

# **Crown Court Survey of Jurors 2010**

Ministry of Justice  
Statistics bulletin

**Published 14 October 2010**

## Contents

<b>Summary of findings</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Introduction .....	3
Overall satisfaction levels .....	4
<b>Summary of findings from key service areas</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Information provision.....	4
Internet use .....	5
Waiting times .....	6
Court staff .....	7
Accessibility .....	8
Court environment and facilities.....	9
After completing jury service .....	10
<b>Confidence in the Criminal Justice System</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Diversity differences</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Using research to drive improvements</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Statistical reliability.....	12
Topline findings.....	14
Pre-court experience (Summons by the Jury Central Summoning Bureau (JCSB) and everything prior to attending court) .....	15
<b>Explanatory notes</b> .....	<b>33</b>
Symbols and conventions .....	33
Contact points for further information.....	33

# **Summary of findings**

## **Introduction**

The HM Courts Service (HMCS) Jurors Survey looks at each stage of the process of jury service to measure the expectations, attitudes and experiences of jurors. Jurors are asked to rate the service provided during the pre-court, at court and after court stages of their jury service. This survey is a subsidiary of the HMCS Court User Survey which is carried out across England and Wales, and aims to assist those working to improve services for jurors. The survey is conducted via a self completion questionnaire mailed out to individuals who have recently completed jury service. It is conducted on an annual basis in order to enable progress to be monitored. This is the fourth year the survey has been carried out by Ipsos MORI.

Fieldwork for the 2010 Jurors Survey took place between 26 March and 7 May 2010 among jurors who completed jury service in February 2010. The sample was selected using a stratified random sampling design whereby the number of jurors selected from each court is proportionate to the number attending that court.

In total, 3,045 jurors were contacted and 1,490 questionnaires were returned. A further thirty four people responded saying they could not fill out the survey as their jury service had been deferred or delayed. The overall response rate was therefore of 50 per cent.

This is slightly below to the response rate achieved last time (55 per cent), but still some way above the response rate in the 2008 and 2007 surveys (41 per cent and 40 per cent respectively).

This summary highlights the key findings from the survey, discussing improvements, declines, and measures of performance where appropriate.

It should be noted that this report focuses on the postal survey of jurors only. Results from the HMCS Court User Survey of all types of court users are discussed in a separate report.

## **Overall satisfaction levels**

Jurors remain positive overall about most aspects of their jury service experience. The 2010 survey shows that satisfaction has been maintained following previous significant increases in certain areas of service seen between 2008 and 2009.

Overall satisfaction remains high; over three quarters (77 per cent) of jurors stated they are 'satisfied' with their experience. This is split equally between those stating they are 'very' and those who are 'fairly' satisfied, two in five (39 per cent) each. One in ten (10 per cent) are dissatisfied with the overall experience. These figures indicate no change since last year.

The vast majority (87 per cent) were satisfied with the treatment received from the Jury Central Summoning Bureau before attending court. Of these, almost half (46 per cent) were very satisfied and a similar proportion (42 per cent) were fairly satisfied. These are also in line with the 2009 figures.

One in six (16 per cent) had been on jury service before, and of these, two in five (40 per cent) found the experience better, and a similar proportion (42 per cent) found it the same. One in seven (14 per cent) stated they had a worse experience this time around.

Across key service areas, the significant increases in satisfaction seen between 2008 and 2009 have been sustained. Satisfaction with court staff has been maintained at a high level, which is particularly positive given treatment by staff is a key priority for jurors.

In terms of information provided by the court, the increased satisfaction with information provided in alternative formats and regarding the choice of Holy book that was observed in 2009 has been sustained this year. Other areas, such as information contained in the speech given by court staff, indicate there is still room for improvement.

## **Summary of findings from key service areas**

### **Information provision**

Information provided by the court is important in helping jurors to feel more confident about the complex process of attending court and conducting jury service. There were significant increases in jurors' satisfaction with information provision between 2008 and 2009 and ratings have been maintained in most areas in 2010.

The vast majority were satisfied with information regarding allowances; 84 per cent in 2010 compared with just three quarters (75 per cent) in 2008 and seven in ten (70 per cent) in 2007. Three quarters (73 per cent) were satisfied with information regarding claims for loss of earnings or benefits, up from two thirds (67 per cent) in 2008 and in line with 2009 (74 per cent).

Satisfaction with information provided in alternative formats has remained high; four in five (82 per cent) state this which is comparable to the 2009 level and is significantly higher than 2008 (70 per cent). This trend is also apparent regarding information given about the choice of Holy book; nine in ten (90 per cent) were satisfied compared to four in ten (80 per cent) back in 2007.

However, there are some aspects of information provision that have seen declines in ratings between 2009 and 2010. Although these are not large and levels of satisfaction remain relatively high, it is worth noting these in case a trend develops. In particular, fewer jurors were satisfied with the video 'Your Role as a Juror', (down from 87 per cent in 2009 to 84 per cent) and the information contained in the jury speech given by court staff (down from 91 per cent in 2009 to 88 per cent).

Although overall satisfaction with ease of understanding the forms needed has remained consistent across the years, the proportion of those who consider themselves to be 'very satisfied' has decreased (39 per cent stated this in 2010 compared to 45 per cent in 2009).

Booklets and leaflets are also important methods of providing information; jurors in 2010 were more positive than in 2009. Nine in ten (92 per cent) were satisfied with the 'Your Guide to Jury Service' booklet, and eight in ten (82 per cent) were satisfied with the local information leaflet (compared to 91 per cent and 82 per cent respectively in 2009).

