for failure to respond to jury service, as it is unfair to those who fulfill their civic duty.</i> |
| Other Suggestions | Other random | <i>Ensure racial/ethnic representation and provide training/education about unconscious bias among jurors; Provide public service announcements to encourage BIPOC communities to participate; Find ways to really address gender-based discrimination in employment (to eliminate worries about future job security).</i> |
| | Unhelpful or rude responses | <i>No real solutions given (just profanity or used as a platform to vent).</i> |
| | Don't know or not applicable | <i>No real solutions given.</i> |

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

| Survey Questions | Response Options |
|---|--|
| Please identify the County where you are serving: | 1) King, 2) Pierce, 3) Snohomish |
| Please indicate whether your current jury service is online/virtual or you are required to report to a courthouse in person: | 1) Online/virtual, 2) In person, 3) It began online, but now I'm attending in person because I was selected as a juror, 4) I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in person if selected |
| How many times have you received a notification for jury duty in Washington State? | 1) This is the first time I've received a jury duty notification in the mail, 2) This is the second time, 3) This is the third time, 4) This is the fourth time, 5) Five or more times |
| How many times have you showed up/attended selection for jury duty in Washington State? | 1) This is my first time reporting for jury duty, 2) This is the second time, 3) This is the third time, 4) This is the fourth time, 5) I've attended five or more times |
| How many times have you been selected as a juror on a case in Washington State? | 1) 0, 2) 1, 3) 2, 4) 3, 5) 4, 6) 5 or more times |
| Have you ever experienced any barriers that impact your ability to attend jury service? Examples include but are not limited to: lack of child or dependent care, lack of transportation, or work-related issues. | 1) Yes, 2) No |
| Please describe the barriers that you experienced. | Open-ended |
| Please describe any possible solutions that could help you overcome those barriers to improve your response to your jury summons and/or serve on a jury. | Open-ended |
| Do you have any suggestions for improving the jury service experience? If no, please proceed to the next question. | Open-ended |
| What is your age? | Sliding scale from 18-100 |
| What is your gender identity? Please select all that apply. | 1) Agender, 2) Gender queer or gender fluid, 3) Man, 4) Non-binary, 5) Questioning or unsure, 6) Transgender man, 7) Transgender woman, 8) Woman, 9) An identity not listed: _____, 10) Prefer not to answer |
| What is your sexual orientation? Please select all that apply. | 1) Asexual, 2) Bisexual, 3) Gay, 4) Heterosexual (straight), 5) Lesbian, 6) Pansexual, 7) Queer, 8) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Questioning or unsure, 9) An identity not listed: _____, 10) Prefer not to answer |
| What is your race? Please select all that apply. | 1) African-American or Black, 2) American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Indigenous, 3) Asian Indian, 4) Cambodian, 5) Chinese, 6) Filipino, 7) Guamanian or Chamorro, 8) Japanese, 9) Korean, 10) Middle Eastern or North African, 11) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 12) Other Asian, 13) Vietnamese, 14) White, 15) A category not listed: _____, 16) Prefer not to answer |
| Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latinx? Please select all that apply. | 1) No, not Spanish, Hispanic, or Latinx, 2) Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, 3) Yes, Puerto Rican, 4) Yes, Cuban, 5) Yes, another Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin, 6) A category not listed: _____, 7) Prefer not to answer |
| What is your current employment status? Please select all that apply. | 1) Employed full-time (40 or more hours per week), 2) Employed part-time (up to 35 hours per week), 3) Furloughed due to COVID-19, 4) Military – Active Duty, 5) Homemaker, 6) Retired, 7) Self-employed, 8) Student, 9) Unable to work, 10) Unemployed and currently looking for work, 11) Unemployed and not currently looking for work, 12) A category not listed: _____, 13) Prefer not to answer |
| Do you have a child and/or other dependents under your care? | 1) Yes, 2) No, 3) Prefer not to answer |
| What is your current relationship status? | 1) Single, never married, 2) Single, but cohabitating with a significant other, 3) In a domestic partnership or civil union, 4) Married, 5) Divorced, 6) Separated, 7) A category not listed: _____, 8) Prefer not to answer |
| What is your combined household income? | 1) Less than \$10,000, 2) \$10,000-\$19,999, 3) \$20,000 - \$29,999, 4) \$30,000 - \$39,999, 5) \$40,000 - \$49,999, 6) \$50,000 - \$59,999, 7) \$60,000 - \$69,999, 8) \$70,000 - \$79,999, 9) \$80,000 - \$89,999, 10) \$90,000 - \$99,999, 11) \$100,000 - \$149,999, 12) More than \$150,000, 13) Prefer not to answer |
| What is your highest level of education? | 1) Some high school, 2) High school degree or GED, 3) Trade school, 4) Some college but no degree, 5) Associate degree, 6) Bachelor's degree, 7) Master's degree, 8) Doctorate degree, 9) A category not listed: _____, 10) Prefer not to answer |

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL BIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES FOR KING COUNTY

King County Bivariate Tables Online/Virtual by Race, Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Employment Status.

