Representations of Victims, Suspects and Offenders:
A Content Analysis of Four Television Crime Shows

Jessica Levin
University of Colorado at Boulder
Sociology Department

Spring 2013

Honors Committee Members:
Dr. Joanne Belknap, Sociology (Chair)
Dr. Liam Downey, Sociology
Dr. Tracy Ferrell, Program for Writing and Rhetoric

ABSTRACT

This study draws on Social Learning Theory and uses a content analysis to critically examine the representations of victims, suspects and offenders on fictional crime television shows. Specifically, four such shows were studied: *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit, Criminal Minds, Body of Proof* and *Rizzoli & Isles*. Although some previous research assessed the representations of suspects and offenders on fictional crime television series, examination of the representations of victims is rare, and to date, no study has included such an extensive list of variables. There were two units of analysis used while coding. Coding of the entire show included the year of the episode, number of victims, number of suspects, number of offenders, type of crime and time of the crime. The second unit of analysis included individual victims, suspects and offenders. An extensive range of demographic data was recorded for each victim, suspect and offender. The results from this study indicate that a very narrow lens is used in television fictional crime show portrayals of victims, suspects and offenders. The findings include a relationship between the type of crime and the television show, the victims' gender and survival rate, the victims' race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status, the victims' hair color and whether they were drugged, and the victims' survival and whether they had children with the defendant. There were also significant relationships between the suspects' gender and the crime show, the suspects' race/ethnicity and gender, perpetrators' race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status, and the perpetrators' gender and survival rate.

Table of Contents

Abstract

I. Introduction…….…..4

II. Literature Review……...…….....7

III. Methods……...……14

IV. Results…….....17

V. Conclusion and Discussion…….…….....32

VI. References……...……..……....36

VII. Tables……41

VIII. Appendix…….....52

INTRODUCTION

Society is often negatively influenced by the inaccurate media portrayals of the criminal justice system (e.g., Dowler, 2006). More specifically, members of society are frequently fascinated by crime and justice; however, the unrealistic portrayals seen on television have led to an incorrect, almost naïve, view of the legal system (e.g., Dowler, 2006).

We are taught at a young age that people come in all different races/ethnicities, shapes and sizes, and that they should embrace their unique qualities. Yet, how can children actually learn to embrace their qualities when the media tends to exaggerate white female victimizations while simultaneously emphasizing African American offenders (see Entman, 1990)? Society is bombarded with hundreds of messages daily, through the news, advertisements for home security systems, fictional crime television shows, and so on, that misinform us about victims, offenders, and the criminal justice system. These advertisements typically re-enforce the stereotypical victim and offender as well as skew actual crime patterns (Ardovini-Brooker & Caringella-MacDonald, 2002; Bufkin & Eschholz, 2002). For example, "movies and television entertain with realistic and bloody dramatizations of murders, beatings and tortures" (Earles et al., 2002, p. 797). Not surprisingly, taken together, these media practices can result in viewers' manipulation into a distorted line of thinking.

Sociologists' *Social Learning Theory*, that behavior is learned, is appropriate to guide this thesis examining the portrayal of crime, victims, suspects, offenders, and criminal legal system actors' decision-making on fictional television crime shows. Anthony Bandura's classic work on social learning theory describes how behavior is learned (e.g., Akers, 1973; Bandura, 1973, 1977, 1978, 1979; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Earles et al., 2002; Grusec, 1992). It is important to remember that "people are not born with preformed repertories of aggressive

behavior; they must learn them" (Bandura, 1978, p.14). When responses have been positively or negatively reinforced, "the individual is predisposed to perform the behavior for positive [or negative] feedback" (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963, p. 3; Mowrer, 1960). Many scholars draw on social learning theory to explain individuals' violent behavior as learned through exposure to this behavior in person, but also including media images that normalize, or even reward, violence, particularly as a successful masculinized behavior (e.g., Akers, 1973; Bandura, 1973, 1977, 1978, 1979; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Earles et al., 2002; Grusec, 1992; Renner, 2012). Many sociologists, parents, and others worry that the mass media cultivates violent thinking through lenses that eroticize, minimize, and/or normalize it, and thus, the media is responsible for such troubling societal and individual perceptions (e.g., Akers, 1973; Bandura, 1973, 1977, 1978, 1979; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Earles et al., 2002; Grusec, 1992). For example, many people watch television shows where limbs are violently amputated and people suffer extremely brutal deaths (Ardovini-Brooker & Caringella-MacDonald, 2002). Someone might find this as pure entertainment, but it is really showing society that violence is not all that bad. If children are receiving this message at such a young age they may grow up thinking this is appropriate behavior and, ultimately, become violent individuals (Heath & Petraitis, 1987). It could be perceived as the media's way of "giving permission" to be violent.

Furthermore, many boys learn at a young age that violence is acceptable (e.g., Bandura, 1978; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Goodey, 1997). They learn this through many different sources such as television, movies, and even their parents (e.g., Bandura, 1978; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Goodey, 1997). Many parents teach young boys that they need to be masculine and condone violent play. An example of this is when parents buy combat toys, like the perennially popular G.I Joe dolls, for their sons. These army characters represent violence, therefore these

children grow up surrounded by aggression and this might not even be on purpose (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Goodey, 1997).

If a parent hits her/his child, this child may believe that hitting exemplifies love, perhaps leading the child to ultimately treat his/her children the same way because that was instilled in his/her "mental behavior" at an early age (Gil, 1971). The child knows that his/her mom/dad loves him/her and the hitting is a sign of affection as well as discipline (Gil, 1971). Therefore, when the child is older, and possibly has children, there is an ever-present danger that the child might show love the same way due to his/her childhood experiences (Gil, 1971). It is a learned behavior.

Rape is just like any of these other learned behaviors. Someone will watch television or go to a movie and see a form of violent sex (Palmer, 1989). They might think this is normal sex, when, in fact, it is a felonious crime. Or they might know it is not legal, but the point is they are learning it by seeing it elsewhere and then performing what they witnessed (e.g., Bandura, 1973, 1977, 1978, 1979; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Palmer, 1989). Indeed, surviving long term sexual abuse or child abuse is a risk factor for becoming a perpetrator of these crimes (Nixon, Tutty, Downe, Gorkoff & Ursel, 2002). It is unfortunate, but not a surprise. This is because some of these victims were taught that sex equals love. They figure that if they want to show someone their love, then this is how they should act (Nixon, Tutty, Downe, Gorkoff & Ursel, 2002). It is a warped mindset but they do not know any better because this is a learned behavior (e.g., Bandura, 1973, 1977, 1978, 1979; Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Palmer, 1989). For example, children who are repeatedly raped or abused at a young age often become very sexual (Nixon, Tutty, Downe, Gorkoff & Ursel, 2002). This is because they have learned, though falsely, that sex gives them control and can show someone else love (Palmer, 1989).

The freedom that screenplay writers have can be liberating, but it can also be dangerous for naïve people. There is nothing stopping these writers from penning anything they might wish to write (Surette, 1998). On television shows, an actual person is never on the line of being sent to jail or in any danger. However, the real world is not like what we see on television—there are real consequences when a crime is committed. Actual lives are in real danger, and in some cases, changed forever. Society must ask if individuals can watch a television show and expect that they now know everything necessary about the law? Are television shows a true and good reflection of the law? Although they can give accurate information at times, writers almost always embellish in order to appeal to the public (Surette, 1998).

LITERATURE REVIEW

There have been a plethora of studies conducted on the media's representation of crime and violence. Research has shown that criminal dramas tend to focus on an evil offender, an innocent victim, a violent crime, and at least one police officer willing to bend the rules in order to see that justice is served (e.g., Britto, Hughes, Saltzman & Stroh, 2007; Surrette, 1998). According to Humphries (2009), crime shows "strive to present a realistic picture of what police actually do in the course of an investigation" (p. 57). Viewers anticipate the suspense in each show, waiting patiently to determine who perpetrated the crime, as well as testing their own police-like thought-process by seeing if they correctly identified the killer when the culprit is revealed at the end of each episode (Humphries, 2009). Loyal watchers are generally satisfied by the resolution of the case (Humphries, 2009). Furthermore, these shows allow staunch and casual viewers an opportunity to form their own opinions about crime, the efficiency of the

criminal justice system, and the representation of victims, suspects and offenders (Surrette, 1998).

Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of society is only exposed to crime and the criminal justice system through television shows, since, of course, most people will never experience crime in their everyday lives (Dominick, 1973). Studies conclude that criminal dramas influence society's perceptions and ideas about crime and the criminal justice system. However, there is still some dispute about how viewers are affected by crime dramas. One researcher argues that television shows reduce the public's fear of crime because each show ends with a resolution of the issue (Sparks, 1995). On the contrary, more recent studies argue that criminal dramas increase society's fear of crime (Eschholz, Chiricos & Gertz, 2003). Due to the fact that violent crimes are over-represented in the media, society's view of crime may be incorrectly influenced by the frequency of violent crime as well as what actually constitutes a violent act (Heath & Petraitis, 1987).

The majority of studies on the media's representation of crime focus on the portrayal of offenders. However, it is equally important to examine the picture of victims. Giving inaccurate information about either group can distort thinking. Furthermore, the inaccurate portrayal of offenders can result in unnecessary fears of certain social and ethnic groups. Similarly, the inaccurate portrayal of victims can increase fear and "create or reinforce myths about victimization" (Britto, Hughes, Saltzman & Stroh, 2007, p. 42). Some studies have been conducted to assess the ways in which victims are presented in the media. A study from the 1980s concluded that when a storyline involved rape, the show usually referenced at least one myth about this violent act (as cited by Britto, Hughes, Saltzman, & Stroh, 2007; Brinson, 1992). By the 1990s, more television shows were embracing a different myth. The criminals were

portrayed as "sadistic, disturbed, lower class individuals who prey on children and the vulnerable" (Bufkin & Eschholz, 2000, p. 1337).