Before court, a third (33 per cent) of jurors telephoned the Jury Central Summoning Bureau (the same proportion as in 2009), and of these, the vast majority were satisfied with the speed with which their call was answered and the information they were provided with. More than four in five (82 per cent) were satisfied with the speed of response; with over half (52 per cent) 'very' satisfied. A similar proportion (85 per cent) were satisfied with the advice or information provided during the call, with three in five (61 per cent) stating they were 'very satisfied'. These figures are broadly consistent with those in 2009.

## **Internet use**

Although only a minority of 7 per cent of jurors contacted the Jury Central Summoning Bureau by email, this is a significant increase in numbers compared to 2009 (5 per cent). One in ten (10 per cent) of those aged 18-34 used this method of communication. Nearly two thirds were very satisfied with the information they received (65 per cent) and the speed of the response (67 per cent).

Those aged 18-34 were also more likely than other age groups to have used the HMCS Internet on Jury Service; 16 per cent amongst this age group compared to 12 per cent overall. Of those who accessed these web pages, the vast majority were satisfied (87 per cent). A quarter (25 per cent) of those aged 18-34 viewed 'Your Role as a Juror' on Directgov compared to one in six (18 per cent) overall.

## Waiting times

Waiting times are an issue consistently shown to be a key driver of court users' satisfaction with their experience overall. This has been shown by the separate HMCS Court User Survey<sup>1</sup>, and also by the question asked of jurors regarding their priorities, where a third (33 per cent) cited time spent waiting as important, second only to how staff dealt with them.

**Table 1: Jurors' priorities**

Which of these (maximum of two) are most important to you regarding the service you Received from the court as a juror?	2010	2009	2008	2007
How staff deal with jurors	41	46	43	40
Time spent waiting	33	35	40	39
Safety and security	29	28	29	27
Information about your jury service	21	22	23	25
Recognition of your contribution to the CJS	19	21	36	39
Court environment	14	9	8	8
Refreshments provided at court	9	8	9	8
Disabled access/facilities	1	1	1	1
None of these	1	1	1	1
Don't know	2	2	1	1

Therefore, it is positive that the rise in satisfaction with waiting times seen in 2009 has been maintained this year. More than two in five (43 per cent) were satisfied with the time spent waiting to be selected for trial – the same figure as in 2009, and up from more than a third (36 per cent) in 2008. The proportion of those who are dissatisfied remains at a third (32 per cent), which is down from nearly two in five (38 per cent) in 2008, though is still a significant number of jurors. Indeed, waiting times are frequently highlighted in the verbatim responses within the questionnaire; one in five (19 per cent) overall spontaneously cited this as a potential area for improvement.

“Less sitting around doing nothing whilst waiting to be picked for a trial.”

“The ... time while waiting to see if you were selected. Sat there most days until the end of 2 weeks before I was selected to do a trial.”

Although rising, satisfaction with being kept informed by court staff of the reasons for any delay to trials has not returned to the peak of 75 per cent last seen in 2007 (is 70 per cent this year and was 69 per cent in 2009).

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.justice.gov.uk/publications/hmcsusersurvey.htm](http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/hmcsusersurvey.htm)

In the 2010 survey, a new question was asked regarding how often jurors felt they received updates from court staff on reasons for delays. A quarter (24 per cent) stated they were updated 'every 30 minutes or more often' (in line with HMCS targets). A third (34 per cent) thought they had been updated 'every 30 minutes to one hour', and a further 17 per cent thought it was 'every 1 to 2 hours'. A similar percentage, 18 per cent, stated this was not applicable as there were no delays.

It is worth noting that these responses are, of course, based on jurors' perceptions of times rather than the actual times of updates.

When analysed alongside satisfaction with waiting times, it is clear that the frequency of updates affects levels of satisfaction. Those who stated they were 'very satisfied' with the time spent waiting for trial were significantly more likely to recall being updated every 30 minutes or more often. Those who were updated less often than every 2 hours or never received an update were significantly more likely to state they were very dissatisfied.

**Table 2: Waiting times**

If you experienced any delays to your trial(s), generally how often did you receive updates from court staff on the reasons for the delays?	Percentage satisfied with being kept informed	Percentage satisfied with time spent waiting
Every 30 minutes or more often	89	62
Every 30 minutes to one hour	77	47
Every 1 to 2 hours	52	19
Less often than every 2 hours	38	21
Never received an update when there were delays	8	13
Not applicable/no delays	63	45

This is a useful finding as it indicates that although sometimes delays may be unavoidable, updating jurors regarding the situation may alleviate dissatisfaction. The verbatim comments also allude to this:

"Managing my expectations about the time spent waiting around."

"Length of time sitting waiting. Lack of clear time scale of wait."

## **Court staff**

How court staff treat jurors is an important factor in determining levels of satisfaction with the overall jury service experience, and it is encouraging that high satisfaction levels with court staff have been maintained.

The overwhelming majority (94 per cent) were satisfied with the both politeness and helpfulness of staff, and staff treating jurors fairly and sensitively. A very high proportion, seven in ten (70 per cent) were very satisfied with these attributes. These ratings are consistent with 2009.

Similar proportions were satisfied with staff being easily identifiable and able to deal with queries, although fewer were 'very satisfied' with these attributes. Around two thirds (63 per cent) were 'very' satisfied that there were easily identifiable staff to deal with queries whilst more than a quarter are fairly satisfied (28 per cent), leading to overall satisfaction of more than nine in ten (91 per cent). Two thirds (64 per cent) were 'very' satisfied with the ability of court staff to deal with jurors' queries, and a quarter (25 per cent) were very satisfied.

