8-1-2003

The Influence of Mass Media Use on Individual Opinions of Courts

Steven John Briggs
University of Nebraska at Omaha

The Influence of Mass Media Use on Individual Opinions of Courts

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Criminal Justice

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Steven John Briggs

August 2003

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College,
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree Master of Arts,
University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Samuel Walker

Jeremy H. Lipschultz

Chairperson Marian A. DeLyser

Date 7-30-03

Steven John Briggs, MA

University of Nebraska, 2003

Advisor: Dr. Miriam DeLone

This study analyses the influence of media consumption, specifically an individuals viewing of television and their reading of newspapers, on their perceptions of how the court system deals with suspected criminals during sentencing. Data are analyzed from the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS), which is a nationwide survey administered by the National Opinion Research Council (NORC) on a semi-annual basis. The variables related to mass media use are based on self reporting. Two explanations, frequently cited in the criminal justice literature, the cultivation hypothesis (Gerbner et al., 1978) and Fiske's (1986) and subcultural identities, also known as interpretive communities, will be used in explaining the results. The hypotheses are that as the frequency of newspaper reading and television news viewing increase, as well as total television viewing, the more likely the respondent will perceive the courts as being 'not harsh enough.' Variables that previous research indicates are important explanations of perceptions, such as race, income, and education, are included in the analysis. Results indicate a lack of support for the Cultivation hypothesis as there is no direct relationship between any of the mass media

variables and the measure of citizen perception. The findings support an interpretive communities explanation of media effect on perceptions of the criminal justice system.

Acknowledgements

Without the help and encouragement of countless people, I would not be where I am today and could not go tomorrow. On this most recent of tasks, Drs. Samuel Walker and Jeremy Lipschultz provided time, insight, and direction. Dr. Miriam DeLone spent countless hours pouring though draft upon draft, ensuring that I understood the big picture while carefully proof reading to the finest of details. For their continuing encouragement of educational pursuits, I thank my grandparents and parents for the value they place on knowledge and curiosity. Finally, I would like to my wife, Jill. Her patience, support, and well timed encouragement kept me moving forward through school while she also ensured my health and happiness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Many people have never been inside a courtroom, yet most people have opinions about the operation of the criminal courts (Nebraska Minority and Justice Task Force, 2003). For example, when the General Social Survey for the years 1993, 1994, 1996 and 1998 asked respondents whether they thought the criminal courts in their area were too harsh or not harsh enough, an overwhelming number of respondents, between 92.7 and 95 percent, had an opinion (General Social Survey, 2002). Other opinion response rates from this questionnaire include 91.8 percent for the topic of capital punishment, 99.9 percent for age, 99.6 percent for education, and 95.9 percent for police (General Social Survey, 2002).

These opinion response rates closely match other attitude surveys in relation to crime and justice. A Gallup poll conducted in 1993 asked respondents whether there was more or less crime than a year ago and had an opinion response rate of 96 percent (Warr, 1993:306). Another Gallup poll conducted in 1994 focused on punishment and found 96 percent of respondents had an opinion regarding the death penalty (Warr, 1993:309). In a 1996 poll by the Public Policy Research Institute at Texas A&M University of confidence in local police had an opinion response rate of near 100 percent (Shaw et al., 1998:414). In short, when the topic is crime and the criminal justice system, it appears most people have an opinion.

Individual perceptions and opinions can originate from a number of places including personal experience and personal interactions (Akers, 1998). Unfortunately, there are no nationwide figures available on the exact number of

people who have been through, witnessed, or taken part in courtroom proceedings during a criminal trial. Thus, other peripheral statistics, which range from victimization statistics to the number of annual felony convictions as well as an individual state survey, will have to be used.

In a trend of a continued decline of victimizations since about 1993, the 2001 National Crime Victimization Survey found that about 24.2 million people, or about 8.5 percent of the population, had been victimized in the United States (Rennison, 2002:1). Over five million were victims of violent crimes (Rennison, 2002). However, many of the victims do not call the police and therefore never advance through the stages of the criminal justice system.

A recent study found that a fifth of the population had a contact with the police during the previous year (Langan et al., 2001:1). Twenty percent of the individuals that had contact with the police, or about 8.3 million people, were the result of respondents reporting a crime (Langan et al., 2001:7). This would be a liberal proxy for the number of people who see the inside of a courtroom.

Many of the crimes that are reported to the police will not result in arrests while some of the individuals arrested will have their charges dropped. Of those who were charged in 1998, 978,211 individuals were convicted on felony charge in the United States (Durose et al., 2001:1). This is a very conservative proxy for the number of people who see the inside of a courtroom because it does not account for people who passed through the criminal courts in other years, the number of recidivists, individuals who have served on a jury, or the court personnel.

One survey has been conducted within a state that included a question as to whether the respondent had ever been in the court of law. This survey found that 55.7 percent of the respondents had been in the court of law (Nebraska Minority and Justice Task Force, 2003: 2). Of these respondents, "approximately 40%...had been called for jury duty, 24.9% had testified at a court proceeding, 20.2% had been litigants in a civil action, and 13.3% had been defendants in a criminal case" (Nebraska Minority and Justice Task Force, 2003:2). The survey does not differentiate between civil and criminal courts. Further, it does not break down how many of the respondents had participated in the sentencing of defendant. In addition to not providing an estimate of the number of people who have been in court room during the sentencing phase of a criminal trial, it is also limited to a sample of a single state: Nebraska.

Based on these numbers provided above, the conclusion is drawn that most people have never been inside of a courtroom to witness, nor participate in, a criminal trial or sentencing. Without having personal experience of being a victim or offender, people get their information from alternative sources such as friends, family, co-workers, school, and the mass media. In short, while questionnaire opinion response rates for the harshness of court sentences in the United States, which has a population of 281.4 million people (US Census, 2002), hovers around 90-95 percent, many of the 253.3 million people, or 90 percent of the population, must inform their opinions from information beyond their personal experiences. The influence of mass media use on the formation of

individual opinion relating to the treatment of offenders by the courts will be the focus of this paper.

CHAPTER 1

Literature Review

Perceptions of Crime and the Criminal Justice System

A great deal of research has focused on individual perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system. This section is a review of the research on perceptions of neighborhood crime and fear of crime as well as views of police, courts, and punishment held by the public. Special attention is placed on group membership such as race, sex, income, and education. Following the review of research on citizen perceptions will be a section that reviews the research on crime and the criminal justice system as they are presented in the media, as well as a review of the research on media use and perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system.

Perceptions of Neighborhood Crime and Fear of Crime

This subsection will review the literature pertaining to citizen perceptions of the presence of crime and then related fear of crime in neighborhoods. Fear of crime is generally defined as an emotion that is the result of an individual's judgment of an increased probability of being victimized (Fagan, 1981; Glick and Pruet, 1985). Glick and Pruet state that related to fear of crime, is the notion of concern with crime (1985:331). The difference between the two, according to Fagan (1981) is the inclusion or exclusion of the element of risk. Fear of crime is associated with an element of risk; an increase in risk will equate with an increase in fear in crime. Thus, individuals residing in low crime areas, actual or

perceived, may have greater concern with crime while individuals in more poor areas have greater fear of crime (Fagan, 1981).

Many citizens are fearful of crime in their neighborhoods and cities. A Bureau of Justice Statistics report found between 20 percent and 48 percent of residents from various cities were "very" or "somewhat" fearful of neighborhood crime (Smith et al., 1999; 12). When asked about crime at the city level between 36 percent and 80 percent of the respondents reported feeling "very" or "somewhat" fearful (Smith et al., 1999; 18). While many respondents were fearful of crime in their own neighborhood, an even greater number were fearful of crime outside of their neighborhood, in the greater city.

Fear of crime has been found to exist beyond urban centers. Benedict et al. (2000) examined the fear of crime in a small town with a population of about 20,000. This study found between one quarter and a half of respondents reported being fearful of crime in their neighborhoods (Benedict et al., 2000:289). Neighborhood characteristics and racial composition have been the focus of some research.

A similar study focused on the respondents' perception of racial composition in her or his the neighborhood (Chiricos, McEntire, and Gertz, 2001). This study found that Whites and Hispanics' perceived risk of victimization, what Glick and Pruet (1985) refer to as fear of crime, increased with a perceived greater proportion of Blacks and Hispanics in the neighborhood. However, the Hispanic respondents who lived in a predominantly Hispanic area had reduced perceptions of risk. Similarly, when the White respondents lived in a

predominantly white area, their perception of risk was reduced (Chiricos, McEntire, and Gertz, 2001).

Two studies used census data and surveys to look at actual racial composition of neighborhood and how that relates to perceptions of neighborhood crime. One study used census data for neighborhood racial composition, UCR data for interracial crime statistics, and a survey for fear of crime found the presence of Minority residents increased the fear of crime for both Minority and White residents (Liska et al., 1982). The other study used similar data from Chicago, Seattle, and Baltimore (Quillian and Pager, 2001). In addition, this study included respondent views of the condition of the neighborhood such as noise, negative social interactions, and neighborhood appearance (Quillian and Pager, 2001). Once these variables were controlled for, it was concluded that the presence of young, Black males resulted in respondents perceptions of increased crime in the neighborhood, or what Glick and Pruet (1985) referred to as concern with crime (Quillian and Pager, 2001). In short, the presence of African American males increases fear and concern about crime (Chiricos et al., 2001; Lisak et al., 1982; Quillian and Pager, 2001).

Much like the fear of crime, the concern over crime, including crime as an increasing problem, has been found to be widespread. Ackerman et al. found crime to be viewed as one of the most serious problems facing the nation, particularly through the 1990's (2001). From 1994 through 1999, crime was of more concern to people than the economy, deficit, drugs, and health care (Ackerman et al., 2001). In addition, Ackerman et al. (2001) found that

respondents felt that crime was increasing in their own neighborhoods compared to each of the previous year from 1972 through 1997. While Ackerman et al. (2001) demonstrated a consistent fear of crime, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that the crime rate over the same period has varied with a dramatic decrease in violent crime victimizations during the 1990's (Rennison, 2002).

A review of research findings reveals that fear of and concern about crime is more common among people who classify themselves as Black and/or Hispanic than people who describe themselves as White (Chiricos et al., 2000; Chiricos et al., 2001; DeFrances and Smith, 1998; Liska et al., 1982; Quillian and Pager, 2001). Women have also been found to be consistently more fearful of crime than men (Baker et al., 1983; Browning and Cao, 1992; Benedict et al., 2000: 290; Chiricos et al., 2000; Chiricos et al., 2001; Quillian and Pager, 2001; Skogan, 1995; see Heath and Gilbert, 1996 for additional studies). Two other variables that showed up in a number of studies were education and income. Sometimes, an inverse relationship was found between education (Baker et al., 1983; Chiricos et al., 2001) or income (Chiricos et al., 2001; Eschholz, 2002) and fear. As education and income increased, fear of crime decreased.

Finally, some of the research has focused on the influence of previous victimizations on fear of crime. Chiricos et al. (2001) found that respondents who had been victimized in the previous year were more likely to be fearful of crime. Quillian and Pager had similar findings (2001:735, 741, and 743).

The studies of perception of neighborhood crime had an interesting difference when compared to those that focused on the fear of crime. In contrast

to the studies of fear of crime, no relationship was found between education and perception of neighborhood crime (Chiricos et al., 2000; Quillian and Pager, 2001). Glick and Pruet (1985) explain that different reactions will be found when questioning a respondent about fear of crime and perceptions of neighborhood crime because of differences between the two things being measured. A respondent's fear of crime is related to that individual's evaluation of the chances of becoming a victim whereas a respondent's concern of neighborhood crime is "the most general and diffuse expression" of opinion toward crime (Glick and Pruet, 1985; 331). Thus, while people with higher educations are more likely to rationalize their chances of victimization and reduce their fear (Baker et al., 1983; Chiricos et al., 2001), they must rely on similar sources as individuals with lower education levels for their source information on the general occurrence of crime.

In conclusion, fear of crime is greatest among African Americans and Hispanics, women, individuals who reside in neighborhoods shared by racial minorities, and individuals who had been victimized in the last year. Perceptions of neighborhood crime as a problem are related to the racial composition of the neighborhood with the perception of crime as a neighborhood problem increasing with the presence of young, Black males and possibly the education of the respondent. The next subsection will examine citizen perceptions of the police.

Police

Police tend to have mixed support from the public with important divisions occurring along race lines. A study of Gallup polls from 1977 to 1995 found that minorities consistently rate police honesty and ethics as "low" or "very

low" more frequently than Whites (Tuch and Weitzer, 1997). A more recent Gallup poll conducted in October, 2000 found 61 percent of Whites and 34 percent of Blacks reported having confidence in the police (Sherman, 2002:23). Further evidence of a racial divide will be presented in a moment, but it is important to note that even though there is a large amount of evidence of a divide, there also remains an impressive showing of confidence in the police.

In a Gallup poll conducted in July, 1997, 89 percent of the respondents stated they had "some," "quite a lot," or "a great deal" of confidence in the police (Shaw et al., 1998:414). This support had remained almost constant since 1993 (Shaw et al., 1998). The gap between Sherman's 61 percent and Shaw's 89 percent of respondents reporting confidence in the police may have come from the exclusion or inclusion of those who answered "some." When those who answered "some" are excluded from Shaw's sample, confidence in police is reduced to 59 percent.

The racial disparity between African Americans and Whites with African Americans having less confidence in the police has been replicated in several studies (Baker et al., 1983; Eschholz et al., 2002; Hagan and Albonetti, 1982; Hurst et al., 2000; Reisig and Parks, 2000; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002) with an important exception (Frank et al., 1996). The Frank et al. (1996) study contained a sample limited to a city that has both a large African American population and about half of the police officers in the city are African American, which may have contributed to the positive attitudes expressed by the Black respondents.

The Frank et al. (1996) study was the exception and other studies examining views of the police have come to different conclusions. One study examined specific attitudes toward police in New York City and Los Angeles (Weitzer, 2002). Weitzer (2002) found racial disparities between Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics in approval of job performance and in the belief that police brutality and racism are common.