Furthermore, the media has provoked an increased fear of crime by frequently presenting society with the idea that serious offenses happen often. The serious offenses that are portrayed on television do not happen nearly as frequently as the media would want us to believe. In order to keep viewers enthralled, the media tends to bombard the public with stories of crime that would usually be considered as heinous or extreme (Chermak, 1995). Even though murder is one of the least common crimes in the United States, the media makes society think that murder is much more prevalent (Potter & Ware, 1987). Unfortunately, because of the media's misrepresentation, societal views are often very skewed pictures of just how often and in which contexts violent crimes actually occur (Kappeler et al., 2000).

Moreover, some researchers believe that criminal shows frequently portray police officers as individuals who bend the rules and violate civil rights. Representing law enforcement in this way can give viewers a negative perception of police officers (Britto, Hughes, Saltzman & Stroh, 2007; Levin & Thomas, 1997). On the other hand, some researchers believe that this portrayal can actually increase society's confidence in the police by resolving conflicts and arresting offenders by the end of each episode (Sparks, 1995).

Furthermore, many television shows and movies portray prosecutors as heroes. Prosecutors save the day by putting criminals away. Although this depiction is not inaccurate, it is hardly the full truth. Television shows and movies rarely deal with the dark issues of the prosecution. Who would want to see a show or movie where both of the prosecutors are corrupt? Hollywood usually follows a certain theme where one of the prosecutors follows all the rules and one tends to bend all the rules to get a conviction. However, even when shows and movies

portray a prosecutor in an unfavorable light, in the end, one's actions are usually seen as justifiable (Davis, 2009).

This skewed portrayal of prosecutors can have a negative impact on the public. The public will start to believe that prosecutors really are heroes, when in actuality they are far from heroes. Hollywood would like the public to believe that prosecutors take most of the cases that come their way. However, this is far from the truth when it comes to real life. This portrayal of prosecutors can be harmful to the public because of the misconceptions it causes when someone has been the victim of a crime. When someone goes into the police station and reports a crime, s/he might expect for his/her hero of a prosecutor to come through the doors to save the day. However, this rarely happens in real life. It can be confusing to a person who watches crime shows and movies when a prosecutor decides not to take his/her case, which is contrary to his/her own media-biased perceptions that prosecutors always take cases to support victims (Davis, 2009). For example, the *Law and Order* franchise, along with many other crime shows, is known for reassuring "its audience that murder is wrong, and that the courts can be counted on to enforce laws against murder" (Humphries, 2009; p. 61).

Television shows tend to enforce the negative stereotype that comes with being victimized. Unfortunately, crimes happen often, leaving behind a plethora of victims. Some victims feel they cannot report crime for fear that they will be blamed by those around them or even killed by their attackers (Surette, 1998). Furthermore, abusers often tell their victims that they cannot break their silence because of the common belief that, "If you tell, no one is going to believe you" (Anderson, Berkowitz & Donnerstein et al., 2003). Television also teaches children that reporting a crime will, oftentimes, result in punishment and accountability for the criminal. This can be especially difficult for children to understand and make them hesitant to report

crimes for the fear of getting someone they know in trouble—especially if it is someone they "implicitly trust," such as a parent (Eschholz, Chiricos & Gertz, 2003).

Feminist scholars believe that labeling victims as either "good" or "bad" can be detrimental and therefore insist that such categories cease to exist (Benedict, 1992). However, the media regularly depicts victims in such a way (Benedict, 1992). Unfortunately, many crime shows tend to focus on either the "good" victim or the "bad" victim. Furthermore, television shows, more often than not, portray "bad" victims as deserving of being victimized and sometimes, even as prostitutes, drug addicts and drug dealers (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006). Whereas, "good" victims are oftentimes portrayed as innocent and are usually portrayed by children (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006).

The phrase "No Humans Involved" is often used in a criminal series when investigating crimes against prostitutes. Furthermore, some detectives might make inappropriate or even awkward comments about victims. For example, when someone is raped and it is known that he or she is sexually promiscuous, it is not unusual to hear detectives making jokes about the victim's "kinky sexual habits, however they do not discount the possibility of a sexual violation" (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006, p. 308). Nevertheless, there still are certain television series, such as *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit*, which makes sure to state that a "person's sexual practices must not be used to undermine the person's credibility" (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006, p. 308).

Some research has found that people of color are rarely depicted as perpetrators (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006). However, many crime series still enforce the notion that black men are criminals (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006). On television shows, once these men are arrested, they are usually found to be innocent. Although these men have been cleared of the crime, the media still portrays them as dangerous, continuing to fuel a long-standing stereotype (Cuklanz & Moorti,

2006). This misrepresentation can undoubtedly skew with the general population's thoughts about crime and predators. Consequently, these criminal series continue to fortify an unnecessary stereotype that depicts people of color as being "animalistic in their sexual appetite, and lusting after and desiring to rape white women" (George & Martinez, 2002, p. 110).

The ever-growing number of crime shows produced for prime-time television demonstrates just how captivating violence is in our society. Aggression is pervasive in today's media world and its presence can, unknowingly, ruin someone's life—both the victim and assailant (Ardovini-Brooker & Caringella-MacDonald, 2002). Someone might find this as pure entertainment, but it is really showing us that violence is not all that bad. If youth are getting this message at such a young age they may likely grow up believing that this is appropriate behavior and, ultimately, become violent individuals (Anderson, Berkowitz & Donnerstein, et al., 2003).

There have been an abundance of studies conducted on many different aspects of television—from medical dramas to crime shows to reality television. Yinjiao and Ward (2010) examined the depiction of illness in medical dramas and determined that these shows portray a wide variety of illnesses and diseases. They concluded that these shows discuss illnesses and diseases from a medical perspective in that they reference the causes, diagnoses, treatments and prevention of the illnesses (Yinijiao & Ward, 2010). Ley, Jankowski and Brewer (2010) researched the potential impact of forensic crime shows, more specifically *Crime Scene Investigation* (*CSI*), and their possible effect on society's understanding of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) testing. The results of this study demonstrated that "*CSI* tends to depict DNA testing as routine, swift, useful, and reliable and that it echoes broader discourses about genetics" (Ley, Jankowski & Brewer, 2010, p. 51). *CSI* typically implies that DNA analyses have a one-day turnaround process. In reality, DNA analyses can take days, if not weeks or months to complete,

particularly in backlogged forensic labs. Thus, *CSI*'s portrayal of DNA processing may have cultivated unrealistic expectations of quick and easy DNA analysis (Ley, Jankowski & Brewer, 2010).

Now turning to portrayals of women and girls, Neuendorf et al. (2009) studied the media's representation of women in the *James Bond* films. The results of this study found that there was an increase in sexual activity and harm to women over the course of the James Bond franchise (Neuendorf et al, 2009). Signorielli (2003) researched the amount and type of violence depicted on television and found that men are more likely than women to be victimized in the media. Smith et al (1998) conducted a national study to investigate violence on television. The researchers found that women, on television programs, are more likely to be hurt than to inflict harm upon others. Additionally, women are rarely portrayed as violent perpetrators. In fact, they found that only one in ten violent perpetrators on television are women—which is fitting, as most violent offenders are men (Smith et al., 1998). Cecil (2006) researched the representation of troubled girls in the media in order to better comprehend how these girls are portrayed and to distinguish the different messages that are sent to viewers. Perceptions of women delinquents are fashioned, to some extent, by exposure to this group of girls through the media. Cecil (2006) found that the news depicts an abundance of troubled girls ranging anywhere from promiscuous to mean-spirited as well as violent, privileged and powerful, or any combination of these descriptors.

Although the media's representation of crime and violence has been extensively examined, there is a lack of research surrounding the representation of victims and offenders in some more current popular crime dramas. Although these television programs are usually fictional, and most likely only used for entertainment purposes, it is still necessary to think about

how the portrayals of victims and offenders might shape viewers' ideas of "typical" victims and offenders. When television shows only portray a certain type of person as a victim or a certain type of person as a perpetrator, it can negatively impact society's views of these individuals. The goal of this study is to address this issue by examining the portrayal of victims, suspects and offenders on four popular television crime series.

METHOD

The Sample

The goal of the current study is to examine how victims and offenders are portrayed in the media, with a focus on crime shows. This study consists of a content analysis of four television series: *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit, Criminal Minds, Body of Proof* and *Rizzoli & Isles*. Thirteen episodes, from each of the four shows, were randomly selected and coded accordingly. The four television series took place in different metropolitan areas such as Manhattan, Philadelphia, Boston, and Quantico.

To select the four crime shows, sixteen different crime show titles[1] were put into a hat and four slips of paper containing the television series name was pulled from the hat. The four shows that were chosen from the hat became the four shows used in this study. Furthermore, episodes of the four randomly selected crime show series were also randomly selected in a similar manner. Slips of paper with possible episode numbers were placed into a hat and selected. The numbers placed in the first hat corresponded with the number of television seasons available for each television series. The numbers placed in the second hat corresponded with the numbers of available episodes for each television season. For example, at the time of this study

[1] The sixteen crime shows included in the pool were: *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit, Law and Order, Law and Order: Criminal Intent, Criminal Minds, Body of Proof, Rizzoli & Isles, CSI: Crime Scene Investigation, CSI: New York, CSI: Miami, NCIS, NCIS: Los Angeles, The Wire, Bones, Blue Bloods, Cold Case,* and *Flashpoint.*

Body of Proof only had a total of two television seasons available. Furthermore, *Body of Proof* had a limited number of episodes in the first season. However, its second season had twenty episodes. I focused on one television series at a time since they all had a different amount of seasons and episodes available. I picked one slip of paper from the hat that correlated to the season that would be watched for this study. Next, I picked one slip of paper from the hat correlated to the episode that would be watched for this study. The two slips of paper were recorded and then put back into the hat. If a season and episode were already recorded as a pair, and the same pair was pulled from the hat, I would replace them and pull out two new slips of paper. There were also occasions when I pulled a season and episode that did not exist for the particular show in question. If this occurred, I would replace them and pull out two new slips of paper. I would repeat this until I finally had a season and episode that existed.