Half said they had read the Juror Charter (51 per cent), a similar proportion to 2009 (49 per cent). Three quarters (75 per cent) agreed that the Juror Charter standards of service were met by HMCS staff throughout their jury service.

In line with these high levels of satisfaction, only 3 per cent spontaneously commented that staff being more courteous, polite or helpful would have improved their jury service experience.

## **Accessibility**

Accessibility continues to be an area on which most jurors are satisfied. Nine in ten (89 per cent) were satisfied with how easy it was to find the court building, including any directions provided.

Satisfaction with accessibility for disabled jurors is also high, although the level of dissatisfaction has risen from 2008. Around two thirds (63 per cent) were satisfied, although one in five (19 per cent) stated they were dissatisfied compared to less than one in ten (9 per cent) in 2008.

Two thirds (64 per cent) were satisfied with facilities for disabled jurors in general, with more than a third 'very' satisfied (36 per cent). One in eight (12 per cent) stated they were dissatisfied with this aspect.

Those with a disability were significantly more likely to state they had not been selected for trial, compared to those without a disability (34 per cent of those with a disability compared to 16 per cent of those without). However, the base size for disabled jurors is small so this result should be treated with caution.

2010 was the first year in which disabled access was mentioned in response to the open ended question. Comments included:

"As a disabled person who has problems with balance, and staircases can be difficult, it would have made it a lot easier if there was a lift to the jury."

"Disabled access to the refreshment area."



## Court environment and facilities

The court environment and facilities are areas in which jurors have consistently been less likely to be satisfied over the past few years of research. In particular, refreshments are often seen as expensive and of poor quality. This year is no exception, with ratings similar to those in 2009, and below those recorded in 2007.

Half (49 per cent) of jurors were satisfied with the **choice** of refreshments available at court, with around a third (31 per cent) expressing dissatisfaction. This has dropped from a level of satisfaction of nearly three in five (57 per cent) in 2007.

Less than half (46 per cent) were satisfied with the **quality** of refreshments, and three in ten (30 per cent) were dissatisfied. Again, these are lower ratings than in 2007 when a quarter (25 per cent) were dissatisfied.

More jurors were dissatisfied with the cost of refreshments than were satisfied. Two in five (39 per cent) were dissatisfied compared with 35 per cent who stated they were satisfied. A higher figure than any other year, one in five (21 per cent), were 'very' dissatisfied (only 13 per cent stated this in 2007).

These figures are reflected in responses to the open ended question where jurors were asked what would have improved their experience, where 13 per cent mentioned there should be improved catering facilities, and 9 per cent noted that food and drink was too expensive and should be made cheaper.

"You can be waiting around a lot during jury service. It would have been nice if you could have got a cheap tea/coffee from recollection they were both over a £1. I brought my own tea bags in and staff wouldn't serve hot water. Small but goes a long way when you can get tea bags for a few pence!!"

"Would have tea and coffee free of charge. The amount of credit on cards is not enough for lunch and 3 coffees so you end up out of pocket by a couple of pounds."

"Catering facilities. Free tea and coffee. More choice of food, [it was the] same every day."

"Better quality of food in the jurors canteen at a cheaper price."

Regarding the court environment, the vast majority of jurors were satisfied. Eight in ten (81 per cent) were satisfied that the waiting areas kept jurors safe and separate from other court users. Two thirds (65 per cent) were satisfied with the comfort of the Jurors Assembly Area, and eight in ten (81 per cent) were satisfied with the cleanliness. These figures are all consistent with the 2009 scores, with repeated improvements since 2008.

In response to the open ended question asking for improvements, 9 per cent mentioned potential improvements to the Jurors Assembly Area, and 5 per cent mentioned more comfortable seating.

“More books and magazines available. Also, seating needs to be made more comfortable. Ok for up to 30 mins, but any longer and it becomes uncomfortable.”

“The waiting area was FAR too hot and the court was freezing which meant I ended up with a bad cold after changing temperature so many times..”

“The assembly area was rather cramped at times. More daily newspapers would have been appreciated.”

### **After completing jury service**

The majority of jurors remain satisfied with the payment system. One in five (19 per cent) received their payment within 5 days of submitting a valid claim, and about half (47 per cent) received payment between 6 to 10 days. However, a significantly higher proportion than in 2009, one in five (19 per cent) had to wait 11 to 15 days (16 per cent in 2009).

Eight in ten (81 per cent) were satisfied with the speed of payment, and more than half (54 per cent) were ‘very’ satisfied. This is a lower proportion than in 2009, when three in five (60 per cent) were very satisfied.

A total of 15 per cent recall receiving the ‘Living with the Evidence’ leaflet providing information on what to do if distressed by evidence given in court.

### **Confidence in the Criminal Justice System**

Seeing the court process in action may potentially have an influence on jurors’ perceptions of the Criminal Justice System. Seven in ten (70 per cent) agreed that they had confidence in the Criminal Justice System before beginning jury service, and a similar proportion (69 per cent) agreed they did after finishing jury service. This pattern has remained consistent across all years of the survey.

### **Diversity differences**

Those in older age groups were more satisfied with their experience of jury service than those in younger age groups. More than two in five (44 per cent) of those aged 55+ were ‘very’ satisfied with their overall experience, compared to three in ten (31 per cent) of those aged 18-34. This older age group were more confident that they knew what to expect before going to court; nearly two thirds (64 per cent) were confident compared to half of those aged 18-34 (52 per cent).