Other variables, in addition to race, have been found to influence citizen perceptions of the police. Women (Benedict et al., 2000: 291; Eschholz et al., 2002:335; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002:446) and the elderly (Baker et al., 1983) have more confidence in the police than younger men. Ninety percent of female respondents in one study believed police were effective in providing protection (Benedict et al., 2000:291).

Some of the studies to date have tried to explain where opinions of the police might originate. Using OLS regression, Hurst et al. found the greatest predictor of negative opinions of police to be "seeing or hearing about police misconduct aimed at another person" (2000:49). Eschholz et al. (2002) found that the frequency of viewing television news had a positive impact on citizen attitudes toward police for both African Americans and Whites, while viewing "reality" programs improved attitudes for only Whites. In addition, Weitzer and Tuch (2002) found direct experience with the police associated with negative opinions of the police.

The relationship between education and views of police are inconsistent and weak (Eschholz et al., 2002:335; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002:446). Weitzer and

Tuch (2001) found the effect of education on opinions about police to be specific rather than global. The effect of education varied depending on whether the respondent was being questioned about local or state police and opinions or specific treatment by the police.

Finally, Reisig and Parks (2000) looked at how neighborhood conditions might change an individual's opinions about the police. Reisig and Parks (2000) found that citizen perceptions of neighborhood conditions, including fear of crime and perceived incivility, explained much of the variations in attitudes towards the police. In addition, they found variations in their measurement of reported neighborhood conditions from which Reisig and Parks concluded "citizens living in the same locations perceive neighborhood conditions quite differently" (2000:626). In other words, it is not the neighborhood conditions alone that produce the perceptions, but other influences that effect how people perceive their neighborhoods that also may change their perceptions of the police or fear of crime. Perhaps media use, which varies by individual, could help explain this variation.

There are many complex factors that seem to have an influence on individual perceptions of the police. This review is limited in its scope and depth. For a full review of research pertaining to citizen perceptions of the police, see Brown and Benedict (2002).

Courts

Confidence in the courts lags far behind the confidence level in the police. An October, 2000 Gallup poll found 36 percent of Whites and 16 percent of

Blacks had confidence in the local courts compared to the 61 percent of White and 34 percent of Black respondents reporting confidence in the police (Sherman, 2002:23). This section will review the research on citizen perceptions of the courts, as well as the influence of victimization, perceptions of other parts of the criminal justice system, and various demographic variables on perceptions of the courts.

An early study of attitudes toward the courts used an "injustice scale." The scale was created by Hagan and Albonetti (1982) who found significant differences in the attitudes of African Americans and Whites towards the courts. Many other studies have found racial disparities in attitudes towards courts (Kaukinen and Colavecchia, 1999; Wortley, 1996; Wortley et al., 1997).

Kaukinen and Colavecchia (1999) looked at specific attitudes towards the criminal courts focusing specifically on the treatment of victims and the accused. They found older, educated, male respondents who had higher incomes, who had been victimized, who felt that crime was on the increase, and lived in urban areas were more likely to rate the courts as doing a poor job in providing help to the victims of crime (Kaukinen and Colavecchia, 1999:377). After controlling for contact with the courts, Wortley (1996) found a statistically significant racial difference between African American and White opinions of the fairness of the courts, with African Americans having higher ratings on Hagan and Albonetti's "injustice" scale (1996:455).

Education has been shown to influence perceptions of courts as well. Respondents who had a college degree were statistically more likely to have

higher ratings on the injustice scale (Wortley, 1996: 455). Race, education, and contacts with the police were also found to be indicators of perceptions of injustice in another similar study (Wortley et al., 1997).

Fear of crime has also been shown to be associated with opinions regarding courts. Kaukinen and Colavecchia (1999:377) found that respondents with lower incomes and those who fear criminal victimization were more likely to feel the courts were failing to protect the rights of the accused. Sprott and Doob (1997:281) found that individuals who were more fearful of victimization were more likely to believe that court sentences were too lenient. Taken together, the respondents were fearful of victimization felt that the courts were failing to protect the rights of the accused while they were sentencing the convicted too leniently. It is clear that respondents' perceptions of the courts are complex.

Fagan (1981) was able to show that there is a strong relationship between punitive attitudes and lack of support for the courts. Using data from the National Opinion Research Center, Flanagan et al. (1985) demonstrated that there has been an increasing perception of the courts not using harsh enough sentences. Flanagan et al. (1985:67) state that from 1965 to 1982, the proportion of respondents perceiving the courts has not being harsh enough has increased from 48 percent to 86 percent. During approximately the same period, Gallup polls from 1965 to 1985 show support for the death penalty increased from 45 percent to 72 percent (Warr, 1995:308). Flanagan et al. (1985) found that the strongest determinant of support for the courts was attitudes towards punishment. These

attitudes had a stronger effect than age, race, class, victimization, and television news viewing (Flanagan et al., 1985:77).

Clearly individual perceptions of courts are complex. However, there are some consistent findings that a number of factors influence these perceptions: education, race, and punitive attitudes.

Corrections/Punishment

Using a report by the Gallup Organization, Sherman found fewer citizens expressed confidence in corrections than in police and courts (Sherman, 2002). Furthermore, the racial disparities continue to remain present. An October, 2000 Gallup poll found 26 percent of Whites and 15 percent of African Americans had confidence in prisons (Sherman, 2002:23). In a study of political ideology, Browning and Cao (1993:690) use a measure of conservativism that includes "support for long prison sentences." The strongest predictor of conservativism was race; people who were White were much more likely to be conservative than African Americans (Browning and Cao, 1992:694).

Summary

This section reviewed the research on citizen perceptions of crime, fear of crime, police, courts, and corrections. This review has found that there is a greater fear of crime among African Americans, women, individuals who reside in neighborhoods shared by Minorities, and individuals who have been victimized. The characteristics that influence fear of crime are also related to attitudes about police, courts, and corrections. There are dividing lines in support for the police, courts, and corrections that parallel race lines. Explanations for the

dividing line include contact with the system, television news and "reality" program viewing (where viewing television news improved perceptions of the police for both Whites and African Americans while viewing "reality" television programs improved only White respondents' perceptions of the police) neighborhood conditions, victimization, fear of crime, and ideology. The following section will review the research on how crime, the police, courts, and corrections are presented in the media.

CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN THE MEDIA

Before reviewing the existing literature on how media effects individual perceptions, it is important to review what is known about what is presented in the media. This section will detail the existing literature on how crime, the police, the courts, and corrections are depicted in various forms of the media.

Crime

The Center for Media and Public Affairs (2003) reported a dramatic increase in crime stories in the ABC, CBS, and NBC national news from 1990 and peaking in 1995. The increase in the number of murder stories presented during the years 1994, 1995, and 1996 may have been influenced by the O.J. Simpson investigation and trial rather than an increase in quantity and variety of murder stories. In 1994, the investigation and trial of O.J. Simpson comprised over half the stories of homicide, and in 1995, that number increased to two-thirds (Center for Media and Public Affairs, 2003).

Crime, specifically violent crime, is a news story topic that receives frequent attention. It is not uncommon for crime to be the most frequent number

or the greatest proportion of news stories (Yanich, 2001). The presentation of crime is uniform across most media sources, particularly news sources. The more violent the crime, the more likely the incident will receive attention from news agencies (Chermak, 1994; Gilliam and Iyengar, 2000; Maguire et al., 1999; Marsh, 1991; Yanich, 2001). A study of "reality" programs that recreated actual crimes had a heavy emphasis on violent crime, specifically murder (Cavender and Bond-Maupin, 1993). When there is a shortage other news stories, crime stories can be used as filler.

TV news stations in smaller cities that have fewer and less frequent incidents of violent crimes have a lower frequency of violent crime news stories (Maguire, Sandage, and Weatherby, 1999). Crime is presented as a problem of large cities (Yanich, 2001). When crime stories take place outside of major cities, it is viewed as "spreading" from the cities into the surrounding areas (Yanich, 2001:231).

Steven Chermak (1994) studied which characteristics of a crime influence how much attention news media will focus on any given story. The best predictor of determining the amount of attention given to a particular crime was the number of victims (Chermak, 1994). Later research found that not all victims are treated equally in news media.

Research that has focused on the race of the victim has found an overrepresentation of white victims in news stories (Chermak, 1998; Dixon and Linz, 2000; Weiss and Chermak, 1998). Although the research is rather clear on

the overrepresentation of violent crime and White victims in the news media, the representation of race of offenders has resulted in mixed research findings.

Some research finds an overrepresentation of African Americans as offenders (Dixon and Linz, 2000; Marsh, 1991; Peffley et al., 1996; Weiss and Chermak, 1998). Other research does not find an overrepresentation of African American offenders (Chermak, 1998; Maguire et al., 1999; Mastro and Robinson, 2000; Tamborini et al., 2000). Mastro and Robinson (2000) found minorities were underrepresented as criminal suspects in prime time television shows. When they were shown, they were significantly more likely to have excessive force used against them (Mastro and Robinson, 2000).

To summarize, crime is presented as a problem of primarily cities, with an overrepresentation of violent crime and White victims. There is mixed support for whether there is an overrepresentation of Black offenders. After examining the nature of quotations made in newspapers, Welch et al. state "the prevailing construction of lawlessness depicted by the media and the state managers is a collage of individual street crimes decontextualized from social factors" (1998:237). Similarly, Surette states, "because media portray crime almost exclusively in episodic terms—that is, reporting on specific individual and violent criminal acts—the cause of crime is largely framed in the media in the individual responsibility perspective"(1998:214). Crimes are presented as individual events without any connection to the social conditions surrounding the individuals involved. Some have suggested that this might be a result of how crime news is attained (Barak, 1994; Chermak, 1994; Welch et al., 1998).

The Criminal Justice System

Very little research has looked at how courts or corrections have been presented in entertainment or news media. For this reason, these areas will be examined with the research on the presentation of the police in the media. With existing institutional arrangements that help satisfy a demand for crime news stories, the police have an advantage over courts and corrections.

Some research has looked into the institutional arrangements that influence news formation (Chermak, 1994; Welch et al., 1998). Chermak found that "news personnel and representatives of criminal justice organizations are the primary participants in producing news about crime" (1994:566). In other words, news personnel are not seeking out academics on a regular basis for their interpretation and opinion for crime news. The reason for this, Chermak states, is because of a "cordial relationship" between the news organizations and criminal justice agencies (1994:567).

The "cordial relationship" that Chermak (1994) presents is the result of mutual needs and benefits. News organizations are in need of easy to obtain news stories, for which criminal justice agencies can be a regular supplier. Furthermore, these agencies, specifically police, "are culturally accepted as credible, [which] heighten[s] the appearance of objectivity and fairness" (Chermak, 1994:568). In return, the police are able to present themselves as the solution to the problem at hand. This phenomenon has been documented on a global scale. Marsh (1991) found that newspapers from several nations including Australia, Canada, and Great Britain present a "false image of police

effectiveness" (75). In addition to the reliance on criminal justice sources for news and interpretation, some research has looked at the outcome of this reliance.

Welch et al. focused on newspaper feature articles and the quotes they contained (1998). Welch et al. separated the quote makers into two groups: "politicians and practitioners" and "professors and researchers" (1998:227). Welch et al. (1998) found that politicians and practitioners' quotes focused more on hard control strategies such as expanding prisons (232) while professors and researchers focused more on the social factors that might lead to crime such as poverty and unemployment (231). Welch et al. came to similar conclusions in 2000. The research regarding Chermak's "cordial relationship" appears to be carried through in what is presented in the news.

Summary

In conclusion, the research presented in this section found that there is an overrepresentation of violent crime with White victims and mixed research on whether the race of the offender is important. Crimes are presented as individual events without connection to the social conditions surrounding the individuals involved. Finally, criminal justice agencies, specifically the police, have institutional arrangements that help to promote a "cordial relationship" which allows these agencies to promote themselves as a solution to the problem in which the news agencies may have an interest in covering. The next section will review the research on media use and how it influences those who use it.

Media Use and Influence on Users

This section will review the research on media use on citizen perception of seriousness of crime or of fear of crime, perceptions of police, and courts. It will begin by looking at the influence of media on concern for crime seriousness and fear of crime. This will be followed by media influence on perceptions of police and courts. It will conclude with a discussion of why it is important to study the influence of media on users.

Crime Seriousness and Fear of Crime

Television news has been found to be a primary source of information about local and neighborhood crimes. Gebotys et al. (1988) looked at the perception of crime seriousness rather than the fear of crime. The concept of crime seriousness used by Gebotys et al. (1988) is comparable to the concept of concern over crime put for by Glick and Pruet (1985) presented in the first section of the review. Gebotys et al. concluded, "the best predictors of crime seriousness ratings were: 1. exposure to television news; 2. sex of respondent; and 3. whether the respondent had been victimized within the last year" (1988:11). Those who had NOT been victimized in the previous year viewed crime as being more serious (Gebotys et al., 1988).

A more recent study by Smith et al. (1999) asked respondents if and where they had received information about a serious crime taking place in their neighborhood. Smith et al. (1999:14) found that 20 percent of respondents had found out about a crime during a neighborhood meeting, 16 percent from mass media, 7 percent were a witness, 5 percent were a victim, and 4 percent from the

police. In addition to being the source of crime news, television news has been found to increase fear among its viewers.

Some studies have found watching local and national television news to be a significant predictor of respondent fear of crime even after controlling for the crime rates in the surrounding area of the respondent and whether the respondent had been victimized (Chiricos et al., 1997; Chiricos et al., 2000:769). One study contradicts this finding. Gilliam and Iyengar (2000:565) concluded that fear of crime is not related to local television news viewing, but rather neighborhood of residence, prior victimization, socio-economic status, and gender alone. It is possible that Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) were measuring concern over crime rather than fear of crime. While the respondents may have been concerned about crime in the city in which they lived and with concentrations of wealth and poverty within cities, the respondents may have not been fearful of crime in their own neighborhoods where wealth was concentrated.

