entirely different analogy. When it works, the analogy can influence the jury's discussion. When it doesn't work, it can lower the overall quality of discussions.

The "All-Or-Nothing" Juror: This juror is not satisfied with mere influence during deliberations. He must be right on every issue, which undermines his influence on issues where he is actually right.

Sometimes, he just desperately wants the opportunity to be a leader. Sometimes, it is simply a personality quirk. Other jurors tire quickly and the arrogance can alienate the group and result in this juror having no influence at all.

The Conspiracy Theorist: This juror often causes awkward moments of silence where other jurors internally debate whether it is even worth attempting to respond to him or her comment. Perceptions of the evidence are often filtered through any of a variety of known or presumed conspiracies ranging from far-fetched corporate deception to government cover-ups of UFOs. Most dangerous for defendants, the conspiracy theorist can spot collusion where not a whiff of it exists.

The Referee: This juror focuses heavily on the correct procedures for decision-making and plays the role of rule enforcer in deliberations. He or she will give great credence to the jury instructions and encourage the group to stick to the rules when interpreting evidence and reaching decisions.

The Soft-Power Leader: This juror slowly builds influence in the group by helping and befriending other jurors. It may be as simple as getting a cup of coffee for another juror or walking out to their car with them at the end of the day.

This juror treats all other jurors' comments as valuable even when they are not, which makes the other jurors feel good. When he finally speaks, his opinion is given extra weight because he has been so nice to everyone else.

The Been There, Done That (BTDT) Juror: This juror translates completely foreign case-specific evidence to real-life circumstances and situations he or she has directly experienced. The result is often an extreme focus on irrelevant personal experiences that pertain to only one juror in the group and carry a great deal of influence for this particular juror. Sometimes the BTDT juror can persuade others, but more often than not he or she will draw objections that the personal experiences are irrelevant.

The "Louder Is Better" Juror: When other jurors don't hear him the first time, he says it louder. When other jurors disagree or are simply unmoved by his argument, he ups the volume again rather than rephrasing the argument to achieve a better outcome.

The Shampoo Juror: This juror relies heavily on a single persuasive argument that has convinced him or her of the right decision in the case, then repeats it over and over again during deliberations in an attempt to persuade others. Others will tire quickly of the repetition, which this juror is immune to, sticking instead to the basic rules upon which this label is based: wash, rinse, repeat.

The Harmonious Monk: This juror does not want to rock the boat and is more interested in making sure other jurors get along than getting a decision based on the evidence.

Thomas M. O'Toole, Ph.D., is president of Sound Jury Consulting, LLC, in Seattle. You can learn more about Sound Jury Consulting at www.soundjuryconsulting.com.

Kevin R. Bouly, Ph.D., is a litigation consultant at Persuasion Strategies in Denver. You can learn more about Persuasion Strategies at www.persuasionstrategies.com.

1 We are not relying upon nor attempting to present a scientific methodology for identifying juror types.