Limitations of the Study

As with many studies, this study was not without limitations. The coding was done solely by the author, and it is possible that others might code behaviors or characteristics differently as there is a bit of subjectivity to the analyses. It is also possible that even with random selection, the series and episodes that I selected were not representative of television crime shows. Also, given that I tried to collect data on any variable I thought might become important, there was a significant amount of unknown data. For example, sexual orientation was not always addressed. Finally, because the shows often focused on quite bizarre offenses, it was difficult to find statistical patterns.

Coding the Data

The method that was used to collect, code and analyze the content of the television crime shows was a content analysis. Neuendorf (2002) describes a content analysis as "a summarizing,

quantitative analysis of messages that relies on the scientific method" (p. 10). There were two units of analysis used while coding. Coding of the entire show included the year of the episode, number of victims, number of suspects, number of offenders, type of crime and time of the crime. The second unit of analysis included individual victims, suspects and offenders. Comprehensive demographics were recorded for each victim, suspect and offender. Some of the demographics included race, class, sex, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, victim-offender relationship as well as many other detailed characteristics. More specifically, because a particular unit of analysis in the large file (an episode of a television crime show) could have more than one victim, suspect, or offender, it was difficult to accurately reflect each of these categories without transforming the large data file into separate files. Thus, in addition to making a large data matrix with the 52 crime show episodes and 814 variables, five additional data matrices were developed from this large file: one that included 113 variables on 151 victims, one that included 45 variables on 154 suspects, one that included 68 variables on 74 offenders, one that included 9 variables on 50 criminal proceedings and one that included 30 variables on 95 crimes.

Construction of Variables

The descriptions and measurements of each variable can be found in the appendix. In some cases I created new categories from the ones I collected. For example, I started a new category named "victim pregnant" when one of the victims was pregnant. I did this because it was hard to account for a pregnancy, when determining the number of children a victim had in each case. Furthermore, I added the variables: "drugged," "took drugs," and "what drug" when there was a drug in the victim or perpetrator's system. These variables were created to help me keep track of what type of drug was discovered in the victim's or perpetrator's system, and to account for voluntary and involuntary drug use.

Analyses

Once all of the data was entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), frequencies were run to clean the data and determine how television shows portray victims, suspects and offenders. Correlational and chi-square analyses were conducted to examine bivariate relationships.

RESULTS

This section will identify some of the significant relationships, but also include some of the non-significant relationships that may be unexpected. As stated above, the frequencies of the variables regarding victims, suspects, offenders and general crime information will be reported. Correlational and chi-square analyses will also be reported regarding bivariate relationships.

Overall Prevalence and Descriptive Findings

The "Typical" Victim

The "typical" victim on these television shows was a White, woman with brown hair, brown eyes, between the ages of 20-29 and at a healthy weight. This victim was typically a student who was single, straight and a member of the upper class. Additionally, she rarely had tattoos or piercings. See Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7.

The "Typical" Suspect

The "typical" suspect on these criminal television series was a White, man between the ages of 19-29 with brown hair, brown eyes and at a healthy weight. He was also likely to be portrayed as middle-class, but could be working a blue-collar job. Additionally, this suspect was typically single, straight and without any piercings or tattoos. Lastly, he was often an

acquaintance of the victim's, as well as likely to be arrested and the charges were usually not dropped. See Table 8.

The "Typical" Perpetrator

The "typical" perpetrator portrayed on these television shows was a White man between the ages of 30-39, with brown eyes, brown hair and part of the middle class. He was likely to be straight, single, at a healthy weight, without any piercing or tattoos, and often either an offender or working an illegal job. He was also likely to be an acquaintance of the victim's, as well as to be arrested and not have the charges dropped. See Table 9.

The "Typical" Crime and Criminal Proceedings

The "typical" crime on these television shows usually occurred at night and in a private location. There were likely to be two victims and the crime was most likely to be murder. If a trial occurred, the prosecutor and judge were likely to be women and the public defender was most likely to be a man. The case was not likely to be dismissed and the verdict was usually "guilty". See Tables 2 and 3.

The Victims

There were 151 victims portrayed on the 52 television episodes that were coded. One in five episodes (21.2%) portrayed only one victim. Slightly more than a quarter of the episodes (28.8%) featured two victims. Furthermore, 25.0% of the time, three victims were portrayed per episode, and almost a quarter of the episodes (24.9%) featured anywhere from four to six victims per episode. Victims were most commonly women (60.3%). Furthermore, 88.7% of victims were White, 8.6% were African American and 2.6% were Latino/a. The majority of the victims (30.6%) were between the ages of 20-29 and 25.5% of the victims were between the ages of ten and nineteen. Furthermore, victims were most commonly students (22.7%), which made sense

considering the majority of the victims fell between the ages of ten and twenty-nine. Moreover, victims were oftentimes members of the upper class (50.7%). Lastly, 68.2% of the victims were single. See Table 4 for a detailed view of the victim demographics.

In regards to the general descriptors of the victims, please see Table 5. The majority of the victims had brown hair (70.3%). In addition, 83.9% of the victims had brown eyes. It was also most common for the victim to be in a normal or healthy weight range (96%). One interesting fact was that only 9.0% of victims had piercings and 4.7% had tattoos.

The research concluded that more than half of the victims were likely to die (52.3%) as a result of being a crime victim. Furthermore, only 39.7% of victims received medical attention and of the victims that received medical attention, 85.1% of them went to the hospital. In addition, 36.5% of victims had a rape kit done and 27.9% of victims had an STD check performed. Among the fatalities depicted on these shows, 60% of victims had an autopsy conducted on them. These shows typically used the following types of violent deaths: blunt force trauma (14.8%), gunshot (12.9%), missing genitals (8.8%), poisoned (7.6%) and strangled (7.4%). See Table 6 for more information regarding the general descriptors of the victims of these crimes.

The vast majority of victims were considered cooperative (82.1%), scared (87.7%) and withdrawn (36.4%). Furthermore, more than a third (36.4%) of the victims blamed themselves for the crime and 5.6% of the victims were lying about at least one factor of the crime. Contrary to popular belief, only 2.4% of victims were questioned about what they were wearing during their victimization. However, an alarming amount of victims (98.7%) were asked about their sex lives. Furthermore, a fraction of victims, (13.8%) were drinking alcohol around the time of their victimization—perhaps leaving some to speculate that this was a catalyst in their attack. An

equal percentage (12.8%) of the victims had drugs in their system, whether voluntary or involuntary. Only 2.4% of the victims used drugs voluntarily, whereas, 14.3% of the victims were drugged. See Table 7 for detailed information about the general descriptors of the victim's actions during and after the crime.

The Crimes

Most of the crimes portrayed on television shows were committed at night (58.5%) followed by the morning (36.5%), with only a handful committed in the afternoon (3.8%). Crimes were most likely to occur at night in *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (77%), followed by *Criminal Minds* (62%), *Rizzoli & Isles* (54%) and *Body of Proof* (46%). Furthermore, the majority of crimes were committed at a private location (53.8%). The most common offenses portrayed on television where: murder (82.7%), sexual abuse/assault (39.6%), kidnapping (17.3%), physical assault (7.7%) and attempted murder (5.8%). However, from looking at Table 1, which is below, it is clear that the crimes portrayed most often on television are not the most common crimes committed in reality. One may conclude that the most frequently committed crimes in real life are not the same as the most frequently committed crimes on television because larceny-theft, burglary and robbery are not as fascinating and gripping as murder, sexual assault/abuse and kidnapping. Please also see Table 2.

Table 1. The Five Most Frequently Portrayed Crimes on Television Compared to the Five Most Frequently Committed Crimes in Real Life

Television Crimes*	Real Life Crimes**
1. Murder	1. Larceny-Theft
2. Sexual Assault/Abuse	2. Burglary
3. Kidnapping	3. Robbery
4. Assault	4. Forcible Rape
5. Attempted Murder	5. Murder

---

*Based on 52 television episodes
**Based on the Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Report

The Suspects and Perpetrators

There were a total of 154 suspects and the average number of suspects per episode was 2.96. The total number of perpetrators came to 74 with the average number of perpetrators per episode being 1.42. Only 8% of the episodes included a trial; however, this could be due to the fact that not all of the shows focused on the criminal proceedings that generally occur once the perpetrator has been caught. Furthermore, the only prosecutors portrayed were women and the only public defenders portrayed were men. Oddly enough, all of the judges on these television crime shows were women, when in reality only 27% of judges in the United States are women (National Association of Women Judges, 2012). The cases were dismissed 25% of the time. This portrayal certainly does not seem realistic. For more information regarding the general descriptors of the criminal case, please see Table 3.

The majority of shows (26.7%) portrayed two suspects per episode and the majority of suspects (78.6%) were men. Furthermore, White individuals were the most common suspects (86.4%). Suspects were, more often than not, between the ages of 19-29, with an average of 25 years, two months (38.1%). In addition, the majority of suspects were employed in blue-collar jobs (19.3%). For more information on the general descriptors of the suspects, see Table 8.

The majority of shows portrayed only one perpetrator (46.7%). Furthermore, perpetrators were most commonly men and boys (68.0%), White (89.2%) and 30-39 years old (40.1%). In addition, most of the perpetrators were either offenders or working an illegal job (20.8%). Perpetrators were mainly members of the middle class (43.1%). Interestingly, seven percent of the perpetrators identified as either gay or lesbian. The most common victim-offender

relationships were: acquaintance (15.2%), friend (9.5%), husband (9.1) and father (7.1). Just over a tenth of the time (12.3%), the perpetrator was not arrested and six percent of the time the charges were dropped. Another interesting fact was that 36.9% of the perpetrators were asked about their sex life. For more information on the general descriptors of the perpetrators, see Table 9.

Findings on Victims

There was a significant relationship between the occurrence of a sexual abuse crime and the television show: *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (84.6%), *Criminal Minds* (38.5%), *Rizzoli & Isles* (30.8%) and *Body of Proof* (0.0%) ($X^2 = 20.15$, $p \leq .001$). *Criminal Minds* episodes ($X = 4.2$) had almost twice as many victims on average per show than the average among the remaining television crime show episodes ($X = 2.4$) ($F = 17.39$, $p \leq .001$). Another interesting finding was that murders were correlated to the location of the crime, meaning that murders were most likely to happen in public ($r = -.42$, $p \leq .001$).