Table A1. King County Frequency & Percent: Online/Virtual by Binary Race (n = 3,197).

| Race | Online/Virtual | In-Person | Online & In-Person* | Online & Unknown** | Total |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|
| White | 730 | 307 | 26 | 1457 | 2520 |
| | 29.00% | 12.20% | 1.00% | 57.80% | 100% |
| Non-White | 194 | 78 | 7 | 398 | 677 |
| | 28.70% | 11.50% | 1.00% | 58.80% | 100% |
| Total | 924 | 385 | 33 | 1855 | 3197 |
| | 28.90% | 12.00% | 1.00% | 58.00% | 100% |

Notes: *It began online, but now I'm attending in-person because I was selected as a juror. **I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in-person if selected.

Table A2. King County Frequency & Percent: Online/Virtual by Binary Gender (n = 3,294).

| Gender | Online/Virtual | In-Person | Online & In-Person* | Online & Unknown** | Total |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Men | 457 | 182 | 10 | 817 | 1466 |
| | 31.20% | 12.40% | 0.70% | 55.70% | 100% |
| Women | 470 | 193 | 23 | 997 | 1683 |
| | 27.90% | 11.50% | 1.40% | 59.20% | 100% |
| All other categories | 32 | 19 | 1 | 93 | 145 |
| | 22.10% | 13.10% | 0.70% | 64.10% | 100% |
| Total | 959 | 394 | 34 | 1907 | 3294 |
| | 29.10% | 12.00% | 1.00% | 57.90% | 100% |

Notes: *It began online, but now I'm attending in-person because I was selected as a juror. **I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in-person if selected.

Table A3. King Co. Frequency & Percent: Online/Virtual by Sexual Orientation (n = 3,276).

| Orientation | Online/Virtual | In-Person | Online & In-Person* | Online & Unknown** | Total |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Asexual | 27 | 15 | 0 | 37 | 79 |
| | 34.20% | 19.00% | 0.00% | 46.80% | 100% |
| Bisexual | 24 | 5 | 1 | 75 | 105 |
| | 22.90% | 4.80% | 1.00% | 71.40% | 100% |
| Gay | 27 | 11 | 1 | 45 | 84 |
| | 32.10% | 13.10% | 1.20% | 53.60% | 100% |
| Heterosexual (straight) | 787 | 335 | 29 | 1538 | 2689 |
| | 29.30% | 12.50% | 1.10% | 57.20% | 100% |
| Lesbian | 11 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 33 |
| | 33.30% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 60.60% | 100% |
| Pansexual | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 14 |
| | 7.10% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 92.90% | 100% |
| Queer | 8 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 27 |
| | 29.60% | 3.70% | 0.00% | 66.70% | 100% |
| Questioning or unsure | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 14 |
| | 14.30% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 71.40% | 100% |
| An identity not listed | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 16 |
| | 31.30% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 68.80% | 100% |
| Prefer not to answer | 45 | 18 | 2 | 95 | 160 |
| | 28.10% | 11.30% | 1.30% | 59.40% | 100% |
| Multi- category Answer | 13 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 55 |
| | 23.60% | 3.60% | 0.00% | 72.70% | 100% |
| Total | 950 | 390 | 34 | 1902 | 3276 |
| | 29.00% | 11.90% | 1.00% | 58.10% | 100% |

Notes: *It began online, but now I'm attending in-person because I was selected as a juror. **I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in-person if selected.

Table A4. King Co. Frequency & Percent: Online/Virtual by Employment Status (n = 3,295).

| Employment Status | Online/Virtual | In-Person | Online & In-Person* | Online & Unknown** | Total |
|---|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Employed full-time (40+ hours/week) | 560 | 175 | 15 | 1058 | 1808 |
| | 31.00% | 9.70% | 0.80% | 58.50% | 100% |
| Employed part-time (to 35 hours/ week) | 70 | 33 | 3 | 129 | 235 |
| | 29.80% | 14.00% | 1.30% | 54.90% | 100% |
| Furloughed due to COVID-19 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 21 |
| | 28.60% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 57.10% | 100% |
| Military - Active Duty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100% | 100% |
| Homemaker | 16 | 11 | 1 | 49 | 77 |
| | 20.80% | 14.30% | 1.30% | 63.60% | 100% |
| Retired | 146 | 87 | 7 | 294 | 534 |
| | 27.30% | 16.30% | 1.30% | 55.10% | 100% |
| Self-employed | 51 | 25 | 1 | 100 | 177 |
| | 28.80% | 14.10% | 0.60% | 56.50% | 100% |
| Student | 16 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 48 |
| | 33.30% | 6.30% | 0.00% | 60.40% | 100% |
| Unable to work | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| | 33.30% | 5.60% | 0.00% | 61.10% | 100% |
| Unemployed/ looking for work | 16 | 11 | 0 | 68 | 95 |
| | 16.80% | 11.60% | 0.00% | 71.60% | 100% |
| Unemployed/not looking for work | 8 | 8 | 1 | 20 | 37 |
| | 21.60% | 21.60% | 2.70% | 54.10% | 100% |
| A category not listed | 8 | 4 | 3 | 18 | 33 |
| | 24.20% | 12.10% | 9.10% | 54.50% | 100% |
| Prefer not to answer | 8 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 22 |
| | 36.40% | 9.10% | 0.00% | 54.50% | 100% |
| Multiple Selections | 48 | 32 | 3 | 106 | 189 |
| | 25.40% | 16.90% | 1.60% | 56.10% | 100% |
| Total | 959 | 395 | 34 | 1907 | 3295 |
| | 29.10% | 12.00% | 1.00% | 57.90% | 100% |

