alaska judicial council

1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969 (907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046
http:/ /www.ajc.state.ak.us E-Mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
William T. Cotton

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Janice Lienhart
Mary Matthews
Vicki A. Otte

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Geoffrey G. Currall
Paul J. Ewers
Robert H. Wagstaff

CHAIRMAN, EX OFFICIO
Warren W. Matthews
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council

FROM: Staff PP

DATE: April 10, 1998

RE: Juror Survey Analysis

Background of Survey

The Judicial Council surveyed jurors in 1976 and 1978, its first two years of judicial performance evaluation for retention elections. After the 1978 election, the Council's evaluation contractor (the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan) advised it to drop the survey because it lacked statistical validity. The difficulty stemmed from the fact that most jurors rated most judges "Good" or "Excellent" most of the time, permitting no distinctions among the judges or among the qualities found in each judge. This phenomenon, often termed the "halo" effect, appears in other juror surveys, and other types of surveys.

Based on this recommendation, the Council discontinued the survey for twelve years. In 1990, the Council began a major public education program. The program encouraged more public participation in the evaluation process, and gave the public more information about the evaluation results and recommendations. An experimental juror survey with the Anchorage trial court judges led the Council to conclude that juror surveys serve three purposes, distinct from any question of statistical merit. First, they greatly improve public participation in the process. Jurors responding to the survey become aware of the evaluation process by contributing to it. Their evaluations of judges increase public confidence in the process because the public perceives juries to be trustworthy groups. Second, judges benefit from the comments made by the jurors on temperament, clarity of instructions, courtroom control, fairness and the other characteristics included in the jurors' surveys. Third, while the survey does not provide

statistically useful information because of the "halo effect," it does give the Council another perspective on the judges' performance. (If a judge did **not** receive scores in the expected range, the lower scores would become useful information.) The Council expanded the survey to include all trial court judges standing for retention in 1992.

Juror Survey Methodology

The 1998 juror survey included approximately 3,000 jurors, who sat on trials before 12 judges in 1996 and 1997. Each juror received only one form, with no followup mailings. Of the 3,000 surveys mailed, 1,308 were returned (44%). Council staff entered and analyzed the data from the surveys. Because the data were, as expected, predominantly positive for all variables and all judges, only simple frequencies and cross-tabulations were used for cleaning and analyzing the data. Comments were entered separately.

Table 1 shows that the distribution of jurors for each judge on civil or criminal cases tended to vary somewhat. Most jurors served eight or fewer days, on a single case. In communities where jurors are called to serve for one to three months at a stretch, they may sit on several different juries.

Table 1: Distribution of Jurors
1998 Retention Juror Survey, AJC

Judge	*Civil*	*Criminal*	*Both*	*No Answer*
Collins	14	23	0	20
Cutler	12	109	0	42
Froehlich	6	25	0	16
Jeffery	3	22	0	22
Kauvar	30	106	0	85
Lohff	25	48	2	47
Motyka	22	41	0	24
Murphy	17	31	0	25
Neville	15	29	0	16
Reese	63	13	0	29
Rhoades	18	50	0	46
Steinkruger	27	122	0	63

Table 2: Typical Days Served by Jurors
1998 Retention Juror Survey, AJC

Percentage	*Value*
2%	No response
12%	less than 2 days
22%	2 days
21%	3 days
13%	4 days
13%	5 days
4%	6 days
3%	7 days
2%	8 days
8%	9-90 days
100%	

Survey Results

The comments from the juror surveys will be distributed to Judicial Council members and to each judge, who will receive copies of the comments pertaining to his or her performance. This memorandum summarizes the findings from the survey, and will go to the Council and to all judges. Council publications about the overall evaluation of each judge will include juror survey ratings as well as the other evaluation information.

The survey results appear in tables below. Jurors used a five-point scale, with Excellent scored as five, and Unacceptable scored as one. The closer the jurors' scores were to five, the higher that judge's evaluation by the jurors. The mean score and number of responses appear for each variable. Virtually all mean scores fell between 4.3 and 5.0, indicating that the majority of the responses were either "excellent" or "good."

The number of responses also affects the reliability of the data. The smaller the number of responses, the more effect a single response will have.

