

Perceptions of Guilt in Sensational Cases: The Influence of Media

by

Allison Kozlowski, B.A.

A Thesis

In

Sociology

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
Of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment for
The degree of

Master of Arts

Approved

Committee:

Dr. Ignacio Luis Ramirez, Chair
Dr. Martha Smithey

Dominick Joseph Casadonte
Interim Dean of the Graduate School

May 2013

© 2012 Allison Kozlowski

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Luis Ramirez for offering invaluable assistance, encouragement, and guidance throughout this project. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Martha Smithey for her support and assistance in developing this thesis.

I also wish to thank my parents, Dave and Doreen Kozlowski for their love and encouragement through this process.

Ann Rodriguez for sparking my interest and introducing me to this topic.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgements..... | ii |
| Abstract | iv |
| List of Tables | v |
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Literature Review..... | 2 |
| General Overview of Juries | 2 |
| Biasing During Voir Dire | 4 |
| History of Media | 8 |
| Use of Online News Sources | 14 |
| Perceptions of Guilt Influenced by Media | 14 |
| Incorrect Data Spread through the Media | 22 |
| Pretrial Publicity | 26 |
| Gag Orders | 31 |
| Cases of Wrongful Convictions | 32 |
| Decision Making | 33 |
| Meaning | 35 |
| Summary of Literature Review | 37 |
| III. Theory | 38 |
| IV. Research Design | 46 |
| V. Data Analysis | 48 |
| Correlation Matrix | 52 |
| Bivariate Regressions..... | 53 |
| Hypothesis Testing | 56 |
| VI. Discussion | 61 |
| VII. Conclusion | 65 |
| References | 66 |
| Appendix | 72 |

Abstract

The media has been a major influence on society in recent decades. New forms of media have been invented and continue to influence and impact society. Media also has a major influence on many facets of society and especially perceptions of guilt in sensational cases. The media tends to bias and manipulate how people think and make decisions. Through a review of literature and the theoretical perspective of the social construction of reality, a quantitative analysis of 500 undergraduate students at Texas Tech University was conducted in order to measure perceived levels of guilt in sensationalized media cases and look at factors that could bias and manipulate the decision-making process. This study found that Caucasian females have higher perceptions of guilt. Age also is statistically significant.

List of Tables

1. Demographic Variables... (00000000) (0000) 48

2. Independent Variables and Dependent Variable (00000000) (0) .. (00) 51

3. Correlation of Dependent, Independent, and Demographic Variables (000000000000) 53

4. Regression of Opinion of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized cases and
 ""hours watching TV per week (00) (0) 53

5. Regression of Opinion of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized cases and
 ""hours using Internet per week 0 (00) 54

6. Regression of Opinion of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized cases and
 ""hours listening to the radio per week (00) 54

7. Regression of Opinion of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized cases and
 ""hours reading newspapers or magazines per week 55

8. Regression of Opinion of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized cases and
 ""hours using social media Web sites per week (00) 55

9. Regression of Opinion of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized cases and
 ""discussion with personal networks per week (00) 56

10. Hypothesis 1 Regressions of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized Cases
 ""and Number of Hours Spent Watching TV 56

11. Hypothesis 2 Regressions of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized Cases
 ""and Number of Hours Spent using the Internet 0 57

12. Hypothesis 3 Regressions of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized Cases
 ""and Number of Hours Spent listening to the Radio (000) 57

13. Hypothesis 4 Regressions of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized Cases
 ""and Number of Hours Spent Reading Newspapers and Magazines 58

14. Hypothesis 5 Regressions of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized Cases
 ""and Number of Hours Spent Using Social Media Web Sites (00) 58

15. Hypothesis 6 Regressions of Guilt or Innocence on Publicized Cases
 ""and Discussion with Personal Networks 59

16. Regression of Opinions of Guilt or Innocence on Sensationalized
 ""Cases, gender, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and number of hours spent
 ""watching TV, Internet, radio, newspapers and magazines, and social media, and
 ""personal networks. Hypothesis 7 0 .. 60

Chapter I

Introduction

This paper investigates perceptions of guilt in sensationalized media cases and how people can be biased and manipulated by media sources. I hypothesize that factors such as media exposure to television, the Internet, radio, reading newspapers and magazines, social media Web sites, and interaction with interpersonal networks will increase the likelihood of guilt in the decision-making process. I predict that the Internet will have the greatest affect on the public when it comes to decision-making over any other type of media sources.

Media have been a powerful influence on society since its inception. Whether it is reading a newspaper, watching a newscast, or checking updates on social media Web sites, people are exposed to numerous stories and details of criminal cases, sometimes without even knowing it. Technology and media change constantly and what we have today was not influencing people years or decades ago. With up-to-the-minute updates it is impossible for society to not hear about highly publicized cases. Media's influence on society continues to change, and can effect groups such as juries. It is impossible for anyone to verify all information that various forms of media disseminate on an hourly basis. Furthermore, there have been few studies comparing their influence of traditional media sources (newspapers, magazines, television) to newer media sources (Internet, social media) and the effect they would have on people's perceptions of guilt.

Chapter II

Literature Review

There have been a number of studies done on juries, how they work, and what they do, but not as many on jury bias and manipulation with modern methods of media influence such as Internet use and social media. Juries and society in general can be manipulated and biased based on a number of variables including demographics, education, social networks, and the media, among other things. It is difficult to establish trends and make generalizations based on the little research done on jury manipulation and modern forms of media at this point, but it is evident based on the literature available that traditional media can and does have an influence on jury decision-making. Again, as society advances technologically, so do the methods of media influence. Media influences could then bias a person on a jury and their decision about guilt or innocence.

General Overview of Juries

Voir Dire

Finding sources of jury bias starts with the voir dire process. In theory, the voir dire process is done to reduce bias among jurors. In practice, it is the opposite. Judges and attorneys want to ensure that there are no outside influences on the decisions jurors could make. Sometimes, this involves sequestering juries. Sequestering a jury means to completely isolate them from anyone else or anything else that could potentially give them information related to a case or sway opinions that are different from what is presented to the jurors. Jurors are only allowed to have contact with one another. The main purpose of sequestering is to close off the jurors from any outside influence that could change opinions or give false information. If a juror who is sequestered is caught

leaving the areas they are allowed to be in or using media, etc. they can be fined or placed in prison for contempt of court (Levine 1996).

Rose (2005) measured how jurors view the actual process of voir dire. Voir dire is a preliminary process where the pool of people are selected and examined in order to find the members of the jury. The research looked at how the selected participants have different perceptions of both procedural and distributive justice. Rose found that people who had more protection of their privacy were happier to serve on a jury. Satisfaction with the voir dire process was also rated on how relevant the questions were that were being asked of the potential jurors. The comfort of those being questioned was also important when it came to their satisfaction. Positive perceptions of the attorneys involved in the case were important as well for overall happiness.

Research by Hazelwood and Brigham (1998) studied anonymous jury verdicts and how accountable juries are for their final verdict. This means that if a juror knows that their decision will be anonymous, they may be more inclined to give a harsher sentence. The researchers took twenty, four-person anonymous mock juries as well as twenty, four-person non-anonymous mock juries. They each made an individual decision about a case involving three students that were caught selling drugs on campus. The jurors also made a group decision. Once their decisions were made, the subjects made a decision on what the students' punishment should be and filled out a final survey at the end. The study found that anonymous jurors had a higher conviction rate when the evidence against the defendant was presented well. Anonymous jurors also gave harsher punishments than the non-anonymous jurors. Anonymous jurors said that they did not feel less accountable than the non-anonymous jurors. An anonymous juror also thought

the process was fairer for them than the non-anonymous jurors. The researchers conclude that anonymous jurors give harsher punishments if they do not see the person on trial. They are biased to the person on trial because they know they will never have contact with them and they will never see each other or know whom the jurors were who gave the sentence.

During the voir dire process, people also tend to use terms such as “only”, “just”, “except”, etc. These terms are used in reference to what the potential juror has read from media sources. They put a minimization spin on what they know about the case to make it seem as if they know some but not that much (Vidmar 2002). They believe that they are not supposed to know anything about the case, so they give the socially desirable answer that the judge or attorney want to hear. This minimization vocabulary is an effect that many do not realize they are doing (Vidmar 2002).

The modern jury has many influences and persuasions that can bias them during a trial. The voir dire process is meant to eliminate biasing, but this does not always happen.

Biasing During Voir Dire

The process of jury selection or voir dire is biased. This has been apparent throughout history. Juries started as wealthy, white men. This trend, although a little more diverse can still be seen today. Certain groups are underrepresented while others are overrepresented. Before the 1980s, diversity was barely evident in juries.

Jury Characteristics

People who are young, a minority, a woman, or not very well educated are not represented in juries. Education tends to be the most significant overrepresentation in juries. People who did not finish high school as well as those with postgraduate education

were underrepresented. There is also a bias for the young and old as well as the lower and upper classes similar to education (Hayward et al. 1976).

It is evident that someone who is selected to be on a jury must fit a certain criteria. Unlike the early days of the modern jury, white, middleclass males are the most likely to be chosen. People tend to be biased first by society, then by the media. This can be a problem if they carry that influence when they are chosen to help the prosecution and defense's case.

Biasing Factors during the Trial

Being on a jury can be confusing and intimidating if the case is complex. Judges and attorneys are used to the terminology used in a courtroom, but jurors are not. The entire situation can be stressful, but also boring. It is hard to pay attention for hours, days, weeks, etc. when someone is hearing similar or confusing statements repeatedly.

Evidence can cause jury bias based on how it is presented. When a juror views photographs that are disturbing, they are unable to make a reasonable decision based on the fact that the images or other evidence they viewed had temporarily impaired their mental state or hearing. Evidence that is gruesome and given verbally has little to no effect on juror's decision. However gruesome images or other evidence does have a biasing effect on jurors when it comes to making a decision. Conviction rates are higher when photographs are seen over verbal evidence (Bright and Goodman-Delahunty 2006).

Court instructions are another factor that may bias a juror. Instructions are given to jurors, usually by the judge about what they are to do and what is expected of them throughout the trial. The courtroom jargon and chatter of attorneys can be confusing if a juror is not aware of what the attorneys are talking about. Spackman et al. studied jury

bias when jurors do not understand instructions. The study focuses on murder and manslaughter and the distinction between the two. It also looked at the reasoning in the decision the juries made. The researchers found the reasoning participants gave to murder or manslaughter was similar to the instructions they received. Convictions were given most when the defendant had a previous criminal history with the victim. The media could influence how a juror takes in instructions. If a person watches a lot of television or movies that have court scenarios, this may lead them to think that they know what is going on in the courtroom. This is more than likely untrue since many crime shows on television are sensationalized and have fictitious plots and facts to bring in viewers.

Biasing can be caused by how much someone knows about the law.

Comprehension of instructions and what is happening during the trial are important, so knowing what is going on is beneficial to the juror. When jurors' asked questions of the judge such as those over procedural law, understanding improved greatly. Judges also tend to not encourage questions by jurors (Reifman et al. 1992). Reifman et al. found jurors understand less than half of instructions given to them when they become jurors versus getting the information about trials on television or through the Internet.

Past juror experience can also have a biasing effect on jurors. Jurors who have been on a jury in the past are more likely to convict over those who have never served on a jury previously because the guilty conviction is usually easier. In relation to this, jury consultants prefer those who are new to serving on a jury. A jury or trial consultant is someone who assists judges and attorneys in the courtroom with the voir dire process and other aspects of the trial. Jury conviction in relation to juror experience is small, but still

evident. Those who have served on a jury before are significantly more likely to convict over those who have not (Dillehay et al. 1985).

Trial Delays

Trial delays are when the trial is pushed to a later date based on a number of circumstances. Delaying of trials can make jurors biased because they have time to gather more information through the media or through their interpersonal networks. Jurors may change opinions, not remember facts accurately and a number of other causes that could not give a fair trial. Memory bias can affect decision-making abilities. Previous decisions can influence future decisions. After longer periods of time people are more likely to deliver a guilty verdict since there was more time to gather information and get other opinions that could bias them (Sherrod 1985). People also tend to change memories they have in order to make them more appealing to their emotions. Negative media coverage could also potentially affect emotions as well. People will also alter their attitudes to justify something else, leading them to have memories that did not actually happen. Memory bias is evident when a long period of time passes. More information is remembered when attitudes are similar to their own (Sherrod 1985).

Race and Gender as a Biasing Factor

Race can be a biasing factor for many different reasons dealing with juries. Race can be used during the voir dire process if it is evident the potential juror seems to be racist towards the defendant. Race can also be a factor when peremptory challenges are used. Judgments of those on trial vary based on the race of the juror. Black jurors tend to be challenged at a higher percentage than White jurors. Less than 10 percent (according to a study done by Sommers and Norton) say that race was a factor when

deciding on peremptory judgments of the jurors. Their reasoning was based on what jurors said during the voir dire process. College students also used race as a factor when it came to decision of guilt from a juror. The researchers found that peremptory judgments do tend to relate to race, but when reasoning is given, it is race-neutral (Sommers and Norton 2007).

Gender can also influence how males and females form opinions based on media. Men in the media tend to be photographed more close-up than women. It was found that people viewing photographs of someone in a close-up shot were considered more intelligent than those shots that were further away. This phenomenon can also be used with race. Those who were white were photographed close-up over other races. This effect is referred to as face-ism. These subdued things can subconsciously cause someone to form an opinion without knowing it. Something as simple as someone smiling more when talking about one person over another can cause a person to like that person more than the other (Anastasio et al. 1999). Such subtle things can change a person's opinion completely without them even realizing it is happening.

Media is a leading cause of jury bias, but there are a number of other factors that can affect a juror's decision-making process. These factors including race, gender, and biasing during the actual trial can influence the outcome of the case greatly.

