

---

# Minority Matters: *12 Angry Men* as a Case Study of a Successful Negotiation against the Odds

*Eirini Flouri and Yiannis Fitsakis*

---

*In his famous book, Social Influence and Social Change, celebrated social psychologist Serge Moscovici contended that minorities influence change by creating conflict. Because people wish to avoid conflict, they will often dismiss the minority position. But when the minority refuses to be dismissed by remaining committed to its position and maintaining a well-defined and coherent point of view, then the minority can make the majority reconsider its beliefs and consider the minority's position as a viable alternative. Moscovici identified five key aspects of the minority's influential behavior: consistency, investment, autonomy, rigidity, and fairness.*

*In this article we analyze the negotiation process depicted in the 1957 film 12 Angry Men. This critically acclaimed film powerfully illustrates the dynamics of bargaining and the use of informal authority with a focus on the role of personality. The film illustrates how, by adopting the five behavioral strategies described by Moscovici, the minority — in this case a lone dissenting juror — is able to successfully negotiate and, against the odds, influence the overwhelming majority comprising the other eleven jurors.*

---

**Key words:** negotiation, minority viewpoints, persuasion, juries, film.

---

**Eirini Flouri** is senior lecturer in psychology at the School of Psychology and Human Development, Institute of Education, University of London. Her e-mail address is e.flouri@ioe.ac.uk.

**Yiannis Fitsakis** is senior risk manager for the Kashagan Oil and Gas Project at AGIP KCO. His e-mail address is y.fitsakis@gmail.com.

---

## Minority Viewpoints and Social Change

In the late 1960s, French psychologist Serge Moscovici challenged the dominant functionalist approach to social influence, promoted largely by American social psychologists in the 1950s and 1960s, which emphasized the unidirectional flow of social influence from the majority to the minority. Moscovici argued instead that change, innovations, and new ideas are really products of the influence of the minority.

In his celebrated book *Social Influence and Social Change*, Moscovici (1976) contended that minorities influence change by creating conflict. Because people wish to avoid conflict, they will often dismiss the minority position. But when the minority refuses to be dismissed by remaining committed to its position and by maintaining a well-defined and coherent point of view, then the minority can make the majority reconsider its beliefs and consider the minority's position as a viable alternative (see Martin and Hewstone 2003 for a review). Moscovici identified five key aspects of the minority's influential behavior: *consistency*, *investment*, *autonomy*, *rigidity*, and *fairness*.

In this article, we analyze the negotiation process depicted in the 1957 film *12 Angry Men* (Orion-Nova Productions), which was written by Reginald Rose and directed by Sydney Lumet. This critically acclaimed film powerfully illustrates the dynamics of bargaining and the use of informal authority with a focus on the role of personality. The film illustrates how, by adopting the five behavioral strategies Moscovici described, the minority — in this case a lone dissenting juror — is able to successfully negotiate and, against the odds, influence the overwhelming majority comprising the other eleven jurors.

According to Jacques Rojot (1991) the goal of parties to a negotiation is to reach agreement, often while operating under time constraints. They do not primarily seek to destroy each other, and the chance that they will fail to reach agreement is always present to some degree. Although the plot of *12 Angry Men* encompasses each element of Rojot's definition of negotiation, it does not exhibit many of the criteria typically present in "one-off" negotiations: the jurors do not have quantifiable positions, and they stand to gain or lose nothing of material value. Instead, highly emotional discussions involve such deeply felt issues as civic duty. Personalities and conscience seem to drive the negotiation.

### The Story

*12 Angry Men* is a gripping drama that depicts twelve American jurors confined to a jury room on a hot and humid summer day to decide the guilt or innocence of a defendant in a murder trial.<sup>1</sup> Before sending out the twelve jurors to deliberate, the judge reminds them that their verdict must be unanimous and that if they hold "reasonable doubt" as to the guilt of the

---

accused then their verdict must be “not guilty.” If, however, they find the defendant guilty then he will be sentenced to death.