When both local and national news effects were examined simultaneously, it was found that local news has most of the effect on fear (Chiricos et al., 2000:770). The effects were concentrated among women, particularly African American women, even when controlling for crime rates and victim experience (Chiricos et al., 2000:777-778). Finally, the effect of local news was significantly amplified by residing in a high crime area, being a recent victim of a crime, and perceived realism of crime news, particularly for those individuals who have no college education (Chiricos et al., 2000).

One study changed the focus to include the content of television news. Eschholz (2002) tested whether the race of the offender on television changes the fear of the respondent. Eschholz (2002) found that fear was related to the amount of television watched. Further, when the offender was portrayed as Black, the fear significantly increased for the White viewers (Eschholz, 2002). While several studies have focused on how the various media influence viewer's fear of crime, fewer studies have focused on how the media influence attitudes toward the police.

Police

Eschholz et al. (2002) looked specifically at the effects of viewing television news and "reality" police programming on attitudes toward the police. Eschholz et al. found "watching the news significantly improved attitudes toward police for both African Americans and Whites" and had more of an effect on women than men (2002:336). The viewing of "reality" police programs was significantly related to positive attitudes toward police for Whites but not for African Americans and those without a college education or more (Eschholz et al., 2002:335-336). The effect of reading newspapers or viewing television news stories on a respondent's desire for punitive outcomes will now be examined.

Courts/Sentencing

Gilliam and Iyengar (2000:568) found punitive attitudes to be strengthened among Whites when the perpetrator in a news story is African American. A similar finding was made from an experimental study by Peffley, Sheilds, and Williams (1996). Peffley et al. (1996) conducted an experiment

where they manipulated the footage of a news story to vary the race of the defendant pictured in the news story in criminal case. When the offender pictured was an African American, respondents were significantly more likely to rate the defendant as guilty and would assign the defendant more years in prison (Peffley et al., 1996:316). Other variables that were significantly related to punitive attitudes in addition to frequent viewing of local television news were education, the less educated, the more punitive, income with higher incomes resulting in more punitive attitudes, and conservatives were significantly more likely to hold punitive attitudes (Gillaim and Iyengar, 2000:568).

While Peffley et al. (1996) manipulated news footage for their experiment, Roberts and Doob (1990) conducted a series of experiments examining reactions to different newspaper accounts and court information. Roberts and Doob (1990) conducted three experimental studies of the impact of newspaper reading on individual perceptions of sentencing severity. The study involved giving respondents newspaper articles about non-highly publicized cases. This first study found that people were willing to judge the severity of the sentence from a small amount of information and that the respondents were confident in their judgment of the sentence (Roberts and Doob, 1990:457). The second study involved assigning the respondents one of three articles regarding the same case with one article originating from a tabloid (Roberts and Doob, 1990:459). Respondents who read the tabloid account were significantly more likely to rate the sentence as too lenient (Roberts and Doob, 1990:460). The third and final study compared respondents' view of sentence severity who had read a news

description of an assault case to respondents who had read a summary of court documents detailing the case. This study found that respondents who had read the newspaper description of the case and sentence were significantly more likely to rate the sentence as lenient (63 percent of respondents) compared to 19 percent of respondents who had read the summary of court documents (Roberts and Doob, 1990:462). Roberts and Doob concluded that "the overall pattern of our findings suggests that much current public dissatisfaction with sentencing is based upon media misinformation about general and specific sentencing practices" (1990:466).

Summary

In summary, there is a fair amount of research suggesting that media use effects the user. Media use has been tied to fear of crime (Chiricos et al., 1997; Chiricos et al., 2000; Esccholz, 2002; Geboyts et al., 1998; Gilliam and Iyengar, 2000), perceptions of the police (Esccholz et al., 2002), and courts (Peffley et al., 1996; Roberts and Doob, 1990). While most of the research has focused on television use on perceptions of the criminal justice system (Chiricos et al., 1997; Chiricos et al., 2000; Esccholz, 2000; Geboyts et al., 1998; Gilliam and Iyengar, 2000; Peffley et al., 1996), a separate analysis of newspaper use has also found similar effects (Roberts and Doob, 1990).

Summary

This review has found that fear of crime is widespread, that there is a perception that crime is increasing, and the fear of crime is not equally dispersed throughout the population. It also appears that, in at least some cases, there seems

to be an institutional arrangement which can influence the nature of the presentation. Furthermore, the presentation of crime on television news and in print news has an overrepresentation of violent crimes with White victims and, as some evidence suggests, an overrepresentation of African American suspects. Evidence has been found of groups that interpret the news in similar ways—"interpretive communities"—(Chiricos et al., 1997) while there continues to be individual variation which could be partially accounted for by individual habits—such as the use of television. The following section will provide two theoretical explanations for how media use influences its viewers.

THEORY

Two explanations have been frequently cited and tested when trying to explain how the media influences perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system: the cultivation hypothesis and a cultural hypothesis. Both explanations assume that what people see on television or read in the newspaper has an effect on those individuals' perceptions of their surroundings. The explanations differ in explaining the interaction between the consumer and the effect.

One theory, the cultivation hypothesis, suggests that viewers of media will all be influenced the same way (Chiricos et al., 2000; Eschholz 2002; Eschholz et al., 2002; Lipschultz and Hilt, 2002). People are born to a culture in which "innumberable facts outside of personal experience can only be learned from the mass media or from others who have learned them from the mass media" (Gerbner et al., 1978:193). The result of media consuming by the viewing public would be equally distributed among all viewers based sole on the basis of the

frequency of exposure to various media (Eschholz, 2002; Lipschultz and Hilt, 2002). According to Eschholz (2002), the outcome would be "that viewers would develop an image of the world as a 'mean and scary' place" (43). It did not take long for the unidimensional cultivation hypothesis to be challenged by more comprehensive explanations.

One explanation was put forth by Fiske (1986) who suggested that there are subcultures and that each group would interpret what they viewed in the media differently. Fiske states, "television...allows the various subcultures to generate meanings from it that meet the needs of their own subcultural identities" (1986:392). What Fiske refers to as subcultures would later be referred to as interpretive communities (Chiricos et al., 1997; Eschholz, 2002). Members of these different interpretive communities "produce different meanings from the same given text or visual image" (Eschholz, 2002:44). Eschholz et al. (2002) in their research of television viewing on attitudes toward police tested these two theories and found more support for the cultural perspective or the interpretive communities hypothesis.

Like many of the researchers before them, Eschholz et al. (2002) included various variables that could be used to define various groups: sex, race, and education. Eschholz et al. found "that members of these different communities interpreted media messages based on their own personal circumstances and experiences, which were shaped by race, sex, and education" (2002:336). This study includes variables used by Eschholz et al. (2002) and examines the influence of both the media and the different communities.

Chapter 2

The Present Study

The goal of this study is to determine the effects of television viewing and newspaper reading on the respondents' opinion of harshness of the courts. The data used is the General Social Survey (GSS) that is administered by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC).

Hypothesis

Based on the findings of existing literature, two hypotheses concerning frequency of media use on respondent opinions of the harshness of the courts have been formulated.

Hypothesis 1: Respondents who have reported more hours of television viewing are more likely to view the courts as dealing not harsh enough with criminals.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents who have reported more frequent viewing to television news and frequent reading to newspapers are more likely to view the courts as dealing not harsh enough with criminals.

The hypothesis themselves will be a test of the cultivation hypothesis (Gerbner et al., 1978): the greater the exposure, the greater the change in attitudes. In addition, variables that have been found to be important in prior research of interpretive communities such as race, sex, age, income, and education will be included in the analysis. Using these variables, further analysis will be conducted to examine the possible existence of interpretive communities. Variables that

previous research have found to be related to television and news use and fear of crime will also be included.

Data

Since 1972, the General Social Survey (GSS) has been administered 23 times (NORC, 2002). The survey is administered during an in-person interview and takes, on average, about 90 minutes to complete (NORC, 2002). The sample is taken from the GSS 1993 sample because of the number of mass media specific questions administered in this year.

Sample

The General Social Survey uses a multi-stage area probability sample (GSS, 2002). The first stage of sample selection involves selecting non-metropolitan counties and "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" (GSS, 2002). From these units, "block groups" and "enumeration districts" are selected (GSS, 2002). Both the block groups and larger units are stratified by age, race, and income (GSS, 2002). From the block groups, blocks are selected. When the interviewer arrives at the selected block, she or he is to begin in "the northwest corner of the block and proceed in a specific direction until [respondent] quotas have been filled" (GSS, 2002:2).

A sub-sample of the original data set consisting of 932 cases will be used in the analysis. This sub-sample consists of all of the 1993 cases for which data on all variables is available.

Variables

Respondents in the General Social Survey were asked whether the courts in their area dealt with criminals too harshly or not harshly enough. The dependent variable will be created from this question. In addition, thirteen independent variables will be included in the analysis. The specific questions used in the administration of the questionnaire as well as the variable names are included in Appendix A.

Dependent Variable

The General Social Survey asked respondent how they felt their local courts [COURTS] dealt with criminals, too harshly, not harshly enough, or about right. The responses from this question will be used to create a dichotomous variable, NOTHARSH. The respondents who didn't answer will be removed from the analysis. Respondents who answered not harshly enough will be coded 1. Respondents who answered too harshly or about right will be the reference category and will be coded 0.

Independent Variables

Independent variables include four measures of media use, a measure of fear of crime, and demographic characteristics. Media use consists of four variables: number of hours of television per day (TVHOURS), frequency of public television viewing (TVPBS), frequency of television news viewing (TVNEWS), and frequency of newspaper reading (NEWSP).

The measure for fear of crime (FEAR) is a question in which the respondents were asked whether there was any place, within a mile of their

residence, where the respondent would be afraid to walk alone at night. Demographic variables include age (AGE), sex (SEX), race (RACE), education (EDU), employment status (EMPL), income (INCOME), type of residence structure (RESIDE), and surrounding population size (POP).

Analysis

Frequencies

Frequency distributions for each variable are presented in Table 1 where each variable's distribution characteristics can be examined. Table 1 also includes coding information as to how each variable was split to create dummy variables used in later analysis.

Bivariate

Bivariate analyses are conducted between the dependent variable and independent variables using a crosstabulation strategy with chi-square analysis to examine associations between the variables. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, liberal significance levels of .10 will be accepted. In addition, because of the distribution of cases in the dependent variable expected counts, also known as expected frequencies (f_e), will be displayed in Table 3 as well as minimum expected counts to ensure proper calculation of the chi square statistics.

Multivariate

With a dichotomous dependent variable, an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression is inappropriate (Berry and Sanders, 2000:72). As a result, logistic regression will be used instead. While logistic regression "can still estimate coefficients that allow us to assess the effects of the independent variables on the

dependent variable, and we can determine whether these coefficients are statistically significant...one cannot arrive at a simple interpretation of the impact of an independent variable on the basis of a quick inspection of the coefficients for that variable" (Berry and Sanders, 2002:73). However, predicted probabilities can be calculated using the logistic coefficients for an independent variable (Berry and Sanders, 2002:74). By using logistic regression, the effects of the other independent variables can be controlled for to examine the strength of the explanatory power of the various measures of mass media.

Chapter 3

Results

After all cases with missing data were removed from the sample, 932 cases remained. In response to the question, "in general, do you think the courts in this area deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals," eight hundred-one (86%) respondents report the courts as "not being harsh enough" and 131 (14%) who report the courts as being "too harsh" or "about right[1]." A summary of the distribution of respondents can be seen in Table 1 for the dependent variable as well as the independent variables. The independent variables include several indicators of mass media use and key respondent characteristics.

Univariate

The first indicator of mass media use, total television watching, comes from a question that asked respondents how many hours of television they watch everyday. One hundred ninety-one (20.5%) of respondents report watching one hour of television per day, 259 (27.8%) report watching two hours, 449 (48.2%) report watching three or more hours of television per day, while 33 (3.5%) respondents report watching no television. The mean number of hours of television viewing is 2.95 and the median is 2.0 hours. Another question was directed at respondents viewing habits in regard to a specific television network, the Public Broadcasting System (PBS). One hundred seventy-six (18.9%)

[1] An alternative dependent variable was created for comparisons which combined respondents who reported the courts being "about right" (n=98) and "not harsh enough" (n=801) when sentencing to compare with a group of 33 (3.5%) of respondents reporting the courts as "too harsh." Bivariate analysis with this alternatively coded variable reveals similar findings for the variables of interest, including significance in chi square tests for sex (p=.032), race (p=.000), and work status (p=.095).

respondents report watching PBS everyday, 486 (52.1%) report watching several times a week or month, and 270 (29%) report rarely or never watching PBS. Another question focused on the content of the television viewing. This question, asking about television news viewing, 591 (63.4%) of respondents report watching everyday, 271 (29.1%) report watching several times a week or month, and 70 (7.5%) report rarely or never watching television news. The final indicator of mass media use focused on the frequency of newspaper reading among respondents. Four hundred thirty-two (46.4%) of the respondents reported reading the newspaper everyday, 361 (38.5%) reading a few times to once a week, and 139 (14.9%) reading less than once a week or never.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Several demographic characteristics of the respondent are included in the analysis: sex, race, age, education, employment status, income, type of residence, and surrounding population size. The sample contains 432 (46.4%) male respondents and 500 (53.6%) female respondents. Seven hundred eight-one (83.8%) of the respondents are White, 101 (10.8%) are Black, and 50 (4.3%) are classified as "other[2]." The age of respondents ranges from 19 to 89 years with a mean of 45 years and a median of 42 years. One hundred eighty-five (19.8%) of the respondents have less than a high school education, 284 (30.5%) have completed twelve years of school, 363 (39.0%) have thirteen to sixteen years of school, and 100 (10.7%) have 17 or more years of school. Most of the

---

The group "other" is classification used in the GSS as a category for individuals who the interviewer does not feel fits the categories of Black or White. Individuals who are placed in this category can range anywhere from Native American, Middle Eastern, or Pacific Islander to Native Alaskan, Latin American, or Asian. This classification of racial groups is often referred to as minority when compared to Whites.

respondents were employed (n=581, 62.3%), going to school (n=22, 2.4%), homemakers (n=124, 13.3%), or retired (n=138, 14.8%) with only 50 (5.3%) of the respondents reporting that they are not employed. Seven hundred sixty-four (49.7%) of the respondents have a household income over $30,000 per year with 147 (15.8%) respondents reporting a household income of less than $10,000 per year, 173 (18.5%) reporting $10,000 to $19,999 per year, 148 (15.9%) reporting $20,000 to $29,999 per year, 150 (16.1%) reporting $30,000 to $39,999 per year, 80 (8.6%) reporting $40,000 to $49,999 per year, 72 (7.7%) reporting $50,000 to $59,999 per year, and 162 (17.3%) reporting greater than $60,000 annual household income. Five hundred ninety-five (63.8%) of the respondents live in a single family house, while 337 (36.2%) live in a trailer, apartment, or a multiunit house.