History of the Media

The history of media can be traced back to the mid 1450's when printing technology was sweeping across Europe. Printing allowed society to know what was going on rather than just getting information from interpersonal connections. During the 19th century, technology involving the media became industrialized with technologies

like the telegraph. These technologies gained even larger audiences than previously (Kovariak 2011).

Early Media

In 1628, the first printing press was used in North America. The printing press was used to spread the Puritan faith. This press was eventually used in the Cambridge Press and besides religious materials being printed, books and pamphlets used in various areas were created. The first item printed in the American colonies was the Freeman's Oath (Demers 2007). In 1765, John Adams said that nothing was more sacred than freedom of the press. What he meant by this was that the press could be used as a sort of weapon against England during that time. The media was used as a partisan instrument during the late 1700s and early 1800s (Sheppard 2008).

Newspapers

Early newspapers had very small circulations. The news published in these papers was rarely local and focused mostly on national or international stories. The more modern newspaper that published news regularly came about in the early 1800s. Magazines first came about in the U.S. in 1741. These early magazines included items such as book reviews, news, poems, sermons, and other literary items of the time (Demers 2007).

Benjamin Franklin was a very established and successful printer in Philadelphia. He is known for making printing and journalism profitable in the U.S. Although printing was widespread from the late 1600s to the early 1800s, only wealthy people could afford the printed material. Newspapers and magazines began gaining more popularity because of a variety of factors. Fact checking in the early days of media was not a goal because it was just getting started. More people became literate in the U.S. so reading these types

of materials became important. The population was also increasing in the colonies so more people were interested in reading these materials. Transportation and the postal services were improving so it was becoming easier to get news and information from one area to another (Demers 2007).

The press became a social institution and the penny press during the revolutionary times helped to put citizens into power of the political system. During the 19th century, newspapers continued to grow and the content in the papers was more specialized and diversified. During the Civil War, many changes came about with newspapers. The inverted pyramid (a way of writing in journalism starting with the most important information first and going down to the least important) that journalists still use today was established as well as fact checking. Although there was fact checking, the truth about stories was still sensationalized. An example of this is, newspapers would lower the death toll on their side and up the death toll on the opposing side during the Civil War. These stories were sensationalized during the war because of national security and keeping the morale up of the surrounding communities (Demers 2007).

Newspapers and journalism continued to grow through the mid-1800s to the early 1900s. During this time stories continued to be sensationalized with the beginning of investigative reporting. Yellow journalism, which is often associated with Hearst and Pulitzer, was a type of journalism that did little fact checking and used sensationalized headlines that would catch the reader's eye even if it were not true. This was a time of great sensationalism (Demers 2007).

During the 1920s, journalism became more professional and established a code of ethics. Times were changing and there were more than just newspapers and magazines that you could get your news from.

Radio

Radio transmissions were first discovered in the late 1890s. Modern radio, where actual voices were heard did not come around until the early 1920s. Radio was changing and targeted people who were not a part of the wealthy elite since the news and other programming on radio was against the elites in society. Radio was different because not only did it have news and other types of shows it included music. Radio did face its own problems, as seen with newspapers before it. The practice of payola (record companies paying DJs to play their music) was becoming popular. The 1940s through the 1950s was considered the golden age of radio in the U.S.

Television

Television was becoming very popular in the 1950s and 1960s. Almost 90 percent of homes in the U.S. had a television by 1960. Although films were declining, people still chose to see movies over television because they were in color and TV was not yet. News however was offered on televisions and it was free, unlike films (Demers 2007). Control and accuracy of the content was suspect.

The network CBS, formerly a radio network, started broadcasting in 1929. Television was temporarily halted because of World War II. During the war, television was in its experimental stages and only a few sets were around and only a few stations aired a couple times a week. Television still continued to spread slowly after WWII. By

the 1950s television had become widespread and nearly every home had one. In 1953, the FCC approved color television and NBC was the first network to offer color programming. In 1960, the first presidential debate was broadcasted of John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon. The televised debates are said to have had a major impact on the outcome of the election. Television continued to be a popular medium and for the first time people were able to see events as they happened. Events like the assassination of JFK, the Vietnam War, discrimination, and environmental degradation were some of the controversies America could watch and follow because of television. Television continued to change and the controversies presented were still evident and the public continued to watch as updated coverage of events happening throughout the world was becoming more popular (Demers 2007).

Internet

In 1969, ARPANET, connected government supported research sites and soon after that was able to network overseas. A simpler form of e-mail was also established during this time. In 1974, Vinton Cerf and Robert Kahn coined Internet, formerly ARPANET. In 1979, the first “civilian Internet” was established, and it was called USENET. It did everything that ARPANET was capable of, but also included discussion boards where people could communicate in real time. The World Wide Web was what really started the “Internet Revolution”. By 1992, there were only about fifty Web sites throughout the world and e-mail and discussion boards were what most people used the Internet for. The number of users on the Internet skyrocketed within 5 years to 40 million users because of the World Wide Web. Newspapers also began putting sites on the Internet to disseminate their stories. The Internet continued to grow at rapid rates and more browsers flooded the

Internet. The Internet became a way for businesses to advertise and get information out to consumers. The Internet is still growing at rapid rates and continues to be one of the most popular forms of media (Demers 2007).

Social Media

Social networking sites seem to have been popping up all over the Internet recently, but this is a phenomenon that started in 1985, and has not slowed down since. The first social networking site was called The Well and it was a part of the bulletin board system (BBS). The Well was basically a discussion board that people could join in on and get responses in real time. Social networking continued to grow into the 1990s. The Web site classmates.com was one of the first to begin connecting people, followed by sixdegrees.com, a site that let people connect with others through their own connections. The early 2000s also brought sites like Friendster and MySpace that allowed friends to connect through the Internet medium. Facebook, Twitter, and Google+ are the new generation of social networking sites. As they grow, new networks will come and go, but social networking is not something that seems like it will die out soon (Ebsco 2012).

Throughout the history of media, it can be concluded that those who control the media are the ones with the influence in society. As media continues to change forms, jury bias may become a more serious problem than it is currently.

Use of Online News Sources

As of 2010, more people get their news from online sources than by reading newspapers. This was the first year this has ever happened. A study by O'Dell (2011), found that about 34 percent of people said they have read news online in the past 24 hours as opposed to 31 percent who have read their news from a newspaper. People from the ages of 18-21 overwhelmingly get their news online as their main source. Although television is still the number one source from which people get their news, Internet sources come in second with online news sources being the only group that shows constant annual growth. Over half of people get some type of news online. Online news sources are continuing to grow and it seems as if newspapers are going out slowly (O'Dell 2011).

Perceptions of Guilt Influenced by Media

Perception of guilt influenced by the media can ultimately sway a case if jurors are easily influenced by what they see or hear rather than what is actually presented in court. Manipulation can also lead to serious errors where innocent people are convicted or guilty people are set free.

The media will do what it can to gain more viewers and that includes leaving out important facts, sensationalizing stories and not telling the whole truth. When the public hears these stories they trust them and base their opinions and decisions about things off of what the media says. This could be consciously or unconsciously. Media sources could be lying as well. The source may have another agenda they are trying to get at and there is no telling who actually verifies sources that the media gets their information from. This is just like in the past.

Media Biasing

The majority of people have cellular phones. Of these people, most will use it to access Internet, get news, discuss recent stories and issues on social media Web sites, etc. There have been several cases in very recent years where mistrials were declared because of use of Internet pages such as Wikipedia and Facebook. With the recent wave of new technology and Internet access being nearly everywhere, the courts were not prepared for how this would affect the juries and what would happen when they became sequestered. It has become routine for people to simply “Google” or do an Internet search of something such as a case. Jurors are especially vulnerable to doing an Internet search in order to ensure they have the correct information, understood everything correctly, and are making the right decision (Lacey 2010). The problem with these Internet searches by jurors is that the information presented in court probably is not what is being published on the Internet. This information has a high potential of being incorrect or inaccurate. Jurors are told they cannot use electronic devices to search the Internet and use numerous sites, but they are not told why they cannot. Jurors see no harm in looking up a word an attorney said, so they have a better understanding, they believe there are exceptions to the “no use of Internet sites” rule (Lacy 2010).

Access to better tools in the courtroom would be better for jurors so there is less of a chance of jurors wanting to access Internet for help. Tools like dictionaries, access to materials for note taking, and the ability to ask questions if necessary. These tools would allow jurors to be more engaged in what is happening during the trial as well, therefore leading to a better, more informed decision (Lacy 2010).

The only way to keep jurors from accessing the Internet is to sequester them. Since this is not always a viable option because it is expensive, attorneys must search the Internet tirelessly to see what information is out there about the case. With the right tools, jurors will be less likely to use Internet searches (Lacy 2010). The Internet has caused numerous new challenges for the court and legal system. With such easy access to numerous sites and sources of information both accurate and inaccurate, jurors find themselves turning to the Web in order to help with their decisions if they are not given the appropriate tools.

Media Access

Access to media is in most cases is completely off limits or extremely limited. Jurors are not allowed access to newspapers or magazines or if they are, the material is censored so no information about the case or anything in any way related to the case is seen by the sequestered jury. Television is also extremely restricted or viewing is prohibited completely (Levine 1996). Newspapers, magazines, and television have been restricted with sequestered jurors, but with new media such as Internet being easily accessed through cellular phones and other electronic devices, it is harder to limit these activities and restrict jurors from using them.

Media tends to draw attention to a case. When audiences view news sources, read newspapers, and do Internet searches, they are interested in the case and want to know more about it, leading them to discuss the case or trial with friends, family, and the rest of their social network. Along with reporting about the case, the media also reports responses from the community and how they feel about the case. This can also shape the opinions of others (Vidmar 2002). Social networks both formal and informal play a role

in how the media portrays the story to the community. The news sources want to give the socially desirable response to their community about the case, so feedback about the trial and case are important to the media.

Media Deception

Robbennolt and Studebaker's (2003) study on news media and civil litigation found that there is a relationship between civil litigation and the news that was sent out to the public. The media do influence how a jury member makes a decision. By leaving out parts of stories that their viewers do not want to hear about or may find boring (Robbennolt and Studebaker 2003). Underreporting can also be a problem.

Underreporting is when the media does not report everything about a subject. Little can be done about underreporting because of freedom of the press (Drakos and Gofas 2006). Such facts could be important and completely change someone's opinion if they were mentioned. Hindsight bias can sway a decision of a juror and determine the outcome of a case since many decisions are made in hindsight. Hindsight bias is realizing what one thinks, after the fact (Smith and Greene 2005).

Personal Opinion and Media Biasing

The media can bias someone based on disagreement with someone's own social network. This can be related back to how American colonial news and media was against the British. Everyone is aware that different news stations lean towards different views, when the media says something against one's own beliefs it may bias them even further on the subject. The disagreement accelerates the bias. This is because people believe what they think is true, and this is unlikely to change. If someone in the person's social network challenges what they think is correct, it causes their bias to increase even more

so than it was to begin with (Eveland and Shah 2003). Political affiliation is significantly related to media biasing. Eveland and Shah found that media that is hostile tends to sway opinions in the opposite direction. Republicans tend to be more biased towards the media, finding that media outlets are more biased towards their opinions than those of Democrats.

Other Factors Biasing Perceptions of Guilt Through Media

Evidence that is presented in court is also not as effective as what the media presents and that they were exposed to previously. Media focus on what will get the attention of the audience, so facts that cannot be backed up that are more interesting may be presented rather than the truth. Repetition can also affect a juror (Robbennolt and Studebaker 2003). If a person is exposed to the same story numerous times, they will remember it and base their decision off what they have seen or heard. An example of this could be someone waking up in the morning and checking their email; they may see a headline or two on the Internet browser about a case. As they get ready to leave for the day the news may be on and they may hear something about the same case. On the way to work a snippet about the same case is on the radio, they talk about it with their coworkers later in the day as well. They may get home and talk about it with family or friends and search more about it on the Internet or see friends discussing it on social media sites. We are exposed to media and information about cases throughout the day, and the more it is heard, the more it will stick in the minds of potential jurors. Jurors also base their decisions off of cases that have similarities to their case. They may give similar punishments because that is what they were exposed to through the media previously. An example of this would be someone seeing an advertisement on television for a

personal injury lawyer, the lawyer may advertise getting someone \$8,000 for a car wreck they were in. A juror may be on a case for a car wreck and believe this person should get the same amount even if the circumstances are not the same. Pretrial media and publicity on a case greatly influences jurors when they make their decision (Robbennolt and Stuebaker 2003).

Bias by the media is amplified because of how it is presented. For example, political candidates get a lot of free advertising from media sources because they are being talked about and discussed constantly because of the popularity at the time (Ridout and Smith 2008). This is the same for sensationalized stories in the media. These stories are amplified because the media lets it happen. It is what the public is interested in so that is what they play on their stations or print in their papers. Media is amplified because of the demand for what is happening.

The media is not always truthful, and most of the population is aware of this, but still we base decisions on what we hear or read. Many only get facts from unreliable media sources that are known to sensationalize and leave out important details. Unreliable sources could range from Wikipedia, where anyone can add information to social media sites where any random person can give an opinion to news sites that may not be giving out correct information. Other reliable sources could come from news anchors who are extremely biased to a certain side. When chosen to be on a jury, people tend to remember more of what the media said because it was presented in a more fascinating way than what was actually presented in court, which ultimately leads to a biased opinion.

Roadmap of Media Biasing

Media biasing begins at the source and with the public. The source giving information to the public decides if they want to have biased opinions or if they want to just give facts and not sound biased either way. Unfortunately, most media sources do not choose the latter and this is because the public wants to hear what they believe to be true. The public believes media to be biased because of the sources that do not have the same views and beliefs that they have (Eveland and Shah 2003).

Exposure to Media Sources

As mentioned previously, repetition can affect how a person perceives guilt or innocence. This is similar to exposure to media. Exposure to different types of media such as television, radio, newspapers, Internet, etc. can influence people in different ways, also the amount of time and how focused someone is can affect a decision.