Victims' Sex/Gender

There were many significant bivariate relationships regarding gender. For example, overall, 58.9% of victims did not survive, but women were more likely to survive (49.5%) than men (28.3%) ($X^2 = 6.66$, $p \leq .01$). Furthermore, 60.0% of all deceased victims were autopsied, but male victims (74.6%) were, again, half as likely as female victims (50.0%) to be autopsied. ($X^2 = 8.61$, $p \leq .01$). Turning to the autopsy results of the victims, men (23.0%) were more likely than women (8.1%) to have been drinking when they were victimized ($X^2 = 5.68$, $p \leq .01$). Interestingly, when compared to women, men were more likely to be shot—22.0% of men and 5.7% of women were shot ($X^2 = 3.70$, $p \leq .05$).

Furthermore, the data reveals that among the victims, men (20.3%) were more likely than women (2.3%) to have a prior criminal record ($X^2 = 13.20$, $p \leq .001$). Moreover, women (44%) were more likely than men (15%) to accuse the defendant of something ($X^2 = 9.79$, $p \leq .01$). Lastly, in regards to the demographics of the victims, women (78.7%) were more likely than men (53.4%) to be single ($X^2 = 14.60$, $p \leq .001$).

Victims' Race/Ethnicity

Victim race/ethnicity was also significantly related to a number of variables. African American victims were more likely to receive medical attention (66.7%) than White (29.2%) and Latino/a victims (25.0%) ($X^2 = 7.15$, $p \leq .05$). Regarding class representations among the race/ethnicity of victims, African Americans (46.2%) were most likely to be members of the lower class, Latino/a victims (50.0%) were most often part of the middle class, and White victims (54.1%) were more likely to be members of the upper class ($X^2 = 23.16$, $p \leq .001$).

Few significant relationships were found regarding victims' reactions during and following their victimizations. Exceptions include: all of the Latino/a victims, nine in ten of White victims (91.8%) and 57.1% of African American, as these victims reported feeling scared either during the victimization or after ($X^2 = 6.99$, $p \leq .05$). Although the findings regarding the Latino/a and White victims were expected, it was unexpected to find that the African American victims had a low percentage of feeling scared either during or after victimization. In addition, the most likely victims to accuse the defendant of a crime were: African American (70.0%) followed by Latino/a (50.0%) and White victims (30.1%) ($X^2 = 6.71$, $p \leq .05$). Additionally, Latino/a (25.0%) victims were the most common victims to be asked what they were wearing during their victimization, whereas White victims were only asked what they were wearing 1.7%

of the time and African American victims were never asked what they were wearing during their victimization ($X^2 = 9.28$, $p \leq .01$).

Victims' Hair Color

Surprisingly, victims' hair color was significantly related to some of the variables. For example, red headed victims (100.0%), along with blonde victims (90.3%) and brunette victims (54.8%), were most commonly women. However, gray haired victims (100%) were always men ($X^2 = 28.54$, $p \leq .001$). In addition, 66.7% of red haired victims were drugged, but drugging only occurred in 18.5% of blonde victims, 14.3% of gray haired victims and 11.4% of brunette victims ($X^2 = 7.48$, $p \leq .05$). Half (51.6%) of blonde victims, 94.2% of brunette victims and all (100%) of the victims with gray hair had brown eyes. However, red headed victims were most likely to have blue eyes (60%) ($X^2 = 40.57$, $p \leq .001$). Moreover, blonde victims were the most likely victims to have piercings (25.8%). Whereas none of the red headed or gray haired victims had any piercings. Only 5.1% of Brunette victims had piercings ($X^2 = 13.74$, $p \leq .01$).

Victim Survival

Numerous variables were related to victim survival rates and some were not surprising. For example, 67.7% of the victims that survived received medical attention, whereas, 94.0% of the victims that died did not receive any medical attention ($X^2 = 62.39$, $p \leq .001$). Other significant survival relationships did not have any logic, such as 30.8% of the victims that survived had children with the defendant, while only 4.8% of the victims that died had children with the defendant ($X^2 = 4.33$, $p \leq .05$). In addition, only 4.6% of the victims that did not survive had piercings, whereas, 15.3% of the victims that survived had piercings ($X^2 = 4.92$, $p \leq .05$). Furthermore, victims that did not survive (19.5%) were four times as likely as victims who survived (5.2%) to have been drinking at the time of their victimizations ($X^2 = 6.04$, $p \leq .01$).

Furthermore, only 3.3% of the victims that survived had any prior criminal record, compared to the fact that 14.1% of those who died had a prior criminal record ($X^2 = 4.81$, $p \leq .05$).

Criminal Justice Professionals Questions Regarding Victims' Sex Lives

This subsection refers to whether or not the victim was asked about his/her sex life. The victims that were asked about their sex lives were primarily single (57.1%) followed by married (27.1%), divorced (1.4%) and widowed (1.4%). On the other hand, of the victims that were not asked about their sex lives, 78.2% were single, 15.4% were married, 6.4% were divorced and none was widowed ($X^2 = 8.21$, $p \leq .05$).

Findings Related to the Suspects

Body of Proof (30.6%) had the most suspects followed by *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (27.4%), *Rizzoli & Isles* (25.8%) and *Criminal Minds* (16.1%). Interestingly, the majority of the suspects (47.9%) were members of the middle class, while one in three was a member of the upper class (33.9%) and 18.2% were characterized as lower class. Another interesting finding was the fact that the number of suspects and the suspect's socioeconomic status were directly correlated—as the number of suspects increased, the suspects' socioeconomic status increased as well ($r = .37$, $p \leq .001$).

Suspects by Sex/Gender

Comparing the four crime shows, there were disproportionately more male suspects portrayed in *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (31.1%) followed by *Body of Proof* (26.2%), *Rizzoli & Isles* (25.2%) and *Criminal Minds* (17.5%). Similarly, among the crime shows, women were represented as suspects on *Body of Proof* (52.4%) and *Rizzoli & Isles* (28.6%), while *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (9.5%) and *Criminal Minds* (9.5%) were less likely to use women suspects ($X^2 = 7.61$, $p \leq .05$). Men (85.4%) and women (76.2%) suspects were most

likely to be White (X^2 =14.43, $p \leq .001$). Furthermore, all of the male suspects were heterosexual, as were nearly all (90.5%) of the female suspects (X^2 = 10.14, $p \leq .01$).

In regards to the suspect's general appearance, 83.2% of male suspects were brunette, 10.8% had gray hair, 5.0% were blonde and 1.0% had red hair. Similarly, 61.9% of women suspects were brunette, though a third (33.3%) were blonde and 4.8% had red hair. None of the women suspects had gray hair (X^2 = 19.02, $p \leq .001$).

Suspects by Race/Ethnicity

Sometimes the suspects' race/ethnicity was related to other variables. Eight in ten (81%) White suspects were single, followed by African American suspects (75%), Latino/a suspects (60%), and Asian American suspects (50%) (X^2 = 12.39, $p \leq .05$). Moreover, African American suspects were most likely to be women (62.5%), whereas, Latino/a (100.0%), Asian American (100.0%) and White (84.6%) suspects were most likely to be men (X^2 = 14.43, $p \leq .001$).

Findings Related to the Perpetrators

One interesting finding, in regards to the perpetrators, was that the number of perpetrators and the perpetrators' race/ethnicity were significantly correlated ($r = .24$, $p \leq .05$). Meaning, as the number of perpetrators increased, the likelihood of the perpetrator being White also increased. Furthermore, the show and whether or not the perpetrator survived, were correlated. Perpetrators on *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* and *Criminal Minds* were least likely to survive ($r = -.28$, $p \leq .05$). Alcohol consumption and having an autopsy were correlated. Perpetrators that consumed alcohol were the most likely perpetrators to have an autopsy ($r = .31$, $p \leq .05$). Furthermore, perpetrators who consumed alcohol and arrest rate were correlated. Perpetrators who consumed alcohol were least likely to be arrested ($r = -.31$, $p \leq .05$). This made sense as perpetrators who consumed alcohol were most likely to have an autopsy and therefore,

would not have been arrested. Lastly, the consumption of alcohol and being tested for sexually transmitted diseases were correlated. Perpetrators who consumed alcohol were the most likely to be checked for sexually transmitted diseases ($r = .69$, $p \leq .001$).

Perpetrators' Race/Ethnicity

In some instances the perpetrators' race/ethnicity was related to other variables. First, African American perpetrators were equally likely to be members of the lower (50.0%) and middle (50.0%) classes. However, all (100.0%) of the Latino/a perpetrators and the majority of White perpetrators (37.5%) were identified as members of the middle class ($X^2 = 9.94$, $p \leq .05$). Furthermore, African American perpetrators were as likely to be married as single. White perpetrators were most likely to be single (78.1%) followed by married (20.3%) and divorced (1.6%). Lastly, Latino/a perpetrators were most likely to be single (75.0%) followed by married (20.8%) and divorced (4.2%) ($X^2 =15.00$, $p \leq .01$).

Perpetrators' Sex/Gender

Notably, in all four crime shows, women perpetrators survived all (100.0%) of the time while perpetrators who were men only survived 78.4% of the time ($X^2 = 5.83$, $p \leq .01$). As previously stated, all (100.0%) of the women perpetrators survived, therefore none (0.0%) of the women needed an autopsy. Of the deceased male perpetrators, 25.0% of them had an autopsy conducted ($X^2 = 5.44$, $p \leq .05$). In addition, male perpetrators were most likely to be members of the middle class (53.1%), whereas, female perpetrators were most likely to be members of the upper class (60.9%) ($X^2 = 13.20$, $p \leq .001$).

In regards to the overall appearance of the perpetrators, 85.7% of male perpetrators had brown hair, 10.2% had gray hair, and only 2.0% had red or blonde hair. Women perpetrators were reported to have brown hair 60.9% of the time, blonde 30.4% of the time and red 8.7% of

the time. Notably, none of the women perpetrators had gray hair ($X^2 = 16.61$, $p < .001$). A quarter (25.0%) of the female perpetrators had piercings, while none (0.0%) of the male suspects had any piercings ($X^2 = 10.65$, $p \leq .001$).