As noted earlier, most prior research on media use and its effects focuses on fear of crime. Another variable, "FEAR," was included in the analysis for this reason. The variable FEAR was created from the responses to the question: "is there any area right around here—that is within a mile—where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?[3]" Two hundred seventeen (44.6%) respondents report being fearful to walk within a mile of their residence at night and 270 (55.4%) report not being fearful to do the same[4].

---

[3] Flanagan and Longmire (1996) is critical of the use of this variable as a measure of fear of crime because the question does not specifically mention crime, rather the question is broadly worded opening up other possibilities for the causation of the fear.

[4] There is a large number of cases with missing data in the variable measuring fear of crime. Analysis using the sub-sample of 487 respondents who have date revealed a skewed sample. For this reason, the analyses including this variable will be limited.

Bivariate

A bivariate analysis is used to investigate the relationship between respondent perceptions of courts and mass media use as well as other demographic variables. Chi square tests for independence reveals a relationship between the dependent variable and several variables. It should be noted that a lower level of significance, a p value of .10 rather than a p value of .05, will be considered acceptable due to the exploratory nature of this research. A summary of results can be found in Table 3.

Bivariate cross-tabulation analysis are conducted on the dependent variable, NOTHARSH, that combine the respondents who answer "about right" and "too harsh" to compare against respondents who answer "not harsh enough." Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c present the results for crosstabulations between the dependent variable and the independent variables sex, race, and fear of crime which have at least moderate chi square results. A summary of crosstabulation analyses between the dependent variable and all independent variables is presented in Table 3. Expected frequencies (f_e) and minimum expected counts are also displayed for determining which chi square analyses are invalid. The first four variables in the bivariate analysis stage are various measures of mass media use. The remaining variables are demographic characteristics of the respondents. The Chi square tests for independence shows that there are several variables with a significant relationship to NOTHARSH. These variables include respondents sex (p=.071) [5], race (p=.020), and fear of crime (p=.011). Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c

[5] It should be noted that a lower level of significance, a p value of .10 rather than p value of .05, is considered acceptable due to the exploratory nature of this research.

present the full crosstab analysis for the pairings found to be significant at the .10 level or better. As can be seen in Table 2a females (87.6%) are more likely to report than courts not being harsh enough than males (84%). People who are White (87.1%), as presented in Table 2b, are more likely to respond 'not harsh enough' when asked about courts than people who are Black (79.2%) or other (82.0%). Finally, people who respond that they are fearful to walk in their neighborhood at night (see table 2c) are more likely (90.8%) to believe that the courts are not harsh enough than respondents (83.3%) who are not fearful of walking in their neighborhood at night.[1] The total number of cases in Table 2c, four hundred eighty-seven, shows that there are a large number of cases within the working sub-sample that are still missing data for this variable. The variable FEARFUL was removed from further analysis because it was discovered that it was not a random sample of respondents missing data. This was done after different results were found using a sub-sample created from the respondents who had data for the variable FEARFUL. Other demographic variables were examined using both the full sample and the FEARFUL sub-sample that resulted in largely different outcomes.

(Insert Tables 2a, 2b, 2c, and 3 about here)

Many variables, including the variables of mass media usage, have no clear relationship to NOTHARSH. None of the measures of mass media use had a statistically significant relationship even with the more liberal $p<.10$ standard employed for exploratory analysis to the variable NOTHARSH. As a result, the first hypothesis, that an increase in the reported number of hours of television

viewing would increase the perception of the courts as not harsh enough, must be rejected. There is no significant relationship between hours of television viewing and NOTHARSH (p=.362), frequency of PBS viewing (p=.671), television news viewing (p=.746), and newspaper reading (p=.374). Other variables that had no significant relationship to NOTHARSH include age (p=.607), education (p=.218), income (p=.538), type of residence structure (p=.513), and surrounding population size (p=.543). However, these results must be read with caution due to the nature of the data which is displayed in the two columns on the right side of Table 3.

The two columns on the right hand side of Table 3 present the number and percentage of cells where the expected frequency or count (f_e) of each variable is less than five as well as the minimum f_e for each variable. Sirkin (1999) states, "to be a valid test of significance, chi-square usually requires that most expected frequencies be 5 or larger. This is always true for two-by-two table. If larger than a two-by-two table, there a few exceptions are allowed as long as (a) no f_e is less than one and (b) no more than 20% of the f_e's are less than 5" (pgs 403-403). As can be observed in Table 3, many of the variables do not meet these criteria: TV hours, age, education employment status, type of residence structure, income, and surrounding population size. One method for overcoming this problem, as suggested by Sirkin (1999; pg 403), is to combine categories within a variable to increase the f_es.

A series of dummy variables were created to alleviate the problem of insufficient data and for analysis in a logistic regression. Bivariate analysis was

run between these variables and NOTHARSH. Two variables, age and education, whose relationship could not be established in the previous analysis due to f_e problems were found to have a limited relationship to NOTHARSH in the analysis with dummy variables. Tables 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d present the full crosstabulation analysis for the pairings found to be significant at the .10 level or better and which were not found to be significant in the earlier analysis. The results of the analysis with all dummy variables are summarized in Table 5.

(Insert Tables 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d and 5 about here)

By collapsing the categories in creating the dummy variables, the problem of expected frequencies was no longer a problem with any of the variables. All of the variables that were found to be significant in the analysis of the original variable remained significant in the form of dummy variables. SEX (p=.071), RACE (p=.020), and UNEMPLOY (p=.079), are all significant predictors of the dependent variable. A couple additional dummy variables are also significant: SOMENEWP (p=.088), AGE1830 (p=.088), AGE5165 (p=.085), and HIGHSCHO (p=.063). As was stated earlier, the dummy variables were created, in part, to overcome the expected frequency problems which plagued the analysis of the original variables, as well as to prepare for the anticipated logistic regression which is to follow. As presented in Table 4a, one of the dummy media variables had a statistically significant relationship to NOTHARSH. Respondents who read the newspaper a few times a week are more likely (88.8%) than those who read the newspaper everyday, once a week, less than once a week, or never (85%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' As can be seen in Table

4b, the respondents in the youngest age category, eighteen to thirty years old, were more likely (88.9%) to respond that the courts are not harsh enough than the respondents older than 30 (85%). The other age group that was found to also have a significant relationship to perceptions of the courts was the fifty-one to sixty-five year olds. This group of respondents was more likely (17.8%) to report that the courts are about right or too harsh than the groups younger than fifty or older than sixty-five (13.3%). These results can be seen in Tables 4b and 4c.

One other variable became significant after collapsing categories to create dummy variables: education. As can be viewed in Table 4d, respondents who have completed twelve years of school (88.7%) are more likely to respond that the courts are not harsh enough than respondents who have more or less than twelve years of school (84.7%).

Aside from the one of the newspaper dummy variables, all of the other media variables continue to have no findings of independent variation with NOTHARSH: TV1HR (p=.382), TV2HR (p=.326), TV3HR (p=.309), TV4HR (p=.254), STVPBS (p=.215), NOTVPBS (p=.178), TVNEWSEV (p=.392), STVNEWS (p=.425), SMTVNEWS (p=.374), NOTVNEWS (p=.327), NEWSPEVE (p=.183), OWNEWSP (p=.238) and NONEWP (p=.400). Amount of television viewing was condensed from 24 categories into 4 with one excluded category: no television viewing. TV1HR, TV2HR, and TV3HR were each coded one respective to the number in the label while all other categories were coded zero for each variable. In the dummy variable TV4HR, all the cases at or above four hours was coded one while all the cases three or lower were coded zero. The

next measure of mass media use, PBS viewing, was collapsed into two dummy variables. PBS viewing was collapsed into STVPBS, which included both watching PBS several times per week and several times per day coded as one while the remaining categories were coded as zero, and NOTVPBS, which collapsed rarely and never to equal one and all remaining categories were coded as zero. The reference category for PBS was watching it everyday. For the following two variables, four dummy variables were created out of the five categories. Television news viewing was broken into TVNEWSEV in which cases in the everyday category were coded as one, STVNEWS in which cases in the several times a week were coded as one, SMTVNEWS in which cases in the several times a month were coded as one, NOTVNEWS in which cases in the rarely category was coded as one, and cases coded as never were the excluded category. The other mass media variable, reading the newspaper, was collapsed into NEWSPEVE which cases in the everyday category were coded as one, SOMENEWP in which cases in the few times a week were coded as one, OWNEWSP in which cases in the once a week category were coded as one, NONEWSP in which cases coded as less than once a week were coded as one, and the cases coded as never were the excluded category. The fifteen remaining dummy variables we also found to have no measurable variation in relation to NOTHARSH.

Three-way Crosstabulation Analysis

Further analysis was conducted on the variables that were found to have a significant association with NOTHARSH, as well as the various media variables

and other theoretically important variables through the use to three-way crosstabs. The results of theses analyses are summarized in Table 7. Tables 6a through 6s contain the results of only the pairings found to be significant. Asterisks (*) by the upper-right corner of the crosstabulation will indicate significant relationships.

Numerous three-way crosstabs were conducted to further examine the relationships between sex, race, other demographic characteristics, media use, and the response that the courts 'are not harsh enough.' Of these analysis, a total of nineteen three-way cross tabs contained statistically significant relationships. Most of these analysis involve either sex or race. One of the strongest phi values in the results is from a three-way crosstab between sex and race.

Before examining the relationships found between race and sex and how these variables are related with other variables to NOTHARSH, there are three relationships between various media variables and variables that are not race or sex that will be examined. As can be seen in Table 6a, respondents who reside in cities or suburbs (83.6%) and read the newspaper everyday are less likely than respondents who read the newspaper less than everyday (88.3%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' The opposite is true for respondents living in the small towns and rural areas. Also in Table 6a, respondents who live in a small town or in a rural area (91.7%) and read the newspaper everyday are more likely (81.3%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than those reading the newspaper everyday.

(Insert Tables 6a, 6b, and 6c about here)

The other three-way crosstabulations that involve the media and not race or sex are presented in Tables 6b and 6c. Table 6b is a three-way crosstabulation using the dummy variable for viewing four or more hours of television per day and the dummy variable for residing in a single family house. Respondents who live in a trailer, apartment, or something else other than a single family house and watches more than four or more hours of television (89.9%) is more likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than a respondent in a similar living situation and watching fewer than four hours of television per day (83.0%). No difference emerges for single family house with hours of television viewing.

Table 6c also uses the dummy variable for viewing four or more hours of television per day. Table 6c presents results which show respondents who are 41 to 50 years old and watch more than four hours of television per day (95.3%) are more likely than respondents the same age and who watch less than four hours of television per day (82.8%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.'

Table 6d shows the results from the three-way cross tabs with race and sex. The significant relationship in this table suggests that African American men and other men who are not considered white (69.1%) are much less likely than African American women and other women who are not considered white (86.5%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' That is, the race pattern that African Americans are significantly less likely to respond that the courts are too harsh does not hold for African American women, only African American men. No similar pattern by sex is apparent among the respondents who are considered White.

(Insert Tables 6d, 6e, and 6f about here)

The sex pattern is further explored with the variables of living in a single family house, living outside of large cities, and of viewing the television news less than everyday. Women who live in a single family house (88.2%) are more likely than men who live in a single family house (84.2%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' This can be seen in Table 6e. Two measures of community size also found a relationship between sex and perceptions of courts. In one measure, presented in Table 6f, women who lived in a community comprising of something other than a large city (88.0%) were more likely than men living in similar communities (83.9%) to respond 'not harsh enough.' Moreover, as can be seen in Table 6g, men living in small towns and rural areas (19.2%) were more likely to report the courts as about right or too harsh than their female counterparts (9.6%).

The final relationship between sex and perceptions of the courts was found with one of the media variables. Table 6h shows that women who watch the television news less than everyday (89.3%) are more likely than men who watch the television news less than everyday (83.1%) to respond that the courts are not harsh enough.

Race is also an important variable in conjunction with several other variables that relate with perceptions of the courts. In Table 6i, one can see a stark difference between respondents of the same age group but different races: 76.1% of African Americans and people classified as other who are eighteen to thirty years old responded that the courts are 'not harsh enough' compared to

92.4% of White respondents ages eighteen the thirty. Notably, no significant difference emerges between respondents who are African American or other and respondents who are White in any of the age groupings over thirty.

(Insert Tables 6g, 6h, and 6i about here)

One significant three-way relationship was found with a variable designed to examine social isolation. These results can be seen in Table 6j. In this case, it was the respondents who were working and going to school who had a significant difference of responses with 81.1% of Minority respondents responding that the courts are 'not harsh enough' while 88.1% of White respondents working and going to school responded 'not harsh enough.' Of additional interest is that there was no statistically significant difference between individuals classified as Black or other and those classified as White in a variable that was arranged to capture social isolation by grouping together people who work at home, who are temporarily out of work, unemployed, or retired. Having an education is another variable that was found to be associated with differences of opinion.