Comparison of cases by jurors is why media exposure can be negative. Since the media can leave out, or give misleading facts, one cannot know what is true and false based solely on media sources. When someone watches media sources about a case similar to the one they are chosen to be a juror for can cause one to be biased. Greene (1990) found that the more violent the offense was, the more likely it was to be in the media. Exposure to legal or criminal themed television or other types of media are not accurate in most cases.

Prolonged exposure to pornographic material causes jurors to feel less compassion towards a rape victim as well (Greene 1990). Accessibility to media does not mediate judgments on the importance of the subject of the case. Media tends to also alter the standards had when it comes to deciding a guilty verdict (Bull Kovera 2002).

Exposure to different types of media can cause a biasing effect. Advertising can cause a juror to be biased and base their decision off of what they have seen previously. Previous exposure to different media sources can lead a juror to think similarly to how they did when they were exposed. This is negative because the case may be similar, but it is not the same.

Media and Public Opinion

People tend to watch news stations and get other information from television stations, newspapers, and Internet sites that match their general opinion already. People would rather listen to what they agree with than hear the actual truth. Someone who is considered conscientious is looking to find truth. Xiang and Sarvary (2007), found that those who are conscientious and seeking the truth tend to be more biased. They get information from many different media outlets, which may all be biased towards one way and they are not actually getting the truth (Xiang and Sarvary 2007). They do not check the integrity of the sources when they are getting the facts.

Along with media, people can be easily persuaded to change their opinions on subjects by something as simple as someone in their social network mentioning their opinion in passing. As mentioned previously, many do not even realize they are doing this. Social influence is what causes someone to form an opinion about a certain subject. Media can be that social influence, and often times it is (DeMarzo et al. 2003). Someone who does not yet have a strong opinion formed about a case could be talking to someone who they trust and often times share opinions with.

The media can affect the outcome of a case because of various reasons. The media does persuade the public to think a certain way based on what medium is chosen

and how it is presented. Sensationalized cases and underreporting are quite prevalent in media sources. Media wants to get the best story out there with the most viewers and sometimes at any cost. Although the media is an important aspect and influence in our culture, there are some negatives that come from it, including the potential of having a biased jury leading to an unfair trial.

Incorrect Data Spread through Media

The media has spread incorrect data, especially now with the Internet and the possibility of getting up to the minute updates on what is going on in the world. There have been numerous cases where incorrect data has spread over the Internet and through other media sources causing the public to believe incorrect facts.

In 1996, at the Olympics in Atlanta, Georgia, Richard Jewell was wrongly accused of planting the pipe bomb that went off in Centennial Olympic Park that injured many people. At first Richard Jewell was believed to have spotted the bomb and let police know what was going on. A few days later, a newspaper in Atlanta sent out a story that accused Jewell of planting the bomb. Once this headline was out, it spread to national news stations like CNN. This prompted the FBI to investigate Richard Jewell, from a claim made by a local newspaper. After the initial article hundreds of others came out about Jewell, his life, family, etc. linking him to the incident. The media portrayed Jewell very negatively and told lies about him to the public (Online News Hour 1996). After about three months of investigation, the FBI realized that he had not planted the bomb and Jewell was cleared (Sack 2007). The media provided inaccurate information to the public about Richard Jewell. This case shows how inaccurate facts and information can spread and label someone who is not a criminal.

Amanda Knox is another example of a case that was misrepresented in the media. “Foxy Knoxy” as many media sources liked to call her because of her good looks and personality was accused of murdering her roommate when she was studying abroad in Italy. Amanda Knox, who is American, was in the media not only in the U.S. and Italy, but globally. A movie on the network Lifetime portrayed Amanda Knox’s story before her trial was finalized. This scared the prosecutor because they believed this may sway opinion. Once Knox was acquitted of the charges, Lifetime opted to change and update the movie. The movie portrayed Knox in a way that made her seem guilty and had numerous inaccuracies (Francis 2011). Aside from the inaccurate movie about Knox before her trial, there were a number of stories across the world explaining why Knox and her boyfriend were guilty of the murder. The attorneys presented how there was no evidence, but the media said something completely different, which was inaccurate (Natanson 2011).

The case of Trayvon Martin who was shot by George Zimmerman in Florida is still undergoing trial, but the media will have an effect on what the public thinks on guilt and innocence. For example NBC played the 9-1-1 call from George Zimmerman the night Martin was shot. NBC edited the clip in a way to make Zimmerman sound racist and that it could have not been self-defense but a hate crime. Other media sources made claims about Zimmerman being racist and how he made numerous emergency calls to the police for reasons that should not have been which was untrue. Other outlets made Martin seem extremely deviant when he was actually doing what normal teenagers do (Fox News 2012).

Casey Anthony, the mother accused of murdering her two-year old daughter Caylee, took the media by storm with her 2008 trial. The trial was streamed live over the Internet and on almost every news station across the country. The Casey Anthony case is known as the first murder trial during the “social media age”. There were hundreds of Facebook pages set up to honor Caylee’s death, also numerous people tweeting about the case on Twitter, and status updates on Myspace. Very few people on social media and on the Internet thought the verdict for Casey Anthony was innocent. When Anthony was acquitted of the murder charges of her daughter there was an outpour of rage and sadness on social media and Internet Web sites. Evidence was weak in the Casey Anthony trial, but the public still believed and most of them today probably still believe she is guilty. The difference in Casey Anthony’s trial and other murder trials before hers is that the public could share their opinions, rage, sadness, and other feelings with the rest of the world through the Internet and social media Web sites. Before, you could share opinions with family, friends, and your other interpersonal connections, but now with the changing Internet and media it is impossible to not know what the rest of the world thinks of a case or its outcome (Cloud 2011).

Gabe Watson or more commonly known by the media as the “honeymoon killer” was accused of drowning his wife while scuba diving on their honeymoon. The case received a lot of media coverage and attention in Australia where the incident happened. The photo of his wife, Tina lying on the ocean floor, dead, was widespread over the Internet and other media sources not only in Australia, but across the world. Most people believed him to be the killer because he asked Tina to put her life insurance in his name before the honeymoon (Battiste 2012).

The Fars news agency, an English Web site in Iran ran a story printed by The Onion saying a poll had found that a majority of rural white Americans would rather vote for Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the Iranian leader than President Barack Obama. The story was removed once the error was found, but people still saw the article (Reals 2012).

Another incident that had incorrect data that spread over the Internet was in 2012 when PR Web published an inaccurate story saying that Google had purchased ICOA for \$400 million dollars. PR Web did not follow up with Google to make sure this story was accurate. Numerous other very popular Web sites and news sources published this story before word got out that it was a hoax. PR Web said they got their information from someone who claimed to be representing the ICOA (Gross 2012).

Media Conspiracy and Public Opinion

Throughout history, there have been a number of hoaxes based on events that have happened, some, more believable than others. There seems to be a conspiracy theory about every major event throughout history including the Holocaust, JFK assassination, September 11, and most recently the Sandy Hook Elementary Massacre. A conspiracy or hoax is when there are multiple influences working together to piece together secrets or hidden agendas. Those who believe in conspiracies and hoaxes usually share the traits of untrustworthiness, alienation, and hostility towards a group or individual. Conspiracy theories are also a way for people to blame something and let out negative feelings they may have about an event. Conspiracy theories are easier to believe sometimes than what is happening in the real world (Abalakina-Paap et al. 1999).

The media has great capability of spreading hoaxes with or without realizing it. The media can present something to the public that is untrue and spread it around making

it a hoax and having people believe it. The media gathers information from multiple sources and some of that information can be inaccurate. When all the information is put together it could lead people to believe things that are completely inaccurate and turn into hoaxes (Bird 1996).

Conspiracy theories and hoaxes spread through the media, and today, especially the Internet can drastically change someone's opinion. Videos, stories, and other sources of media are used to expose "so called" realities about certain events that have happened. These types of media people view cause them to think against the government in most cases and believe what they are viewing about the event even if it is a complete hoax (Butler et.al 1995).

A juror who deeply believes in a conspiracy for a case could affect the outcome and influence others to believe the same. These videos, news stories, and blogs posted about hoaxes and conspiracies grab someone's attention, and whether it is true or not, a person will continue to research about the issue, receiving false or sensationalized information. Hoaxes and conspiracies are usually made up by a group or person with a hidden agenda trying to make a point about a governmental issue or some other big thing going on at the time.

Pretrial Publicity

The objective of Otto, Penrod, and Dexter's 1994 article was to look at the impact of pretrial publicity on juries. The study looked at different types of pretrial publicity and the effects it had on decision-making as well as the impact of trial evidence. Participants of the study were put into groups that ranged from 6-20 people. They were told the study was about decision-making or jury members. Each participant was given two local

newspaper articles. The articles only had basic facts about the trial the participants were about to see. After the participants read the articles, a survey was given. The question provided the researchers with what knowledge of law the participants had as well as behaviors. The participants were then questioned on whether they believed the defendant was guilty or innocent. The participants watched the trial on video. A survey was given again to measure verdict ratings and evaluation of evidence. What the researchers found was that pretrial publicity does affect the initial judgments of juries. Negative pretrial publicity about the character of someone on trial had the biggest effect on jurors.

Pretrial publicity can be a major factor in jury decision-making. When the person on trial is a public figure or is some kind of celebrity, the interest and attention the case gets is even greater. There are many programs in the media that specifically focus on gossip of celebrities. These sources are not as reliable as others and are more sensationalized because they want the largest audience.

Cases such as Mike Tyson or O.J. Simpson had such interest; the trial became a social event to many people. Pretrial publicity does not only occur when the defendant is famous or well known, it is also apparent in many large-scale cases that gain a lot of interest like Casey Anthony or Amanda Knox, who only became well known after they were put on trial and their stories were presented in the media. Pretrial publicity is known to influence decisions and not always lead to a fair trial. In order for jurors to not be influenced too much by publicity and media, policies and other legislatures have been put into place. Voir dire is one of the mechanisms used to question potential jurors about their knowledge of the case and what they know about it. They may also question what their decision may be in the end. Other methods used to help tame pretrial biasing of jurors is

changing the venue, meaning the trial will take place in a different location because the new location may have less buzz than the location where the crime happened. The trial may also be put on hold in order to let time pass so there will not be as many emotions connected with the case and the trial can be given a fair chance (Vidmar and Hans 2007). However, these strategies may no longer be as effective as they were in the past. This is because of the Internet and how information can be disseminated globally in a matter of seconds. Incidents that happened in one region probably were not known about in other areas of the country as they are now.

Media ranging anywhere from television and radio to Internet and newspapers can cause problems for jury decision-making. Unlike other countries, the United States allows media to have access to all points of a trial. Other countries limit what can be publicized once charges have come about. Jurors who read or see a lot of publicity about the trial are more likely to decide a person is guilty than those who have not (Vidmar and Hans 2007).

Kramer et al. (1990) studied pretrial publicity and how it can bias juries. They looked at two different types of pretrial publicity, factual and emotional publicity. The factual publicity gave information about the defendant that made them seem guilty while emotional publicity did not give the same type of incriminating information about the defendant but rather made jurors have negative emotions towards the defendant. When there was time between the jurors seeing the factual publicity and making a decision, it was likely that the publicity did not affect their decision as much. They found that emotional publicity made jurors more biased because the stories stuck with them more than factual publicity.

According to the Supreme Court Case of the Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart, pretrial publicity can lead to an unfair trial. There was so much pretrial publicity surrounding the six murders and the accused Erwin C. Simants in 1975 that both the prosecution and the defense asked the court to no longer allow publicity surrounding the case. The judge found that there was a “clear and present danger” for a fair trial when there is pretrial publicity. When there is an infinite amount of pretrial publicity surrounding a high profile, or any case for that matter, it is close to impossible to find impartial jurors. They found that pretrial publicity alone does not lead a juror to be prejudice or impartial in a case, but the tone in which publicity is presented can lead a person to become biased. Measures have been taken to protect those who have been accused of a crime in order to give them the fairest trial possible.

Pretrial publicity can lead to prejudices, bias, and can lead to an unfair trial with a bias jury. Changing of venues is a popular decision when cases have a lot of publicity before the trial. This is done because the surrounding community may be highly invested in the case and most have already made their decision about the verdict, so finding unbiased jurors that could listen to only facts and not what they have heard previously would be quite difficult. Pretrial publicity also can affect how people judge the defendant. The media may portray this person in a negative light, causing viewers to believe the person is bad even if they are innocent. It was found that when someone views a lot of publicity surrounding a trial, they are more likely to find the defendant guilty.

This is both before and after the trial. As was the case for Timothy McVeigh with the Oklahoma City bombings, the judge decided that it was nearly impossible to have a fair trial in Oklahoma because of the public’s opinions towards him, so the venue was

moved to Colorado. Cases that have national or global coverage are much more likely to have guilty verdicts than those that are just covered locally (Studebaker et al. 2000). Pretrial publicity can greatly affect the outcome of a case. In more cases than not, people will judge a person as guilty without fully knowing all of the facts and basing their decisions solely on publicity and media.

Different media types can also affect an outcome of a case. The amount of exposure has an influence on whether someone is more or less likely to choose a guilty verdict for the defendant. When someone can physically see and/or watch something about a trial or a case they are more likely to have a guilty verdict over those who just read about the same case or trial even when the facts presented were the same. Viewing versus hearing would not be the only reason someone would find someone more or less guilty but there is significance between the factors. Negative pretrial publicity as compared to positive pretrial publicity will also lead to more people deciding guilt. When information is seen it is more persuasive than written information. However, when the viewed material being presented is difficult for jurors or others to understand, the message is lost and the guilty verdict is less likely (Wilson and Bornstein 1998). Pictures, photographs, or anything that can be seen will give jurors a higher chance of deciding. Seeing something is more powerful in this circumstance.