Eleven of the jurors, believing that the prosecution has presented an “open-and-shut” case, quickly vote for conviction. They believe that the young, poor Puerto Rican defendant, who has a criminal record and lives in the “slums,” killed his father with a switchblade knife. The sole initial dissenter is Juror 8, played in the film by Henry Fonda, who votes “not guilty” as the deliberations begin. As the film proceeds, he deconstructs the prosecution’s case, progressing from communicating a sense of vague uneasiness to articulating a precise refutation of the other jurors’ specific arguments.

## **The Negotiation Environment**

To analyze the negotiation environment in *12 Angry Men*, we adopt the methodology outlined by Rojot (1991), who wrote that a negotiation is structured by the relationship between the parties, the resources and constraints within the environment, and the bargaining power. Rojot identified two significant dimensions for evaluating the environment within which a negotiation takes place. The first dimension involves the fixed elements of the negotiation that the parties cannot influence but may use to their advantage. The second dimension involves the changeable elements of the negotiation.

### ***The Parties***

At the jury deliberation stage of the trial with which the movie begins, the jury is left as the only party to the trial that has any ability to influence the outcome (although in reality judges may set aside jury verdicts.). The jury’s deliberations are private and jurors do not need to justify their determinations of fact to anyone, as long as they deliberate appropriately according to the judge’s instructions. Each juror’s obligation is to fulfill his civic duty and the dictates of his own conscience.

### ***Relationship Dynamics***

The jurors have no existing relationships with each other prior to the formation of the jury and are not expected to retain any relationship after the trial (although in reality jurors are free to form social and professional relationships after the trial concludes, and sometimes do). Therefore, this particular negotiation process is a “one-off” situation; the jurors can be predicted to have fewer inhibitions against conflictual and competitive behavior because they will feel less necessity to maintain existing personal and professional relationships. Furthermore, no alliances or teams initially exist; each juror answers only to himself and to the law.

### ***Resources and Constraints***

The jurors’ resources and the constraints on their deliberations appear to be static: they have no access to the external world and have no means to

---

acquire further evidence or even leave the room to which they are confined. But because of the strategies that Juror 8 uses, the resources and constraints change repeatedly: testimony is reexamined — almost as if “new evidence” were actually being produced (although in theory all evidence has been produced and it is just being reframed) — and alliances form and shift among the individual jurors.

The resources at the jury’s disposal are the evidence and the witness testimonies presented at the trial, and the arguments made by the prosecutor and the defense attorney. The internal constraints include time (as soon as the trial is over the jurors may resume their own lives) and the physical environment (they are confined to a small, hot, locked room). The external constraints include the rule of law and the expectation (their own and their community’s) that they will behave responsibly and deliver justice.

A less tangible constraint is human behavior’s “bounded rationality,” that is, personal prejudices that influence people’s decision-making capabilities. Therefore, although “the objective of a negotiation is to negotiate specific items” (Rojot 1991) rather than objectively focus only on the case at hand, jurors can bring their own personal biases and concerns into the jury room.

### ***Bargaining Objectives and Issues***

The lack of quantifiable objectives presents challenges to any effort to analyze *12 Angry Men* from a negotiation perspective. As the judge reminds the jury in the opening scenes, what is at stake is the delivery of justice and the life of the accused. The outcome will have little material effect on any of the parties involved in the deliberations, which is atypical of most negotiations — or at least of those that receive attention in the negotiation literature. In fact, some of the jurors seem to lack any commitment to, or interest in, the process at all, a phenomenon exemplified by such comments as: “I almost fell asleep” (during the trial) or, when pushing for a quick vote, “maybe we can all get outta here.”

Table One outlines each juror’s key bargaining objectives. We make no attempt to define optimum, realistic, and sticking points as all objectives are intangible.

### ***Best Alternatives to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA)***

The best alternative to a negotiated agreement (Fisher and Ury 1981) is the same for each juror. Should they fail after lengthy deliberations to reach a unanimous verdict they can walk out and declare a “hung jury,” which would result in a mistrial.