White respondents who had attended college (Table 6k) were more likely (88.3%) than Minorities who had attended college (73.2%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' with no significant difference between people classified as White, Black, or other who had never attended college or had continued their schooling beyond college. Similarly, as presented in Table 6l, when a college or less education is included by excluding graduate and professional education, African American respondents and respondents classified

as other (79.9%) are less likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than respondents who are White (87.4%).

Table 6m presents an occupation that was considered to be a possible source of social isolation. Although there is no difference by race for homemakers, a three-way crosstabulation found that 80.3% of Minorities that are not homemakers responded that the courts are 'not harsh enough' compared to 87.6% of White respondents who are not homemakers.

(Insert Tables 6j, 6k, 6l, and 4m about here)

Much like with the variable sex, differences where between races in living situations and locations. As presented in Table 6n, Minorities who reside in a single family house are more likely (21.2%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than the respondents living in a single family house and White (12.9%). And, as presented earlier where women were found to differ from men in suburban, small town, and rural areas, as presented in Table 6o, respondents in these areas who are White (86.9%) are more likely than those who are Minorities (80.0%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.'

As presented in Table 6p, differences were also found between respondents who reside in cities and suburbs. African Americans and respondents classified as other are more likely (21.8%) to respond that the courts are 'about right' or 'too harsh' than respondents who are White (12.5%). Three different measures of mass media use were also found to have a relationship with race and perceptions of the courts.

(Insert Tables 6n, 6o, and 6p about here)

The first of the three measures, reading the newspaper everyday, is presented in Table 6q. White respondents (88.6%) who read the newspaper less than everyday are more likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than individuals who are African American or Other (80.2%) who read the newspaper less than everyday. Next, Table 6r presents the results between watching television news and race. People who are White who watch television news everyday (86.6%) or less than everyday (87.8%) are more likely than a respondent classified as Black or other who watches television news everyday (80.4%) or less than everyday (79.6%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' In short, the impact of race is consistent regardless of how much television news viewing the respondents partake in. Finally, as can be seen in Table 6s, respondents who are White and watch television less than four hours per day (86.4%) are more likely than respondents who are Black or other and watch less than four hours of television per day (79.6%) to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.'

(Insert Tables 6q, 6r, 6s, and 7 about here)

Multivariate Analysis

A final examination of the relationships between NOTHARSH and the media variables, as well as the demographic dummy variables, UNEMPLOY, SEX, and RACE, that were significant in the crosstab analysis, a series of models will be run through a logistic regression. Logistic regression is selected as the appropriate method for an analysis of multiple variables simultaneously due to the dependent variable, which is not measured at the interval-ration level (Berry and

Sanders, 2000). In addition, the use of regression will be able to control for multiple influences. This is an advantage over the crosstabulations, which can only control for one variable at a time (Berry and Sanders, 2000). The results from these analysis are presented in Table 8.

(Insert Table 8 about here)

The first model used only demographic variables that were found to be significantly associated with NOTHARSH in the bivariate analysis[6]. This model shows significant relationships between two of the three independent variables, sex (p=.098) and race (p=.020), and NOTHARSH. The third variable, employment status, is not significant (p=.164).

The second model added the three dummy variables that were created from respondent answers regarding frequency of television news viewing. One of the television news viewing variables, several times per week, was significant (p=.086) while the other two, everyday (p=.589) and several times per month (p=.507), were not significant. The variable measuring employment status (p=.174) continues to be not significant. The variable for sex is no longer significant (p=.106). The variable for race (p=.020) continues to remain significant.

The next model, Model 3, added the variables that measure public television viewing. Along with the other mass media variables, TV news everyday (p=.707), TV news several times per week (p=.867), and TV news

[6] The variable FEARFUL was removed from the analysis because it was discovered that it was not a random sample of respondents missing data. This was done after different results were found using a sub-sample created from the respondents who had data for the variable FEARFUL. Other demographic variables were examined using both the full sample and the FEARFUL sub-sample that resulted in largely different outcomes.

several times per month (p=.575), some public television (p=.714) and no public television (p=.682) are found not to be significant. All of the variables of mass media use will remain not significant through the final two models along with employment status (p=.189) and sex (p=.106). Race (p=.019) is significant and will continue to remain significant though the remainder of the analysis.

Model 4 adds three dummy variables of newspaper reading. All three variables, reading the newspaper everyday (p=.595), reading the newspaper a few times a week (p=.522), and reading the newspaper once a week (p=.484), are found to not be significant. The fifth and final model added a dummy variable of television viewing.

Model 5 had only one variable which was found to be significant, race (p=.015). None of the mass media variables was found to be significant, nor were the two other demographic variables, sex (p=.140) and employment status (p=.156).

Chapter 4

Discussion

One of the goals of this research was to examine whether there is a relationship between the use of mass media and individual perceptions of criminal courts, specifically whether the courts are not harsh enough. The stated hypotheses were that general mass media use, as measured by hours of television viewing, and the use of informative mass media, as measured by frequency of television news viewing and newspaper reading, would be related to the opinion that the criminal courts are not harsh enough.

The results presented above lend little support to the first hypothesis. The respondents reported use of mass media and news media do not have a direct and clear relation to the respondent's perceptions of whether the courts are 'not harsh enough.' This is based on the bivariate analysis between NOTHARSH and the original as well as the dummy variables which were used to indicate mass media use. When the original variables were used, public television viewing, television news viewing, and frequency of reading the newspaper have no clear relationship with the perception of the courts as being 'not harsh enough' while a relationship with the amount of television watched as measured in hours can not be established because of low expected frequencies in the chi square calculation. When the dummy variables were used, only one variable, reading the newspapers several times a week, had a relationship to the response 'not harsh enough.' The remaining variables, including the now calculable hours of television viewing,

continued to have no statistically significant relationship to the opinion that the courts are 'not harsh enough.'

Based on the results presented above, this research fails to support the cultivation hypothesis. There is no clear direct relationship between hours of television viewing, frequency of television news viewing, PBS viewing, or newspaper reading and respondent opinions about the courts in the respondents area.

Further analysis using three-way crosstabulations and multivariate techniques finds some support for the idea of interpretive communities. In three-way crosstabulations, various media dummy variables were found to be important with age, sex, and race of respondents as well as the respondents' type of residence and population in the surrounding area. Such results suggest an interactive impact rather than a direct impact of media on the respondents' opinion about the courts. Two of the demographic variables, age and sex, appeared only once in a relationship with a media variable while other variables, location and race, were found repeated with multiple measures of mass media use.

Female respondents were consistently more likely than male respondents to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' in all three-way crosstabulations including sex as a variable. One three-way crosstabulation, presented in Table 6h, a statistically significant relationship where women who watch television news less than everyday are more likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than men who watch television news less than everyday.

Variables for age and living situation were found to relate to NOTHARSH after controlling for media variables. Table 6c presents the findings that show respondents who are 41 to 50 years old and watch more than four hours of television per day are more likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than respondents who are the same age and watch less than four hours of television per day. Respondents whose residence is not a single family house and who watch more than four hours of television per day are more likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' than a respondent with a similar residence who watches less television.

There was a very interesting outcome found in Table 6a. This three-way crosstabulation used variables indicating frequency of newspaper reading, everyday or less than everyday, and the location of the respondents' residence, whether they live in or around a city or in a small town or the country. Aside from race, which will be examined in a moment, these variables seem to be one of the strongest indications of interpretive communities. The analyses of these two variables found that respondents who live in or around a city who read the newspaper everyday are LESS likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough' while the respondents who live in small towns and rural areas and read the newspaper everyday are MORE likely to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' This indicates that reading the newspaper everyday can have an effect on the reader with the effect varying based on a number of unforeseen exogenous variables. Thus, there is partial support for the second hypothesis. However, the direction of the effect is contingent on an unknown number of other variables.

Race, it appears, is one of these other variables. Race is found to have a significant relationship with three of the four measures of mass media: television hours per day, frequency of television news viewing, and frequency of newspaper reading. In most analyses, respondents who are White are consistently responding that the courts are 'not harsh enough' more frequently than are respondents who are Black or other, with at least one exception which was not statistically significant and can be found in Table 6p. Otherwise, who are African American or other are less likely than respondents who are White and watch less than four hours of television per day, watch television news less than everyday, or read the newspaper less than everyday and respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough.' This would be consistent with the past research conducted by Gilliam and Iyengar (2000:568) who found that punitive attitudes were related to television viewing for whites when the perpetrator in a story was African American.

One other method is used to investigate for a relationship between the mass media variables and respondent opinions about the courts. To control for the various influences, a multiple regression is run. Because the dependent variable is dichotomous, it was necessary to use a logistic regression. The results from running various models that included important demographic characteristics as well as the measures of mass media use can be found in Table 8. In the first model that contains measures of mass media use, Model 2, two variables are significant: viewing television news several times per week and race. Race is the

only variable that continues to remain significant in subsequent models where other media variables are added.

These results from the multiple regression analysis raise two questions. First, why is the person who watches television news several times per week less likely than someone who rarely or never watches television news to respond that the courts are 'not harsh enough?' This result seems to contradict the first hypothesis. Second, why does this effect vanish with the addition of multiple variables? The first question can be answered by taking a closer look at the specific question listed in Appendix A as well as the prior research. The question is asking specifically about national and world news and Chiricos et al. (2002) found that when both local and national news effects were examined together, local news has more of an effect on fear. However, as table 6a shows us, simple awareness (reading the newspaper) does not necessarily translate into a reaction (opinion). As to the second answer, race was found to be a mediating variable with media use on opinions. In other words, a respondent's race was important contributing factor in determining the use of various media as well as opinions regarding whether the courts are 'not harsh enough.' As more media variables are added to the regression, the effect of the individual media variables is less while race continues to be a determining factor.

Further bivariate analysis is conducted between race and the mass media variables. These analysis reveal significant relationships between some measures of mass media use and race. Respondents who are Black or other are significantly more likely ($p=.023$) to watch four or more hours of television per day than

respondents who are White. Thirty-five percent of respondents who are African American or other watch four or more hours of television per day compared to twenty-seven percent of respondents who are White. In contrast, respondents who are White are significantly more likely (p=.005) than respondents who are Black or other to read the newspaper on a daily basis. Almost half (48.3%) of the White respondents and thirty-seven percent of Black or other respondents read the newspaper everyday. Based on these findings, there appears to be reason to believe that further investigation using structural equation modeling (SEM). Using such methods, the researcher could create multiple steps that could help clear up which variables form the interpretive communities and which variables are characteristics of the communities.

Through the use of SEM, further understanding could be made of the factors that contribute to the racial differences in opinions regarding the courts and, with the right data, other institutions in the criminal justice system. Analyses could be conducted to see what environmental and social factors as well as individual factors such has prior victimization and/or contact with the criminal justice system effect people, whether these factors effect people of different races in different ways, how this effects what the person does to seek further information through the mass media, and how this results in varying opinions regarding the courts and other criminal justice agencies.

The environmental and social factors could include variables that have been found to be important in previous research such as racial composition of the respondents' neighborhood. In addition, more detailed questions regarding the

nature of personal contacts with various parts of the criminal justice system and contacts friends and family members have had with the criminal justice system should also be included. This further analysis could help reveal how the political realities of race affect perceptions of individual members. The results presented in this paper are clear in the importance of race in opinions of the courts. The further research which is being suggested should look at what social factors vary by race and how this different treatment affects the individual.

The data used for this paper would not be sufficient for future research using SEM. Also, recall that this data set does not include a sufficient number of cases with data on fear of crime. As prior research has found a relationship between fear of crime and television use (Chiricos et al., 1997; Chiricos et al., 2000; Eschholz, 2002), such data would be necessary to conduct a thorough analysis. Fear is not the only variable for which the data in this dataset would be inadequate for such a project.

The dependent variable for this research project was created from a vaguely worded question: "in general, do you think the courts in this area deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals?" In this case, in general is not an understatement. The question does not specify criminals—although it may be implied from subject of the question, criminals. However, criminals can be sued. Some behaviors that are considered a civil matter within the United States, such as the production and distribution of a product harmful to the user, are considered criminal in other countries. The definition of 'in your area' is also up to the respondent. The respondent could be thinking of traffic, county, state, or federal

court. The question can also be interpreted as a civil liberties issue or as a sentencing issue. It is up to the respondent to decide whether the question is getting at what kind of defense an accused individual is entitled to or what kind of sentence should be handed for a particular crime.

With almost infinite sources of information, through observation and experience, researchers must also be content with rather low levels of explained variance. There are a number of additional questions that have the potential to generate a greater understanding of where people's ideas and opinions originate. Based on previous research, knowing whether the respondent has been victimized and the details relating to the crime can be important as well as where the respondent lives, the conditions of the neighborhood, and the racial composition of the neighborhood. In addition, the greater the proportion of sources for which the respondents rely on for their information are gathered, the better. Measures that indicate social contact with other people, who are also sources of information and ideas, specific television content, radio content, or internet usage and websites visited as well as frequency and duration.

This paper begins a description of the low number of people that have had contact with and yet, most people have opinions about the courts. The purpose of the paper was to examine the relationship that between use of sources of mass media and opinions regarding the functioning of the courts. While a very little of what might be described as a linear relationship was found, there is evidence of a more complex relationship between mass media use, personal characteristics, and opinions about the court. Further analysis with better data and more sophisticated

techniques might help further clarify these relationships. The outcome from such an analysis could be used to construct a theory utilizing interpretive communities to explain the origins of public opinion regarding the criminal justice system.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the influence of media consumption, specifically an individuals viewing of television and their reading of newspapers, on their perceptions of how the court system deals with suspected criminals during sentencing. Data were analyzed from the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS), which is a nationwide survey administered by the National Opinion Research Council (NORC) on a semi-annual basis. The variables related to mass media use are based on self reporting. Two explanations, frequently cited in the criminal justice literature, the cultivation hypothesis (Gerbner et al., 1978) and Fiske's (1986) and sub-cultural identities, also known as interpretive communities, were used in interpreting the results. The first hypothesis which states that as television viewing increases, so to will the opinion of the courts as being 'not harsh enough' on criminals. The second hypotheses states that as the frequency of newspaper reading and television news viewing increase the more likely the respondent will perceive the courts as being 'not harsh enough.' Variables that previous research indicates are important explanations of perceptions, such as race, income, and education, are included in the analysis. Results indicate a lack of support for the cultivation hypothesis as there is no direct relationship between any of the mass media variables and the measure of citizen perception and thus rejecting the first hypothesis. Findings from three-way crosstabulations and multivariate analysis

support the effect of some media dummy variables, particularly with race, on respondent opinions of the court. While supporting the second hypothesis in part, these findings support an interpretive communities explanation of media effect on perceptions of the criminal justice system.