Another study by Ogloff and Vidmar (1994) found testimonies about sexual abuse presented through television were more likely to bias a person over print. They also found that when televised and written media were combined, there was a higher significance of bias. People believe that they will not be biased by pretrial publicity when chosen for a jury, but Ogloff and Vidmar's study found something different. People do

not realize the media and the pretrial publicity are biasing their judgments. It could also be because people want to give the socially acceptable and desirable answer. They answer how they believe they should answer (Ogloff and Vidmar 1994).

Pretrial publicity is a biasing factor in jury decision-making. People do not realize they are biased based on what they have been exposed to by the media. Their opinions can change subconsciously based on what they hear or see through different media sources.

Gag Orders

There is little that can be done to prevent the media from spreading false or inaccurate information about a case. A gag order, which is when the courts can prohibit media sources from letting out certain information about a case. The problem with gag orders is that it limits freedom of the press and prior restraint (Roper 1981). The media affects outcomes of cases as seen in the cases presented. The public will believe what the media portrays whether that is truthful or inaccurate. A case of bullying in Asia that caused a young boy to commit suicide-identified people as relatives of the bullies, who actually were not in any way related. Pictures, names, place of work, and other information about these relatives was spread over the Internet, causing an outpour of hate messages and other threats to these people who have no connection with the case at all. A woman in her 60s was said to be the mother of one of the bullies on the Internet, and receives many calls every day of people harassing her. She said she woke up in the middle of the night scared someone might try to attack her. She had no connection with the bullies at all. The main Web site that gave out the wrong information on these

innocent people made a correction, but did not remove anyone's information from the site (Shimbun 2012).

It can be seen in earlier cases (before 2000) that television played a major role in disseminating information to the public. With cases such as Casey Anthony and probably more in the future, social media and the Internet will have a greater effect on how cases are decided.

Cases of Wrongful Convictions

Anthony Graves was wrongfully convicted for murdering a family in Somerville where there was no evidence pointing to Graves. He spent 18 years in prison, 12 of which he spent on death row. The conviction was overturned in 2006, and Graves was fully exonerated in 2010. Graves was paid \$1.45 million dollars for his time spent in prison. Robert Carter, the actual man that committed the crime lied in court and blamed the murders on Graves. On the day of Carter's execution he admitted that he acted alone in the crimes and Graves had no part in it (Azad 2011). The media actually assisted in getting Graves exonerated. Texas Monthly magazine wrote an article that pointed out all of the flaws in the case. There were also documentaries and other media sources that showed the public that Graves was innocent.

Calvin Willis was convicted of aggravated rape in 1982, almost 22 years later; he was exonerated because DNA evidence proved him to not be the perpetrator. Three girls were sleeping in their home, when a man came in and raped the 10 year old. All of the girls explained the incident differently. The girl's story was twisted in court she said she did not pick anyone out of the lineup that she was shown, while the police said she had chosen Calvin Willis. The young girl was also instructed in who she should choose.

Willis was compensated for his time in prison, but the actual perpetrator has not yet been convicted (Innocence Project).

Decision Making

Making a decision is a process. We make decisions throughout the day habitually without even thinking about them, but there are steps that one goes through in order to come to a decision. According to Maskay and Juhasz (1983), there are seven steps in coming to a decision. These steps include figuring out what the problem is that needs to be solved, identifying why it is a problem, weighing possible solution options, determining both positive and negative outcomes of each possible solution, identifying which choice would be the most favorable, deciding the practicality of the possible solutions, and finally coming to a conclusion (Maskay and Juhasz 1983). This model is useful to go through each step, especially when a decision could have a negative outcome for the individual or someone else.

The opportunity to make a decision becomes available when something is uncertain. In order to make a decision there has to be a goal, alternative solutions, and information that will allow the decision maker to come to a conclusion. When there is no goal, just a problem, decisions are not made with as much care if there is a result in mind. There must also be rationale when decisions are being made. If the goal is unattainable then the problem will more than likely stay and a decision will not be made. When there is a foreseeable goal, options for solution, and information to obtain the goal, decisions can be made with care and ethically (Gottfredson 1988).

Representativeness is one way people begin in the decision-making process. Representativeness is when someone draws conclusions about a person, event, or

situation. Based on the information gathered, they draw conclusions in order to come to a solution. There is the question of probability in this type of decision-making. There is a probability that the decision-maker's assumptions will be correct, but there is also a chance they will not. This is not the best decision-making method, but it is used when not a lot of information is available that leads an individual to make a well-informed decision (Kahneman et al. 1982).

Availability is another form of decision-making. This is when some information, but not all is available to the decision-maker. Based on the information that is available, the individual cannot make a decision that is educated because not all materials are presented. This is also not a reliable source of decision-making (Kahneman et al. 1982). Adjustment and anchoring is a starting point for decision-making. Decision-makers should start at the beginning of a problem in order to make a decision that is well informed. Beginning in the middle of a problem will not allow a decision with a solution that will be probable. Starting at different points bring different solutions (Kahneman et al. 1982).

Drawing Conclusions

In order to draw a conclusion, there must be acceptance. Acceptance that there may not only be one conclusion, acceptance that there may not be any conclusion. This is the first step in coming to a decision. Drawing a conclusion also means that there was strong enough information that allowed a decision to be made. Conclusions should also be able to be proven based on the information gathered. It can be disproven later, once more evidence and information is brought forth (Dacey 1978).

Meaning

With any social situation, looking at meaning helps to understand reaction to events and happenings. Signs and symbols have come to be something that our minds relate with something else. These symbols mean something to someone either individually or could have meaning or significance to a group. For example, an eagle tends to symbolize freedom and patriotism to most Americans, this symbol may have little to no meaning or a completely different significance to a different culture. Associating signs and symbols with something is a way to construct realities (Roberts 2004).

The problem with meaning is everyone's interpretation is different. There is no solidified truth because the way each person constructs what is true may be different from everyone else. Meaning means that there can be no completely right way or completely wrong way that every single person follows. Most people would agree that committing a crime such as murder is wrong. Society has socially constructed us to believe this, but to others they have constructed a meaning that allows them to believe murder is fine within the circumstances they have created. This is the same in various cultures, in one culture a certain act may be completely tolerated, but in another it is punishable. Even some liars have made themselves believe that certain untrue meanings they have established are true, even if they did not believe this to begin with (Roberts 2004).

Without meaning, society would not make sense. Meaning is socially constructed based on culture and norms that are presented. Meanings can change in groups or individuals based on what they believe to be true.

Social Construction of Meaning with Media

The media gives society a picture of how the world looks. Most people had never seen a war first hand before, but when Vietnam was broadcasted through the media, people could see what it was really like. The media helps us to imagine a world we cannot be a part of. As the media generates images of the world, society then interprets events, people, wars, tragedies, etc. into their own meaning. Images put into the minds of society by the media has a much larger effect on meaning than stories, or words someone says. As forms of media have changed in the past and continue to change in the future, it is likely that society's construction of reality and meaning will be greatly skewed because of it (Gamson et al. 1992).

Many people tune into the same newscast each night, or read the same article in the morning. Although the information is identical to so many people, the meaning someone constructs about it could, and most likely would be completely different. Down to the relationship in which journalists have with sources, sources who are habitual or ones that are most efficient are the ones that are used for stories. This structures how journalists decide what is actually newsworthy (Gamson et al. 1992).

Images portrayed by the media have a major influence on the construction of meaning to each individual. As society looks for ways to solve social problems and make meaning out of something that is hard to understand, such as terrorism and wars, turning to the media seems to be a promising solution because the visuals assist in making meaning out of something that tends to be difficult to understand. The media helps to make sense of the world, especially in difficult times. Media is supposed to give information that is accurate and useful, but this is rarely the case, therefore this allows

society to falsely construct meanings of reality. Media can be a problem when opposing sides are trying to get their images into the homes of society. This can be seen through different news sources that are more on the liberal or conservative end of the spectrum. Instead of focusing on the issue at hand and the facts, the media paints a picture of how the network wants society to construct their meaning (Gamson et al. 1992).

Summary of Literature Review

As presented by the literature, perceptions of guilt on sensational cases can be influenced by various factors through media sources. Perceptions of guilt can vary based on gender, age, ethnicity, and type of media.

Chapter III

Theory

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) states that people construct what reality is through social activities and responses. Reality is what happens when we do not have control over habits or happenings in society including the media. Over time, events, people, signs, or symbols are used to represent something else in society. Through social norms and activities daily life becomes habitual reality constructed. The knowledge it takes to do routine activities is stored for later use. The patterns society creates are done so many times, that little to no thought is put into the activities (Calhoun et al. 2007). Examples of this include getting dressed each morning, to brushing your teeth. It could even include driving to work or school. Since these activities are done so many times, they become habitual and no longer take thought. Society lives by routines and habits and they can be hard to change.

Signs and Symbols

There are symbols and signs that are almost always associated with a culture. Cultures associate different items that represent them, as well as other cultures having symbols to represent other cultures they are not a part of. Since many people do not know or have never seen other countries or cultures, images and symbols are how they construct the reality to know what it is like. Construction of these cultures through signs and symbols allow imagery of what it could be like. It allows people to have a positive outlook on something, even if it is not positive (Turner 2010).

Even words have an associated meaning with certain things. Society expects different groups to know what different words mean and how they influence different

groups. For example, an elementary school teacher would most likely talk about basic sentence structure, simple arithmetic like addition and subtraction, and basic levels of reading. This is normal as well as expected. The same teacher talking to her students about calculus or reading them Charles Dickens would not be considered normal.

Society has decided what children should know at certain ages. It is how reality was constructed for third or fourth graders, if society would have been teaching eight year olds calculus for hundreds of years; it would not be considered strange and would be a part of habitual teaching. Society has been socially constructed throughout history, which brings us to what we know it as today (Turner 2010).

Groups or individuals may use symbols that they associate with one another or how people outside the group know who they are. An example of this could be the Girl Scouts. Everyone knows the time of year that rolls around when they sell their cookies. This is a symbol associated with this group and large majorities know what it means without having to question it. The knowledge one possesses affects their place and how they interact with society and how they think (Allan 2006).

Categories

As a habitual behavior, people place other people or things into categories when they interact. For example, upon meeting someone, you decide whether they are male or female, what you think their ethnicity and age may be, etc. Even down to personality traits, we place people or other things into how we construct them as a reality, whether these traits turn out to be true or false (Turner 2010). Social processes also allow people to interact with one another. People learn from one another social practices, roles, etc.

People or society, have generalized terms of what reality is and when people break away from this reality, it is considered deviance (Calhoun 2007).

Society will gain a mental representation of someone or something therefore, as it is seen habitually; it becomes a part of reality. This can lead to conflicting views on things, for example, political elections (Johnson 2008). When something such as a political election is highly publicized through the media, it becomes a part of everyday life and is talked about with family, friends, and other parts of an interpersonal network. How they are portrayed through the media is how people get ideas and opinions of candidates. This makes public figures a part of individual realities. The same is for media sources. Certain news anchors or networks, or blogs may have become a part of everyday life. You check in with it daily and it can bias opinions.

Knowledge

Society takes for granted the reality of everyday life. People realize reality is real but do not question or really even think about it as they go about their daily routines (Berger and Luckmann 1966). No thought is put into daily routines and can also become reality through the same process. Examples of this are Facebook, CNN, ESPN, FOX, etc.

Knowledge is also a socially constructed reality, for example math, science, and education. Different people interpret data differently. Individuals share knowledge with which they choose and sometimes they may not share it with anyone at all. Examples are from higher education to taking a social work class vs. a math class. Society shares knowledge because no one person knows everything. Everyone knows whom he or she can go to in order to gain different types of knowledge they seek (Berger and Luckmann 1966:43). This is necessary in order for society to advance technology.

Social Construction of Reality through Media

Before newspapers, it was difficult to know what was going on in different parts of the world or even a few hundred miles away. It was likely that people had no construction of reality besides what they knew. Television and Internet allowed society to visually see what is going on beyond their immediate environment. TV gives images of far away places and experiences that were unimaginable to lay people. The Vietnam War was the first time people could see what was happening in a war zone. Instead of reading about what was going on and trying to construct the meaning of the war, they could see it first hand, which allowed them to have a visual representation of meaning. The media portrays images that allow everyone to socially construct meaning of events and places that previously have not been experienced (Gamson et al. 1992).

Bringing unthinkable crimes, heartwarming stories, and other newsworthy events into the homes of society seems to have allowed people to experience things that were not imaginable and see what is going on in the world.

With the prevalence of the Internet expanding rapidly, the dissemination of information beyond one's immediate environment is expanding also.

Perceptions of Guilt by Potential Jurors

Managing the dissemination of information was probably much easier 100 years ago when up to date, minute-by-minute information could not be easily accessed. People were not as informed as they are today. Today there is an overload of information disseminated to the public. That is to say that people may be more informed today, but the information they are getting may not have all of the facts or the correct information and could be extremely biased. It could also depend on who delivers the message.

Many people believe what they hear or read through media outlets. As potential jurors, this could have a major influence on how they make a decision on a jury. A jury member will go about their normal day, they could see a snippet of a news story when they open their browser, hear about the same story on the radio on their way to lunch, then again they read what their friends are saying about it when they check their social media sites. Co-workers are talking about it during their break and they hear about it again while watching the evening news. As one can see, we are exposed to multiple media outlets and greater social mobility throughout the day. If a person is chosen to be on a jury for this case, it is nearly impossible to make an unbiased decision, given the exposure to various media outlets. More than likely this person has already made a decision about a case or issue. We can hear or read about a story over and over again in a single day. Imagine if we hear about this story for weeks or months. Going through our routines every day the story has had some kind of impact. A person will construct a reality on what they think has happened and how the person on trial should be punished. The social construction of reality has an influence on jury decision-making and how the media is routinized in society today.