Non-significant yet Compelling Findings

The following findings were either non-significant or had small cell-sizes, making statistical significance difficult to determine. Perhaps these directional hypotheses may be tested in further research endeavors.

Findings Related to the Crime

First, *Rizzoli & Isles* was the only show where the majority of crimes (61.5%) were committed in public locations, whereas the majority of the crimes on *Law and order: Special Victims Unit* (61.5%)*, Criminal Minds* (61.5%) and *Body of Proof* (53.8%) were committed in private locations. The highly unusual crime of kidnapping was portrayed most often on *Criminal Minds* (30.8%) and *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (23.1%) and far less likely on *Body of Proof* (7.7%) and *Rizzoli & Isles* (7.7%). Next, all of the episodes of *Body of Proof* and *Rizzoli & Isles* included murders, while under three-quarters of *Criminal* Minds (71%) and slightly over half of *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (54%) included murders. Furthermore, neither *Criminal Minds* nor *Body of Proof* included any physical assault crimes, but 23% of the *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* episodes and 8% of the *Rizzoli & Isles* episodes included crimes of physical assault. Eight percent of *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit, Criminal Minds* and *Rizzoli & Isles* included attempted murders. None of the *Body of Proof* episodes included an attempted murder.

Findings Related to the Victims

Interestingly, the number of victims per episode was not related to the crime show. This was surprising given that *Criminal Minds* is a show about the Behavior Analysis Unit (BAU) at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and this elite team of analysts, is not usually contacted unless there is a serial perpetrator. Furthermore, 67.8% of victims—74.6% men and 63.2% women—did not seek medical attention. In regards to interesting autopsy results, only 12.9% of all victims were killed from being shot. Surprisingly, 8.8% of all victims were missing genitals.

Of all the victims, 88.7% were White. In fact, 91.7% of male victims and 86.8% of female victims identified as White. On a similar note, all of the Latino/a victims and the majority of African American victims (61.5%) and White victims (59.0%) were women. African American victims were more likely to survive (69.2%) victimization, whereas the majority of White (61.2%) and Latino/a victims (75.0%) died. Interestingly, all of the African American victims, with recorded ages, were under the age of eighteen when assaulted. However, 63.6% of White victims and 100.0% of Latino/a victims, with recorded ages, were above the age of eighteen when victimized. Furthermore, Latino/a victims (25.0%) were most likely to have drugs in their systems at the time of their victimization. However, White victims (1.8%) and African American victims (0.0%) were least likely to have drugs in their system at the time of their victimization.

In regards to the victims' demographics, blonde (70.0%), brunette (70.9%) and red headed (60.0%) victims were most commonly single. However, victims with gray hair (42.9%) were most often divorced. Furthermore, red headed victims (50.0%) were the most likely victims to be tested for an STD followed by blonde victims (43.3%), gray haired victims (33.3%) and brunette victims (21.5%). Red headed victims had the biggest percentage of overweight victims

(20.0%). However, the majority of the victims—blonde (96.7%), brunette (98.1%), red headed (80.0%) and gray headed (87.5%)—were at a normal or healthy weight.

Moreover, 28.1% of the victims that died and 51.9% of the victims that survived were under the age of eighteen. In addition, 79.0% of the victims that survived were single, 16.1% were married, 4.8% were divorced and none was widowed. Of the victims that did not survive, 60.5% were single, 24.4% were married, 14.0% were divorced and 1.2% of the victims were widowed. Of the victims that died, 92.1% were White, 4.5% were African American and 3.4% were Latino/a. On the other hand, of those who survived, 83.9% were White, 14.5% were African American and 1.6% were Latino/a. African Americans were three times more likely to survive than die. In regards to the victim's overall appearance, 5.6% of the ones that did not survive were overweight. However, none of the victims that survived was overweight.

The majority (50.7%) of victims—58.3% men and 45.6% women—were categorized as members of the upper class. Furthermore, 61% of all victims were above the age of eighteen at the time of their victimization. In regards to the victim's reactions during or after the crime, 91.1% of women and 75.0% of men reported feeling scared. Furthermore, 39.5% of women and 25.0% of men blamed themselves for being victimized and 8.2% of women lied to the police. None of the male victims lied to the police. Lastly, women (51.0%) were more likely than men (42.4%) to be injured while being victimized.

Surprisingly, 73.1% of victims that were asked about their sex lives had not suffered from any form of sexual abuse/assault, whereas 26.9% of victims that were asked about their sex lives had been victims of at least one form of sexual abuse/assault. This is surprising, as one would expect to be questioned in regards to his/her sex life if he/she was a victim of some form of sexual abuse/assault. This made me wonder what the motivation was for questioning the victim

about his/her sex life when the crime committed against the victim was not sexual in any form. Lastly, female victims (58.3%) were asked about their sex lives only slightly more frequently than male victims (52.7%).

Findings Related to the Suspects

African American suspects (60%) were more likely to be arrested than any other race/ethnicity. However, African American suspects were also the most likely to have the charges against them dropped. The men and women suspects had the same chances of having their charges dropped.

None of the African American suspects was considered overweight, however, 11.7% of the White suspects and 10.0% of the Latino/a suspects were considered overweight. All of the female suspects were in a normal or healthy weight range. However, 12.7% of the male suspects were overweight, leaving 87.3% in a normal or healthy weight range. Furthermore, all of the Asian American suspects, 37.5% of the African American suspects and 35.6% of the White suspects were members of the upper class. Latino/a suspects (60.0%) were most commonly a part of the middle class along with 50.0% of the African American suspects and 47.5% of the White suspects. Lastly, 40.0% of the Latino/a suspects, 16.8% of the White suspects and 12.5% of the African American suspects were members of the lower class.

Findings Related to the Perpetrators

White perpetrators were represented on *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (25.8%), *Criminal Minds* (21.2%), *Body of Proof* (19.7%) and *Rizzoli & Isles* (33.3%). African American perpetrators were only portrayed on *Criminal Minds* (50.0%) and *Body of Proof* (50.0%). Lastly, Latino/a perpetrators were portrayed on *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (50.0%), *Body of Proof* (33.3%) and *Rizzoli & Isles* (16.7%). All of the African American and Latino/a

perpetrators survived. However, only 83.3% of the White perpetrators survived. The only perpetrators that were identified as gay or lesbian were White (7.9%). Furthermore, the only perpetrators to be portrayed as overweight were White (7.8%).

Interestingly, all of the African American and Latino perpetrators were arrested. However, only 86.2% of the White perpetrators were arrested. In addition, none of the African American or Latino/a perpetrators' charges were dropped, but 6.7% of White perpetrators had their charges dropped. Surprisingly, none of the female perpetrators had their charges dropped. However, 9.4% of male perpetrators charges were dropped.

Women perpetrators were portrayed on *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (30.4%), *Criminal Minds* (13.0%), *Body of Proof* (30.4%) and *Rizzoli & Isles* (26.1%). This was interesting because *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* is, more often than not, about crimes of a sexual nature. Furthermore, male perpetrators were portrayed on *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit* (25.5%), *Criminal Minds* (23.5%), *Body of Proof* (17.6%) and *Rizzoli & Isles* (33.3%). White perpetrators (66.1%) were asked about their sex lives more often than African American and Latino/a perpetrators. Lastly, men were asked about their sex lives 69.8% of the time, but women were only asked about their sex lives 50.0% of the time.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to critically examine the representations of victims, suspects and offenders on television criminal series. Previous research has been conducted on the representations of suspects and offenders. However, limited research is available regarding the representations of victims. Furthermore, of the studies already in existence, my study had a much larger data set. This study employed a content analysis in order to critically analyze *Law and*

Order: Special Victims Unit, Criminal Minds, Body of Proof and Rizzoli & Isles. The results from my study prove that there is a very narrow lens in regards to the victims, suspects and perpetrators portrayed on television.

It is very important to widen the lens through which television and other media portray victims, suspects and perpetrators, as it can be dangerous to have such a narrow view. Portraying only a certain victim could make individuals in society believe that there is only one type of victim. When a person is victimized, and s/he does not represent the "typical" victim on television, s/he might be afraid to report the crime. On the other hand, someone who fits the "typical" victim that is portrayed on television might be overly fearful when heading out into the world. S/he might think that s/he is more likely to be a victim, as that is the message s/he is getting from television.

Portraying suspects and perpetrators through a "racist lens" might make society fearful of individuals of color. Television can skew the picture in our minds of what the "typical" suspect or perpetrator looks like, and this could be very dangerous for the police when practicing racial profiling and could cause ordinary citizens to become more suspect of certain races. Although people of color are rarely depicted as perpetrators, crime shows still enforce the idea that they are criminals by suspecting and arresting these individuals (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006). By the end of the episode, these individuals are usually found to be innocent, but television shows are still fuelling this long-standing stereotype by portraying these individuals as suspects (Cuklanz & Moorti, 2006).

Portraying victims through a "racist lens" is equally harmful. This lens, found in the television crime shows, where Latino/a victims were the most likely victims to be questioned about what they were wearing at the time of the crime, could consciously or unconsciously feed

stereotypes by those who watch these shows. This lens also portrayed White victims as the most likely victims to be members of the upper class and Latino/a and African American victims as members of either the lower and middle classes. This representation, whether intentionally or unintentionally, can enforce stereotypes in the audience members.

Perhaps a "male lens" is the reason why the majority of the women on these shows are portrayed as single. Writing through this lens may also be the motivation for frequently asking women victims about their sex lives even at times when it did not seem appropriate. For example, the majority of victims that were asked about their sex lives had not suffered from any form of sexual abuse/assault. This can make one wonder why the victim is even being questioned regarding this aspect of his/her life. One could expect to be questioned in regards to his/her sex life if he/she was a victim of some form of sexual abuse/assault. However, what is the motivation for questioning the victim about his/her sex life when the crime committed against the victim was not sexual in any form?