There are also differences between men and women in their experience of jury service. Women were more likely to state they were ‘very satisfied’ with most aspects of their experience, whereas men were more likely to say they were ‘fairly satisfied’.

The sample this year showed that a significantly greater proportion of jurors surveyed had sat on more than one trial compared to other years. More than a third (36 per cent) stated this compared to just over a quarter (28 per cent) in 2008. This group are significantly more likely to say they are 'very' satisfied with the overall experience of jury service than those who did not sit on any trials (45 per cent vs. 18 per cent).

## **Using research to drive improvements**

Overall, the majority of jurors remain positive about most aspects of their experience and it is encouraging that improvements observed in 2009 have been maintained this year. That said, there have been a couple of slight decreases in satisfaction and there remain some areas for improvement.

- Improving the quality and choice of refreshments
- Reviewing the facilities provided in Jury Assembly areas
- Making an effort to ensure jurors are kept informed about waiting times and expectations are appropriately managed
- Monitoring the speed of payments.

## Appendix A

### Statistical reliability

It should be remembered that the respondents to this survey are only a sample of the total number of jurors. This means that we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been interviewed (the 'true' values). We can, however, predict the variation between the sample results and the 'true' values from our knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95 per cent - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' value will fall within a specified range. The table below illustrates the predicted range for different sample sizes and percentage results at the '95 per cent confidence interval'.

<b>Overall statistical reliability</b>			
<b>Size of sample on which survey result is based</b>	<b>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels</b>		
	<b>10 per cent or 90 per cent</b>	<b>30 per cent or 70 per cent</b>	<b>50 per cent</b>
	±	±	±
200	4	6	7
500	3	4	4
1,000	2	3	3
1,490	1	2	2
2,000	1	2	2
Source: Ipsos MORI			

For example, with a sample of 1,490 where 30 per cent give a particular answer, the chances are 19 in 20 that the 'true' value (which would have been obtained if all jurors had been interviewed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 2 percentage points from the sample result.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be 'real', or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one – i.e. if it is 'statistically significant', we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. At the 95 per cent confidence interval, the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in the following table.

<b>Statistical reliability between subgroups</b>			
<b>Size of sample on which survey result is based</b>	<b>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels</b>		
	<b>10 per cent or 90 per cent</b>	<b>30 per cent or 70 per cent</b>	<b>50 per cent</b>
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
100 vs. 100	8	13	14
100 vs. 250	7	11	12
100 vs. 500	7	10	11
250 vs. 250	5	8	9
250 vs. 500	5	7	8
500 vs. 500	4	6	6
582 vs. 682	4	6	6
2000 vs. 2000	2	3	3
Source: Ipsos MORI			

For example, as 22 per cent of male jurors strongly agreed they had confidence in the criminal justice system before conducting jury service, compared to 17 per cent female jurors, both with sub-samples of around 500, the chances are 95 in 100 times that this 5 percentage point difference is significant (i.e. greater than 4 points) and did not occur by chance.

## Topline findings

- A sample of 3,045 jurors, who served in February 2010, was sent a postal survey asking about the experience of jury service. The survey was also carried out in 2009, 2008 and 2007 using the same methodology but with slight differences to some questions.
- Ipsos MORI received 1,490 completed surveys in 2010 and fieldwork was conducted between Monday 26<sup>th</sup> March and Friday 7<sup>th</sup> May 2010.
- This document shows the results for each question in the survey form
- An asterisk (\*) denotes a finding of less than 0.5 per cent but greater than zero
- Where figures do not add up to 100 per cent this is due to computer rounding, the exclusion of don't know or refused categories or multiple responses
- Data are based on all respondents giving a response unless stated otherwise
- Respondents' answers are based on their understanding of the issues as they were presented in the questionnaire. No extra stimulus materials were used in obtaining these answers.

## Pre-court experience (Summons by the Jury Central Summoning Bureau (JCSB) and everything prior to attending court)

### Jury Summons

Q1.	Did you receive your jury summons in sufficient time to allow you to make any necessary arrangements? <sup>2</sup>			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1414)	(1670)	(1242)	(1193)
Yes	99	98	99	99
No	1	2	1	1

Q2.	How easy did you find the jury summons to complete?			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1413)	(1629)	(1241)	(1193)
Very easy	57	64	51	53
Fairly easy	36	29	38	38
Neither easy nor difficult	5	5	8	6
Fairly difficult	1	1	1	1
Very difficult	*	*	*	*
Don't know/can't remember	1	1	1	1

Q3.	How helpful did you find the guidance leaflet which accompanied your jury summons?			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1416)	(1665)	(1242)	(1195)
Very helpful	59	59	53	55
Fairly helpful	38	38	44	42
Not very helpful	1	1	2	1
Not at all helpful	*	*	*	*
Don't know/can't remember	1	1	1	2
Not applicable	*	*	*	*

<sup>2</sup> Please note that the wording of this question changed slightly between 2008 and 2009, which could have had an influence on results

<b>Q4.</b>	<b>How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the speed with which you received a response to your summons reply from the Jury Central Summoning Bureau?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1412)</b>	(1671)	(1240)	(1191)
Very satisfied	<b>59</b>	58	60	60
Fairly satisfied	<b>31</b>	30	31	30
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<b>7</b>	8	7	7
Fairly dissatisfied	<b>1</b>	2	*	1
Very dissatisfied	<b>*</b>	*	*	*
Don't know/can't remember	<b>1</b>	1	1	2
Not applicable	<b>*</b>	*	*	*