A decision by a juror could be made on the side of the media and not on the side or court presentation of facts and evidence. Looking at the recent case of Jerry Sandusky with Penn State, the story was all over every media source nationwide for weeks ahead of the trial. Since the case had such a strong impact on people's emotions, strong opinions were formed. The jury more than likely had their decision made before they were even chosen for the jury. A jury has the power to decide the outcome of a trial that most people do not get the chance to do in everyday life. With such strong emotions one way

or the other it is difficult to have an unbiased jury, especially in a case such as this one. If the decision was not made on the side of the media this case and many other cases may have turned out much differently.

The social construction of reality lays a foundation for jury bias and manipulation through the media and how people measure guilt of different cases in the media. Decisions are made on the side of the media and not from what is presented in court. Knowledge is also learned from media sources because society tends to trust what they are hearing or feel that is the only way to get information on what they are interested in whether it is true and accurate or it is false and sensationalized. By constructing the reality that the media is all knowing and true or that the media is the only source of knowledge available people do not get accurate information that can be applicable when chosen to be on a jury and decide the outcome of a case.

Based on the review of literature and the presented theoretical perspective, I will test the following hypotheses. My goal is to test different forms of old and new media and how their use will affect opinions about guilt or innocence in publicized cases.

H₁: As the number of hours of TV watched increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases will increase.

H₂: As the number of hours using the Internet increases, the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases will increase.

H₃: As the number of hours of listening to the radio increases, the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases will increase.

H₄: As the number of hours reading periodicals (newspapers and magazines) increases, the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases will increase.

H₅: As the number of hours using social media Web sites increases, the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases will increase.

H₆: As interaction with interpersonal networks increases, the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases will increase.

H₇: Internet usage has a stronger affect on deciding guilt in publicized cases compared to watching television, listening to the radio, reading newspapers or magazines, and spending time on social media Web sites

The hypotheses I have stated will test the effects of perceptions of guilt. I hypothesized that exposure to media such as television or Internet will increase one's likelihood of deciding guilt in a publicized case. Individuals are exposed to media; especially involving cases that are interesting to them it is likely they will form an opinion. Seeing or hearing something about a case, may encourage more research via media sources. Facts in media are not always true or completely accurate. This may cause an opinion to be formulated that is not influenced by accurate facts compared to the case that is actually presented in court.

I also hypothesize that as someone increases their exposure to his or her social network, it could increase the likelihood of deciding guilt in a publicized case. This could occur because those around them influence everyone, whether they realize it or not. It may be a family member, friend, or just an acquaintance, but talking about a case may influence a person's opinion. Everyone does not know every fact about every case.

People, like media also sensationalize stories to make them more interesting. Again, someone on a jury for a case could be fed misinformation and will form an opinion based on inaccurate facts.

My last hypothesis states that Internet usage will have the greatest effect on deciding guilt over the other types of media including TV, radio, social media Web sites, and newspapers or magazines.

Chapter IV

Research Design

A survey was conducted of 500 undergraduate students at Texas Tech University. All of the participants were in undergraduate sociology classes and received extra credit in the class for their participation. The data was collected over two semesters in 2012.

A convenience sample was used since a large amount of students were available to complete the survey. This type of sample was used since a large majority of them would be eligible to be on juries, so their input is valuable. This group is also quite media savvy and is most likely the demographic exposed to various forms of media as well as influenced by it. The dependent variable is perceptions of guilt or innocence and the independent variable is exposure to various types of media.

The questionnaire was completed based on literature and theory to determine appropriate questions for this research. Before the questionnaire was administered, it was pretested by seven graduate students and three faculty members in order to make corrections and add anything they felt was necessary.

The research design is useful in getting a large amount of data quickly. Surveying a large group of people that would be eligible for jury duty will help in understanding jury bias and what media types affect someone to decide guilt or innocence.

The questionnaire starts with questions that include demographics like age, gender, classification, education, etc. These questions were placed at the beginning of the survey in order to get the most accurate and honest responses without having any problems with the response set such as respondents getting tired and not answering the demographic questions if they were placed at the end of the questionnaire. The survey

continues with attitude and opinion questions about popularized cases by the media. These questions were carefully formulated in order to get honest opinions without asking leading questions. For these questions, we used a Likert scale beginning with 0 and increasing as needed. The bottom of the scale (beginning with 0) begins in a negative direction going positive as the numbers increase, hence a low level of guilt or a high level of guilt on popularized cases. All questions use this Likert scale in order to decrease confusion and allow students to answer the questions reliably. Questions range from how much they believe they are exposed to media outlets, to what their thought is on the outcome of certain popular and highly sensationalized media cases such as Casey Anthony and O.J. Simpson (See Appendix).

All of the questions in this survey are close-ended so analysis would be easier. We did not include any contingency questions for less confusion as well. The wording of each question was carefully discussed in order for it to be understood as clearly as possible without question or second guessing one's self. The questionnaire was completed on scantrons with the options ranging from 0-9. Once completed, the data was scanned, cleaned and analyzed. Data that were out of range (respondents put an option that was not listed, etc.) was changed to missing data.

Chapter V

Data Analysis

Table 1 describes the demographic variables used in this study. The sample is 48.2 percent males and 52.8 percent females. The ethnicity variable combined all other ethnicities besides Caucasians into a scale including Asian, African American, Native American, Mexican American, other Hispanic, and other. There are 58.67 percent Caucasians and 41.33 non-Caucasians. The mean age for this sample is 20 years old. Socioeconomic status combined father's income, mother's income, and total family income with a scale range of 0-23. The mean score is 14. The majority of respondent's parents had at least some college education. Family income mean is \$50,000-\$59,999.

Table 1 Demographic Variables

(N = 500, N Will Vary Due to Missing Data)

| Gender | N | Percent |
|--|----------|-----------------------|
| Male | 241 | 48.20 |
| Female | 259 | 51.80 |
| Ethnicity | | |
| Non-Caucasian | 205 | 41.33 |
| Caucasian | 291 | 58.67 |
| Classification | | |
| Freshman | 62 | 12.45 |
| Sophomore | 120 | 24.10 |
| Junior | 128 | 25.70 |
| Senior | 188 | 37.75 |
| Age (Mean) | 500 | 20 years old |
| Socioeconomic Status | 481 | 14.04574 (Mean Score) |
| <i>SES Based on Parent's Education and Family Income Range of Scale 0 - 23</i> | | |
| Cronbach's Alpha | | .655 |

Table 1 Demographic Variables Continued

| Father's Education | N | Percent |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Grade School | 14 | 2.82 |
| Some High School | 32 | 6.44 |
| Completed High School | 88 | 17.71 |
| Some College or Technical School | 113 | 22.74 |
| Associate's Degree | 25 | 5.03 |
| Completed 4 year college or university | 144 | 28.97 |
| Some post-graduate education | 25 | 5.03 |
| Completed a post-graduate degree | 56 | 11.27 |
| Mother's Education | | |
| Grade School | 16 | 3.21 |
| Some High School | 23 | 4.62 |
| Completed High School | 95 | 19.08 |
| Some College or Technical School | 113 | 22.69 |
| Associate's Degree | 34 | 6.83 |
| Completed 4 year college or university | 150 | 30.12 |
| Some post-graduate education | 26 | 5.22 |
| Completed a post-graduate degree | 41 | 8.23 |
| Family Income Mean | | |
| Income (Mean) | N 485 | Thousands \$50-59,999 |

Table 2 shows the independent variables and their means. The number of hours spent watching television, the number of hours spent on the Internet, the number of hours spent listening to the radio, the number of hours spent reading newspapers and magazines, and the number of hours spent on social media Web sites were the mean scale for the independent variable. Knowledge of sensationalized cases from personal networks also includes the mean scale score for the dependent variable. Opinions of guilt or innocence can also be seen (hours spent watching TV, hours spent using the Internet, hours spent listening to the radio, hours reading newspapers and magazines, hours spent using social media Web sites, interaction with personal networks). Respondents spent an average of 6-7 hours watching television per week. They also spend between 8-9 hours

using the Internet per week. Respondents spend between 2-3 hours listening to the radio per week and less than 1 hour reading newspapers or magazines per week. Respondents spend between 4-5 hours using social media Web sites per week. The range of the previous knowledge of publicized cases from discussion with personal networks is 0-9, with a mean score of 2.76. The independent variable of the analysis measured how likely a person would be, to base decisions about guilt on previous knowledge of a case from discussion with friends, family, and people at work. The following is the answer response set for all three questions before they were turned into a scale.

0. Not likely
1. Somewhat likely
2. Likely
3. Extremely Likely

A reliability analysis was run for the personal networks scale and has a Cronbach's alpha of .819. The range of the interpersonal networks scales is a low of 0 to a high of 9.

The three questions used for the interpersonal networks variables are:

1. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from discussion with friends?
2. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from discussion with family?
3. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from discussion with people at work?

The scale of opinions of guilt or innocence has a range from 0-18. Lower scores mean respondents perceive the people in the publicized cases as not guilty at all and as

the scores get higher respondents believed they were extremely guilty based on what they have heard through media sources. The mean opinion score is 12.329.

For the dependent variable, six highly sensationalized cases that have been publicized were chosen (See Table 2). Table 3 also shows the accused, the crime they were charged with, and their status in society.

The rationale behind choosing these cases was because they were popular in the media recently or have been highly sensationalize or publicized in the media where most people would have heard of it and could have had an impact of the decision of guilt or innocence by a jury. Most of these cases have been in the era of Internet and social media and false information could have been disseminated on the Internet by whoever chose to. If a respondent had not heard of a case, they were not included in the analysis.

Table 2: Independent Variables and Dependent Variable

(N = 500, N Will Vary Due to Missing Data)

Hours spent watching TV

N Mean
497 6 - 7 Hours per week

Hours spent using the Internet per week

NMean
498 8 - 9 Hours per week

Hours spent listening to the radio per week

N Mean
500 2-3 Hours per week

Hours spent Reading Newspapers or Magazines per week

N Mean
500 0-1 Hours per week

Hours spent Using Social Media Web Sites

N Mean
497 4-5 Hours per week

Personal Networks Mean Scale Score

Table 2: Independent Variables and Dependent Variable Continued

(Family, Friends, and Work Influence) (Scale Range 0-9)
 The higher the score the higher the likelihood one will base their decision (if chosen to be on a jury) on influence by family, friends, and coworkers on

N Mean
 488 2.768443
 Cronbach's Alpha .819

Dependent Variable

Opinion about deciding guilt in publicized/sensationalized cases (Scale Range 0-18)
 The higher the score indicates an opinion of a higher degree of guilt by respondent.
 Cronbach's Alpha .731

N Mean
 249 12.32932

Publicized/Sensationalized Cases

| Accused | Charge | Status |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Casey Anthony | Murder | Private Citizen |
| O.J. Simpson | Murder | Sports Athlete |
| Michael Jackson | Molestation | Entertainer |
| Kobe Bryan | Rape | Sports Athlete |
| Lindsay Lohan | Shoplifting | Entertainer |
| Charles Manson | Serial Murder | Private Citizen |

Correlation Matrix

A correlation matrix was run to assess possible relationships between the variables. As Internet use increases, their decision of guilt or innocence increases by .1869. There is a weak positive linear relation (Hamilton 1996:318). As reading newspapers and magazines decreases, their decision of guilt or innocence decreases by -.1649. Females have higher opinions of guilt than males (.2302). Caucasians have higher opinions of guilt than non-Caucasians (.2614). As age increases, so do opinions of guilt.

Table 3: Correlation of dependent, independent, and demographic variables. Significance .05*

| | Opinion |
|--|-----------------|
| Opinion | 1.0000 |
| TV | 0.0627 |
| Internet | 0.1869* |
| Radio | 0.0277 |
| Newspapers & Magazines | -0.1649* |
| Social Media | 0.0350 |
| Personal Networks | 0.0004 |
| Gender (0=male) (1=female) | 0.2302* |
| Ethnicity (0=Non-Caucasian) (1=Caucasian) | 0.2614* |
| Age | 0.1544* |
| Socioeconomic Status | 0.0443 |

Bivariate Regressions

A bivariate regression was run for the variable opinions of guilt or innocence in publicized/sensationalized cases on the variable number of hours spent watching television per week and was found to be not statistically significant as can be seen in table 4.

Table 4: Regression of opinion of guilt or innocence on publicized cases on hours of TV per week.

| Source | SSdf | MS | Number of obs = 246 | | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|---------------------|---|---------|--|
| Model | 10.6981098 | 1 10.6981098 | F(1, 244) | = | 0.96 | |
| Residual | 2706.93197 | 244 11.0939835 | Prob> F | = | 0.3271 | |
| | | | R-squared | = | 0.0039 | |
| | | | Adj R-squared | = | -0.0001 | |
| Total | 2717.63008 | 245 11.0923677 | Root MSE | = | 3.3308 | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|---------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| TV | .0861706 | .0877504 | 0.98 | 0.327 | -.0866744 .2590155 |
| _cons | 12.01043 | .3810604 | 31.52 | 0.000 | 11.25985 12.76102 |

A bivariate regression was run for the variable opinions of guilt or innocence in publicized/sensationalized cases on the variable number of hours spent on the Internet use per week. For each change in category change in someone's Internet usage (hours per

week), there is an increase in opinion of guilt score by .222. This model is statistically significant as shown by the probability of F, which is .0031. This model predicts a .0310 percent of the relationship.

Table 5: Regression of opinion of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours using the Internet

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 249 | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Model | 96.4113707 | 1 | 96.4113707 | F(1, 247) | = | 8.94 |
| Residual | 2664.58461 | 247 | 10.787792 | Prob> F | = | 0.0031 |
| Total | 2760.99598 | 248 | 11.1330483 | R-squared | = | 0.0349 |
| | | | | Adj R-squared | = | 0.0310 |
| | | | | Root MSE | = | 3.2845 |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|----------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Internet | .2223765 | .074386 | 2.99 | 0.003 | .0758648 | .3688882 |
| _cons | 11.24333 | .4186728 | 26.85 | 0.000 | 10.41871 | 12.06796 |

A bivariate regression was run for the variable opinions of guilt or innocence in publicized/sensationalized cases on the variable number of hours spent listening to the radio per week and was found to be not statistically significant as can be seen in table 6.