The implications of the BATNA, however, are not the same for all jurors. For the majority, this would mean they failed to fulfill their responsibility and that they will burden another jury. Juror 8, however, seems to perceive that it is his responsibility to ensure that the defendant is treated

**Table One**  
**Bargaining Objectives**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Bargaining Objectives</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Driver</b>
Jurors 1, 2, 6, 9, 12		Follow the majority, "go with the flow"	Compliant personalities
Juror 1		Control the deliberations	Seeks to fulfill his role as foreman, but lacks leadership skills
Juror 3		Punish the defendant	Hostile toward the accused because of his failed relationship with his son
Juror 4		Adhere to facts, pursue logic	Rational, self-assured
Juror 5		Disassociate from his past	Insecurity arising from his disadvantaged background
Juror 7		Finish quickly to go to baseball game	Xenophobia
Juror 8		Consider the possibility of innocence, deliberate carefully and adequately	Sense of duty to the truth; in pursuit of truth and justice
Juror 10		Suppress minorities	Racist convictions against the defendant
Juror 11		Success of democracy and justice	Blind faith in the American system

---

justly during these deliberations and that responsibility is not merely passed to the next jury.

### ***Bargaining Power***

Max Weber (1947) broadly defines power as someone's ability to achieve his or her goal despite resistance, a definition that is particularly appropriate in the case of *12 Angry Men*. In the film it seems initially that Juror 10, who argues immediately that the defendant is guilty, holds more power. A majority of jurors agree with him, and it seems unlikely that Juror 8 will be able to change their minds. Juror 8's only power at the early stages of the process derives from his right to refuse to support the otherwise unanimous guilty verdict. In the context of jury deliberations, this is a legitimate source of power, but on its own it only creates stalemate. It does not seem that he can leverage his position to shift the positions of the other jurors and achieve his objective, which is an adequate deliberation of all the facts in the case.

Juror 8, however, seems to understand that bargaining power is both *relative* and *subjective* because it is based on the party's perceptions of each other. Robert Cialdini (1993) argues that formal authority is fragile — establishing credibility, “common ground,” and emotional connections can shift the balance of power in circumstances such as those that Juror 8 faces. David Mechanic (1962) sees power as resulting from access to and control over *information*, *people*, and *instrumentalities*. Despite his initial weak minority position, Juror 8 dexterously commands all available sources of power.

*Information.* When the jurors convene for the first time, Juror 8 sits back, staring quietly through the window, but at the same time observing the behaviors of his peers, presumably gathering information about them without revealing anything about himself. This behavior is consistent throughout both the deliberations and the break. In the bathroom scenes, for instance, he seems almost oddly quiet, which seems to compel anyone who walks in to speak, revealing personal information in the process. Juror 8 reinforces this behavior with his own brief, neutral, mirroring responses (“Aha. . . .” or “Is that so?”).

*People.* Juror 8 approaches and forms alliances with the jurors who seem most peripheral: the old man (Juror 9), the immigrant (Juror 11), and the follower (Juror 2). Although he always remains opaque and ambiguous, he elicits personal information from the jurors that allows him to both guide the deliberations and encourage the other jurors to bond with him. For example, when Juror 2, a somewhat meek, indecisive man, offers cough drops to dissipate the tension during confrontations, Juror 8 is the only one who accepts them. One assumes that he does so not really because he needs them but in order to connect with Juror 2.

---

**Table Two**  
**Broad Strategies**

---

Strategy Adopted	Party
1. Avoidance/neglect	Jurors 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12
2. Aggression/domination	Jurors 10, 3, (7)
3. Appeasement/self-sacrifice	—
4. Collusion	—
5. Collaborative problem solving	Jurors 4, 8
6. Sharing, give and take	Juror 8

---

*Instrumentalities.* The physical evidence seems to overwhelmingly support a guilty verdict. Nonetheless, Juror 8 is able to use it to make his case. We discuss how he accomplishes this in the next section of this article.

### ***The Lone Dissenter***

In Table Two we outline the strategies initially adopted by the twelve jurors as outlined in Jacques Rojot's (1991) framework.

As the movie begins Juror 10 opens the deliberations with highly inflammatory statements, which is typical in one-off negotiations that are not part of an ongoing relationship and in which parties are unequal in power: "It's pretty tough to figure, isn't it? A kid kills his father. Bing! Just like that. . . . It's the element. . . . I'm telling ya, they let those kids run wild up there. Well, maybe it serves 'em right."<sup>2</sup>

Juror 8 silently evaluates the situation. The jury takes a preliminary vote by raising their hands. Six of the jurors (1, 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12) quickly vote "guilty." After a slight pause, Jurors 2, 5, 6, 11, and 9 join them. Juror 10 shakes his head, indicating that he is unhappy with the lone dissenter (Juror 8).