### Telephoning the Jury Central Summoning Bureau

<b>Q5.</b>	<b>Did you telephone the Jury Central Summoning Bureau before attending court?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1409)</b>	(1654 )	(1236 )	(1189)
Yes	<b>33</b>	33	37	40
No	<b>67</b>	67	63	60

<b>Q5a-Q5b</b>		<b>If yes, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?</b>							
		<b>Base: All giving a response who telephoned the JCSB before attending court</b>							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
<b>a.</b>	The information /advice you were given	<b>2010 (463)</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>1</b>
		2009 (534)	59	25	8	4	2	1	1
		2008 (455)	59	28	6	4	2	-	*
		2007 (477)	62	25	7	3	1	*	1
<b>b.</b>	The speed with which your call was answered	<b>2010 (450)</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
		2009 (504)	54	33	6	2	2	2	1
		2008 (454)	55	30	10	2	1	2	*
		2007 (477)	57	27	7	1	*	6	*



## Emailing the Jury Central Summoning Bureau

Q6.	<b>Did you contact the Jury Central Summoning Bureau by email before attending court?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1385)</b>	(1628)	(1216)	(1103)
Yes	<b>7</b>	5	6	5
No	<b>93</b>	95	94	95

Q6a - Q6b	<b>If yes, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?</b> Base: All giving a response who emailed the JCSB before attending court								
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	The information /advice you were given	<b>2010 (89)</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>
		2009 (72)	68	18	3	6	4	-	1
b.	How quickly you received a response to your email	<b>2010 (84)</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>
		2009 (69)	61	26	3	1	7	-	1

### Information provided by the Jury Central Summoning Bureau

Q7a- Q7d		Thinking about the information provided to you before you attended court, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...? <sup>3</sup>							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	The information provided about the allowances you are entitled to claim	2010 (1391)	41	43	11	3	1	*	1
		2009 (1640)	44	40	11	4	1	*	*
		2008 (1222)	34	40	13	7	5	*	1
		2007 (1187)	31	38	15	9	5	*	2
b.	The information provided about how to claim for loss of earnings or benefits	2010 (1353)	36	38	14	5	1	*	7
		2009 (1599)	38	36	12	5	2	*	7
		2008 (1205)	32	35	15	6	3	1	9
		2007 (1173)	28	30	12	6	4	*	21
c.	Your Guide to Jury Service Booklet	2010 (1352)	52	41	6	1	*	*	*
		2009 (1616)	54	37	7	1	*	*	*
d.	The local information leaflet	2010 (1345)	44	39	10	2	1	3	2
		2009 (1603)	46	35	12	2	*	3	2

Q8.	Did you use the HMCS Internet on Jury Service?	
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1396)	(1648)
Yes	12	14
No	88	86

<sup>3</sup> Please note that the wording of this question changed slightly this year, which could have had an influence on results.

<b>Q8a</b>	<b>If yes, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with this website?</b>	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response who used the HMCS Internet on Jury Service	<b>(164)</b>	(228)
Very satisfied	<b>43</b>	44
Fairly satisfied	<b>44</b>	39
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<b>7</b>	9
Fairly dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	4
Very dissatisfied	<b>2</b>	3
Don't know/ can't remember	<b>1</b>	1
Not applicable	-	-

<b>Q9.</b>	<b>Did you view "Your Role as a Juror" on Directgov (the official UK government website for citizens)?</b>	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1369)</b>	(1632)
Yes	<b>18</b>	17
No	<b>82</b>	83

<b>Q10.</b>	<b>Did you set up the email reminder service to prompt you about your forthcoming Jury Service?</b>	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1377)</b>	(1632)
Yes	<b>1</b>	1
No	<b>99</b>	99

<b>Q11.</b>	<b>Before you went to court how confident were you that you knew what to expect?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1393)</b>	(1661)	(1239 )	(1189)
Very confident	<b>14</b>	13	13	16
Fairly confident	<b>45</b>	43	47	46
Neutral	<b>23</b>	25	23	22
Not very confident	<b>14</b>	16	13	12
Not at all confident	<b>4</b>	3	4	4
Don't know/ can't remember	<b>*</b>	*	*	*

## General satisfaction with the Jury Central Summoning Bureau

<b>Q12.</b>	<b>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the treatment you received from the Jury Central Summoning Bureau before you attended court?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	<b>2009 per cent</b>	<b>2008 per cent</b>	<b>2007 per cent</b>
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1389)</b>	(1653 )	(1234 )	(1189)
Very satisfied	<b>46</b>	48	45	43
Fairly satisfied	<b>42</b>	39	41	44
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<b>9</b>	11	10	9
Fairly dissatisfied	<b>2</b>	1	1	2
Very dissatisfied	<b>*</b>	*	*	1
Don't know/ can't remember	<b>*</b>	*	*	*
Not applicable	<b>1</b>	1	1	1

## Experience at court (everything from the first day at court onwards)

<b>Q13.</b>	<b>How long did it take you to travel to the court?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	<b>2009 per cent</b>	<b>2008 per cent</b>	<b>2007 per cent</b>
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1294)</b>	(1626 )	(1213 )	(1182)
Less than 30 minutes	<b>28</b>	24	27	28
30 minutes to one hour	<b>50</b>	54	51	50
1 hour to 1 and a half hours	<b>20</b>	17	18	18
1 and a half hours to 2 hours	<b>2</b>	4	3	3
More than two hours	<b>*</b>	1	*	1