Comments

Comments added a very useful qualitative dimension to the juror survey. Jurors were asked to comment on each of the individual variables, on ways the judge could improve, and for general comments. The 1,308 surveys returned contained approximately 65 pages of comments that covered everything from the lack of entertainment for jurors in the jury room to the appearance of the judge's robes, to the full range of judicial performance

Table 3: Mean Score for Each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge
1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Judge	Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	Did judge exercise appropriate control over the proceedings?	Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	*Overall Performance* Mean	*Overall Performance* Total
Collins	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	53
Cutler	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6	158
Froehlich	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	47
Jeffery	4.3	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	44
Kauvar	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	216
Lohff	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	115
Motyka	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	82
Murphy	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	72
Neville	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	59
Reese	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	99
Rhoades	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	112
Steinkruger	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	206

Table 4: Juror Survey Results for Patricia Collins

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 57)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	66.7 (36)	29.6 (16)	3.7 (2)	0	0	54
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	67.9 (36)	26.4 (14)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	53
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	67.3 (35)	26.9 (14)	5.8 (3)	0	0	52
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	68.6 (35)	25.5 (13)	5.9 (3)	0	0	51
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	73.6 (39	20.8 (11)	5.7 (3)	0	0	53
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	74.1 (40)	22.2 (12)	3.7 (2)	0	0	54
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	75.5 (40)	22.6 (12)	1.9 (1)	0	0	53
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	67.3 (35)	30.8 (16)	1.9 (1)	0	0	52
Overall evaluation of judge	73.6 (39)	20.8 (11)	5.7 (3)	0	0	53

Table 5: Juror Survey Results for Beverly W. Cutler

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 163)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	70.4 (114)	24.7 (40)	4.3 (7)	0	0.6 (1)	162
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	70.2 (113)	26.1 (42)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	161
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	66.9 (107)	28.8 (46)	3.8 (6)	0	0.6 (1)	160
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	75.0 (120)	21.3 (34)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	160
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	75.6 (121)	20.6 (33)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	160
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	61.7 (100)	29.6 (48)	7.4 (12)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	162
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	70.0 (112)	23.8 (38)	5.0 (8)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	160
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	74.1 (117)	19.6 (31	5.1 (8)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	158
Overall evaluation of judge	67.7 (107)	25.9 (41)	5.1 (8)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	158

Table 6: Juror Survey Results for Peter Froehlich

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 47)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	74.5 (35)	25.5 (12)	0	0	0	47
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	83.0 (39)	17.0 (8)	0	0	0	47
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	80.0 (36)	20.0 (9)	0	0	0	45
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	82.2 (37)	17.8 (8)	0	0	0	45
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	84.4 (38)	13.3 (6)	2.2 (1)	0	0	45
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	72.3 (34)	25.5 (12)	2.1 (1)	0	0	47
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	57.4 (27)	38.3 (18)	4.3 (2)	0	0	47
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	74.5 (35)	21.3 (10)	4.3 (2)	0	0	47
Overall evaluation of judge	68.1 (32)	29.8 (14)	2.1 (1)	0	0	47

Table 7: Juror Survey Results for Michael I. Jeffery

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned =47)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	54.3 (25)	23.9 (11)	21.7 (10)	0	0	46
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	71.7 (33)	21.7 (10)	6.5 (3)	0	0	46
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	70.5 (31)	22.7 (10)	6.8 (3)	0	0	44
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	75.0 (33)	28.3 (8)	6.8 (4)	0	0	44
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	70.5 (31)	22.7 (10)	6.8 (3)	0	0	44
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	56.5 (26)	28.3 (13)	13.0 (6)	2.2 (1)	0	46
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	48.8 (21)	37.2 (16)	14.0 (6)	0	0	43
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	52.3 (23)	29.5 (13)	18.2 (8)	0	0	44
Overall evaluation of judge	52.3 (23)	34.1 (15)	11.4 (5)	2.3 (1)	0	44

Table 8: Juror Survey Results for Jane F. Kauvar

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 221)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	71.0 (152)	22.4 (48)	5.6 (12)	0.5 (1)	0.5 (1)	214
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	75.1 (166)	20.8 (46)	4.1 (9)	0	0	221
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	71.1 (155)	24.8 (54)	4.1 (9)	0	0	218
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	75.9 (164)	20.8 (45)	3.2 (7)	0	0	216
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	82.0 (178)	15.2 (33)	2.8 (6)	0	0	217
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	69.6 (151)	24.4 (53)	5.5 (12)	0.5 (1)	0	217
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	72.2 (156)	24.5 (53)	3.2 (7)	0	0	216
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	72.2 (153)	23.6 (50)	4.2 (9)	0	0	212
Overall evaluation of judge	73.1 (158)	24.1 (52)	2.8 (6)	0	0	216

Table 9: Juror Survey Results for John R. Lohff

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 122)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	77.0 (94)	19.7 (24)	2.5 (3)	0.8 (1)	0	122
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	79.5 (97)	18.0 (22)	2.5 (3)	0	0	122
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	72.5 (87)	25.0 (30)	2.5 (3)	0	0	120
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	80.5 (95)	17.8 (21)	1.7 (2)	0	0	118
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	82.5 (99)	15.8 (19)	1.7 (2)	0	0	120
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	75.4 (92)	20.5 (25)	4.1 (5)	0	0	122
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	66.4 (79)	28.6 (34)	5.0 (6)	0	0	119
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	73.7 (87)	23.7 (28)	2.5 (3)	0	0	118
Overall evaluation of judge	75.7 (87)	20.9 (24)	3.5 (4)	0	0	115