Juror 8 explains that he voted "not guilty" not because he is sure of the defendant's innocence, but because he wishes to discuss the case objectively, without prejudging the defendant. Because Juror 8 is overwhelmingly in the minority, he apparently recognizes that supporting outright acquittal could discredit him with the other jurors. Arguing simply that the jury takes the time to weigh the evidence would seem to be a more defensible and reasonable compromise position.

The frame that a negotiator chooses can be critical in achieving his or her objectives. Research has shown that at critical moments in a negotiation the parties will assess each other as individuals — judging their personal credibility, integrity, trustworthiness, and authority (Atkinson 1990). Speaking softly, Juror 8 would seem to be aware of that. He uses this phenomenon



---

— that each of the jurors is judging each of the other jurors — in his successful attempts to systematically discredit his opponents by forcing to the surface their underlying extreme beliefs.

Juror 8 also achieves his objective by addressing the constraints of time and information. He wants to lessen the time pressure and to question the group's assumptions. He does this by encouraging his fellow jurors to express themselves. Juror 10 says of the defendant: "I don't mind telling you this, mister. We don't owe him a thing. He got a fair trial, didn't he? What do you think that trial cost? He's lucky he got it. You know what I mean? Now look, we're all grown-ups in here. We heard the facts, didn't we? You're not gonna tell me that we're supposed to believe this kid, knowing what he is. Listen, I've lived among them all my life. You can't believe a word they say. You know that. I mean, they're born liars." But the extreme nature of this argument apparently repels some of the more open-minded of his fellow jurors. Juror 9 says: "Only an ignorant man can believe that. . . . Do you think you were born with a monopoly on the truth?"

The willingness of many jurors to commit to a guilty verdict outright can be seen as an indication of "groupthink." *Groupthink* describes the tendency of members of a group to value unanimity at the expense of good decisions and to fail to adequately consider alternatives (Janis 1972 and 1982). By indicating that groupthink is happening, Juror 8 challenges it and manipulates it for his own objectives. He admits that he does not necessarily believe the boy's story, but he feels that the accused is entitled to adequate deliberations.

As the film proceeds, the other jurors decide to "convince" Juror 8 of the defendant's guilt. Going around the table, each juror is given a couple of minutes to make his case. Using questions and logic-based arguments, Juror 8 refutes the other jurors' comments. In these scenes Juror 8 seems to be using an integrative approach to negotiation by focusing on the issue at hand rather than on other jurors, in effect separating the people from the problem (Fisher and Ury 1981). He engages with them in joint problem solving and, in the process, attempts to build relationships.

A rift within the group that supports a guilty verdict then becomes apparent. The extremism and racism of some of the jurors alienates some of the others. For example, when Juror 7 states that the defendant's background doomed him to a life of crime, Juror 5, a man who has himself escaped poverty, becomes uneasy and defensive.

Juror 8 then employs another tactic; he systematically attacks the sources and constraints that have produced the guilty verdict. He does this by discrediting both the trial itself, specifically the competence and performance of the defense lawyer, and the evidence presented at the trial. He does the latter by instilling doubts about the validity of the witness testimonies.

Juror 8 requests that the very unusual knife "in evidence" be brought in for another look. The jury reviews the sequence of events related to the knife, as follows:



- 
1. The defendant left his house at 8:00 P.M. after being “punched” several times by his father.
  2. He went to a neighborhood “junk shop” and bought a switchblade knife with a “very unusual carved handle and blade.”
  3. He met some friends in front of a tavern about 8:45 P.M. and talked with them for about an hour.
  4. The defendant’s friends identified the “death weapon” in court as the “very same knife” that the defendant had with him.
  5. The defendant arrived home at around 10:00 P.M. He said that he went to a movie at about 11:30 P.M., returning home at 3:10 A.M. “to find his father dead and himself arrested.”
  6. The defendant claimed that the knife fell through a hole in his pocket on the way to the movies and that he never saw it again. However, no witnesses saw him go out of the house, or at the theatre, and he could not recall the names of the films he saw.

Juror 8 argues that the defendant’s story may be true. In a dramatic twist he confounds the other jurors by pulling from his pocket a knife that appears to be identical to the one with which the defendant allegedly stabbed his father. He tells the incredulous jurors that someone else could have bought an identical six-dollar knife, just as he did the night before at a little pawn shop in the boy’s neighborhood, and used it to kill the boy’s father. In doing this Juror 8 has confounded procedural constraints by, in effect, introducing new physical “evidence.” This action also indicates a highly premeditated strategy.<sup>3</sup>

With the other jurors surprised or upset by this, Juror 8 shifts his strategy. At this point, perhaps suspecting that he might have turned the tide in his favor, he takes what seems to be a gamble; he proposes that the jury take another vote with secret ballots (with himself abstaining). He states that if there are eleven votes for guilty he will not stand alone and he will agree for the jury to take a guilty verdict to the judge immediately. But if any other juror votes “not guilty” they must agree to stay and continue deliberating.

Suggesting that the ballot be secret seems to be a successful concessionary strategy for Juror 8. If he succeeds in bringing even a single juror over to his side, his position will be strengthened. Juror 8 may have recognized that some of the other jurors may have doubts but are uncomfortable going against the majority.

### ***The Dissenter Is No Longer Alone***

The revelation of the result of the secret balloting marks an important shift in the film and in the balance of power in the negotiation. One juror has

---

indeed changed his vote. Tensions rise and some jurors “get personal” in their arguments. Juror 3 accuses Juror 5 of being swayed by Juror 8. This kind of personal attack can be expected to backfire, however, as it is likely that it will shift Juror 5’s support away from the majority and further toward Juror 8. But, in fact, Juror 9 unexpectedly admits that he was the one who changed his vote, explaining that he did so because he respects Juror 8’s independence of thought.

Juror 8 at this point calls for a break; it seems that he has achieved a critical victory and wishes to consolidate his position. He is no longer alone in his quest and he has defended his credibility. He goes to the bathroom where he is able to speak to several jurors one-on-one and establish rapport. He targets those jurors who seem most receptive to his message and reinforces it in a less formal setting. Establishing personal relations is one of Juror 8’s major tactics for changing the outcome of the deliberations.

Following the short break, the jurors resume discussion of the testimony. Juror 3 discusses the testimony of the elderly witness who heard the young man threaten to kill his father and the sound of the body hitting the floor, and who saw him running down the stairs and out of the house. Jurors 12 and 4 repeat the testimony of the woman who “looked right in the open window and saw the boy stab his father,” and who “saw the killing through the windows of a moving elevated train.” There were six cars on the train, she said, and she saw the killing through the last two cars.

Juror 8 questions how easy it would have been to hear and identify the voice that issued the threat. He asks the jury “Any idea how long it takes an el train at medium speed to pass a given point?” He engages the other jurors and encourages their participation in his brainstorming, giving them “ownership” of the process of reframing the evidence.

The jurors agree that a six-car el train traveling at medium speed would have taken ten seconds to pass by the open window of the room where the killing took place. Juror 8 wonders how the old man in the apartment downstairs could have heard the threat and the body hit the floor a second later so distinctly while a noisy el train passed.

Juror 8 further suggests that the accused seems “too bright” to have shouted “I’m gonna kill you” for the whole neighborhood to hear if he had really intended to kill his father. Juror 10’s objection “Bright! . . . He don’t even speak good English!” is corrected in an ironic manner by Juror 11, an immigrant (“He *doesn’t* even speak good English”), who seems to now distance himself from Juror 10.

According to Robin Martin (1992), power is measured by the degree of dependence between parties, that is, the degree to which one perceives oneself as dependent on another. Juror 8 enhances his power by slowly establishing links with the jurors who are most receptive to his message while marginalizing his most vocal enemies. By shifting the dependence of

---

these “in-the-middle” jurors toward him and away from Jurors 10 and 3, he increases his power in the process.

The tide shifts again in Juror 8’s favor when Juror 5 changes his vote to “not guilty.” Soon after Juror 11 changes his mind because of his “reasonable doubt.” Juror 3 expresses frustration with those who have shifted their votes to not guilty, asking “What is this? Love Your Under-privileged Brother Week or something?” He seems to know that he is losing control of the other jurors, and is angry.

The jurors return to the discussion of the elderly male witness. Juror 8 wonders if an old man who suffered a stroke the previous year and dragged one foot when he walked into the courtroom could have walked from his bedroom to his front door within seconds after the killing to see the defendant descend the stairs. Juror 3 is exasperated with Juror 8. “Suddenly, you start getting through to some of these old ladies,” he says. “Well, you’re not getting through to me. I’ve had enough.” He turns to the rest of the jury and continues, “What’s the matter with you guys? You all know he’s guilty. He’s got to burn. You’re letting him slip through our fingers.”

“Slip through our fingers? Are you his executioner?” asks Juror 8.

Juror 3 says, “I’m one of ‘em.”

Juror 8 replies, “Perhaps you’d like to pull the switch.”

“For this kid?” Juror 3 answers, “You bet I would.”

At this point Juror 8 changes tactics. He apparently senses that Juror 3 is losing credibility with the others as well as his temper, and he makes a personal attack. “I feel sorry for you,” he says. “What it must feel like to want to pull the switch! Ever since you walked into this room, you’ve been acting like a self-appointed public avenger. You want to see this boy die because you *personally* want it — not because of the facts. You’re a sadist.”

Juror 3 lunges at Juror 8 but is held back by other jurors. He plays into Juror 8’s hands by shouting “Let me go! I’ll kill him! I’ll kill him!”

Juror 8 says softly and defiantly, “You don’t really mean you’ll kill me, do you?”

Juror 8 has destroyed Juror 3’s credibility and has also undermined the evidence that pointed to the defendant’s murderous intent (his overheard shout of “I am going to kill you” directed toward his father). The rest of the jurors now gather around Juror 8, silently staring back at the isolated and repudiated Juror 3.

The results of the next vote, an open ballot, are tied. Discussion now turns to the victim’s wounds. Juror 2 asks about the stab wound and its “downward angle.” The accused was seven inches shorter than his father and so the angle looks awkward. Juror 8, as the victim, and Juror 3, as the killer, reenact the murder. The reenactment does little to strengthen Juror

---

8's position, but Juror 3 grows angry and nearly attacks Juror 8, further weakening his own position.

Juror 5, who says he had experience with switchblade fights in his childhood neighborhood, argues that switchblades are normally used "underhanded" to save time by any expert knife user: "Anyone who's ever used a switch knife wouldn't handle it any other way." But the victim's stab wound angled down, according to the trial testimony.

Juror 7 suddenly announces he is changing his vote to "not guilty" because he is "sick of all the talking" and he wants them to reach a decision soon so that he can attend a ball game: "You've heard me. I've had enough." Juror 12 and Juror 1, the foreman, then switch their votes. Jurors 3, 4, and 10 are left as the only supporters of a guilty verdict.

Juror 10 then launches a hateful tirade against minorities. One by one, the other jurors rise and literally turn their backs on his racist attitudes. Eventually, he is left standing and babbling in the middle of the room. Juror 4 silences him firmly: "Now sit down and don't open your mouth again." Eventually, everyone moves back to their seats.

The only other major issue outstanding involves the testimony of the woman living across the street from the defendant who testified that she saw the murder committed. According to Juror 4 she said she saw the boy raise his arm over his head and stab down into his father's chest. She went to bed at eleven o'clock that night. Her bed was next to an open window where she could look out while lying down and see directly into the boy's room across the street. Unable to sleep she turned toward the window at about 12:10 A.M. and, as she looked out, she "got a good look" through the windows of the passing elevated train at the defendant in the act of stabbing his father.

Discussion of her testimony prompts Juror 12 to change his vote back to "guilty." But Juror 9 notices that Juror 4 is rubbing the deep indented marks on the sides of his nose where his glasses rest, and remembers that the woman who testified against the boy had the same marks on the sides of her nose, although she wore no glasses in court. Juror 4 announces that "no one wears eyeglasses to bed," and so it was highly unlikely that the woman could have had time to put her glasses on to see the murder committed sixty feet away, in the split second it occurred through the cars of the passing el train in the middle of the night.

Juror 12 changes his vote back again to "not guilty." Juror 4 says he has "reasonable doubt." And Juror 10, initially the most convinced and forceful of those who advocated a guilty verdict, now switches his vote. Juror 3, left alone to vote guilty, is pressed to argue his beliefs by Juror 8: "We're not convinced; we want to hear them again." Now Juror 8 has taken complete command of the deliberations. He has become the group's leader and representative. Juror 3, broken and incoherent, agrees with the majority at last. The "not guilty" vote is now unanimous.

---

## Conclusion

Juror 8 is a masterful negotiator. His personality and charisma aside, he skillfully employs several negotiation techniques. He builds alliances, uses brainstorming, offers concessions, anticipates offers, and reframes and masters the factual information. Against what seem like overwhelming odds, one juror has managed to dominate this group of twelve men. The strategies and tactics of this successful negotiator are impeccable. He gradually and carefully gains control. As the negotiations proceed the audience witnesses his change from a quiet observer to an increasingly active and resourceful leader. He encourages engagement and uses the strengths and weaknesses of his counterparts to his advantage. His people and information tactics are also exemplary. While on the one hand he establishes alliances at every opportunity, on the other he creates pressure and forces his opponents to lose control and isolate themselves in the absurdity of their positions.

Throughout the film, Juror 8 demonstrates that he is certain and committed to his position, and that he believes that the majority should shift to his position. He exhibits all five key aspects (*consistency, investment, autonomy, rigidity, and fairness*) of a minority's influential behavior. For example, by being consistent, that is, by holding on to his position over time and modality, he is "visible" in the group and attracts attention. Rigidity, a variant of consistency in which the source of influence is perceived negatively, reduces influence. Instead, by being flexible (e.g., by proposing, after making his case, a secret ballot with himself abstaining) Juror 8 appears reasonable and rational. He shows autonomy (i.e., no ulterior motives) and fairness by establishing early on in the process that he is not trying to acquit the defendant but to behave responsibly and deliver justice. He shows a considerable amount of investment, that is, significant sacrifice, by stating that if, after the secret ballot, none of the eleven members holds "reasonable doubt" as to the guilt of the accused, he will accept the majority's position. Juror 8 manipulates the rules of the game and the resources and relationships available in order to build a base for action and establish himself as the unassailable leader of the negotiation. In the end his opponents — fragmented, exposed, and isolated — acknowledge defeat and proclaim a "not guilty" verdict.

## NOTES

1. In the 1957 film version all the jurors are male, white, and mostly middle-aged and middle-class. In a 1997 television remake some of the jurors are African-American. Some subsequent theatrical versions have been renamed *12 Angry Jurors* and have included women.

2. All quotes from the film are from Dirks 1996-2007.

3. Juror 8 has also, however, broken the law, as this action would be illegal in any actual American court of law. And in introducing this plot twist, the scriptwriter would also seem to have violated the play's sense of realism, threatening the audience's suspension of disbelief.

---

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, G. 1990. *Negotiate the best deal*. Cambridge: Director Books.
- Cialdini, R. B. 1993. *The psychology of persuasion*. New York: Quill William Morrow.
- Dirks, T., 1996–2007. *12 Angry Men* (review and synopsis). Available from <http://www.filmsite.org>.
- Fisher, R. and W. Ury. 1981. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin.
- Janis, I. 1972. *Victims of groupthink*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- — —. 1982. *Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascos*, 2nd edn. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Martin, R. 1992. *Bargaining power*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Martin, R. and M. Hewstone. 2003. Social influence processes of control and change: conformity, obedience to authority, and innovation. In *Sage handbook of social psychology*, edited by M. A. Hogg and J. Cooper. London: Sage.
- Mechanic, D. 1962. Sources of power of lower participants in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 192(7): 349–364.
- Moscovici, S. 1976. *Social influence and social change*. London: Academic.
- Rojot, J. 1991. *Negotiation: From theory to practice*. London: Macmillan.
- Weber, M. 1947. *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.