Table 6: Regression of opinion of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours listening to the radio

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 249 | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|---------------------|---|---------|
| Model | 2.12430574 | 1 | 2.12430574 | F(1, 247) | = | 0.19 |
| Residual | 2758.87168 | 247 | 11.169521 | Prob> F | = | 0.6631 |
| Total | 2760.99598 | 248 | 11.1330483 | R-squared | = | 0.0008 |
| | | | | Adj R-squared | = | -0.0033 |
| | | | | Root MSE | = | 3.3421 |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|---------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Radio | .037896 | .0868964 | 0.44 | 0.663 | -.1332565 | .2090485 |
| _cons | 12.23876 | .2966034 | 41.26 | 0.000 | 11.65457 | 12.82296 |

A bivariate regression was run for the variable opinions of guilt or innocence in publicized/sensationalized cases on the variable number of hours spent reading newspapers and magazines per week. For each change in category change in someone's Internet usage (hours per week), there is a decrease in opinion of guilt score by -.3821.

This model is statistically significant as shown by the probability of F, which is .0091.

This model predicts a .0233 percent of the relationship. This can be seen in table 7.

Table 7: Regression of opinion of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours reading newspapers or magazines

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 249 | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|----------------------|---|---------------|
| Model | 75.0810303 | 1 | 75.0810303 | F(1, 247) | = | 6.90 |
| Residual | 2685.91495 | 247 | 10.8741496 | Prob> F | = | 0.0091 |
| Total | 2760.99598 | 248 | 11.1330483 | R-squared | = | 0.0272 |
| | | | | Adj R-squared | = | 0.0233 |
| | | | | Root MSE | = | 3.2976 |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| News & Mags | -.3821191 | .1454224 | -2.63 | 0.009 | -.6685452 | -.095693 |
| _cons | 12.65312 | .2426041 | 52.16 | 0.000 | 12.17528 | 13.13096 |

A bivariate regression was run for the variable opinions of guilt or innocence in publicized/sensationalized cases on the variable number of hours spent using social media Web sites per week and was found to be not statistically significant as can be seen in table 8.

Table 8: Regression of opinion of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours using social media Web sites

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 246 | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|---------------------|---|---------|
| Model | 3.34384511 | 1 | 3.34384511 | F(1, 244) | = | 0.30 |
| Residual | 2728.28624 | 244 | 11.181501 | Prob> F | = | 0.5850 |
| Total | 2731.63008 | 245 | 11.1495105 | R-squared | = | 0.0012 |
| | | | | Adj R-squared | = | -0.0029 |
| | | | | Root MSE | = | 3.3439 |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|--------------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Social Media | .0475703 | .0869887 | 0.55 | 0.585 | -.1237744 | .218915 |
| _cons | 12.20746 | .3304529 | 36.94 | 0.000 | 11.55655 | 12.85836 |

A bivariate regression was run for the variable opinions of guilt or innocence in publicized/sensationalized cases on the variable number of hours spent with personal networks per week and was found to be not statistically significant as can be seen in table 9.

Table 9: Regression of opinion of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and discussion with personal networks

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 244 | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|---------------------|---------|--|
| Model | .000357744 | 1 | .000357744 | F(1, 242) = | 0.00 | |
| Residual | 2603.78653 | 242 | 10.7594485 | Prob> F = | 0.9954 | |
| | | | | R-squared = | 0.0000 | |
| | | | | Adj R-squared = | -0.0041 | |
| Total | 2603.78689 | 243 | 10.7151724 | Root MSE = | 3.2802 | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Personal Networks | .0005323 | .0923054 | 0.01 | 0.995 | -.1812923 | .1823568 |
| _cons | 12.38385 | .3210631 | 38.57 | 0.000 | 11.75141 | 13.01628 |

Hypothesis Testing

The first hypothesis was tested with a regression model. As the Number of hours of TV watched increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized cases will increase.

The hypothesis was not supported.

Table 10: Hypothesis 1 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours spent watching TV

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 235 | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|---------------------|--------|--|
| Model | 398.950474 | 5 | 79.7900948 | F(5, 229) = | 8.29 | |
| Residual | 2202.81974 | 229 | 9.61930017 | Prob> F = | 0.0000 | |
| | | | | R-squared = | 0.1533 | |
| | | | | Adj R-squared = | 0.1349 | |
| Total | 2601.77021 | 234 | 11.1186761 | Root MSE = | 3.1015 | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Gender | 1.603648 | .4126494 | 3.89 | 0.000 | .7905735 | 2.416723 |
| Ethnicity | 1.953284 | .4738989 | 4.12 | 0.000 | 1.019524 | 2.887043 |
| Age | .2062691 | .08603 | 2.40 | 0.017 | .0367576 | .3757807 |
| SES | -.0337966 | .0443319 | -0.76 | 0.447 | -.1211471 | .0535539 |
| TV | .1103483 | .0884034 | 1.25 | 0.213 | -.0638397 | .2845364 |
| _cons | 9.793403 | .7285838 | 13.44 | 0.000 | 8.357818 | 11.22899 |

The second hypothesis was tested with the regression model. As the number of hours of Internet usage increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized cases will increase. The hypothesis was supported. For each change in category change in someone's Internet usage (hours per week), there is an increase in opinion of guilt score by .196. Gender and ethnicity were also significant. Females had a higher opinion of

guilt score than males. Caucasians had a higher opinion of guilt scale than non-Caucasians. Age is also statistically significant. For each change in category for age, there is an increase in opinion of guilt score by .1808. This model is statistically significant as shown by the probability of F, which is .0000. This model predicts a .1551 percent of the relationship. This can be seen in table 11.

Table 11: Hypothesis 2 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours spent using the Internet

| Source | SSdf | MS | Number of obs = 238 | | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Model | 457.31019 | 5 91.4620381 | F(5, 232) = 9.70 | | | |
| Residual | 2187.79905 | 232 9.43016833 | Prob> F = 0.0000 | | | |
| Total | 2645.10924 | 237 11.1607985 | R-squared = 0.1729 | | | |
| | | | Adj R-squared = 0.1551 | | | |
| | | | Root MSE = 3.0709 | | | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Gender (0=Male) (1=Female) | 1.532992 | .4087753 | 3.75 | 0.000 | .7276061 | 2.338379 |
| Ethnicity (0=Non-Caucasian) (1=Caucasian) | 1.980574 | .4670209 | 4.24 | 0.000 | 1.06043 | 2.900718 |
| Age | .1808111 | .0849802 | 2.13 | 0.034 | .0133795 | .3482428 |
| SES | -.0436648 | .0426877 | -1.02 | 0.307 | -.1277699 | .0404403 |
| Internet | .1969275 | .0719968 | 2.74 | 0.007 | .0550764 | .3387787 |
| cons | 9.491377 | .7376737 | 12.87 | 0.000 | 8.037981 | 10.94477 |

The third hypothesis was tested with the regression model. As the Number of hours spent listening to the radio increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized cases will increase. The hypothesis was not supported.

Table 12: Hypothesis 3 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours spent listening to the radio

| Source | SSdf | MS | Number of obs = 238 | | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Model | 396.21399 | 5 79.2427979 | F(5, 232) = 8.17 | | | |
| Residual | 2248.89525 | 232 9.69351403 | Prob> F = 0.0000 | | | |
| Total | 2645.10924 | 237 11.1607985 | R-squared = 0.1498 | | | |
| | | | Adj R-squared = 0.1315 | | | |
| | | | Root MSE = 3.1134 | | | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|---------|----------|-----------|------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Gender | 1.616812 | .4132123 | 3.91 | 0.000 | .8026842 | 2.430941 |

Table 12: Hypothesis 3 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours spent listening to the radio continued

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Ethnicity | 1.956365 | .4742557 | 4.13 | 0.000 | 1.021967 | 2.890763 |
| Age | .2062231 | .0857464 | 2.41 | 0.017 | .037282 | .3751643 |
| SES | -.0344471 | .043173 | -0.80 | 0.426 | -.1195083 | .0506142 |
| Radio | .0836855 | .0847334 | 0.99 | 0.324 | -.0832599 | .2506309 |
| _cons | 10.00685 | .7235329 | 13.83 | 0.000 | 8.581318 | 11.43239 |

The fourth hypothesis was tested with the regression model. As the Number of hours spent reading newspapers and magazines increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized cases will increase. The hypothesis was not supported.

Table 13: Hypothesis 4 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours spent reading newspapers and magazines

| Source | SSdf | MS | Number of obs = 238 | | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|---------------------|---|--------|--|
| Model | 407.764099 | 5 81.5528197 | F(5, 232) | = | 8.46 | |
| Residual | 2237.34514 | 232 9.64372907 | Prob> F | = | 0.0000 | |
| | | | R-squared | = | 0.1542 | |
| | | | Adj R-squared | = | 0.1359 | |
| Total | 2645.10924 | 237 11.1607985 | Root MSE | = | 3.1054 | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Gender | 1.618678 | .4117322 | 3.93 | 0.000 | .8074664 | 2.429891 |
| Ethnicity | 1.73668 | .488279 | 3.56 | 0.000 | .7746518 | 2.698707 |
| Age | .2055016 | .0855059 | 2.40 | 0.017 | .0370342 | .3739689 |
| SES | -.0172854 | .0438773 | -0.39 | 0.694 | -.1037343 | .0691635 |
| News &Mags | -.2293943 | .155432 | -1.48 | 0.141 | -.5356329 | .0768443 |
| _cons | 10.2866 | .7067705 | 14.55 | 0.000 | 8.894088 | 11.67911 |

The fifth hypothesis was tested with the regression model. As the number of hours spent using social media Web sites increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized cases will increase. The hypothesis was not supported.

Table 14: Hypothesis 5 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and number of hours spent using social media Web sites continued

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Gender | 1.654171 | .4174398 | 3.96 | 0.000 | .8316574 | 2.476685 |
| Ethnicity | 1.943751 | .4775445 | 4.07 | 0.000 | 1.002808 | 2.884693 |
| Age | .2250048 | .0865408 | 2.60 | 0.010 | .0544868 | .3955228 |
| SES | -.0410487 | .0439282 | -0.93 | 0.351 | -.1276039 | .0455064 |
| Social Media | .0821232 | .0859522 | 0.96 | 0.340 | -.087235 | .2514814 |
| _cons | 10.01271 | .7284748 | 13.74 | 0.000 | 8.577344 | 11.44808 |

The sixth hypothesis was tested with the regression model. As the number of hours spent with personal networks increases the likelihood of deciding guilt in publicized cases will increase. The hypothesis was not supported.

Table 15: Hypothesis 6 Regressions of guilt or innocence on publicized cases and discussion with personal networks

| Source | SSdf | MS | Number of obs = 234 | | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|---------------------|---|--------|--|
| Model | 355.563063 | 5 71.1126126 | F(5, 228) | = | 7.60 | |
| Residual | 2134.04805 | 228 9.35985986 | Prob> F | = | 0.0000 | |
| | | | R-squared | = | 0.1428 | |
| | | | Adj R-squared | = | 0.1240 | |
| Total | 2489.61111 | 233 10.6850262 | Root MSE | = | 3.0594 | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Gender | 1.551415 | .4098112 | 3.79 | 0.000 | .7439135 | 2.358917 |
| Ethnicity | 1.819961 | .4693327 | 3.88 | 0.000 | .8951768 | 2.744745 |
| Age | .2155329 | .0864096 | 2.49 | 0.013 | .0452694 | .3857965 |
| SES | -.027909 | .042375 | -0.66 | 0.511 | -.1114057 | .0555878 |
| Personal Networks | .0973181 | .0901592 | 1.08 | 0.282 | -.0803337 | .2749699 |
| _cons | 9.98203 | .7533278 | 13.25 | 0.000 | 8.497656 | 11.4664 |

Hypothesis 7 examines how Internet usage has a stronger effect on deciding guilt or innocence in publicized cases compared to other media sources such as watching television, listening to the radio, reading newspapers or magazines, and spending time on social media Web sites. There is a statistically significant relationship between Internet usage and decisions of guilt or innocence. Table 16 shows how Internet usage is the only variable significant with decisions of guilt or innocence.

Table 16 tests hypothesis seven. For each change in category for gender, females have a higher opinion of guilt scale score of 1.487 than males. Caucasians had a higher opinion of guilt scale score than non-Caucasians (1.637). For each change in category for age, there is an increase in opinion of guilt score by .1992. For each change in the category for number of hours spent using the Internet, there is a change in opinions of

guilt scale score of .1843. This implies, as hours of Internet use increases, so does the respondent's opinion of guilt. This model is statistically significant as shown by the probability of F, 0.000. This model predicts 15 percent of the relationship. The hypothesis was supported.

