

# 12 angry men: review 3

[Entertainment](#), [Movie](#)



In the beginning of 12 Angry Men, they clarify that they had sat through six days of court listening to the case, and were now ready to decide the verdict. After those six days of hearing believed conclusive evidence and no defense from the plaintiff, it seemed to be an assured decision. When I researched on what exactly happens in the Jury Room it said: The first motion of business in a jury room is to select one of the jurors as a foreman. He or she leads the discussion and tries to encourage everyone to join in the discussion.

Every juror should have input. The purpose of these deliberations is to have a robust, uninhibited discussion which will lead to a calm, unbiased reasoning. With that being understood, it helped me comprehend and get more of a grasp on what the climate the jury room should have. As we saw in the movie, the jurors entered the room and none of them seemed eager or looked like they had the motivation to sit there and converse. What makes matter worse was the scorching heat with no air conditioning.

They were locked inside a small room with 12 other men; one was sick, and almost all of them were smoking. Absolutely nobody wanted to be there, so the climate is completely negative to begin with. Climate is defined as the atmosphere or environment within a group and is experienced by all members of the group. It materializes and is impacted by communication and can either be supportive or defensive. The frame of mind is set by the irritated baseball fan who tells everyone he has a game to get to and makes it clear that this case has an unambiguous verdict.

With this sort of nonverbal confidence he is showing in his decision, it provides confirmation to the jurors in the room that there is nothing significant to discuss. The only thing established is the fact that the jurors

have already made up their mind about the boy being guilty without any discussion. To start the jurors meeting, they decided to take a vote of how many feel the boy is guilty and how many do not. Fortunately for the boy being tried as guilty, there was one juror, Henry Fonda; that had a reasonable doubt about the case and stood against the others.

It wasn't that he had already made a decision on the verdict; it was that he felt he couldn't vote guilty and send a man to die until he at least talked about it. The climate in the room became exceptionally negative because they all thought they were going to be able to go home but Fonda stopped them from doing so by not voting guilty. One man wouldn't stop yelling and others were taking his side making the environment in the room a bit hostile. Fonda was willing to face the ridicule of eleven angry men.

He challenged every juror to effectively tell him why they are voting guilty, which promoted deliberation. By standing up to all of the others, he gradually began to gain respect from some of the other jurors who were now ready to hear what he actually had to say. Without being named the jury foreman, Fonda turned the broken juror room into a proper and productive room. In my opinion, this was a fine demonstration of leadership. When they decided to take turns around the table putting their two cents in, Fonda sat there and listened.

Instead of arguing for the sake of not guilty, he simply let the other jurors elaborate on some of the main facts they had in the case, which often became major points of speculation. Just by listening, Fonda was able to hear everyone's arguments and the other jurors themselves started to second guess themselves because what they believed were based on wrongful facts.

When they started discussing more and more about a particular fact or certain evidence, the smaller details became inconclusive. Without listening, none of what they had found out by speculating the facts, wouldn't have unfolded the way it did.

It was from there, they started developing cohesiveness and the jurors started opening their minds and exploring all of the other possibilities. As they kept their discussions and expatiated on the facts that they can all relate to, clues about the case started to become clear. They started to listen to one another, realizing it was necessary to hear each other's incite, and they finally began to support each other's views. This is a perfect illustration of groupthink, which is where group members try to cut down on any sort of conflict by not evaluating, scrutinizing, or arguing with other people's ideas.

However, they had a conflict with one of the jurors. There was no intention throughout the entire movie that this was going to switch his vote because he had personal ties from a family feud he was portraying. He had told us that in the beginning of the movie that he got into a fist fight with his 16 year old son and hasn't seen him in two years. Once everyone was on the same page, convincing this man to vote not guilty became the name of the game

<http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/courts/jury/procedure.shtml>