As stated previously, many of the victims portrayed were young adult women with brown hair, brown eyes and at a healthy weight. Although many individuals in society fit this description, being inclusive of many different types of people is necessary. If the majority of victims are portrayed this way, individuals that do not fit this description may feel that they are not at risk of being victimized. Or on the contrary, if an individual that does not fit this description is victimized, s/he may become fearful of reporting his/her victimization as s/he may feel as though s/he will not be believed.

It is also necessary to understand that these television shows could also desensitize people to violence and victimization, as well as promote distorted stereotypes of crimes, victims, suspects and offenders. It is important to realize that what is shown on television is not reflective

of what occurs in reality as what occurs in reality might not be considered suitable for entertainment purposes.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should include more episodes, and ideally, more television crime series. Such data would allow for more meaningful statistical analyses as well as demonstrate any marked differences in show design. It would also be ideal to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) crime statistics for the years of the episodes in order to compare these episodes to reality.

Furthermore, a researcher might want to examine the "CSI Effect" which is, "The ascribed influence of fictionalized and/or 'reality-based' television crime programs upon audience knowledge and expectation of the criminal justice process" (Huey, 2010, p. 49). The researcher could look at specific variables such as how many days it took to solve a crime on the television show. In order to conduct this study, the researcher could watch *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation, CSI: NY* and *CSI: Miami.* Another interesting topic to research would be the comparison of television shows that cover a case in more than just one episode. For example, the researcher might want to compare popular television series such as *The Killing* and *Dexter.* Both of these television shows cover a case for at least one full season.

REFERNCES

Akers, R. L. (1973). *Deviant behavior: a social learning approach.* Belmont, CA: wadsworth Publishing Company.

Anderson, C. A., Berkowitz, L., Donnerstein, E., Huesmann, L.R., Johnson, D. J., Linz, D., Malamuth, N. M. & Warella, E. (2003). The influence of media violence on youth. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest,* 4(3), 81-110.

Ardovini-Brooker, J. & Caringella-Macdonald, S. (2002) Media attributions of blame and sympathy in ten rape cases. *The Justice Professional,* 15, 3-18.

Bandura, A., Ross, D. & Ross, S. A. (1963). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 66(1), 3-11.

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication,* 28(3), 12-29.

Bandura, A. (1979). The social learning perspective: Mechanisms of aggression. In H. Toch (Ed.). *Psychology of Crime and Criminal Justice* (p. 198-236). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Brinson, S. (1992) The use and opposition of rape myths in prime-time television dramas. *Sex Roles,* 2, 359-75.

Britto, S., Hughes, T., Saltzman, K. & Stroh, C. (2007). Does "special" mean young, white and female? Deconstructing the meaning of "special" in law & order: special victims unit. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture,* 14(1), 39-57.

Bufkin, J. & Eschholz, S. (2000) Images of sex and rape. *Violence Against Women,* 6(12), 1317-

344.

Cecil, D.K. (2006). Violence, privilege and power: Images of female delinquents in film. *Women and Criminal Justice, Vol. 17(4).*

Chermak, S., & Chapman, N. M. (2007). Predicting crime story salience: A replication. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35, 351-363.

Cuklanz, L.M., & Moorti, S. (2006). Televisions 'new' feminism: Prime-time representations of women and victimization. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 23(4), 302-321.

Davis, Angela J. (2009) Arbitrary Justice: The Power of the American Prosecutor. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dominick, J. R. (1973). Crime and law enforcement in the mass media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37 (2), 241-250.

Dowler, Kenneth. (2006). Sex, lies, and videotape: The presentation of sex crime in local television news. *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 34, 383-392.

Du Mont, J., Miller, K. & Myhr, T. (2003). The role of real rape and real victim stereotypes in the police reporting practices of sexually assaulted women. *Violence Against Women,* 9, 466-486.

Earles, K.A., Alexandar, R., Johnson, M., Liverpool, J. & McGhee, M. (2002). Media influences on children and adolescents: Violence and sex. *Journal of the National Medical Association,* 94(9), 797-801.

Entman, R. M. (1990). Modern racism and the images of blacks in local television news. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 7, 332-345.

Eschholz, S., Chiricos, T. & Gertz, M. (2003). Television and fear of crime: Program

types, audience traits and the mediating effect of perceived neighborhood racial composition. *Social Problems,* 50(3), 395-415.

Gil, D. G. (1971). Violence against children. *Journal of Marriage and Family,* 33(4), 637-648.

Goodey, J. (1997). Boys don't cry: Masculinities, fear of crime and fearlessness. *The British Journal of Criminology,* 37(3), 401-418.

Grusec, J. E. (1992). Social learning theory and developmental psychology: The legacies of robert sears and albert bandura. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(5), 776-786.

Heath, L. & Petraitis, J. (1987). Television viewing and fear of crime: Where is the mean world? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 8, 97-123.

Huey, L. (2010). I've seen this on CSI: criminal investigators' perceptions about the management of public expectations in the field. *Crime Media Culture,* 6, 49-68.

Humphries, D. (2009). Constructing murderers: Female killers of law and order. In D. Humphries (Ed.), *Women, Violence, and the Media* (p. 57-74). Boston, MA: University Press of New England.

Ley, B.L., Jankowski, N. & Brewer, P.R. (2010). Investigating *CSI*: Portrayals of DNA testing on a forensic crime show and their potential effects. *Public Understanding of Science,* 21(1), 51-67.

Levin, J. & Thomas, A.R. (1997). Experimentally manipulating race: Perceptions of police brutality in an arrest: a research note. *Justice Quarterly*, *14*, 577-587.

Mowrer, O.H. (1960). Learning theory and the symbolic processes. New York, NY: Wiley Publications.

National Association of Women Judges. (2012). Representation of United States state court judges. Retrieved from: http://www.nawj.org/us_state_court_statistics_2012.asp

Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neuendorf, K.A., Gore, T.D., Dalessandro, A., Janstova, P. & Snyder-Suhy, S. (2010). Shaken and stirred: A content analysis of women's portrayals in james bond films. *Sex Roles.* 62, 747-761.

Nixon, K., Tutty, L., Downe, P., Gorkoff, K. & Ursel, J. (2002). The everyday occurrence: Violence in the lives of girls exploited through prostitution. *Violence Against Women,* 8(9), 1016-1043.

Palmer, C. (1989). Is rape a cultural universal? A re-examination of the ethnographic data. *Ethnology,* 28(1), 1-16.

Renner, L. M. (2012). Intrafamilial physical victimization and externalizing behavior problems: Who remain the 'forgotten' children? *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 17, 158-170.

Sacco, Vincent. (1998). Media constructions of crime. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 539, 141-154.

Signorielli, N. (2003). Prime-time violence 1993-2001: Has the picture really changed? *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media.* 47(1), 36-50.

Smith, S.L., Wilson, B. J., Kunkel, D., Linz, D., Potter, W. J., Donnerstein, E., Blumenthal, E. & Berry M. (1998). Violence in television programming overall: University of California, Santa Barbara study. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sparks, R. (1995). Television and the drama of crime: Moral tales and the place of crime in public life. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Surette, R. (1998). Images and realities: Media, crime, and criminal justice. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Welch, M., Price, E. A. & Yankey, N. (2002). Moral panic over youth violence: Wilding and the

manufacture of menace in the media. *Youth Society,* 34, 3-30.

Yinjiao, Y. & Ward, K. E. (2010). The depiction of illness and related matters in two top-ranked primetime network medical dramas in the united states: A content analysis. *Journal of Health Communication,* 15, 555-570.

TABLES

Table 2. General Descriptors of the Crime

Variable	N	%	(n)
Time of Day	52		
morning		36.5	(19)
afternoon		3.8	(2)
night		58.5	(31)
Location	52		
public		46.2	(24)
private		53.8	(28)
Most Common Offenses [1]	79		
murder		82.7	(43)
sexual abuse/assault		39.6	(20)
kidnap		17.3	(9)
assault (physical)		7.7	(4)
attempted murder		5.8	(3)
Number of Victims [2]	52		
1		21.2	(11)
2		28.8	(15)
3		25.0	(13)
4-6		24.9	(13)

[1]Out of the 52 episodes, there were many episodes that had multiple crimes within the episode.
[2]The average number of victims per episode was 2.85. There were 151 victims total, however, this variable represents the final number of victims per episode. For example, fifteen episodes had a total of two victims.

Table 3. General Descriptors of the Criminal Case

Variable	N	%	(n)
Number of Suspects [1]	52		
1		12	(5)
2		26.7	(15)
3		17.3	(9)
4		21.3	(11)
5		22.7	(12)

Number of Perpetrators [2]	52		
1		46.7	(26)
2		36.0	(17)
3		4.0	(2)
4		5.3	(3)
5		6.7	(4)
Was there a Trial?	50		
no		92.0	(46)
yes		8.0	(4)
Sex of the Prosecutor [3]	3		
male		0.0	(0)
female		100.0	(3)
Sex of the Public Defender [4]	3		
male		100.0	(3)
female		0.0	(0)
Sex of the Judge [5]	2		
male		0.0	(0)
female		100.0	(2)
Was the Case Dismissed?	4		
no		75.0	(3)
yes		25.0	(1)
What was the Verdict? [6]	3		
guilty		100.0	(3)
not guilty		0.0	(0)
Sentencing	3		
20 years		33.3	(1)
give up custody		33.3	(1)
unknown		33.3	(1)

[1]There was a total of 154 suspects and the average number of suspects per episode was 2.96. It is important to note that this is reporting the final number of suspects that were on each episode. For example, five episodes only had one suspect, where as fifteen episodes had two suspects.
[2]There was a total of 74 perpetrators and the average number of perpetrators per episode was 1.42 It is important to note that this variable is only reporting the final number of perpetrators that were on each episode. For example, twenty-seven episodes portrayed two perpetrators, creating a total of fifty-four perpetrators.
[3]All of the prosecutors represented on these crime shows were female.
[4]All of the public defenders represented on these crime shows were male.

[5]All of the judges represented on these crime shows were female.
[6]The only verdicts delivered on these crime shows were guilty verdicts.