Table 16: Regression of opinions of guilt or innocence on sensationalized cases, gender, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and number of hours spent watching television, Internet, radio, newspapers and magazines, and social media, and personal networks. Hypothesis 7

| Source | SS | df | MS | | | |
|----------|------------|-----|------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Model | 467.122641 | 10 | 46.7122641 | Number of obs= | 228 | |
| Residual | 1949.55718 | 217 | 8.98413449 | F(10, 217) = | 5.20 | |
| Total | 2416.67982 | 227 | 10.6461666 | Prob> F | = 0.0000 | |
| | | | | R-squared | = 0.1933 | |
| | | | | Adj R-squared | = 0.1561 | |
| | | | | Root MSE | = 2.9974 | |

| Opinion | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Gender (Male = 0) (Female = 1) | 1.487874 | .4116807 | 3.61 | 0.000 | .6764692 | 2.299279 |
| Ethnicity (0=Non-Caucasian) (1= Caucasian) | 1.637963 | .4818433 | 3.40 | 0.001 | .6882709 | 2.587655 |
| Age | .1992609 | .088142 | 2.26 | 0.025 | .0255368 | .372985 |
| SES | -.0254444 | .0443044 | -0.57 | 0.566 | -.1127664 | .0618776 |
| TV | .0960968 | .0952929 | 1.01 | 0.314 | -.0917214 | .2839149 |
| Internet | .1843438 | .0875774 | 2.10 | 0.036 | .0117324 | .3569551 |
| Radio | .158044 | .0953788 | 1.66 | 0.099 | -.0299435 | .3460315 |
| News &Mags | -.2905065 | .1745514 | -1.66 | 0.097 | -.6345397 | .0535268 |
| Social Media | -.1016747 | .1058155 | -0.96 | 0.338 | -.3102324 | .106883 |
| Personal Networks | .1297221 | .0906446 | 1.43 | 0.154 | -.0489344 | .3083786 |
| _cons | 8.990765 | .8005089 | 11.23 | 0.000 | 7.412997 | 10.56853 |

Chapter VI

Discussion

The number of hours spent using the Internet will influence decisions or opinions of guilt and Internet does have a stronger effect on opinions of guilt over other forms of media.

Internet is statistically significant since the sample used is college students. College students spend more time using the Internet than those who are older. Students who are mainly between the ages of 18-22 are used to getting up to the minute updates on everything going on. Television, radio, reading newspapers, and other media sources take some time to get updates, but anyone can go on the Internet and see what is going on in real time, which is why this group may feel this way about guilt or innocence. The more people use the Internet, the more likely they are to believe someone is guilty. This could be from the frequent updates on cases and stories posted to web pages or because of discussions that are interactive through the Internet. It is important to mention that anyone can post their opinions in the comment section of a story. They could write information that is completely false or inaccurate as well. People who read these comments may believe what they see and search for other pages or articles with the same facts posted, furthering the false information they are receiving. If someone is believed to be innocent or guilty by the person searching the Internet, they are going to search for things that are similar to their viewpoint in most cases. There also may be a higher belief in guilt through the Internet because there are no editors and articles or stories blaming people and saying they are guilty tend to be more interesting than those that give actual facts like most newspapers and magazines do.

Internet usage has a larger effect on people, especially like those in this sample, college students because it is what is convenient and available. No one wants to wait until the next day to hear what is going on in the world, like society used to do with newspapers. When something extremely newsworthy is happening, people want up to the minute updates. This could be seen with 9/11. Schools, workplaces, restaurants, and other public venues were constantly updating people with what was going on. Many had friends or family in this disaster and having to wait until the next day to find out what happened from a newspaper seems extremely outdated now.

Although newspapers and magazines were found to be statistically significant in a bivariate regression model, the full regression shows it had no effect. This is because the full regression is a more complete analysis of what influences a person's opinion. This makes sense since the mean age of people sampled was 20 years old. It is unlikely that they would read newspapers for news over other types of media sources.

Application to Theory

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) states that people construct what reality is through social activities and responses. Reality is what happens when we do not have control over habits or happenings in society including the media. Over time, events, people, signs, or symbols are used to represent something else in society. Through social norms and activities daily life becomes habitual reality constructed. The knowledge it takes to do routine activities is stored for later use. The patterns society creates are done so many times, that little to no thought is put into the activities (Calhoun et al. 2007).

According to the analysis done in the study we can make the claim that the media has an effect on constructing someone's reality. Specifically, respondent's perception of

guilt or innocence in sensational cases. For example, this study found that reality is constructed and interpreted differently by gender, ethnicity, age, and by Internet usage. This study found that females have a higher perception of guilt scale score, Caucasians have a higher perception of guilt scale score. In reference to age, older respondents have higher perception of guilt scale score. Respondents, who use the Internet more, have a higher perception of guilt scale score.

Strengths and Limitations

A weakness of this study is that it was a student sample; however given a lack of resources I was still able to conduct the study. Although a generalization could be made from this age group, other age groups are not generalizable. Another weakness could be that since the study is quantitative, there is not as much detail from respondents as a qualitative study may have gathered. In other words, what were the specific reasons why someone would decide guilt? What did they see on the Internet? What information or websites were they most influenced by? In reference to the age of the respondents the vast majority use the Internet. For future research I would like to compare groups of different ages. Some respondents may have combined reading a newspaper online with reading an actual newspaper rather than selecting the online source answer choice, which could have skewed the analysis.

Strengths of this study are that a large sample was able to respond to the questionnaire. We were also able to look at a number of variables in different ways through statistical testing and were able to generalize about the population used. Media is constantly changing; Internet is a newer form in which we get our media. Ten years from now, this will probably seem as outdated as the newspaper. Even television is

becoming a back up instead of the way we get our news. No one wants to wait until 5 or 6pm to see the latest story, especially when you can go online and read multiple stories about what is going on.

Potential jurors can be manipulated or biased by media sources. It can affect different people depending on their demographics as well. They become biased because of how the information is presented through the media and how it is transferred into the way someone will make a decision about a case. This study found that respondents have increased opinions of guilt based on Internet use.

Chapter VII

Conclusion

This study examined jury bias and manipulation through the media and measuring levels of guilt in highly sensationalized media cases. We found that Internet has the largest influence of jury decision making over any other type of media. This study found out how new form of media influence jury decisions of guilt or innocence. Future research in this area would be beneficial because finding out more about new media influence on decisions of guilt or innocence. For example, time spent on a mobile phone. The media can bias and manipulate people in to deciding whether some is innocent or guilty, which could affect the outcome of a case that has been sensationalized through the media. Future research on this subject would be beneficial. Looking at what type of Internet sites people use to get information and how accurate or factual they believe it is would help in furthering the study.

References

- (1976). Pretrial Publicity. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 67(4), 430-436.
- Abalakina-Paap, M., Stephen, W. G., Craig, T., & Gregory, W. L. (1999). Beliefs in Conspiracies. *Political Psychology*, 20(3), 637-647.
- Allan, K. (2006). *Contemporary social and sociological theory: visualizing social worlds*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.
- Anastasio, P. A., Rose, K. C., & Chapman, J. (1999). Can the Media Create Public Opinion? A Social-Identity Approach. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5), 152-155.
- Azad, S. (2011, June 26). Exonerated Anthony Graves wins battle for \$1.4 million in restitution | abc13.com. ABC Owned Television Stations. Retrieved December 1, 2012, from <http://abclocal.go.com/ktrk/story?section=news/local&id=8215647>
- Batson v. Kentucky. 476 U.S. 79. (1985).
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality; a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*, (1st ed.). Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Bird, S. E. (1996). CJ's Revenge: Media, Folklore, and the cultural construction of AIDS. *Critical Studies in Mass Communications*, 13(1), 45-58.
- Bright, D. A., and Jane Goodman-Delahunty. (2006). Gruesome Evidence and Emotion: Anger, Blame, and Jury Decision-Making. *Law and Human Behavior* 30(2), 183-202.
- Bull Kovera, Margaret. 2002. "The Effects of General Pretrial Publicity on Juror Decisions: An Examination of Moderators and Mediating Mechanisms." *Law and Human Behavior*, 26(1) 43-72
- Calhoun, C. J., Gerteis, J., Moody, J., Pfaff, S., & Virk, I. (2007). *Contemporary sociological theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cloud, J. (2011, June 16). Casey Anthony Murder Case: Social-Media Trial of Century - TIME. Breaking News, Analysis, Politics, Blogs, News Photos, Video, Tech Reviews - TIME.com. Retrieved November 29, 2012, from <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2077969-1,00.html>

- Battiste, N. (2012, February 20). Accused 'Honeymoon Killer' Showed Pics of Dead Wife Near 'Drowning' Signs - ABC News.ABCNews.com - Breaking News, Latest News & Top Video News - ABC News. Retrieved November 30, 2012, from <http://abcnews.go.com/US/accused-honeymoon-killer-showed-pics-dead-wife-drowning/story?id=15752949#.ULkFf6zoSCo>
- Butler, L. D., Koopman, C., &Zimbardo, P. G. (1995). The Psychological Impact of Viewing the Film "JFK": Emotions, Beliefs, and Political Behavioral Intentions.*Political Psychology*, 16(2), 237-257.
- Culhane, S. E., Harmon M. Hosch, and W. G. Weaver. (2004). Crime Victims Serving as Jurors: Is there Bias Present?.*Law and Human Behavior* 28(6), 649-659.
- Dacey, R. (1978). A Theory of Conclusions.*Philosophy of Science*, 45(4), 563-574.
- DeMarzo, P. M., Vayanos, D., &Zwiebel, J. (2003). Persuasion Bias, Social Influence, and unidimensional Opinions.*The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(3), 909-968.
- Demers, D. (2007). History and future of mass media: an integrated perspective. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Dillehay, R. C., and M. T. Nietzel. (1985). Juror Experience and Jury Verdicts.*Law and the Human Behavior* 9(2), 179-191.
- Drakos, K., &Gofas, A. (2006). The Devil You Know but Are Afraid to Face: Underreporting Bias and Its Distorting Effects on the Study of Terrorism. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50(5), 714-735
- Edmonson v. Leesville Concrete Co..500 U.S. 614. (1991).
- Eveland, W. P., and Dhavan V. Shah. (2003). The Impact of Individual and Interpersonal Factors on Perceived News Media Bias.*Political Psychology* 24(1), 101-117.
- Francis, E. (2011, October 4).Lifetime to Alter Amanda Knox Movie After Conviction Overturned - ABC News.ABCNews.com - Breaking News, Latest News & Top Video News - ABC News. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/entertainment/2011/10/lifetime-to-alter-amanda-knox-movie-after-conviction-overturned/>
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., &Sasson, T. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 373-393

- Gottfredson, M. R., & Gottfredson, D. M. (1988). *Decision making in criminal justice: toward the rational exercise of discretion* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum Press.
- Greene, E. (1990). Media Effects on Jurors. *Law and Human Behavior*, 14(5) 439-450
- Gross, D. (2012, November 29). How a fake Google news story spread online - CNN.com. CNN.com - Breaking News, U.S., World, Weather, Entertainment & Video News. Retrieved December 4, 2012, from <http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/28/tech/web/google-icoa-fake-news/index.html>
- Hamilton, L. C. (1996). *Data Analysis for Social Scientists*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Hayward, R. A. Jr., Hosticka C., and Mitchell, M. (1976). Jury Selection as a Biased Social Process. *Law & Society Review*, 11(1): 9-24
- Hazelwood, Lynn D. and Brigham, John C. (1998). The Effects of Juror Anonymity on Jury Verdicts. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22(6): 695-713
- History of Online Social Networks, Social Networking Websites, YouTube, Facebook, MySpace, Privacy Issues and Copyright Infringement . (n.d.). EBSCO Online Library Search Engine Directory - Find Articles, News, Periodicals and Other Premium Online Content. Retrieved December 4, 2012, from <http://connection.ebscohost.com/technology/social-networking-sites/history-online-social-networks>
- Hutson, M. (2007, March 1). Unnatural Selection Psychology Today. *Psychology Today: Health, Help, Happiness + Find a Therapist*. Retrieved August 23, 2012, from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/articles/200703/unnatural-selection>
- J.E.B v. Alabama. 511 U.S. 127. (1994).
- Johnson, D. P. (2008). *Contemporary Sociological Theory An Integrated Multi-Level Approach*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (1982). *Judgment under uncertainty: heuristics and biases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kovarik, B. (2011). *Revolutions in communication: media history from Gutenberg to the digital age*. New York: Continuum.
- Kramer, G. P., Kerr, N. L., & Carroll, J. S. (1990). Pretrial Publicity, Judicial Remedies, and Jury Bias. *Law and Human Behavior*, 14(5), 409-438.

- Lacy, G. S. (2010, May 5). Should Jurors Use the Internet? by Gareth Lacy :: SSRN. Going to search. Retrieved November 26, 2012, from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1600585
- Levine, J. P. (1996). The Impact of Sequestration on Juries. *Judicature*, 79(5), 266.
- Maskay, M. H., & Juhasz, A. M. (1983). The Decision-Making Process Model: Design and Use of Adolescent Sexual Decisions. *National Council on Family Relations*, 2(1), 111-116.
- NBC News doctors audio of Trayvon Martin 911 call? | Fox News Video. (n.d.). Ohio dad gets jail time for mocking girl with cerebral palsy | Fox News Video. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from <http://video.foxnews.com/v/1543999825001/nbc-news-doctors-audio-of-trayvon-martin-911-call/>
- Natanson, P. (2011, September 23). Amanda Knox Prosecutor Warns of Media Interference - ABC News. ABCNews.com - Breaking News, Latest News & Top Video News - ABC News. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from <http://abcnews.go.com/International/amanda-knox-prosecutor-warns-media-interference/story?id=14585166#.ULZpgYfoSCo>
- O'Dell, J. (2011, March 14). For the First Time, More People Get News Online Than From Newspapers. Mashable. Retrieved December 5, 2012, from <http://mashable.com/2011/03/15/online-versus-newspaper-news/>
- Ogloff, J. R., & Vidmar, N. (1994). The Impact of Pretrial Publicity on Jurors: A Study to Compare the Relative Effects of Television and Print Media in a Child Sex Abuse Case. *Law and Human Behavior*, 18(5), 507-525.
- Online NewsHour: Olympic Bombing: Richard Jewell -- October 28, 1996. (n.d.). PBS: Public Broadcasting Service. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/sports/jewell_10-28.html
- Otto, A. L., Penrod, Steven D., Dexter, Hedy R. (1994). The Biasing Impact of Pretrial Publicity on Juror Judgments. *Law and Human Behavior*, 18(4) 453-469.
- Powers v. Ohio. 499 U.S. 400. (1991).
- Reals, T. (2012, September 28). Iran news agency picks up "Onion" story, tells Iranians rural Americans prefer Ahmadinejad to Obama. Retrieved December 4, 2012, from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-202_162-57522363/iran-news-agency-picks-up-onion-story-tells-iranians-rural-americans-prefer-ahmadinejad-to-obama/