Table 1: Frequencies for Original and Dummy Variables

Variable (N=932)	N	%	Recode Variable Name and description	Recode N
Courts				
Not harsh enough	801	85.9	NOTHARSH, 1=Not harsh enough, 0=About right & Too harsh	1=801, 0=131
About right	98	10.5		
Too harsh	33	3.5		
Hours per day watching tv				
None	33	3.5		Excluded
One hour	191	20.5	TV1HR, 1=1, 0=0 & 2+	1=191, 0=741
Two hours	295	27.8	TV2HR, 1=2, 0=0-1 & 3+	1=259, 0=673
Three hours	188	20.2	TV3HR, 1=3, 0=0-1 & 4+	1=188, 0=744
Four or more hours	261	28.0	TV4HR, 1=4+, 0=0-3	1=261, 0=671
Watch Public Television				
Everyday	176	18.9		Excluded
Several times per week	286	30.7	STVPBS, 1=several times per week/month, 0=everyday, rarely & never	1=486, 0=446
Several times per month	200	21.5		
Rarely	186	20.0	NOTVPBS, 1=rarely & never, 0=everyday, several times per week/month	1=270, 0=662
Never	84	9.0		

Table 1 (Continued)

Watch Television News				
Everyday	591	63.4	TVNEWSEV, 1=everyday, 0=several times per week/month, rarely & never	1=591 0=341
Several times per week	202	21.7	STVNEWS, 1=several times per week, 0=everyday, several times per month, rarely & never	1=202, 0=730
Several times per month	69	7.4	SMTVNEWS, 1=several times per month, 0=everyday, several times per week, rarely & never	1=69 0=863
Rarely	48	5.2	NOTVNEWS, 1=rarely & Never, 0=everyday, several times per week/month & never	1=70, 0=862 Excluded
Never	22	2.2		
Read Newspaper				
Everyday	432	46.4	NEWSPEVE, 1=everyday, 0=few times a week, once a week, less than once a week, & never	1=432 0=500
Few times a week	240	25.8	SOMENEWP, 1=few times a week, 0=everyday, once a week, Less than once a week, & never	1=240, 0=692
Once a week	121	13.0	OWNEWSP, 1=once a week, 0=everyday, few times a week, less than once a week, & never	1=121, 0=811
Less than once a week	82	8.8	NONEWSP, 1=less than once a week & Never, 0=everyday, few times a week, & less than once a week	1=139, 0=793 Excluded
Never	57	6.1		
Sex				
Male	432	46.4	SEX, 1=male, 0=female	1=432, 0=500
Female	500	53.6		Excluded

Table 1 (Continued)

Race			Recode Variable name and description	Recode N
White	681	83.8	RACE, 1=white, 0=black & other	1=681, 0=151
Black	101	10.8		
Other	50	4.3		
Age				
18-30	217	23.3	AGE1830, 1=19-30, 0=31+	1=217, 0=715
31-40	221	23.7	AGE3140, 1=31-40, 0=19-30 & 41+	1=221, 0=711
41-50	177	19.0	AGE4150, 1=41-50, 0=19-40 & 51+	1=177, 0=755
51-65	163	17.5	AGE5165, 1=51-65, 0=19-50 & 66+	1=163, 0=769
65+	154	16.5		Excluded
Highest Year of School Completed				
Less than 12	185	19.8		Excluded
12	284	30.5	HIGHSCHO, 1=12, 0=less than 12 & 13+	1=284, 0=648
13-16	363	39.0	COLLEGE, 1=13-16, 0=0-12 & 17+	1=363, 0=569
17+	100	10.7	GRAD, 1=17+, 0=0-16	1=100, 0=832

Table 1 (Continued)

Employment Status			Recode Variable name and description	Recode N
Working fulltime	470	50.4		
Working part time	111	11.9		
Temporarily not working	16	1.7	UNEMPLOY, 1=temporarily not working, unemployed, & laid off, 0=working fulltime/part-time, retired, school, keeping house, & other	1=50, 0=882
Unemployed, laid off	34	3.6	ATHOME, 1=temporarily not working, unemployed, laid off, retired, & keeping house, 0=working fulltime/part-time, school, & other	1=312, 0=620
Retired	138	14.8		
School	22	2.4		
Keeping house	124	13.3	HOMEMAKE, 1=keeping house, 0=working fulltime/part-time, temporarily not working, unemployed, laid off, retired, school, & other	1=124, 0=808
Other	17	1.8		
Type of Residence Structure				
Trailer	71	7.6		
Detached 1 family house	595	63.8	SGLHOME, 1=detached 1 family house, 0=trailer, 2 units side by side/one above, 3-4 family house, row house, apartment, & other	1=595, 0=337
2 units side by side	18	1.9		
2 units one above	27	2.9		
3-4 family house	17	1.8		
Row house	41	4.4		
Apartment house	122	13.1		
Apartment 4 stories	29	3.1		
Apartment commercial	2	.2		
Other	10	1.1		

Table 1 (Continued)

Income			Recode Variable name and description	Recode N
Less than $10000	147	15.8		Excluded
$10000-19999	173	18.5	INCOME10, 1=$10000-19999, 0=less than $10000 & $20000+	1=173, 0=759
$20000-29999	148	15.9	INCOME20, 1=$20000-29999, 0=less than $19999 & $30000+	1=148, 0=784
$30000-39999	150	16.1	INCOME30, 1=$30000-39999, 0=less than $29999 & $40000+	1=150, 0=782
$40000-49999	80	8.6	INCOME40, 1=$40000-49999, 0=less than $39999 & $50000+	1=80, 0=852
$50000-59999	72	7.7	INCOME50, 1=$50000-59999, 0=less than $49999 & $60000+	1=72, 0=860
$60000+	162	17.3	INCOME60, 1=60000+, 0=less than $59999	1=172, 0=770

Table 1 (Continued)

Surrounding Population Size			Recode Variable name and description	Recode N
City Greater than 250,000	156	16.7	CITY, 1=city greater than 250,000, 0=city less than 250,000, suburb, unincorporated, town, smaller areas, & open country	1=156, 0=776
City 50,000-250,000	106	11.4		
Suburb, large city	222	23.8		
Suburb, medium city	115	12.3		
Unincorporated, large city	44	4.7		
Unincorporated, medium city	58	6.2		
City 10,000- 50,000	80	8.6		
Town greater than 2,500	55	5.9	SMLTOWN, 1=town greater than 2,500, smaller areas, & open country, 0=city greater than 10,000,unincorporated, & suburb	1=151, 0=781
Smaller areas	62	6.7		
Open country	34	3.6		
Fear of Crime in Neighborhood[1]				
Yes	217	44.6	FEARFUL, 1=yes, 0=no	1=217, 0=270
No	270	55.4		

[1] A smaller sub-sample of 487 cases are used in analysis using this variable. The remaining 445 cases for this variable have incomplete data and must be excluded from analysis.

Table 2a: Full Crosstabulation of Court Perceptions with Respondent Sex

NOTHARSH * SEX Crosstabulation

			SEX		
			MALE	FEMALE	Total
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	69	62	131
		% within SEX	16.0%	12.4%	14.1%
	NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	363	438	801
		% within SEX	84.0%	87.6%	85.9%
Total		Count	432	500	932
		% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 2b: Full Crosstabulation of Court Perceptions with Respondent Race

NOTHARSH * RACE Crosstabulation

			RACE			
			WHITE	BLACK	OTHER	Total
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	101	21	9	131
		% within RAC	12.9%	20.8%	18.0%	14.1%
	NOT HARSH ENOU	Count	680	80	41	801
		% within RAC	87.1%	79.2%	82.0%	85.9%
Total		Count	781	101	50	932
		% within RAC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 2c: Full Crosstabulation of Court Perceptions with Respondent Fear of Crime

NOTHARSH * FEAR Crosstabulation

			FEAR		Total
			YES	NO	
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	20	45	65
		% within FEAR	9.2%	16.7%	13.3%
	NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	197	225	422
		% within FEAR	90.8%	83.3%	86.7%
Total		Count	217	270	487
		% within FEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 3: Summary of Chi Square Analysis with NOTHARSH

Variable	X[1]	DF	P-Value	Cramer's V[2]	N (%) cells expected count <5	Minimum Expected Count
TV hours	16.314	15	.362[7]	.132	17 (53.1)	.14
TV PBS	2.355	4	.671	.050	0 (0)	11.81
TV news	1.946	4	.746	.046	1 (10)	3.09
Read Newspaper	4.247	4	.374	.068	0 (0)	8.01
Sex	2.448*	1	.071	.051	0 (0)	60.72
Race	5.254*	2	.072	.075	0 (0)	7.03
Age	64.235	68	.607	.263	76 (55.1)	.14
Education	22.365	18	.218	.155	14 (36.8)	.14
Employment status	20.874***	7	.004	.150	4 (25.0)	2.25
Type of residence structure	8.216	9	.513	.094	7 (35.0)	.28
Income	18.754	20	.538	.142	8 (19.0)	1.41
Surrounding population size	7.917	9	.543	.092	1 (5.0)	4.78
Fear of crime in neighborhood	5.774**	1	.011	.109	0 (0)	28.96

*p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.01

[1] Lambda could not be used as a measure of association because of large differences in the row totals (Healey, 1999). Further, because many of the variables have more than two responses for which phi is not fit (Healey, 1999). Cramer's V is an additional method that can be used to rank the associations between the variables and the dependent variable (Healey, 1999). Unfortunately, unlike lambda, Cramer's V has no convenient interpretation (Healey, 1999).

[2] Due to the nature of some of the variables, some of the p-values are based on an asymp. Sig. (2-sided). These include income, read newspaper, employment status, age, race, TV hours

Table 4a

NOTHARSH * SOMENEWP Crosstabulation

			SOMENEWP		
			Everyday, Once a Week, Less than Once a Week, Never	Few Times per Week	Total
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	104	27	131
		% within SOMENEW	15.0%	11.3%	14.1%
	NOT HARSH ENOUG	Count	588	213	801
		% within SOMENEW	85.0%	88.8%	85.9%
Total		Count	692	240	932
		% within SOMENEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4b

NOTHARSH * AGE1830 Crosstabulation

			AGE1830		
			AGE 31-89	AGE 18-30	Total
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	107	24	131
		% within AGE183	15.0%	11.1%	14.1%
	NOT HARSH ENOUG	Count	608	193	801
		% within AGE183	85.0%	88.9%	85.9%
Total		Count	715	217	932
		% within AGE183	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4c

NOTHARSH * AGE5165 Crosstabulation

			AGE5165		
			AGE 18-50/AGE 66-89	AGE 51-65	Total
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	102	29	131
		% within AGE516	13.3%	17.8%	14.1%
	NOT HARSH ENOUG	Count	667	134	801
		% within AGE516	86.7%	82.2%	85.9%
Total		Count	769	163	932
		% within AGE516	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4d

NOTHARSH * HIGHSCHO Crosstabulation

			HIGHSCHO		
			LESS THAN/MORE THAN HS DEGREE	HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE	Total
NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	99	32	131
		% within HIGHSCHO	15.3%	11.3%	14.1%
	NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	549	252	801
		% within HIGHSCHO	84.7%	88.7%	85.9%
Total		Count	648	284	932
		% within HIGHSCHO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5 Summary of Chi Square Analysis with NOTHARSH and Dummy Variables

Variable	X^2	DF	P-Value	Φ^1
TV1HR	.186	1	.382	.014
TV2HR	.298	1	.326	-.018
TV3HR	.366	1	.309	-.020
TV4HR	.598	1	.254	.025
STVPBS	.783	1	.215	-.029
NOTVPBS	1.058	1	.178	.034
TVNEWSEV	.143	1	.392	-.012
STVNEWS	.101	1	.425	.010
SMTVNEWS	.219	1	.374	-.015
NOTVNEWS	.432	1	.327	.022
NEWSPEVE	.995	1	.183	-.033
SOMENEWP	2.106*	1	.088	.048
OWNNEWSP	.704	1	.238	-.027
NONEWSP	.165	1	.400	.013
AGE1830	2.102*	1	.088	.047
AGE3140	.184	1	.370	.014
AGE4150	.001	1	.529	.001
AGE5165	2.282*	1	.085	.049
MALE	2.448*	1	.071	.051
WHITE	5.038**	1	.020	.074
HIGHSCHO	2.629*	1	.063	.053
COLLEGE	.000	1	.539	.000
GRAD	.351	1	.322	-.019
INCOME10	1.898	1	.106	-.045
INCOME20	.216	1	.376	.015
INCOME30	1.097	1	.180	.034
INCOME40	.065	1	.453	-.008
INCOME50	.560	1	.292	.025
INCOME60	1.407	1	.143	.039
UNEMPLOY	2.760*	1	.079	.054
HOMEMAKE	.982	1	.195	-.032
ATHOME	1.057	1	.130	-.040
SGLHOME	.102	1	.410	.010
CITY	.073	1	.435	-.009
SMLTOWN	.039	1	.464	-.006

*p<.10 **p<.05

[1] This table consists of all dummy variables and are, therefore, all dichotomous variables. An appropriate measure of associations among dichotomous variables in bivariate analysis is *phi* (Healey, 1999). While this measure can only be used to compare among other variables for strength of association, it has no specific interpretations available (Healey, 1999).