Table 3: Mean Score for Each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge
1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Judge	Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	Did judge exercise appropriate control over the proceedings?	Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	*Overall Performance* Mean	*Overall Performance* Total
Collins	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	53
Cutler	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6	158
Froehlich	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	47
Jeffery	4.3	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	44
Kauvar	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	216
Lohff	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	115
Motyka	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	82
Murphy	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	72
Neville	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	59
Reese	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	99
Rhoades	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	112
Steinkruger	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	206

Table 4: Juror Survey Results for Patricia Collins

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 57)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	66.7 (36)	29.6 (16)	3.7 (2)	0	0	54
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	67.9 (36)	26.4 (14)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	53
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	67.3 (35)	26.9 (14)	5.8 (3)	0	0	52
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	68.6 (35)	25.5 (13)	5.9 (3)	0	0	51
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	73.6 (39	20.8 (11)	5.7 (3)	0	0	53
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	74.1 (40)	22.2 (12)	3.7 (2)	0	0	54
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	75.5 (40)	22.6 (12)	1.9 (1)	0	0	53
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	67.3 (35)	30.8 (16)	1.9 (1)	0	0	52
Overall evaluation of judge	73.6 (39)	20.8 (11)	5.7 (3)	0	0	53

Table 5: Juror Survey Results for Beverly W. Cutler

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 163)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	70.4 (114)	24.7 (40)	4.3 (7)	0	0.6 (1)	162
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	70.2 (113)	26.1 (42)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	161
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	66.9 (107)	28.8 (46)	3.8 (6)	0	0.6 (1)	160
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	75.0 (120)	21.3 (34)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	160
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	75.6 (121)	20.6 (33)	3.1 (5)	0	0.6 (1)	160
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	61.7 (100)	29.6 (48)	7.4 (12)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	162
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	70.0 (112)	23.8 (38)	5.0 (8)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	160
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	74.1 (117)	19.6 (31	5.1 (8)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	158
Overall evaluation of judge	67.7 (107)	25.9 (41)	5.1 (8)	0.6 (1)	0.6 (1)	158

Table 6: Juror Survey Results for Peter Froehlich

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 47)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	74.5 (35)	25.5 (12)	0	0	0	47
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	83.0 (39)	17.0 (8)	0	0	0	47
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	80.0 (36)	20.0 (9)	0	0	0	45
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	82.2 (37)	17.8 (8)	0	0	0	45
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	84.4 (38)	13.3 (6)	2.2 (1)	0	0	45
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	72.3 (34)	25.5 (12)	2.1 (1)	0	0	47
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	57.4 (27)	38.3 (18)	4.3 (2)	0	0	47
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	74.5 (35)	21.3 (10)	4.3 (2)	0	0	47
Overall evaluation of judge	68.1 (32)	29.8 (14)	2.1 (1)	0	0	47

Table 10: Juror Survey Results for Gregory Motyka

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 87)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	78.0 (64)	19.5 (16)	1.2 (1)	1.2 (1)	0	82
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	83.3 (70)	16.7 (14)	0	0	0	84
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	74.1 (60)	25.9 (21)	0	0	0	81
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	79.5 (62)	20.5 (16)	0	0	0	78
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	85.2 (69)	14.8 (12)	0	0	0	81
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	72.6 (61)	25.0 (21)	2.4 (2)	0	0	84
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	79.3 (65)	15.9 (13)	4.9 (4)	0	0	82
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	76.8 (63)	20.7 (17)	2.4 (2)	0	0	82
Overall evaluation of judge	74.4 (61)	23.2 (19)	2.4 (2)	0	0	82

Table 11: Juror Survey Results for Sigurd E. Murphy

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 73)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	91.8 (67)	8.2 (6)	0	0	0	73
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	90.4 (66)	9.6 (7)	0	0	0	73
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	87.7 (64)	12.3 (9)	0	0	0	73
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	94.4 (68)	5.6 (4)	0	0	0	72
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	98.6 (72)	1.4 (1)	0	0	0	73
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	94.5 (69)	5.5 (4)	0	0	0	73
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	90.4 (66)	9.6 (7)	0	0	0	73
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	93.2 (68)	6.8 (5)	0	0	0	73
Overall evaluation of judge	94.4 (68)	5.5 (4)	0	0	0	72

Table 10: Juror Survey Results for Gregory Motyka

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 87)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	78.0 (64)	19.5 (16)	1.2 (1)	1.2 (1)	0	82
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	83.3 (70)	16.7 (14)	0	0	0	84
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	74.1 (60)	25.9 (21)	0	0	0	81
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	79.5 (62)	20.5 (16)	0	0	0	78
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	85.2 (69)	14.8 (12)	0	0	0	81
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	72.6 (61)	25.0 (21)	2.4 (2)	0	0	84
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	79.3 (65)	15.9 (13)	4.9 (4)	0	0	82
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	76.8 (63)	20.7 (17)	2.4 (2)	0	0	82
Overall evaluation of judge	74.4 (61)	23.2 (19)	2.4 (2)	0	0	82

Table 11: Juror Survey Results for Sigurd E. Murphy

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 73)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	91.8 (67)	8.2 (6)	0	0	0	73
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	90.4 (66)	9.6 (7)	0	0	0	73
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	87.7 (64)	12.3 (9)	0	0	0	73
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	94.4 (68)	5.6 (4)	0	0	0	72
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	98.6 (72)	1.4 (1)	0	0	0	73
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	94.5 (69)	5.5 (4)	0	0	0	73
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	90.4 (66)	9.6 (7)	0	0	0	73
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	93.2 (68)	6.8 (5)	0	0	0	73
Overall evaluation of judge	94.4 (68)	5.5 (4)	0	0	0	72

Table 12: Juror Survey Results for M. Francis Neville

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 60)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	68.3 (41)	25.0 (15)	5.0 (3)	0	1.7 (1)	60
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	66.7 (40)	26.7 (16)	3.3 (2)	1.7 (1)	1.7 (1)	60
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	65.5 (38)	32.8 (19)	1.7 (1)	0	0	58
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	74.6 (44)	23.7 (14)	1.7 (1)	0	0	59
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	76.3 (45)	22.0 (13)	1.7 (1)	0	0	59
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	71.7 (43)	21.7 (13)	6.7 (4)	0	0	60
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	72.9 (43)	18.6 (11)	6.8 (4)	1.7 (1)	0	59
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	61.0 (36)	30.5 (18)	8.5 (5)	0	0	59
Overall evaluation of judge	67.8 (40)	23.7 (14)	6.8 (4)	0	1.7 (1)	59

Table 13: Juror Survey Results for John Reese

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 105)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	83.7 (87)	12.5 (13)	3.8 (4)	0	0	104
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	86.5 (90)	9.6 (10)	3.8 (4)	0	0	104
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	77.9 (81)	18.3 (19)	2.9 (3)	1.0 (1)	0	104
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	84.6 (88)	12.5 (13)	2.9 (3)	0	0	104
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	90.4 (94)	7.7 (8)	1.9 (2)	0	0	104
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	74.0 (77)	22.1 (23)	2.9 (3)	1.0 (1)	0	104
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	79.8 (79)	17.2 (17)	3.0 (3)	0	0	99
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	85.9 (85)	11.1 (11)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)	0	99
Overall evaluation of judge	82.8 (82)	13.1 (13)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)	0	99

Table 14: Juror Survey Results for Stephanie Rhoades

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 114)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	83.3 (95)	15.8 (18)	0.9 (1)	0	0	114
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	84.1 (95)	14.2 (16)	1.8 (2)	0	0	113
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	83.0 (93)	15.2 (17)	1.8 (2)	0	0	112
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	84.5 (93)	12.7 (14)	2.7 (3)	0	0	110
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	87.5 (98)	11.6 (13)	0.9 (1)	0	0	112
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	78.8 (89)	15.9 (18)	4.4 (5)	0.9 (1)	0	113
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	88.4 (99)	9.8 (11)	1.8 (2)	0	0	112
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	85.3 (93)	12.8 (14)	1.8 (2)	0	0	109
Overall evaluation of judge	83.0 (93)	15.2 (17)	1.8 (2)	0	0	112

Table 15: Juror Survey Results for Niesje J. Steinkruger

1998 Retention Juror Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Total Respondents (Total returned = 212)
Was judge fair and impartial to all sides?	87.2 (184)	11.4 (24)	0.9 (2)	0	0.5 (1)	211
Was judge respectful and courteous to parties?	82.9 (175)	16.1 (34)	0.5 (1)	0.5 (1)	0	211
Was judge respectful and courteous to attorneys?	79.6 (168)	18.5 (39)	1.4 (3)	0.5 (1)	0	211
Was judge respectful and courteous to witnesses?	86.7 (182)	12.4 (26)	1.0 (2)	0	0	210
Was judge respectful and courteous to jurors?	90.5 (191)	9.5 (20)	0	0	0	211
Was judge attentive during the proceedings?	84.4 (178)	14.7 (31)	0.5 (1)	0.5 (1)	0	211
Did judge exercise appropriate control over proceedings?	83.1 (172)	15.9 (33)	1.0 (2)	0	0	207
Evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge.	85.0 (175)	13.1 (27)	1.5 (3)	0.5 (1)	0	206
Overall evaluation of judge	85.4 (176)	13.1 (27)	1.0 (2)	0	0.5 (1)	206