<b>Q14.</b>	<b>How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the length of time you had to travel to get to court?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	<b>2009 per cent</b>	<b>2008 per cent</b>	<b>2007 per cent</b>
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1296)</b>	(1622 )	(1207 )	(1175)
Very satisfied	<b>36</b>	35	32	34
Fairly satisfied	<b>37</b>	36	37	37
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<b>22</b>	24	24	20
Fairly dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	3	4	6
Very dissatisfied	<b>2</b>	2	2	3
Don't know/ can't remember	<b>*</b>	*	*	-

## Accessibility

Q15a – 15b		How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	How easy it was to find the building – including following any directions provided	<b>2010 (1306)</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	*	<b>1</b>
		2009 (1632)	60	30	6	2	1	*	1
		2008 (1218)	56	35	4	3	1	-	1
		2007 (1185)	63	30	5	2	*	*	1
b.	If applicable, the access for disabled jurors*	<b>2010 (99)</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>		
		2009 (107)	36	32	18	7	8		
		2008 (258)	38	30	22	4	5		
		2007 (96)	23	31	29	10	6		

\*This question is based on all giving a rating only owing to the high number of “not applicable” responses

## Information

Q16a-Q16e		Now thinking about the information provided by the court, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	The video “Your role as a Juror” played to you on your first day of jury service	<b>2010 (1283)</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
		2009 (1614)	48	39	8	1	*	*	3
		2008 (1218)	42	43	10	1	1	*	3
		2007 (1184)	45	41	10	1	1	1	1
b.	The information contained in the jury speech given by court staff regarding court procedures and facilities <sup>4</sup>	<b>2010 (1278)</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
		2009 (1596)	61	30	5	2	*	*	1
		2008 (1216)	56	35	6	2	*	*	1
c.	How clear and easy it was to understand the forms you needed <sup>5</sup>	<b>2010 (1277)</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>3</b>
		2009 (1605)	44	37	11	4	1	*	2
		2008 (1210)	39	42	11	5	1	*	2
		2007 (1185)	34	45	11	5	1	1	3

<sup>4</sup> Please note that the wording of this question changed slightly this year, which could have had an influence on results.

<sup>5</sup> Please note that the wording of this question changed slightly between 2008 and 2009, which could have had an influence on results.

Q16a-Q16e		Now thinking about the information provided by the court, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
d.	Any information provided in alternative formats <sup>6*</sup>	<b>2010 (192)</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	-	-
		2009 (269)	49	28	22	1	1	-	-
		2008 (144)	39	31	27	-	3	-	-
		2007 (115)	47	28	23	3	-	-	-
e.	The help/ information given about the choice of Holy book or the option to affirm	<b>2010 (1240)</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	*	*	<b>3</b>
		2009 (1552)	65	24	6	1	*	*	3
		2008 (1186)	56	30	6	1	*	1	6
		2007 (1166)	55	24	8	2	1	1	10

\* This question is based on all giving a rating only owing to the high number of “not applicable” responses

### Waiting times

Q17.	How many trials did you sit on?			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1309)</b>	(1629)	(1210)	(1168)
None	<b>17</b>	18	23	16
One	<b>47</b>	52	49	50
More than one	<b>36</b>	29	28	34

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the wording of this question changed slightly between 2008 and 2009, which could have had an influence on results.

Q18a – 18b		Now thinking about the time you waited at court, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	The time you spent waiting to be selected for a trial	<b>2010 (1288)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	*	<b>2</b>
		2009 (1615)	13	30	24	18	14	-	1
		2008 (1217)	9	27	24	22	16	*	1
		2007 (1186)	10	29	26	19	15	*	1
b.	Being kept informed by court staff of the reasons for any delay to your trial	<b>2010 (1282)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	*	<b>3</b>
		2009 (1577)	33	36	12	10	5	*	3
		2008 (1210)	29	37	12	12	6	*	4
		2007 (1176)	38	38	12	8	3	1	1

Q19	If you experienced any delays to your trial(s), generally how often did you receive updates from court staff on the reasons for delays?	
		2010 per cent
	Base: all giving a response	(1253)
	Every 30 minutes or more often	24
	Every 30 minutes to 1 hour	34
	Every 1 to 2 hours	17
	Less often than every 2 hours	5
	Never received an update when there were delays	2
	Not applicable/no delays	18



### Perceptions of staff

Q20a-Q20d		Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with each of the following aspects of the service provided by the court...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	The politeness and helpfulness of court staff	<b>2010 (1294)</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	*	*	<b>1</b>
		2009 (1611)	73	22	3	1	*	*	1
		2008 (1220)	69	25	3	1	*	*	1
b.	Court staff treating you fairly and sensitively	<b>2010 (1271)</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	*	<b>2</b>
		2009 (1603)	72	22	4	1	*	*	1
		2008 (1220)	68	25	5	1	*	*	1
		2007 (1178)	69	23	5	1	1	-	2
c.	Easily identifiable staff available to deal with any queries	<b>2010 (1280)</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	*	*	<b>1</b>
		2009 (1609)	65	25	6	1	*	*	1
		2008 (1216)	60	30	6	2	*	*	1
		2007 (1185)	60	31	6	2	*	*	1
d.	The ability of court staff to deal with your query <sup>7</sup>	<b>2010 (1268)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	*	*	<b>4</b>
		2009 (1535)	62	27	6	1	1	*	4
		2008 (1217)	57	30	7	1	1	*	4
		2007 (1179)	59	28	6	1	1	-	6

<sup>7</sup> Please note that the wording of this question changed slightly between 2008 and 2009, which could have had an influence on results.