Table 6a

NOTHARSH * NEWSPEVE * SMLTOWN Crosstabulation

SMLTOWN				NEWSPEVE: Less than everyday	NEWSPEVE: Everyday	Total	
CITY/SUBURB	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	48	61	109	*
			% within NEWSPEVE	11.7%	16.4%	14.0%	
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	361	311	672	
			% within NEWSPEVE	88.3%	83.6%	86.0%	
	Total		Count	409	372	781	
			% within NEWSPEVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
SMALL TOWN/RURAL	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	17	5	22	*
			% within NEWSPEVE	18.7%	8.3%	14.6%	
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	74	55	129	
			% within NEWSPEVE	81.3%	91.7%	85.4%	
	Total		Count	91	60	151	
			% within NEWSPEVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 6b

NOTHARSH * TV4HR * SGLHOME Crosstabulation

SGLHOME				TV4HR: less than 4 hours	TV4HR: 4 or more hours	Total
TRAILER/APARTMENT/ OTHER	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	37	12	49
			% within TV4HR	17.0%	10.1%	14.5%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	181	107	288
			% within TV4HR	83.0%	89.9%	85.5%
	Total		Count	218	119	337
			% within TV4HR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	61	21	82
			% within TV4HR	13.5%	14.8%	13.8%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	392	121	513
			% within TV4HR	86.5%	85.2%	86.2%
	Total		Count	453	142	595
			% within TV4HR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6c

NOTHARSH * TV4HR * AGE4150 Crosstabulation

AGE4150				TV4HR: less than 4 hours	TV4HR: 4 or more hours	Total
AGE 18-40/AGE 51-89	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	75	31	106
			% within TV4HR	14.0%	14.2%	14.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	462	187	649
			% within TV4HR	86.0%	85.8%	86.0%
	Total		Count	537	218	755
			% within TV4HR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AGE 41-50	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	23	2	25
			% within TV4HR	17.2%	4.7%	14.1%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	111	41	152
			% within TV4HR	82.8%	95.3%	85.9%
	Total		Count	134	43	177
			% within TV4HR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6d

NOTHARSH * SEX * WHITE Crosstabulation

WHITE				SEX		Total
				Female	Male	
BLACK/OTHER	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	13	17	30
			% within SEX	13.5%	30.9%	19.9%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	83	38	121
			% within SEX	86.5%	69.1%	80.1%
	Total		Count	96	55	151
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WHITE	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	49	52	101
			% within SEX	12.1%	13.8%	12.9%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	355	325	680
			% within SEX	87.9%	86.2%	87.1%
	Total		Count	404	377	781
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6e

NOTHARSH * SEX * SGLHOME Crosstabulation

SGLHOME				SEX		Total
				Female	Male	
TRAILER/APARTMENT/ OTHER	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	26	23	49
			% within SEX	13.3%	16.3%	14.5%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	170	118	288
			% within SEX	86.7%	83.7%	85.5%
	Total		Count	196	141	337
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	36	46	82
			% within SEX	11.8%	15.8%	13.8%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	268	245	513
			% within SEX	88.2%	84.2%	86.2%
	Total		Count	304	291	595
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6f

NOTHARSH * SEX * CITY Crosstabulation

CITY				SEX		Total
				Female	Male	
SUBURB/TOWN/RURAL	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	49	59	108
			% within SEX	12.0%	16.1%	13.9%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	361	307	668
			% within SEX	88.0%	83.9%	86.1%
	Total		Count	410	366	776
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CITY	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	13	10	23
			% within SEX	14.4%	15.2%	14.7%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	77	56	133
			% within SEX	85.6%	84.8%	85.3%
	Total		Count	90	66	156
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6g

NOTHARSH * SEX * SMLTOWN Crosstabulation

SMLTOWN				SEX		Total
				Female	Male	
CITY/SUBURB	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	55	54	109
			% within SEX	12.9%	15.3%	14.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	372	300	672
			% within SEX	87.1%	84.7%	86.0%
	Total		Count	427	354	781
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SMALL TOWN/RURAL	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	7	15	22
			% within SEX	9.6%	19.2%	14.6%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	66	63	129
			% within SEX	90.4%	80.8%	85.4%
	Total		Count	73	78	151
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6h

NOTHARSH * SEX * TVNEWSEV Crosstabulation

TVNEWSEV				SEX		Total
				Female	Male	
Less than everyday	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	20	26	46
			% within SEX	10.7%	16.9%	13.5%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	167	128	295
			% within SEX	89.3%	83.1%	86.5%
	Total		Count	187	154	341
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Everyday	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	42	43	85
			% within SEX	13.4%	15.5%	14.4%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	271	235	506
			% within SEX	86.6%	84.5%	85.6%
	Total		Count	313	278	591
			% within SEX	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6i

NOTHARSH * RACE * AGE1830 Crosstabulation

AGE1830				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
AGE 31-89	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	19	88	107
			% within RACE	18.1%	14.4%	15.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	86	522	608
			% within RACE	81.9%	85.6%	85.0%
	Total		Count	105	610	715
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AGE 18-30	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	11	13	24
			% within RACE	23.9%	7.6%	11.1%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	35	158	193
			% within RACE	76.1%	92.4%	88.9%
	Total		Count	46	171	217
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6j

NOTHARSH * RACE * ATHOME Crosstabulation

ATHOME				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
working/school	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	20	61	81
			% within RACE	18.9%	11.9%	13.1%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	86	453	539
			% within RACE	81.1%	88.1%	86.9%
	Total		Count	106	514	620
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
work at home/temp not working/unemployed/retired	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	10	40	50
			% within RACE	22.2%	15.0%	16.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	35	227	262
			% within RACE	77.8%	85.0%	84.0%
	Total		Count	45	267	312
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6k

NOTHARSH * RACE * COLLEGE Crosstabulation

COLLEGE				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
HS/GRAD AND PROF	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	15	65	80
			% within RACE	15.8%	13.7%	14.1%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	80	409	489
			% within RACE	84.2%	86.3%	85.9%
	Total		Count	95	474	569
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
COLLEGE	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	15	36	51
			% within RACE	26.8%	11.7%	14.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	41	271	312
			% within RACE	73.2%	88.3%	86.0%
	Total		Count	56	307	363
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6l

NOTHARSH * RACE * GRAD Crosstabulation

GRAD				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
BS/BA OR LESS	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	28	87	115
			% within RACE	20.1%	12.6%	13.8%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	111	606	717
			% within RACE	79.9%	87.4%	86.2%
	Total		Count	139	693	832
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GRAD OR PROF SCHOOL	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	2	14	16
			% within RACE	16.7%	15.9%	16.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	10	74	84
			% within RACE	83.3%	84.1%	84.0%
	Total		Count	12	88	100
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6m

NOTHARSH * RACE * HOMEMAKE Crosstabulation

HOMEMAKE				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
Other	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	26	84	110
			% within RACE	19.7%	12.4%	13.6%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	106	592	698
			% within RACE	80.3%	87.6%	86.4%
	Total		Count	132	676	808
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Homemaker	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	4	17	21
			% within RACE	21.1%	16.2%	16.9%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	15	88	103
			% within RACE	78.9%	83.8%	83.1%
	Total		Count	19	105	124
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6n

NOTHARSH * RACE * SGLHOME Crosstabulation

SGLHOME				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
TRAILER/APARTMENT/ OTHER	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	16	33	49
			% within RACE	18.8%	13.1%	14.5%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	69	219	288
			% within RACE	81.2%	86.9%	85.5%
	Total		Count	85	252	337
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	14	68	82
			% within RACE	21.2%	12.9%	13.8%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	52	461	513
			% within RACE	78.8%	87.1%	86.2%
	Total		Count	66	529	595
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6o

NOTHARSH * RACE * CITY Crosstabulation

CITY				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
SUBURB/TOWN/RURAL	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	19	89	108
			% within RACE	20.0%	13.1%	13.9%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	76	592	668
			% within RACE	80.0%	86.9%	86.1%
	Total		Count	95	681	776
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CITY	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	11	12	23
			% within RACE	19.6%	12.0%	14.7%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	45	88	133
			% within RACE	80.4%	88.0%	85.3%
	Total		Count	56	100	156
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6p

NOTHARSH * RACE * SMLTOWN Crosstabulation

SMLTOWN				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
CITY/SUBURB	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	27	82	109
			% within RACE	21.8%	12.5%	14.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	97	575	672
			% within RACE	78.2%	87.5%	86.0%
	Total		Count	124	657	781
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SMALL TOWN/RURAL	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	3	19	22
			% within RACE	11.1%	15.3%	14.6%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	24	105	129
			% within RACE	88.9%	84.7%	85.4%
	Total		Count	27	124	151
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6q

Crosstab

NEWSPEVE				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
Less than everyday	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	19	46	65
			% within RACE	19.8%	11.4%	13.0%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	77	358	435
			% within RACE	80.2%	88.6%	87.0%
	Total		Count	96	404	500
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Everyday	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	11	55	66
			% within RACE	20.0%	14.6%	15.3%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	44	322	366
			% within RACE	80.0%	85.4%	84.7%
	Total		Count	55	377	432
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 6r

Crosstab

TVNEWSEV				RACE		Total	
				Black/Other	White		
Less than everyday	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	11	35	46	*
			% within RACE	20.4%	12.2%	13.5%	
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	43	252	295	
			% within RACE	79.6%	87.8%	86.5%	
	Total		Count	54	287	341	
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Everyday	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	19	66	85	*
			% within RACE	19.6%	13.4%	14.4%	
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	78	428	506	
			% within RACE	80.4%	86.6%	85.6%	
	Total		Count	97	494	591	
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 6s

Crosstab

TV4HR				RACE		Total
				Black/Other	White	
less than 4 hours	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	20	78	98
			% within RACE	20.4%	13.6%	14.6%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	78	495	573
			% within RACE	79.6%	86.4%	85.4%
	Total		Count	98	573	671
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4 or more hours	NOTHARSH	ABOUT RIGHT/TOO HARSH	Count	10	23	33
			% within RACE	18.9%	11.1%	12.6%
		NOT HARSH ENOUGH	Count	43	185	228
			% within RACE	81.1%	88.9%	87.4%
	Total		Count	53	208	261
			% within RACE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*

Table 7 Results of 3-way Crosstabulations with NOTHARSH

Variable 1 (Variable 2)	X^2	DF	P-Value	Φ
Read Newspaper Everyday				
(City/Suburb)				
City/Suburb	3.526**	1	.038	-.067
Small Town/Rural	3.111*	1	.060	.144
Television 4 or More Hours				
(Single Family House)				
Single Family House	.159	1	.391	-.016
Trailer/Apartment/Other	2.940*	1	.058	.093
(Age 41-50)				
Age 41-50	4.202*	1	.028	.154
Age 18-40/51+	.008	1	.505	-.003
Sex				
(Race)				
Black/Other	6.625***	1	.010	-.209
White	.480	1	.279	-.025
(Single Family House)				
Single Family House	1.968*	1	.100	-.058
Trailer/Apartment/Other	.613	1	.265	.043
(City)				
City	.015	1	.539	-.010
Suburb/Town/Rural	2.805*	1	.058	-.060
(City/Suburb)				
City/Suburb	.908	1	.198	-.034
Small Town/Rural	2.816*	1	.073	-.137
(TV News Everyday)				
Everyday	.502	1	.277	-.029
Less than everyday	2.771*	1	.066	-.090
Race				
(Age 18-30)				
Age 18-30	9.804***	1	.004	.213
Age 31+	.948	1	.202	.036
(At Home)				
Working/School	3.580**	1	.038	-.076
Work at home; temporarily not working; unemployed; retired	.196	1	.385	-.025

Table 5 (Continued)

(College)				
College	8.894***	1	.005	.157
High School or less/Graduate or Professional	.282	1	.348	.022
(Grad)				
Graduate or Professional School[1]	NA	NA	NA	NA
College or less	5.599**	1	.015	.082
(Homemaker)				
Homemaker	1.970	1	.199	-.126
Other	.042*	1	.042	-.064
(Single Family House)				
Single Family House	1.678*	1	.053	.063
Trailer, Apartment, & Other	3.450	1	.133	.195
(City)				
City	3.343	1	.240	.103
Suburb/Town/Rural	1.668*	1	.081	.066
(City/Suburb)				
City/Suburb	7.502***	1	.006	.098
Small Town/Rural[2]	NA	NA	NA	NA
(Newspaper Everyday)				
Everyday	1.086	1	.197	.050
Less than everyday	4.846**	1	.024	.098
(TV News Everyday)				
Everyday	2.553*	1	.078	.066
Less than everyday	2.603*	1	.085	.087
(4 or More Hours of Television Everyday)				
Less than 4	3.099*	1	.058	.078
4 or more	2.333	1	.101	.095

*p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.01

[1] The respondents under the category "Graduate or Professional School" could not be included in this analysis because of a low number of expected frequencies in one (25%) of the cells.

[2] The respondents under the category "Small town/rural" could not be included in this analysis because of a low number of expected frequencies in one (25%) of the cells.

Table 5 (Continued)

(College)				
College	8.894***	1	.005	.157
High School or less/Graduate or Professional	.282	1	.348	.022
(Grad)				
Graduate or Professional School[1]	NA	NA	NA	NA
College or less	5.599**	1	.015	.082
(Homemaker)				
Homemaker	1.970	1	.199	-.126
Other	.042†	1	.042	-.064
(Single Family House)				
Single Family House	1.678*	1	.053	.063
Trailer, Apartment, & Other	3.450	1	.133	.195
(City)				
City	3.343	1	.240	.103
Suburb/Town/Rural	1.668*	1	.081	.066
(City/Suburb)				
City/Suburb	7.502***	1	.006	.098
Small Town/Rural[2]	NA	NA	NA	NA
(Newspaper Everyday)				
Everyday	1.086	1	.197	.050
Less than everyday	4.846**	1	.024	.098
(TV News Everyday)				
Everyday	2.553*	1	.078	.066
Less than everyday	2.603*	1	.085	.087
(4 or More Hours of Television Everyday)				
Less than 4	3.099*	1	.058	.078
4 or more	2.333	1	.101	.095

*p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.01

[1] The respondents under the category "Graduate or Professional School" could not be included in this analysis because of a low number of expected frequencies in one (25%) of the cells.

[2] The respondents under the category "Small town/rural" could not be included in this analysis because of a low number of expected frequencies in one (25%) of the cells.

Table 8-Logistic Regression Results N=932

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5		
Variable	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.
Employment Status	-.500	.359	.164	-.489	.360	.174	-.474	.361	.189	-.491	.363	.176	-.517	.364	.156
Sex	-.137*	.191	.098	-.311	.192	.106	-.311	.192	.106	-.293	.194	.130	-.286	.194	.140
Race	.540**	.233	.020	.542**	.233	.020	.547**	.233	.019	.561**	.235	.017	.572**	.235	.015
TV News Everyday				-.215	.397	.589	-.152	.405	.707	-.110	.413	.790	-.109	.413	.791
TV News Several Times/week				-.127*	.424	.086	-.073	.438	.867	-.073	.442	.870	-.047	.442	.916
TV News Several Times/month				-.334	.504	.507	-.284	.507	.575	-.287	.508	.572	-.264	.509	.605
Some Public Television							-.094	.255	.714	-.094	.256	.713	-.607	.258	.793
No Public Television							.121	.296	.682	.119	.297	.688	.152	.299	.612
Newspaper Everyday										-.159	.299	.595	-.118	.302	.696
Newspaper few/week										.211	.330	.522	.243	.332	.464
Newspaper once/week										-.249	.356	.484	-.223	.357	.532
4+ Hours Television													.206	.225	.361
R^2 Each Model	.010			.011			.012			.015			.016		

*p<.10 **p<.05

APPENDIX A

COURTS	In general, do you think the courts in this area deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals? (about right is a voluntary answer)
NEWSP	How often do you read the newspaper—every day, a few times a week, once a week, less than once a week, or never?
TVHOURS	On the average day, about how many hours do you personally watch television?
TVPBS	Would you tell me how often you watch prime-time drama or situation comedy programs? Would you say every day, several times a week, several times a month, rarely, or never? C. Programs shown on public television.
TVNEWS	Would you tell me how often you watch prime-time drama or situation comedy programs? Would you say every day, several times a week, several times a month, rarely, or never? B. World or national news programs.
AGE	Recoded from date of birth given
RACE	CODE WITHOUT ASKING ONLY IF THERE IS NO DOUBT IN YOUR MIND. What race do you consider yourself? RECORD VERBATIM AND CODE.
SEX	Interviewer coded
INCOME	In which of these groups did your total family income, from all sources, fall last year before taxes, that is?
EDUC	A. What is the highest grade in elementary school or high school that (you/your father/ your mother/your [husband/wife]) finished and got credit for? CODE EXACT GRADE. B. IF FINISHED 9th-12th GRADE OR DK*: Did (you/he/she) ever get a high school diploma or a GED certificate? [SEE D BELOW.] [See REMARKS] C. Did (you/he/she) complete one or more years of college for credit--not including schooling such as business college, technical or vocational school? IF YES: How many years did (you/he/she) complete? D. Do you (Does [he/she]) have any college degrees? (IF YES: What degree or degrees?) CODE HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED.
XNORCSIZ	Respondent's home community size (population)
DWELLING	Respondent's living arrangement (house, apartment, trailer, etc…)
WRKSTAT	Last week were you working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what? HAND CARD A; CIRCLE ONE CODE

REFERENCES

Ackerman, G., Anderson, B., Jensen, S., Ludwig, R., Montero, D., Plante, N., and Yanez, V.
2001 Crime Rates and Confidence in the Police: America's Changing Attitudes toward Crime and Police, 1972-1999. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 28(1):43-54.

Akers, Ronald L.
1998 A Social Learning Theory of Crime. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
2000 Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Baker, Mary Holland, Nienstedt, Barbara C., Everett, Ronald S., McCleary, Richard
1983 The Impact of a Crime Wave: Perceptions of Fear, and Confidence in the Police. *Law & Society Review* 17(2):319-335

Barak, Gregg
1994 Between the Waves: Mass-Mediated Themes of Crime and Justice. *Social Justice* 21(3):133-147.

Benedict, Wm. Reed, Brown, Ben, and Bower, Douglas J.
2000 Perceptions of the Police and Fear of Crime in a Rural Setting: Utility of a Geographihcally Focused Survey for Police Services, Planning, and Assessment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 11(4):275-298

Berry, William D. and Mitchell S. Sanders
2000 Understanding Multivariate Research: A Primer for Beginning Social Scientists. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Brown, Ben and Benedict, Wm Reed
2002 Perceptions of the Police: Past Findings, Methodological Issues, Conceptual Issues and Policy Implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 25(3):543-580

Browning, Sandra Lee and Liqun Cao
1993 The Impact of Race on Criminal Justice Ideology. *Justice Quarterly.* 9(4):685-701.

Cavender, Gray and Bond-Maupin, Lisa
1993 Fear and Loathing on Reality Television: An Analysis of "*America's Most Wanted*" and "*Unsolved Misteries.*" *Sociological Inquiry* 63(3):305-317.

Center for Media and Public Affairs
2003 Crime Coverage in TV News Data. http://www.cmpa.com/factoid/crime.htm

Chermak, Steven M.
1994 Body Count News: How Crime is Presented in the News Media. *Justice Quarterly* 11(4):561-582
1998 Predicting Crime Story Salience: The Effects of Crime, Victim, and Defendant Characteristics. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 26(1):61-70

Chiricos, Ted, Eschholz, Sarah, and Marc Gertz
1997 Crime, News and Fear of Crime: Toward an Identification of Audience Effects. *Social Problems* 44(3):342-357.

Chiricos, Ted, Padgett, Kathy, and Gertz, Marc
2000 Fear, TV News, and the Reality of Crime. *Criminology* 38(3):755-785

Chiricos, Ted, McEntire, Ranee, and Gertz, Marc
2001 Perceived Racial and Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood and Perceived Risk of Crime. *Social Problems* 48(3):322-340

DeFrances, Carol J. and Smith, Steven K.
1998 Perceptions of Neighborhood Crime, 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Dixon, Travis L. and Linz, Daniel
2000 Race and Misrepresentation of Victimization on Local Television News. *Communications Research* 27(5):547-574

Durose, Matthew R., Levin, David J., and Langan, Patrick A.
2001 Felony Sentences in State Courts, 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics

Eschholz, Sarah, Blackwell, Brenda Sims, Gertz, Marc, and Chiricos, Ted
2002 Race and Attitudes Toward the Police: Assessing the Effects of Watching "Reality" Police Programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30(4):327-341.

Eschholz, Sarah
2002 Racial Composition of Television Offenders and Viewers' Fear of Crime. *Critical Criminology* 11(1):41-60.

Fagan, Ronald W.
1981 Public Support for the Courts: An Examination of Alternative Explanations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 9(6):403-418.

Fiske, John
1986 Television Polysemy and Popularity. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*. 3(4):391-408.

Flanagan, Timothy J., McGarrell, Edmund F., and Brown, Edward J.
1985 Public Perceptions of the Criminal Courts: The Role of Demographic and Related Attitudinal Variables. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 22(1):66-82.

Flanagan, Timothy J. and Longmire, Dennis R.
1996 Americans View of Crime and Justice: A National Public Opinion Survey. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Frank, J., Brandl, S., Cullen, F., and Stichman, C.
1996 Reassessing the Impact of Race on Citizens' Attitudes Toward the Police: A Research Note. *Justice Quarterly* 13(2):321-334

Gebotys, Robert J., Roberts, Julian V., and DesGupta, Bikram
1998 News Media Use and Public Perceptions of Crime Seriousness. *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 30(1):3-16.

General Social Survey
2002 Code Variable: Courts
http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/GSS/rnd1998/merged/cdbk/courts.htm
Accessed 7/2/02
2002 Appendix A: Sampling Design & Weighting
http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/GSS/rnd1998/appendix/apdx_a.htm
Accessed 7/24/02

Gerbner, George, Gross, Larry, Jackson-Beeck, Marilyn, Jefferies-Fox, Suzanne, and Signorielli, Nancy
1978 Cultural Indicators: Violence Profile No. 9. *Journal of Communication* 28(2):176-207.

Gillaim, Franklin D. and Shanto Iyengar
2000 Prime Suspects: The Influence of Local Television News on the Viewing Public. *American Journal of Political Science* 44(3):560-573

Glick, Henry R. and Pruet, George W., Jr.
1985 Crime, Public Opinion and Trial Courts: An Analysis of Sentencing Policy. *Justice Quarterly* 2(3):319-343.

Hagan, John and Albonetti, Celesta
1982 Race, Class, and the Perception of Criminal Injustice in America. *American Journal of Sociology* 88(2):329-355

Healey, Joseph F.
1999 Statistics: A Tool for Social Research, 5th Ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing Company

Heath, Linda and Gilbert, Kevin
1996 Mass Media and Fear of Crime. *American Behavioral Scientist* 39(4):379-386

Hurst, Y. G., Frank, J., and Browning, S.
2000 The Attitudes of Juveniles Toward the Police: A Comparison of Black and White Youth. Policing: *An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 23(1):37-53

Kaukinen, Catherine and Colavecchia, Sandra
1999 Public Perceptions of the Courts: An Examination of Attitudes Toward the Treatment of Victims and Accused. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*. 41(3):365-384.

Langan, Patrick A., Greenfeld, Lawrence A., Smith, Steven K., Durose, Matthew R., and Levin, David J.
2001 Contacts Between Police and the Public: Findings from the 1999 National Survey. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Lipschultz, Jeremy H. and Michael L. Hilt
2002 Crime and Local Television News: Dramatic, Breaking, and Live From the Scene. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Liska, Allen E., Lawrence, Joseph J., and Sanchirico, Andrew
1982 Fear of Crime as a Social Fact. *Social Forces* 60(3):760-770.

Maguire, Brendan, Sandage, Diane and Weatherby, Georgie Ann
1999 Crime Stories as Television News: A Content Analysis of National, Big City, and Small Town Newscasts. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture* 7(1):1-14

Marsh, Harry L.
1991 A Comparative Analysis of Crime Coverage in Newspapers in the United States and Other Countries from 1960-1989: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 19(1):67-79

Mastro, Dada E. and Robinson, Amanda L.
2000 Cops and Crooks: Images of Minorities on Primetime Television. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 28(5):385-396.

Nebraska Minority and Justice Task Force
2003 Final Report. State Justice Institute

NORC
2002 General Social Survey www.norc.uchicago.edu/projects/gensoc.asp Accessed 7/22/02

Peffley, Mark, Shields, Todd, and Williams, Bruce
1996 The Intersection of Race and Crime in Television News Stories: An Experimental Study. *Political Communication* 13(3):309-327.

Quillian, Lincoln, and Pager, Devah
2001 Black Neighbors, High Crime? The Role of Racial Stereotypes in Evaluations of Neighborhood Crime. *American Journal of Sociology* 107(3):717-676.

Reisig M., and Parks, R.
2000 Experience, Quality of Life, and Neighborhood Context: A Heirarchical Analysis of Satisfaction With Police. *Justice Quarterly* 17(3):607-630.

Rennison, Callie
2002 Criminal Victimization 2001: Changes 2000-01 with Trends 1993-2001. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Shaw, Greg M., Shapiro, Robert Y., Lock, Shmuel, and Jacobs, L.R.
1998 The Polls—Trends: Crime, the Police, and Civil Liberties. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62(3):405-426.

Sherman, Lawrence W.
2002 Trust and Confidence in Criminal Justice. *NIJ Journal*. 248:23-31.

Sirkin, R. Mark.
1999 Statistics for the Social Sciences, 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Skogan, Wesley G.
1995 Crime and the Racial Fears of White Americans. *Annals of the American Academy* 539:59-71.

Smith, Steven K., Steadman, Greg W., and Minton, Todd D.
1999 Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety in 12 Cities, 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Sprott, Jane B., and Doob, Anthony N.
1997 Fear, Victimization, and Attitudes to Sentencing, the Courts, and the Police. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*. 39(3):275-291.

Surette, Ray
1998 Media, Crime and Criminal Justice: Images and Realities. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Tamborini, Ron, Mastro, Dana E., Chory-Assad, Rebecca M., and Huang, Ren He
2000 The Color of Crime and the Court: A Content Analysis of Minority Representation on Television. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77(3)639-653.

Tuch, S., and Weitzer, R.
1997 The Polls—Trends: Racial Differences in Attitudes Toward the Police. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(4):642-663.

Warr, Mark
1995 The Polls—Poll Trends: Public Opinion on Crime and Punishment. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59(2):296-310.

Weiss, Alexander and Chermak, Steven M.
1998 The News Value of African-American Victims: An Examination of the Media's Presentation of Homicide. *Journal of Crime and Criminal Justice* 21(2):71-85.

Weitzer, Ronald and Tuch, Steven A.
2002 Perceptions of Racial Profiling: Race, Class, and Personal Experience. *Criminology* 40(2):435-456.

Weitzer, Ronald
2002 Incidents of Police Misconduct and Public Opinion. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30(5):397-408.

Welch, Michael, Fenwick, Melissa, and Roberts, Meredith
1998 State Managers, Intellectuals, and the Media: A Content Analysis of Ideology in Experts' Quotes in Feature Newspaper Articles on Crime. *Justice Quarterly* 15(2):219-241

Welch, Michael, Weber, Lisa, and Edwards, Walter
2000 "All the News That's Fit to Print": A Content Analysis of the Correctional Debate in the *New York Times. The Prison Journal* 80(3):245-264.

Wortley, Scot
1996 Justice for All? Race and Perceptions of Bias in the Ontario Criminal Justice System—A Toronto Survey. *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 38(4):439-467.

Wortley, Scot, Hagan, John, and Macmillan, Ross
1997 Just Des(s)serts? The Racial Polarization of Perceptions of Criminal Injustice. *Law and Society Review* 31(4):637-676

Yanich, Danilo
2001 Location, Location, Location: Urban and Suburban Crime on Local TV News. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23(3-4):221-241.