Notes: *It began online, but now I'm attending in-person because I was selected as a juror. **I'm starting online/virtual but I do not know if I will be required to report to a courthouse in-person if selected.

Table A5. King County Employment Status & Barrier Indicator (n = 3,328).

| Employment Status | No | Yes | Total |
|--|---------|---------------|-------|
| Employed full-time (40 or more hours per week) | 1366 | 452 | 1818 |
| | 75.10% | 24.90% | 100% |
| Employed part-time (up to 35 hours per week) | 158 | 78 | 236 |
| | 66.90% | 33.10% | 100% |
| Furloughed due to COVID-19 | 15 | 6 | 21 |
| | 71.40% | 28.60% | 100% |
| Military - Active Duty | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | 100.00% | 0.00% | 100% |
| Homemaker | 28 | 50 | 78 |
| | 35.90% | 64.10% | 100% |
| Retired | 420 | 127 | 547 |
| | 76.80% | 23.20% | 100% |
| Self-employed | 102 | 76 | 178 |
| | 57.30% | 42.70% | 100% |
| Student | 35 | 13 | 48 |
| | 72.90% | 27.10% | 100% |
| Unable to work | 14 | 4 | 18 |
| | 77.80% | 22.20% | 100% |
| Unemployed and currently looking for work | 70 | 27 | 97 |
| | 72.20% | 27.80% | 100% |
| Unemployed and not currently looking for work | 25 | 12 | 37 |
| | 67.60% | 32.40% | 100% |
| A category not listed | 16 | 18 | 34 |
| | 47.10% | 52.90% | 100% |
| Prefer not to answer | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| | 50.00% | 50.00% | 100% |
| Multiple Selections | 114 | 77 | 191 |
| | 59.70% | 40.30% | 100% |
| Total | 2376 | 952 | 3328 |
| | 71.40% | 28.60% | 100% |

Notes: n/a.

Table A6. King County Race & Sexual Identity Crosstab (n = 3,296).

| Racial Category | LGBTQ+ | % | Hetero (straight) | % | Total |
|---|--------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------|
| African-American or Black | 13 | 17.11 | 63 | 82.89 | 76 |
| Am. Indian, Alaskan Native, Indigenous | 1 | 11.11 | 8 | 88.89 | 9 |
| Asian Indian | 4 | 8.16 | 45 | 91.84 | 49 |
| Cambodian | 1 | 20.00 | 4 | 80.00 | 5 |
| Chinese | 8 | 12.50 | 56 | 87.50 | 64 |
| Filipino | 12 | 19.05 | 51 | 80.95 | 63 |
| Guamanian or Chamorro | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 100.00 | 1 |
| Japanese | 4 | 11.43 | 31 | 88.57 | 35 |
| Korean | 6 | 18.18 | 27 | 81.82 | 33 |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 2 | 22.22 | 7 | 77.78 | 9 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 2 | 22.22 | 7 | 77.78 | 9 |
| Other Asian | 3 | 13.04 | 20 | 86.96 | 23 |
| Vietnamese | 1 | 5.88 | 16 | 94.12 | 17 |
| White | 315 | 12.85 | 2137 | 87.15 | 2452 |
| A category not listed | 15 | 19.23 | 63 | 80.77 | 78 |
| Prefer not to answer | 7 | 17.95 | 32 | 82.05 | 39 |
| Multi-race | 31 | 18.24 | 139 | 81.76 | 170 |
| Total | 425 | 13.57 | 2707 | 86.43 | 3132 |

Notes: n/a.

Table A7. King County Binary Race & Sexual Identity (n = 3,100).

| Binary Race | LGBTQ (%) | Hetero (%) | Total |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| non-White | 110 (16.98) | 538 (83.02) | 648 |
| White | 315 (12.85) | 2137 (87.15) | 2452 |
| Total | 425 (13.71) | 2675 (86.29) | 3100 |

Notes: Does not include "prefer not to answer" category.