### Court environment

Q21a-Q21g		Now thinking about the court environment and facilities, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
a.	The choice of refreshments available at the court	<b>2010 (1288)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	*	<b>4</b>
		2009 (1607)	19	33	18	16	11	*	3
		2007 (1177)	21	36	15	14	11	*	3
b.	The quality of refreshments available at the court	<b>2010 (1273)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	*	<b>4</b>
		2009 (1583)	18	31	20	17	10	*	4
		2007 (1175)	20	36	16	16	9	1	4
c.	The cost of refreshments available at the court	<b>2010 (1274)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>
		2009 (1590)	12	26	22	18	17	*	5
		2008 (1214)	13	29	21	18	14	1	5
		2007 (1176)	15	31	18	17	13	1	5
d.	How well the waiting area kept jurors safe and separate from other court users	<b>2010 (1280)</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	*	<b>2</b>
		2009 (1601)	45	36	10	5	2	*	2
		2008 (1218)	39	41	12	3	3	*	1
		2007 (1177)	53	31	7	4	3	*	1
e.	The comfort of the Jury Assembly Area	<b>2010 (1288)</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	*	<b>2</b>
		2009 (1592)	24	45	16	9	5	*	1
		2008 (1217)	20	44	18	12	5	*	1
		2007 (1177)	25	44	16	10	4	*	1

Q21a-Q21g		Now thinking about the court environment and facilities, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...?							
		Year/ base	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dis- satisfied	Fairly dis- satisfied	Very dis- satisfied	Do not Know	n/a
f.	The cleanliness of the Jury Assembly Area (including the toilet areas)	<b>2010 (1288)</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>2</b>
		2009 (1595)	44	39	9	4	2	*	2
		2008 (1220)	39	43	11	5	2	*	1
		2007 (1177)	45	42	8	3	1	*	1
g.	Facilities for disabled jurors*	<b>2010 (172)</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
		2009 (250)	34	32	24	6	4	-	-
		2008 (172)	27	34	29	5	5	-	-
		2007 (108)	22	31	31	8	7	-	-

\* This question is based on all giving a rating only owing to the high number of “not applicable” responses

### After jury service

Q22.	<b>Was the green leaflet ‘Living with the Evidence’ made available to you during jury service?</b>	
		2010 per cent
Base: all giving a response		(1205)
Yes		15
No		85

Q23.	<b>How quickly after submitting a valid claim for allowances did you receive payment?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1271)</b>	(1592)	(1146)	(983)
Within 5 days	<b>19</b>	19	17	11
6 to 10 days	<b>47</b>	51	49	49
11 to 15 days	<b>19</b>	16	16	25
16+ days	<b>7</b>	6	6	8
Not applicable	<b>8</b>	8	12	7

<b>Q24.</b>	<b>How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the speed of payment?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1287)</b>	(1596)	(1214)	(1175)
Very satisfied	<b>54</b>	60	57	46
Fairly satisfied	<b>26</b>	23	26	31
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<b>7</b>	7	6	8
Fairly dissatisfied	<b>2</b>	2	1	2
Very dissatisfied	<b>2</b>	2	1	2
Don't know/can't remember	<b>*</b>	*	3	4
Not applicable	<b>8</b>	7	6	6

<b>Q25.</b>	<b>Before you began your jury service, to what extent do you agree or disagree that you had confidence in the Criminal Justice System?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1306)</b>	(1618)	(1227)	(1178)
Strongly agree	<b>19</b>	20	18	17
Tend to agree	<b>50</b>	48	49	51
Neither agree nor disagree	<b>19</b>	20	22	19
Tend to disagree	<b>7</b>	8	8	9
Strongly disagree	<b>1</b>	1	1	2
Don't know	<b>2</b>	2	1	1

<b>Q26.</b>	<b>Since finishing your jury service, to what extent do you agree or disagree that you had confidence in the Criminal Justice System?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1285)</b>	(1609 )	(1221)	(1177)
Strongly agree	<b>25</b>	24	23	21
Tend to agree	<b>44</b>	43	44	44
Neither agree nor disagree	<b>15</b>	17	16	17
Tend to disagree	<b>9</b>	10	10	12
Strongly disagree	<b>3</b>	2	3	3
Don't know	<b>3</b>	3	4	3

<b>Q27.</b>	<b>Had you been on jury service before?</b>			
	Base: all giving a response who had been on jury service before			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
	<b>(1343)</b>	(1629 )	(1223 )	(1188)
Yes	<b>16</b>	17	16	22
No	<b>84</b>	83	84	78

Q27a	<b>If yes, was this time better or worse than last time?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(201)</b>	(260 )	(182 )	(229)
Better	<b>40</b>	44	42	41
The same	<b>42</b>	41	42	41
Worse	<b>14</b>	10	12	12
Don't know/ can't remember	<b>4</b>	5	4	6

Q28.	<b>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience of jury service?</b>	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1294)</b>	(1615)
Very satisfied	<b>39</b>	38
Fairly satisfied	<b>39</b>	39
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<b>12</b>	13
Fairly dissatisfied	<b>6</b>	7
Very dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	3
Don't know/ can't remember	<b>1</b>	1