- Reifman, A., Spencer M. G., and Phoebe C. Ellsworth. (1992) Real Jurors' Understanding of the Law in Real Cases. *Law and Human Behavior* 16(2) 539- 554.
- Ridout, T. N., & Smith, G. R. (2008). Free Advertising: How the Media Amplify Campaign Messages. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(4), 598-608.
- Robbennolt, J. K. and Studebaker, Christina A. (2003). News Media Reporting on Civil Litigation and Its Influence on Civil Justice Decision Making. *Law and Human Behavior* 27(1): 5-27
- Roberts, M. D. (2004). Does Meaning Evolve?. *Behavior and Philosophy* , 32(2), 401-426.
- Roper, R. T. (1981). The Gag Order: Asphyxiating the First Amendment . *The Western Political Quarterly*, 34(3), 372-378.
- Rose, M. R. (2005). A Dutiful Voice: Justice in the Distribution of Jury Service. *Law & Society Review*, 39(3) 601-634
- Sack, K. (n.d.). Richard Jewell, 44, Hero of Atlanta Attack, Dies - Obituary (Obits) - NYTimes.com. The New York Times - Breaking News, World News & Multimedia. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/30/us/30je>
- Sheppard, S. (2008). *The partisan press: a history of media bias in the United States*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co.
- Sherrod, D. (1985). Trial Delay as a Source of Bias in Jury Decision Making. *Law and Human Behavior* 9., 101-108. Print.
- Shimbun, Y. (2012). Wrong information in school bullying case spread on Internet. Asiaone. Retrieved December 5, 2012, from <http://news.asiaone.com/News/Latest%2BNews/Edvantage/Story/A1Story20120730-362163.html>
- Smith, A. C. and Greene, E. (2005). Conduct and Its Consequences: Attempts at Debiasing Jury Judgments. *Law and Human Behavior*, 29(5) 505-526
- Sommers, S. R., and M. I. Norton. (2007). Race-Based Judgments, Race-Neutral Justifications: Experimental Examination of Peremptory Use and the Batson Challenge Procedure. *Law and Human Behavior* 31.3, 261-273.
- Spackman, M. P., Jann C. Belcher, J. W. Calaap, and A. Taylor. (2002). An Analysis of the Effects of Subjective and Objective Instruction Forms on Mock-Juries' Murder/Manslaughter Distinctions. *Law and Human Behavior* 26(6), 605- 623.

- Strier, Franklin. (1999). Whither Trial Consulting? Issues and Projections. *Law and Human Behavior* 23(1), 93-115.
- Studebaker, C. A., Maithilee, J. K., Pathak-Sharma, K., & Penrod, S. D. (2000). Assessing Pretrial Publicity Effects: Integrating Content Analytic Results. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(3), 317-336.
- Swain v. Alabama. 380 U.S. 202. (1965).
- The Innocence Project - Home. (n.d.). The Innocence Project - Home. Retrieved December 4, 2012, from <http://www.innocenceproject.org/>
- Turner, C. (2010). Investigating sociological theory. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Vidmar, N. (2002). Case Studies of Pre- and Midtrial Prejudice in Criminal and Civil Litigation. *Law and Human Behavior*, 26(1), 73-105.
- Vidmar, N., & Hans, V. P. (2007). *American juries: the verdict*. Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books.
- Wilson, J. R., & Bornstein, B. H. (1998). Methodological Considerations in Pretrial Publicity Research: Is the Medium the Message?. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22(5), 585-597.
- Xiang, Y., & Sarvary, M. (2007). News Consumption and Media Bias. *Marketing Science*, 26(5), 18.

Appendix

Questionnaire

Dr. Ignacio Luis Ramirez and Ms Allison Kozlowski are researching; How the Media could affect juries. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions, just what you think. This survey will take about 20 to 30 minutes of your time, and we will use the results for a research study. We will not be able to identify you individually – *please do not put your name on this survey*. If you would prefer not to answer a question, please leave it blank. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. When you are done with your surveys please bring them to class the next day and you will be instructed deposit them into a covered box. If you have any questions about this study, please call Dr. Ramirez at L.Ramirez@ttu.edu or Ms Kozlowski at Allison.kozlowski@gmail.com.

Thank you for helping us with this research.

1. What is your gender?
 0. Male
 1. Female

2. What is your ethnicity?
 0. Asian
 1. African American
 2. Caucasian
 3. Native American
 4. Mexican American
 5. Other Hispanic
 6. Other

3. What is your age?
 0. 18 or younger
 1. 19
 2. 20
 3. 21
 4. 22
 5. 23
 6. 24
 7. 25
 8. 26
 9. 27 or older

4. What is your classification at school?
 0. Freshman
 1. Sophomore
 2. Junior
 3. Senior

5. What is your current relationship status?
 0. Single
 1. Dating
 2. Engaged
 3. Married

6. What is your father's highest level of education?
 0. Grade School
 1. Some high school
 2. Completed high school
 3. Some college or technical school
 4. Associate's Degree
 5. Completed 4 year college or university
 6. Some post-graduate education
 7. Completed a post- graduate degree (M.A., M.D., Ph.D., etc.)

7. What is your mother's highest level of education?
 0. Grade School
 1. Some high school
 2. Completed high school
 3. Some college or technical school
 4. Associate's Degree
 5. Completed 4 year college or university
 6. Some post-graduate education
 7. Completed a post- graduate degree (M.A., M.D., Ph.D., etc.)

8. What is your family's combined yearly income?
 0. Under \$10,000
 1. \$10,000-\$19,999
 2. \$20,000-\$29,999
 3. \$30,000-\$39,999
 4. \$40,000-\$49,999
 5. \$50,000-\$59,999
 6. \$60,000-\$69,999
 7. \$70,000-\$79,999
 8. \$80,000-\$89,000
 9. \$90,000 or more

9. What is your current employment status?
0. Not currently employed
 1. Employed full-time
 2. Employed part-time
10. With which political party do you most relate to?
0. Republican
 1. Democrat
 2. Independent/Other
11. Which religion do you belong to?
0. Catholic
 1. Baptist
 2. Methodist
 3. Non-denominational Protestant/Christian
 4. Jewish
 5. Muslim
 6. Hindu
 7. Buddhist
 8. Other
 9. No Affiliation

Frequency of church attendance:

12. How often do you attend a place of worship (church, synagogue, etc.)?
0. Never
 1. Once or twice a year
 2. Several times a year
 3. About once a month
 4. 2-3 times a month
 5. Weekly or more often

Strength of religious faith:

13. In general, would you consider your religious faith to be?
0. Non-existent
 1. Very weak
 2. Moderately weak
 3. Moderately strong
 4. Very strong

Frequency of prayer:

14. Approximately how often do you pray?
0. Never
 1. Less than once a week
 2. Once a week

3. Several times a week
 4. Daily
 5. Several times a day
15. Beliefs about God:
0. I don't believe in God.
 1. I don't believe in a personal God, but I believe in a higher power of some kind.
 2. I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at other times.
 3. While I have some doubts, I feel that I do believe in God.
 4. I know that God really exists and I have no doubts about it.

Please answer the next set of questions with the following responses

- 0 = Strongly Disagree
1 = Disagree
2 = Not Sure
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree

16. I am sure the Bible contains no errors or contradictions
17. It is very important for true Christians to believe that the Bible is the infallible Word of God
18. The Bible is the final and complete guide to morality; it contains God's answers to all important questions about right and wrong.
19. Christians should not let themselves be influenced by worldly ideas.
20. Christians must try hard to know and defend the true teachings of God's word.
21. The best education for a Christian child is in a Christian school with Christian teachers.

22. How many hours of TV do you watch per week?

0. 0-1
1. 2-3
2. 4-5
3. 6-7
4. 8-9
5. 10-11
6. 11-12
7. 13-14
8. 15-16
9. 17 or more

23. How many hours do you spend using the internet per week?

0. 0-1

1. 2-3
2. 4-5
3. 6-7
4. 8-9
5. 10-11
6. 11-12
7. 13-14
8. 15-16
9. 17 or more

24. How many hours do you spend listening to the radio?

0. 0-1
1. 2-3
2. 4-5
3. 6-7
4. 8-9
5. 10-11
6. 11-12
7. 13-14
8. 15-16
9. 17 or more

25. How many hours do you spend reading newspapers and magazines?

0. 0-1
1. 2-3
2. 4-5
3. 6-7
4. 8-9
5. 10-11
6. 11-12
7. 13-14
8. 15-16
9. 17 or more

26. How many hours do you spend on a social media web site?

0. 0-1
1. 2-3
2. 4-5
3. 6-7
4. 8-9
5. 10-11
6. 11-12
7. 13-14

- 8. 15-16
- 9. 17 or more

27. Where do you get your news?

- 0. Traditional TV news (CNN, FOX, ABC, CBS, NBC, MSNBC, PBS, Etc.)
- 1. Non-traditional news (The Daily Show, Colbert Report, Etc.)
- 2. Newspaper
- 3. Radio
- 4. Social Media
- 5. News web site
- 6. Other

28. Which TV news station do you watch most often?

- 0. CNN
- 1. FOX
- 2. ABC
- 3. MSNBC
- 4. CBS
- 5. PBS
- 6. NBC
- 7. Local TV Station
- 8. Other

29. On the following scale with 0 being the lowest and 9 being the highest, how informed are you on current events and news?

- 0. Not informed at all
- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4. Somewhat informed
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9. Completely informed

30. Have you ever been summoned for jury duty?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

31. Have you ever been selected to be on an actual jury?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

32. Has anyone in your immediate family been selected to be on an actual jury?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

Please use the response set below for the following questions.

- 0. Not guilty at all
 - 1. Somewhat guilty
 - 2. Guilty
 - 3. Extremely Guilty
 - 4. I have never heard of this case or have not opinion about this case
33. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Casey Anthony (murder) case?
34. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the O.J. Simpson (murder) case?
35. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Michael Jackson (child molestation) case?
36. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Kobe Bryant (rape) case?
37. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Mike Tyson (rape) case?
38. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Lindsay Lohan (shoplifting) case?
39. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Winona Ryder (shoplifting) case?
40. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Scott Peterson (murder) case?
41. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Timothy McVeigh (terrorism) case?

42. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Charles Manson (serial killer) case?
43. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Rodney King police officers (assault) case?
44. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Phil Spector (murder) case?
45. Based on what you have heard or seen on the news, TV, Internet, radio, Etc., what is your personal opinion of the Amanda Knox (murder) case?

Please use the response set below for the following questions.

0. Not likely
 1. Somewhat likely
 2. Likely
 3. Extremely likely
46. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from the Internet?
 47. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from the TV?
 48. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from discussion with friends?
 49. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from discussion with family?
 50. If selected to a jury, how likely are you to base your decision on previous knowledge about the case from discussion with people at work?
 51. I like watching fictional (pretend or made up), TV shows about crime and violence (NCIS, Law and Order, etc.).
 0. Never
 1. Rarely
 2. Sometimes
 3. Almost Always
 4. Always
 52. I like watching non-fictional (real life), TV shows about crime and violence.
 0. Never

1. Rarely
2. Sometimes
3. Almost Always
4. Always

53. How accurate do you believe facts and events are presented on fictional (pretend or made up) TV shows about crime and violence?

0. Not Accurate at all
1. Somewhat accurate
2. Accurate
3. Extremely accurate
4. I don't watch this type of TV shows

54. How accurate do you believe facts and events are presented on non-fictional (real life) TV shows about crime and violence?

0. Not Accurate at all
1. Somewhat accurate
2. Accurate
3. Extremely accurate
4. I don't watch this type of TV shows

55. How closely do you follow Hollywood or celebrity scandals?

0. Not closely at all
1. Somewhat closely
2. Closely
3. Very closely
4. I don't follow Hollywood or celebrity scandals.

56. How loyal are you to a public figure or celebrity, even when they commit a crime?

0. Lose all loyalty
1. Somewhat loyal
2. Loyal
3. Still very loyal

Please use the response set below for the following questions.

0. Not likely
1. Somewhat likely
2. Likely
3. Extremely likely

57. If selected to be on a jury that involved a child murder, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?

58. If selected to be on a jury that involved an accidental death, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
59. If selected to be on a jury that involved an adult murder that was premeditated, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
60. If selected to be on a jury that involving the death of a law enforcement officer, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
61. If selected to be on a jury that involved a famous entertainer, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
62. If selected to be on a jury that involved a politician, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
63. If selected to be on a jury that involved a politician, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
64. If selected to be on a jury that involved a property crime of high monetary cost, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
65. If selected to be on a jury that involved a property crime of low monetary cost, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
66. If selected to be on a jury that a violent crime where the victim did not get seriously hurt, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
67. If selected to be on a jury that involved a violent crime where the victim got seriously hurt, how likely would you be to give the defendant the death penalty as punishment?
68. Have you ever been a victim of a crime?
 0. No
 1. Yes
69. Have you ever been a victim of a property crime?
 0. No
 1. Yes
70. Have you ever been a victim of a violent crime?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

71. Do you have a family member or close personal friend who has ever been a victim of a crime?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

72. Do you have a family member or close personal friend who has ever been a victim of a property crime?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

73. Do you have a family member or close personal friend who has ever been a victim of a violent crime?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

Please use the response set below for the following questions.

- 0. Strongly Disagree
- 1. Disagree
- 2. Agree
- 3. Strongly Agree

74. I have knowledge of previous high profile or sensationalized cases

75. If I were a member on a jury to a case that I have knowledge from another similar case, I would base my decision on that previous case

76. Since the age of 15, I have physically attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them.

77. Since the age of 15, I hit or threatened to hit someone who is not a member of my family.

78. Since the age of 15, I have stolen money (from anyone, including family).

79. I answered the questions in this study honestly.