Table 4. Victim Demographics

Variable	N	%	(n)
Victim Sex	151		
male		39.7	(60)
female		60.3	(91)
Race/Ethnicity [1]	151		
White		88.7	(134)
African American		8.6	(13)
Latino/a		2.6	(4)
Victim's Age	59		
0-9		17.0	(10)
10-19		25.5	(15)
20-29		30.6	(18)
30-39		13.6	(8)
40-49		10.2	(6)
50-69		3.4	(2)
Most Common Jobs for Victims	54		
student		22.7	(25)
white Collar		18.2	(20)
witch		15.5	(17)
unemployed		11.8	(13)
offender/Illegal		8.2	(9)
Socioeconomic Status	150		
lower Class		10.0	(15)
middle class		39.3	(59)
upper class		50.7	(76)
Victim's Sexual Orientation	148		
straight		97.3	(144)
gay/lesbian		2.0	(3)
bisexual		0.7	(1)
Relationship Status	148		
single		68.2	(101)
married		20.9	(31)
divorced		10.1	(15)

widowed	0.7	(1)

[1]The only races/ethnicities represented on these crime shows were African Americans, Whites and Latinos/as.

Table 5. General Descriptors of the Victim

Variable	N	%	(n)
Hair Color	148		
blonde		20.9	(31)
brown		70.3	(104)
red		3.4	(5)
gray		5.4	(8)
Eye Color [1]	149		
blue		16.1	(24)
brown		83.9	(125)
Body Type	151		
underweight		0.7	(1)
healthy/normal weight		96.0	(145)
overweight		3.3	(5)
Piercings [2]	145		
yes		9.0	(13)
no		91.0	(132)
If the victim had piercings, how many were visible?	14		
2		78.6	(11)
5		14.3	(2)
15		7.1	(1)
Tattoos [3]	148		
yes		4.7	(7)
no		95.3	(141)
If the Victim had tattoos, how many were visible?	7		
1		57.1	(4)
3		14.3	(1)
4		14.3	(1)
5		14.3	(1)

[1]All eye colors were coded as either Blue or Brown as it was sometimes hard to differentiate hazel, green, brown and black.
[2]Piercings were recorded if the piercings were visible.
[3]Tattoos were recorded if the tattoos were visible.

Table 6. General Descriptors of the Victim in Regards to the Crime

Variable	N	%	(n)
Did the Victim Survive?	151		
yes		47.7	(72)
no		52.3	(79)
Did the Victim Get Medical Attention?	146		
yes		39.7	(58)
no		60.3	(88)
If the Victim Got Medical Attention, when?	47		
right away		86.9	(40)
hours later		13.1	(7)
Did the medical attention include a trip to the hospital?	47		
yes		85.1	(40)
no		14.9	(7)
Did the Medical Attention Include a Trip to the Doctor?	79		
yes		2.5	(2)
no		97.5	(78)
Was a Rape Kit Done?	123		
yes		36.5	(45)
no		63.5	(78)
Was there an STD Check?	122		
yes		27.9	(34)
no		72.1	(88)
Was an Autopsy Performed?	150		
yes		60.0	(90)
no		40.0	(60)
Most Common Causes of Death	30		
blunt force trauma		14.8	(8)
shot		12.9	(8)
missing genitals		8.8	(6)

poisoned	7.6	(5)
strangled	7.4	(4)

Table 7. General Descriptors of the Victim's Actions During and After the Crime

Variable	N	%	(n)
Was the victim Cooperative?	56		
yes		82.1	(46)
no		17.9	(10)
Was the Victim Scared?	57		
yes		87.7	(50)
no		12.3	(7)
Was the Victim Withdrawn?	56		
yes		35.7	(20)
no		64.3	(36)
Was the Victim Blaming Self?	55		
yes		36.4	(20)
no		63.6	(35)
Was the Victim Lying?	71		
yes		5.6	(4)
no		94.4	(67)
Was the Victim Asked What He/She was Wearing?	127		
yes		2.4	(3)
no		97.6	(124)
Comment Made About Victims Clothing	140		
yes		0.7	(1)
no		99.3	(139)
Was the Victim Drinking Alcohol?	145		
yes		13.8	(20)
no		86.2	(125)
Were there drugs in the victims system?	148		
yes		12.8	(19)
no		87.2	(129)

Victim Used Drugs	126		
yes		2.4	(3)
no		97.6	(123)
Victim was Drugged?	119		
yes		14.3	(17)
no		85.7	(102)
Did the Victim have any Priors?	145		
yes		13.8	(20)
no		86.2	(125)
Was the Victim Injured?	149		
yes		51.7	(77)
no		48.3	(72)
Was the Victim Asked About His/Her Sex Life?	151		
yes		54.9	(83)
no		45.1	(68)

Table 8. General Descriptors of the Suspects

Variable	N	%	(n)
Suspect Sex	154		
male		78.6	(121)
female		21.4	(33)
Suspect Race/Ethnicity	154		
African American		5.8	(9)
White		86.4	(133)
Latino/a		6.5	(10)
Asian American		1.3	(2)
Suspect Age[1]	34		
0-10		0.0	(0)
11-18		26.4	(9)
19-29		38.1	(13)
30-39		20.5	(7)
40-49		14.7	(5)
Most Common Suspect Jobs	99		
white collar		12.8	(14)
blue collar		19.3	(21)

government/criminal justice system		9.2	(10)
health care		8.3	(9)
offender/illegal job		11.9	(13)
student		17.4	(19)
witch		11.9	(13)
Suspect Socioeconomic Status	151		
lower class		15.9	(24)
middle class		45.7	(69)
upper class		38.4	(58)
Suspect Sexuality	154		
straight		97.4	(150)
gay/lesbian		2.6	(4)
bisexual		0.0	(0)
Suspect Relationship Status	150		
single		78.0	(117)
married		16.7	(25)
divorced		5.3	(8)
widowed		0.0	(0)
Suspect Hair Color	151		
blonde		9.9	(15)
brunette		81.5	(123)
red		1.3	(2)
gray		7.3	(11)
Suspect Eye Color	152		
blue		9.2	(14)
brown		90.8	(138)
Suspect Body Type	153		
underweight		0.0	(0)
healthy/normal weight		90.2	(138)
overweight		9.8	(15)
Did the Suspect Have Any Piercings	152		
no		94.8	(144)
yes		5.3	(8)
Did the Suspect have any Tattoos?	152		
no		97.4	(148)
yes		2.6	(4)
Most Common Victim-Offender Relationships	41		

acquaintance		15.9	(13)
friend		9.8	(9)
boyfriend		14.6	(7)
father		8.3	(7)
brother		5.1	(5)
Was the Suspect Arrested?	153		
no		45.1	(69)
yes		54.9	(84)
Were the Charges Dropped?	98		
no		84.8	(56)
yes		15.2	(42)

[1]The average suspect age is 25.15

Table 9. General Descriptors of the Perpetrators

Variable	N	%	(n)
Perpetrator Sex	74		
male		68.0	(50)
female		32.0	(24)
Perpetrator Race/Ethnicity	68		
African American		2.7	(2)
White		89.2	(66)
Latino/a		8.1	(6)
Perpetrator Age	15		
0-10		0.0	(0)
11-18		13.4	(2)
19-29		26.5	(4)
30-39		40.1	(6)
40-49		20.0	(3)
Most Common Perpetrator Job	46		
white collar		13.2	(7)
blue collar		18.9	(10)
government/criminal justice system		7.5	(4)
offender/illegal job		20.8	(11)
student		11.3	(6)
witch		15.1	(8)

Perpetrator Socioeconomic Status	72		
lower class		25.0	(18)
middle class		43.1	(31)
upper class		31.9	(23)
Perpetrator Sexuality	71		
straight		93.0	(66)
gay/lesbian		7.0	(5)
Perpetrator Relationship Status	72		
single		75.0	(54)
married		20.8	(15)
divorced		4.2	(3)
Perpetrator Hair Color	72		
blonde		11.1	(8)
brunette		77.8	(56)
red		4.2	(3)
gray		6.9	(5)
Perpetrator Eye Color	72		
blue		6.9	(5)
brown		93.1	(67)
Most Common Victim-Offender Relationships	15		
acquaintance		15.2	(5)
friend		9.5	(4)
husband		9.1	(3)
father		7.1	(3)
Did the Perpetrator Survive?	74		
no		14.9	(11)
yes		85.1	(63)
Perpetrator Body Type	72		
healthy/normal weight		93.1	(67)
overweight		6.9	(5)
Did the Perpetrator have any Visible Piercings?	59		
no		91.5	(54)
yes		8.5	(5)
Did the Perpetrator have any Visible Tattoos?	57		
no		98.2	(56)
yes		1.8	(1)

Was the Perpetrator Arrested?	73		
no		12.3	(9)
yes		87.7	(64)
Where the Charges Dropped?	50		
no		94.0	(47)
yes		6.0	(3)
Did the Perpetrator Need Medical Attention?	57		
no		93.0	(53)
yes		7.0	(4)
Was the Perpetrator tested for STD's?	19		
yes		89.5	(17)
no		10.5	(2)
Was an Autopsy Performed on the Perpetrator?	58		
no		82.8	(48)
yes		17.2	(10)
Was the Perpetrator Asked about His/Her Sex Life?	65		
no		36.9	(24)
yes		63.1	(41)

APPENDIX

Variables Related to the Episode:

Show: What show was this episode from? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit*, 2 = *Criminal Minds*, 3 = *Body of Proof*, 4 = *Rizzoli & Isles.*

Season: What season was this episode from? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3, 4 = 4, 5 = 5, 6 = 6, 7 = 7, 8 = 8, 9 = 9, 10 = 10, 11 = 11, 12 = 12, 13 = 13.

Episode Number: What was the episode number? This variable is represented by the following numbers: 1-30.

Year of Episode: What year was the episode recorded? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 2000, 1 = 2001, 2 = 2002, 3 = 2003, 4 = 2004, 5 = 2005, 6 = 2006, 7 = 2007, 8 = 2008, 9 = 2009, 10 = 2010, 11 = 2011, 12 = 2012.