Q29.	<b>What, if anything, would have improved your experience of jury service?</b>	
	Please note: Top ten mentions	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(756)</b>	(844)
Reduce the amount of time you have to wait around	<b>19</b>	17
Improved catering/better quality refreshments	<b>13</b>	12
Improved waiting areas/cleaner/ warmer/more pleasant to use/good facilities	<b>9</b>	5
Food/drinks are too expensive/make them cheaper	<b>9</b>	6
Being called as a juror/actually sitting on a trial	<b>7</b>	6
More advice/information about delays/ adjournments/updates on what's happening	<b>6</b>	6
To sit on another case/a more interesting/longer case/more than one case	<b>5</b>	5
More comfortable/better seating	<b>5</b>	5
Separate entrances/exits for jurors/ dislike having to see defendants and their families upon arrival/departure	<b>5</b>	4
Improve the jury selection process	<b>4</b>	2

<b>Q30</b>	<b>Did you read the Juror Charter?</b>	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1257)</b>	(1567)
Yes	<b>51</b>	49
No	<b>49</b>	51

<b>Q30a</b>	<b>Did you feel that the Juror Charter standards of service were met by HMCS staff throughout your jury service?</b>	
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(618)</b>	(756)
Yes – fully met	<b>75</b>	78
Yes – partly met	<b>16</b>	15
No – not met	<b>*</b>	*
Don't know/can't remember	<b>7</b>	6
Not applicable	<b>1</b>	1

### Overall priorities

<b>Q31</b>	<b>Overall, which of these (maximum of two) are most important to you regarding the service you received from the court as a juror?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1275)</b>	(1600 )	(1214 )	(1161)
How staff deal with jurors	<b>41</b>	46	43	40
Time spent waiting	<b>33</b>	35	40	39
Safety and security	<b>29</b>	28	29	27
Information about your jury service	<b>21</b>	22	23	25
Recognition of your contribution to the criminal justice service	<b>19</b>	21	36	39
Court environment	<b>14</b>	9	8	8
Refreshments provided at court	<b>9</b>	8	9	8
Disabled access/facilities	<b>1</b>	1	1	1
None of these	<b>1</b>	1	1	1
Don't know	<b>2</b>	2	1	1

<b>Q32</b>	<b>Would you be willing to be re-contacted by Ipsos MORI or Her Majesty's Courts Service to take part in further research to help to improve the service provided to jurors in the future?</b>			
	<b>2010 per cent</b>	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	<b>(1337)</b>	(1626)	(1199 )	(1153)
Yes	<b>45</b>	46	47	49
No	<b>55</b>	54	53	51

## Demographic information

QA	Age			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1400)	(1663)	(1240 )	(1190)
18-24	5	6	5	4
25-34	13	14	12	14
35-44	21	21	21	21
45-54	27	25	30	25
55-64	26	26	26	28
65+	9	7	7	8

QB	Gender			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1374)	(1622)	(1228 )	(1171)
Male	45	45	43	43
Female	55	55	57	57

QC	Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits your daily activities or the work you can do?			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1380)	(1620)	(1229 )	(1178)
Yes	6	6	6	6
No	94	94	94	94

QD	Which of these groups to you consider you belong to?			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
Base: all giving a response	(1329)	(1629)	(1228)	(1183)
<b>White</b>	93	92	95	95
British	93	88	92	93
Irish	1	2	1	-
Any Other White Background	-	2	2	2
<b>Black Or Black British</b>	2	3	2	1
Caribbean	1	1	1	1
African	1	1	1	1
Any Other Black Background	-	*	*	1
<b>Asian Or Asian British</b>	3	4	2	3
Indian	2	2	1	2
Pakistani	1	1	*	1
Bangladeshi	*	*	-	*
Any Other Asian Background	-	1	1	*
<b>Chinese Or Other Ethnic Group</b>	1	*	*	*
Chinese	1	-	*	*
Any Other Background	-	*	*	*

QD	Which of these groups to you consider you belong to?			
	2010 per cent	2009 per cent	2008 per cent	2007 per cent
<b>Mixed</b>	<b>1</b>	1	1	1
White And Black Caribbean	*	*	*	-
White And Black African	-	*	*	*
White And Asian	<b>1</b>	*	*	*
Any Other Mixed Background	-	*	*	*



## Explanatory notes

1. The statistics in this bulletin relate to a sample of jurors who completed jury service in England and Wales during February 2010. The sample was selected using a stratified random sampling design whereby the number of jurors selected from each court is proportionate to the number attending that court.
2. The survey is conducted by post on an annual basis in order to enable progress to be monitored. This is the fourth year the survey has been carried out by Ipsos MORI for Her Majesty's Courts Service.

## Symbols and conventions

The following symbols have been used throughout the tables in this bulletin:

- = no response
- \* = denotes a finding of less than 0.5 per cent but greater than zero
- n/a = not applicable

## Contact points for further information

Press enquiries should be directed to the Ministry of Justice press office:

Mark Kram  
Tel: 0203 334 6697  
Email: [mark.kram@hmcourts-service.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:mark.kram@hmcourts-service.gsi.gov.uk)

Other enquiries about these statistics should be directed to:

**Paul Lucas**  
102 Petty France  
7th floor Zone A  
London SW1H 9AJ

Tel: 0203 334 3087

Email: [paul.lucas@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:paul.lucas@justice.gsi.gov.uk)

General enquiries about the statistical work of the Ministry can be e-mailed to: [statistics.enquiries@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:statistics.enquiries@justice.gsi.gov.uk)

General information about the official statistics system of the UK is available from [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright  
Produced by the Ministry of Justice. Alternative formats are available on  
request from [statistics.enquiries@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:statistics.enquiries@justice.gsi.gov.uk)