Variables Related to the Crime:

Crime: Qualitative representation of the crime that was committed.

Time of Day: What time of the day was it when the crime was committed? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1= morning, 2= afternoon, 3= night.

Location: Where did the crime take place? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = private, 1= public.

Variables Related to the Victims:

Number of Victims: How many victims were portrayed in the episode? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 0, 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3, 4 = 4, 5 = 5, 6 = 6.

Sex of Victim: Whether the victim was a male or a female. This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

Victim Survive: Whether or not the victim survived the crime. This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Medical Attention: Whether or not the victim received medical attention. This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

When Medical Attention: This was a subsection of "Medical Attention"—When was the medical attention was received? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Right Away, 2 = Hours Later.

Hospital: This was a subsection of "Medical Attention"—If the victim received medical attention, did the medical attention included a trip to the hospital. This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Doctor: This was a subsection of "Medical Attention"—Did the medical attention include a trip to the doctor? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Rape Kit: Was a rape kit performed on the victim: This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim STD Check: Was the victim checked for sexually transmitted diseases? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Autopsy: Was an autopsy performed on the victim? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Autopsy Results: Qualitative representation of the results of the autopsy.

Race/Ethnicity: What was the victim's race/ethnicity? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = African American, 2 = White, 3 = Latino/a, 4 = Asian American.

Age: What was the victim's age? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 0 – 10, 1 = 11 – 18, 2= 19 – 29, 3 = 30 – 39, 4 = 40 – 49, 5 = 50 – 59, 6 = 60 – 69, 7 = 70 – 79, 8 = 80 – 89, 9 = 90 – 99.

Job: What was the victim's job? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Unemployed, 2 = White collar, 3 = Blue collar, 4 = Government/Criminal Justice Official, 5 = Military, 6 = Health Care, 7 = Offender/Illegal, 8 = Student, 9 = Witch, 10 = Other.

Victim Social Economic Status: What was the social economic status of the victim? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Lower Class, 2 = Middle Class, 3 = Upper Class.

Sexuality: What was the victim's sexuality? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Straight, 2 = Gay/Lesbian, 3 = Bisexual.

Status: What was the victim's relationship status? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Single, 2 = Married, 3 = Divorced, 4 = Widowed.

Hair Color: What was the victim's hair color? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Blonde, 2 = Brunette, 3 = Red, 4 = Gray, 5 = Other.

Eye Color: What was the victim's eye color? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1= Blue, 2 = Brown.

Body Type: What was the victim's body type regarding his or her weight? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Underweight, 2 = Healthy/Normal weight, 3 = Overweight.

Piercings: Did the victim have any visible piercings? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Tattoos: Did the victim have any visible tattoos? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Cooperative: Was the victim cooperative when talking to the police? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Scared: Was the victim scared during or after the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Withdrawn: Was the victim withdrawn during or after the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Blaming Self: Was the victim blaming him or her self for the crime committed against him/her? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Lying: Did the victim lie about anything in regards to the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Asked What Wearing: Was the victim asked what he or she was wearing at the time of the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Comment Made About Clothes: Was a comment made about the victim's clothing? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

By Detective: This is a subsection of "Comment made about clothes"—If a comment was made about the victim's clothing, was the comment made by a detective? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

By Someone Else: This is a subsection of "Comment made about clothes"—If a comment was made about the victim's clothing, was the comment made by someone other than a detective? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Alcohol: Was the victim drinking alcohol? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Drugging: Were any drugs in the victim's body? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Took Drugs: Did the victim take any drugs? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Was Drugged: Was the victim drugged? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Priors: Did the victim have any priors? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Injured: Was the victim injured? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes

Anyone Else See Injures: If the victim was injured, did anyone see them besides the victim? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Accuse Defendant: Did the victim accuse the defendant of anything? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Have Children: Did the victim have any children? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Pregnant: This is a subsection of "Victim Have Children"—Was the victim pregnant? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Children With Defendant: This is a subsection of "Victim Have Children"—Did the victim have any children with the defendant? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Victim Sex Life: Was the victim asked about his or her sex life? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Disabled: Was the victim disabled? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Variables Related to the Suspects:

Number of Suspects: How many suspects were there in the episode? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 0, 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3, 4 = 4, 5 = 5.

Suspect Gender: Was the suspect male or female? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

Suspect Race/Ethnicity: What was the suspect's race/ethnicity? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = African American, 2 = White, 3 = Latino/a, 4 = Asian American.

Suspect Age: What was the age of the suspect? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 0 – 10, 1 = 11 – 18, 2= 19 – 29, 3 = 30 – 39, 4 = 40 – 49, 5 = 50 – 59, 6 = 60 – 69, 7 = 70 – 79, 8 = 80 – 89, 9 = 90 – 99.

Suspect Job: What was the suspect's job? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Unemployed, 2 = White collar, 3 = Blue collar, 4 = Government/Criminal Justice Official, 5 = Military, 6 = Health Care, 7 = Offender/Illegal, 8 = Student, 9 = Witch, 10 = Other.

Suspect Socioeconomic Status: What was the suspect's social economic status? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Lower Class, 2 = Middle Class, 3 = Upper Class.

Suspect Sexuality: What was the suspect's sexual orientation? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Straight, 2 = Gay/Lesbian, 3 = Bisexual.

Suspect Status: What was the suspect's relationship status? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1= Single, 2 = Married, 3 = Divorced, 4 = Widowed.

Suspect Hair Color: What was the suspect's hair color? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Blonde, 2 = Brunette, 3 = Red, 4 = Gray, 5 = Other.

Suspect Eye Color: What was the suspect's eye color? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Blue, 2 = Brown.

Suspect Body Type: What was the suspect's body type regarding his or her weight? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Underweight, 2 = Healthy/Normal weight, 3 = Overweight.

Suspect Piercings: Did the suspect have any visible piercings? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Suspect Tattoos? Did the suspect have any visible tattoos? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Relationship to Victim: Qualitative representation of the suspect's relationship to the victim.

Suspect Arrested: Was the suspect arrested? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Charges Dropped: This is a subsection of "Suspect Arrested"—Were the charges against the suspect dropped? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Variables Related to the Perpetrators:

Number of Perpetrators: This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 0, 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3, 4 = 4, 5 = 5.

Perpetrator Sex: What was the sex of the perpetrator? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

Perpetrator Survive: Did the perpetrator survive? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Race/Ethnicity: What was the perpetrator's race/ethnicity? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = African American, 2 = White, 3 = Latino/a, 4 = Asian American.

Perpetrator Age: This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = 0 – 10, 1 = 11 – 18, 2= 19 – 29, 3 = 30 – 39, 4 = 40 – 49, 5 = 50 – 59, 6 = 60 – 69, 7 = 70 – 79, 8 = 80 – 89, 9 = 90 – 99.

Perpetrator Job: What was the perpetrator's job? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Unemployed, 2 = White collar, 3 = Blue collar, 4 = Government/Criminal Justice Official, 5 = Military, 6 = Health Care, 7 = Offender/Illegal, 8 = Student, 9 = Witch, 10 = Other.

Perpetrator Socioeconomic Status: What was the perpetrator's socioeconomic status? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Lower Class, 2 = Middle Class, 3 = Upper Class.

Perpetrator Sexuality: What was the perpetrator's sexuality? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Straight, 2 = Gay/Lesbian, 3 = Bisexual.

Perpetrator Status: What was the perpetrator's relationship status? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1= Single, 2 = Married, 3 = Divorced, 4 = Widowed.

Perpetrator Hair Color: What was the perpetrator's hair color? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Blonde, 2 = Brunette, 3 = Red, 4 = Gray, 5 = Other.

Perpetrator Eye Color: What was the perpetrator's eye color? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Blue, 2 = Brown.

Perpetrator Body Type: What was the perpetrator's body type? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Underweight, 2 = Healthy/Normal Weight, 3 = Overweight.

Perpetrator Piercings: Did the perpetrator have any visible piercings? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Tattoos: Did the perpetrator have any visible tattoos? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Relationship to Victim: Qualitative representation of the perpetrator's relationship to the victim at the time of the crime.

Perpetrator Arrested: Was the perpetrator arrested? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Charges Dropped: This was a subsection of "Perpetrator arrested"—Were the charges against the perpetrator dropped? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Medical Attention: Did the perpetrator receive any medical attention? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

When Medical Attention: This was a subsection of "Perpetrator medical attention"—If the perpetrator received medical attention, when was it received? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 1 = Right Away, 2 = Hours Later.

Hospital: This was a subsection of "Perpetrator medical attention"—If the perpetrator received medical attention, did it include a trip to the hospital? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Regular Doctor: This was a subsection of "Perpetrator medical attention"—If the perpetrator received medical attention, did it include a trip to the doctor? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator STD Check: Was the perpetrator tested for sexually transmitted diseases? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Autopsy: Was an autopsy performed on the perpetrator? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Sex Life: Was the perpetrator questioned about his/her sex life? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Drinking: Was the perpetrator drinking alcohol around the time of the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Drugging: Were the drugs in the perpetrator's system (voluntary or involuntary)? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Took Drugs: Did the perpetrator take drugs around the time of the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator was Drugged: Was the perpetrator drugged (involuntary) around the time of the crime? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Perpetrator Accuse Victim: Did the defendant accuse the victim of anything? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Injury: Was the defendant injured? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Anyone See Injures: Did anyone see the defendant's injuries? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Variables Related to the Criminal Proceedings:

Was there a Trial: Did the episode include a trial? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Sex of Prosecutor: What was the sex of the prosecutor? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

Sex of Public Defender: What was the sex of the public defender? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

Perpetrator Self Represent: Did the perpetrator self represent during the trial? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Judges Sex: What was the judge's sex? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

Treatment of Case: Was the judge leaning toward the prosecution or the defendant? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Prosecution, 1 = Defendant.

Dismissed: Was the case dismissed? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

Verdict: What was the verdict? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = Guilty, 1 = Not Guilty.

Sentencing: Was the defendant sentenced during the episode? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

No Humans Involved: Was the saying "No Humans Involved" mentioned on the show? This variable is represented as the following numerical code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes.