

Television viewers' exposure to crime shows and their knowledge of constitutional rights.

Katie N. Smith

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Master of Arts in Communicology

August 2018

Committee Members:

R. Kelly Aune, Chairperson

Jessica Gasiorek

Hye-Ryeon Lee

Abstract

This study looked at the amount of crime television a person watches, his/her knowledge of their constitutional rights, and the confidence a person has in that knowledge. Implicit learning and cultivation theory were used to predict that as the amount of crime television watched increased, so would knowledge and confidence levels. The sample consisted of 187 university aged students. Participants reported how much crime television they watched, then took a test about civil rights knowledge. Participants also indicated how confident they were about each of their answers on this test. Results showed there was a significant, positive correlation between crime television viewing and constitutional rights knowledge. Results also showed a marginally significant, positive correlation between crime show viewing and respondents' confidence in their constitutional rights knowledge; although, this relationship disappeared after controlling for knowledge. Results are consistent with both implicit learning and cultivation effects.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

Cultivating Beliefs and Understandings About Constitutional Rights.....6

Implicit Learning of Constitutional Rights7

Hypothesis 19

Cultivation Theory Applied to Crime Show Viewing.....9

Crime Shows Depiction of Constitutional Rights.....12

Misperceptions of Constitutional Rights.....12

Hypothesis 214

Methods14

Results17

Discussion18

Appendix A22

Appendix B25

Appendix C28

Appendix D31

References32

Introduction

Even before there was television, the crime drama existed. Eschholz, Mallard, and Flynn (2004) defined crime dramas as “general fictional portrayals of the criminal justice system focusing primarily on violent offenders” (p. 161). Popularized on radio, crime shows moved to television when TV sets became household items (Robards, 1985). Since that time, these shows have given law-abiding citizens an inside look at crime, the criminal justice system, and those that work within it. For those with no first-hand experience with the criminal justice system, media depictions may be the only experience with crime or the justice system that these viewers will be exposed to.

In the United States, 96% of homes have a television with a network or internet connection (Nielsen, 2016). Today’s streaming possibilities make television easier to watch than ever before. Further, it has become our primary source of knowledge for a number of topics (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002). This is in part due to the advance of in depth information television is now providing. For instance, cooking shows have now grown into entire networks devoted to food. For many viewers, television programs help shape their realities (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). George Gerbner referred to this as *cultivation* – the idea that television programs help cultivate attitudes and beliefs in the minds of the people who watch them (Gerbner & Gross, 1976).

Television can be especially helpful providing us with information for which we have no firsthand experience. For instance, the majority of people have not read the United States Constitution or had firsthand experience with law enforcement (barring traffic tickets). But people who watch crime television shows get a peek at what law enforcement looks like and how our constitutional rights work – or at least how Hollywood portrays it happening. Without

firsthand encounters with the criminal justice system, we are more susceptible to believing what we see on television, even when we know the programs are fictional.

Repeated exposure to crime shows may not just affect what we believe to know about the criminal justice system, it may also help us to better understand the set of rules that govern this system. We may be learning this information passively through a process known as implicit learning. Scholars suggest that this is a subconscious process in which we assimilate information without intent (see example: Dienes, Broadbent, & Berry, 1991; Reber, 1967). If someone is watching a television show solely for enjoyment, they may not realize they are actually absorbing information from the program. For instance, someone may solely watch crime television shows, because they may just enjoy the thrill of the chase. But while viewing, they may inadvertently learn about their constitutional rights, if those rights are being depicted in the show in some way. In this study, I will test to see if the amount of crime television a person watches is related to their knowledge of their constitutional rights.

It is also likely that some people who watch these shows believe that they are learning from them. If someone watches these shows often, and what they have seen on previous shows is reinforced in later episodes, it could increase their confidence in this knowledge. They could come to believe that, through their extensive experience with shows of this genre, they have become fairly expert in their understanding of the criminal justice system in general, and their constitutional rights specifically. In this study, I will also look at how confident people are in their knowledge of their constitutional rights in relation to their crime show viewing habits, and if that confidence correlates with their actual knowledge base. I predicted people who watch more crime television shows will report being more confident in their knowledge of their

constitutional rights, because watching these shows will instill and reinforce that confidence in them.

Cultivating Beliefs and Understandings About Constitutional Rights

Since the moment that television entered households, people have been influenced by its programming. George Gerbner and colleagues developed the cultivation hypothesis in the 1960-70s to explain how the world of television molds our own social realities (see example: Gerbner & Gross, 1976). The hypothesis states that the more time one spends watching television, the more likely one will start to foster beliefs based on what they have seen on TV shows (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). Before Gerbner, research was more focused on the short-term influences on individuals associated with their viewing behavior. For instance, watching a violent television show may make one feel more violent in the immediate moments after watching the violent program. Gerbner was more interested in cultivation as a long-term process that occurs on a societal level through repeated exposure to multiple television programs (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1986); for example, whether repeated exposure to violent video games would increase the likelihood of someone to commit an act of violence.

It also is the case that television has become one of our primary sources of knowledge, including what Gerbner et al. (2002) referred to as “everyday information” (Cohen & Weimann, 2000; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002). Viewers take the information they learn from television programs and incorporate it with their direct, “real-world” experience, and knowledge they have acquired from other sources (e.g. other people, books, etc.). Consequently, even people who claim they do not believe what they see on television may be influenced by information they were exposed to via television, and accept that information as true (Gerbner et al., 2002). For instance, if a detective on television says that 30% of people are

victims of a violent crime during their lifetime, a viewer might incorporate that claim into their knowledge base and lose track of where the information came from.

The crime genre as a whole includes representations of all parts of the criminal justice process. This starts with crime, then usually an investigation, followed by an arrest, an interrogation, and then a trial. Not every show includes every aspect. However, what one show may lack, viewers may find depicted in another show. One of the aspects of the justice system depicted in crime dramas is the relevant constitutional rights associated with enforcing the law and prosecuting crimes. Incorporation of these rights begins as soon as law enforcement officers get involved (investigation, usually), and continue to be illustrated until the process is over (someone is receiving punishment for a crime).

These rights are set in the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the constitution. The Fourth Amendment protects citizens against unreasonable search and seizure. The Fifth Amendment protects someone from being compelled to implicate themselves in a crime, and also gives citizens the right to due process of the law. This includes, but is not limited to, the right to legal counsel, the right to a fair trial, and the right to a trial by peers. The Sixth Amendment ensures the right to a speedy trial and that an arrestee understand why they are being held. The Eighth Amendment protects from cruel and unusual punishment, and the Fourteenth protects people charged under state authority with the same rights as under federal jurisdiction (see Appendix A for the full text of each Amendment).

Implicit Learning of Constitutional Rights

Because crime dramas deal with constitutional rights, such as Miranda warnings, illegal search and seizure, etc., people who watch these shows get some exposure to their rights as they are depicted on TV. Even though these rights may not be explicitly discussed in the shows, it is

likely viewers will still be able to learn their rights – however indirectly – by repeatedly being exposed to the structure and operation of the criminal justice system.

Arthur Reber (1989) defined implicit learning as “the process by which knowledge about the rule governed complexities of the stimulus environment is acquired independently of conscious attempts to do so” (p. 219). In relation to this study, that would mean that even for people who watch crime shows solely for enjoyment, they would likely indirectly learn something about their constitutional rights during the process. Although some people will be aware they are acquiring knowledge, they may not realize to what extent. Given this process, we would expect that people who watch more crime television would know more about their constitutional rights than people who watch less of these shows.

It is not necessary for shows to discuss civil rights directly, as we have the capacity to passively abstract patterns from stimuli. Several studies have found that people exposed to an artificial grammatical structure became increasingly sensitive to the structure, and they were able to use their knowledge later in a recognition task (Mathews, Buss, Stanley, Blanchard-Fields, Cho, & Druhan, 1989; Reber, 1967, 1976; Reber & Allen, 1978). We would expect the same to be true for the structure of the criminal justice system. Viewers of crime shows are exposed to this structure, usually without being told specifically that each action taken by a law enforcement officer should follow a rule governed system. Implicit learning would suggest that if given a recognition task, these viewers would be able to correctly identify these rules, but they may not be able to verbally articulate them on a free response test.

Additionally, Berry and Dienes (1991) explain that sometimes a person can pinpoint an episode where they “learned to make a right decision without being able to justify the decision (pp. 359).” In sum, these lines of reasoning can explain how someone can watch repeated

sequences of action across shows, abstract from those episodes a pattern of behavior, but not necessarily be able to articulate the pattern (Dienes, Broadbent, & Berry, 1991; Reber, 1989).

Berry and Dienes (1991) mark this as one of the staple characteristics of implicit learning. This information leads to the following hypothesis.

H1: The more crime television a person watches, the better he/she will know their constitutional rights.

Cultivation Theory Applied to Crime Show Viewing

Overall, the body of research on cultivation theory shows that regardless of topic area, there is a relationship between television viewing and beliefs (Hawkins & Pingree, 1981). This appears to be true of all types of television programming. Studies have shown that people who are heavy viewers of medical dramas view cancer as more fatal (Lee & Niederdeppe, 2011), and also underestimate the gravity and importance of chronic illness (Chung, 2014). A study by Quick in 2009 suggested that people who watch the medical drama, *Grey's Anatomy*, were more likely to view doctors as courageous. Comedy television and news programs (in Israel) give people rose-colored glasses, making them believe the world is more positive than it is (Cohen & Weimann, 2000).

A study by Cohen and Weimann (2000) provided evidence that cultivation was, in fact, a cumulative process. The researchers surveyed nearly 5,000 teenagers attending Jewish high schools (grades 9-12) in Israel to assess their viewing habits and determine whether the students were experiencing cultivation effects. On average, students watched 3.39 hours of television a day on school days but increased their viewing to 6 hours on days they were not in school. The researchers asked students to report on 9 different genres, but ultimately analyzed the 5 most popular genres: movies, horror/mystery, comedies, MTV, and news.

The analysis showed that genre type and length of viewing were both significant factors in predicting cultivation effects. For example, teens who watched a lot of news programming were less likely to be afraid of victimization (i.e. being a victim of a crime) or exploitation (e.g., someone taking advantage of them), and more likely to view others as trustworthy and helpful. In addition, the older teenagers (16 and up) showed evidence of being more impacted by television programs than did their younger counterparts (13-15 years old). Researchers suggest this is because the older respondents have watched more television in their lifetimes than their younger counterparts. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that cultivation effects develop over time.

News in the United States, however, was found to make people more fearful of being the victim of a crime (Callanan, 2012). Those who engaged in viewing romantic programs were more likely to report believing in predestined soulmates and having a higher expectation of mind-reading by significant others (Holmes, 2007). Finally, a study found that people who are heavy viewers of talk shows are have an inflated perception of the number of incidents of infidelity, running away from home, and premarital sex that occur (Woo & Dominick, 2001).

Research on this topic provides evidence that crime television (news, reality, drama, etc.) has influenced its viewers in many ways. Callanan (2012) found that increased viewing of news programs and crime reality shows positively correlated with an increase in fear of crime and increased assessment of the risk of victimization (in the U.S.). Increased viewing of crime programs can create “mean world syndrome” in the mind of the viewer. Mean world syndrome refers to frequent TV viewing leading people to believe that others are inherently selfish, and the world is dangerous (Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980). This assumption of increased risk also correlates with crime television viewing and increased support of the death penalty and

other capital punishments, support of handgun ownership, and actual handgun ownership (Holbert, Shah, & Kwak, 2004).

Further, mean world syndrome may be exacerbated by the geographical constraints of any given show. The majority of shows take place in the same location every week (e.g. *Law & Order* and *NYPD Blue* both take place in New York, *CSI: Miami* is always set in Florida, etc.). Consequently, it can seem as though more crime occurs in these places than is actually happening. One study suggested that crime dramas show 10 times more crime proportionately than what is happening in real life (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1986). The authors of that study speculate that the increased perception of risk of victimization is most likely due to this disproportion of criminal activity occurring. Theoretically, if more crime is happening, more people are being victimized. Therefore, watching shows that portray high amounts of crime in a particular area could make people in that area feel as though that crime is at a higher rate than it actually is, consequently increasing their perception of their risk of being a victim.

There is an abundance of crime television available through many different media today. We see crime on the news, in fictional dramatizations, and reality TV shows. In this paper, I will focus solely on the fictional television genre known as crime dramas. Eschholz, Mallard, and Flynn (2004) said these shows can shape “perceptions of the crime problem, [viewers’] interpretations of the bill of rights, and their sense of the meaning of justice” (p. 162). This is especially true of those that purport to be drawn from real life. For instance, “*Law & Order*” used to run the tagline, “Ripped from the headlines” about their episodes. Every week, they would choose a real-life news story to recreate on their show, which made it easier for people to assume that each show was a similar, if not identical recreation of the events that occurred.

Crime Shows Depiction of Constitutional Rights

Many crime dramas today employ some of these rights in their storylines to make the shows seem more realistic. But how realistic are they? A study by Eschholz et al. (2004) analyzed the 2000-2001 season of two popular crime dramas: “NYPD Blue” and “Law & Order”. They coded 4 civil rights violations when watching these shows: officers not explaining to arrestees why they are being arrested (no Miranda warnings), physical abuse by police, forced confessions, and promises of leniency by officers. In the episodes they watched, they found “NYPD Blue” to have 64 instances of violation ($M = 2.7$ per episode), and “Law & Order” to have 18 ($M = .9$ per episode). There are some episodes where violations are addressed by characters in the show, and others where they are not.

There was no indication from viewers that they found these violations problematic, at least as reflected in viewership, because viewership remained steady. Eschholz et al. (2004) speculate that if viewers are not rejecting the shows because of displays of civil rights violations, it may be because a fundamental assumption of the show is that police officers are the good guys. They write, “officers and lawyers often implied that they were the good guys who were protecting society from evil, and the very format of these programs transmitted this same message” (p. 173). In short, what the authors suggest is that people view cops as trying to bring bad guys to justice, and if they have to go around the law to do so, it is excusable in the name of justice. However, it may also be the case that viewers do not notice the violations, or they are simply watching the shows for the storyline.

Misperceptions of Constitutional Rights

Viewers who have little experience with the criminal justice system may be more susceptible to accepting the television version of law enforcement. Gross (1995) said that the

effects of media are powerful in people who have little to no first-hand experience with the criminal justice system. He refers to anything that differs from what one sees on television as a “contradicting message.” Aside from traffic violations, the general public does not have much direct contact with law enforcement. Without the first-hand experience, viewers may not receive any information that is inconsistent with or contradicts what they have seen on television. So, if someone has not had any experience with the criminal justice system, then it is likely he/she have no contradicting messages to what they have seen on television. And if they have no opposing experiences, they are likely to accept what they see as a valid depiction of reality. Viewers may develop inaccurate understandings if what they are watching does not offer a valid depiction of the law and people’s constitutional rights in reference to criminal investigations, because they have no reason to challenge these depictions.

Since most of these viewers do not have some sort of personal experience (victim, offender, etc.), crime dramas give them exposure to the criminal justice system they would not otherwise have (Eschholz et al., 2004). For instance, if a perpetrator in a show is not read his/her Miranda rights at the time of their arrest, then someone who has never been arrested may not know that it is their legal right under the U.S. Constitution for them to be told why they are being arrested, that they have the right to not incriminate themselves, and that they have the right to legal counsel.

A person who has no experience with the criminal justice system, but watches a lot of crime television, would get much of their understanding of the “facts” of the criminal justice system from these fictional dramatizations of events. And if that person has no controverting messages, then they have no reason to doubt the legitimacy of these facts. If a person is well-

versed in the happenings of these fictional crime dramas, they most likely believe they understand and have knowledge of the criminal justice system.

If one sees something on a television show repeatedly, and they experience no contradicting messages to go against what is depicted on those shows, then that idea becomes reinforced in their mind. For example, if one watches multiple episodes of a television show, and he/she only see a person being Mirandized in half of the instances of arrest, then the viewer may believe the process of reading someone their Miranda rights is optional or only applicable in certain situations that are not clarified in the show. If it does not consistently happen across all episodes, a viewer might be more likely to see the process of Mirandizing an arrestee as not required in all circumstances. The more this idea is reinforced, the more confident a person will become that they understand these rights and when these rights are invoked. Consequently, the more crime television a person watches, the more confidence they would have in their knowledge of their constitutional rights when subject to criminal investigation. This leads to the hypothesis:

H2: The more crime television a person watches, the more confident he/she will be that he/she knows his/her constitutional rights regarding criminal interrogation.

Methods

Participants

The sample included 187 participants, ranging from 18-31 years of age ($M = 20.44$, $SD = 2.65$). There were 46 males (24.6%), 122 females (65.2%), and 2 preferred not to say (1.1%). Ethnically, participants broke down as 39% Asian ($N = 66$), 16% Caucasian ($N = 30$), 2.1% Hispanic ($N = 4$), 1.6% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ($N = 3$), .5% African American ($N = 1$). 3.2%

identified outside of options provided (by selecting “other”), and 32.6% identified as multi-ethnic ($N = 61$).

Design and Procedure

Data were collected via an online survey. Students from a large public university enrolled in the study through a research participation system. Students who completed the study received course credit or extra credit. The survey was completed on independent, personal devices with an internet connection. Participants were first asked to identify how often they watched each show on a list provided for them. Then participants were asked to identify rights afforded to them by the United States Constitution and rate how confident they were for each answer.

Measures/Instrumentation

Crime television shows. In order to narrow down the options of crime dramas, I selected those described as “procedural,” because these shows are more likely to deal with aspects of law and civil rights than other types of crime dramas that might be described as action-oriented. Shows were taken from 4 internet lists. The first was from a Ranker forum called “The Best Ever Police Procedural Shows”. This site allows people to list their favorite TV shows in a given category, then other users can upvote or downvote each show to create a list. The top 25 shows (September 2017) from this list were used in the present study. The second list was “Our Favorite Crime Shows of All Time” from Refinery 29. This article was written by two well-known movie critics. This yielded 10 additional shows. The final two lists came from the website “TV Tropes.” I took all live action TV shows from both the “Police Procedural” and “Law Procedural” groups. All four of these lists produced a combined total of 129 different shows.

A list this long would likely contribute to respondent fatigue and attrition, so I created criteria to narrow the list. I selected criteria that increased the likelihood that respondents will

have been exposed to the show and perhaps watched it more frequently. Shows had to have at least one production since 2010 and had run at least 4 seasons (because typically syndication starts at 88 episodes and most shows average 22 shows a season). 2010 was 8 years before this study was conducted. Because the participant pool was university aged students, shows that had been produced in the last 8 years were more likely to have been seen by participants in that age range. If a show reached syndication, then it had even greater likelihood of being seen. Also, shows that were cancelled before 4 seasons were presumably less popular, so they were not included in the final list. Shows that began before 2017 and were still running at the time the list was compiled were included. The only exception to the criteria was the show “The Wire” (last production – 2008), because it appeared on 3 of the 4 lists, indicating that it was a well-known and well-liked show. Finally, shows that originated outside of the United States were removed. Application of the selection criteria reduced the list to 40 shows.

Participants were asked to identify how much of each one of these television shows they watched on a 7-point Likert-type scale (where 1 = have never seen and 7 = watched every episode). The sum of the responses to these items served as the measure of how much crime television a respondent watches.

Identification of Constitutional Rights. A list of constitutional rights was derived from 5 amendments to the United States Constitution (4, 5, 6, 8, and 14; see Appendix C). Wrong answers on the list were derived from common sayings (e.g., innocent until proven guilty, jury of your peers, etc.), elements of the Declaration of Independence (e.g., life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness), and scenarios propagated on popular TV shows (e.g., undercover police officers must identify themselves before interrogation occurs, one cannot be arrested in a place of worship, etc.). These statements were chosen due to their perceived association with

constitutional rights and their exploitation on television shows that would make them likely to be chosen by heavy viewers of crime television.

Participants evaluated each statement as “true” or “false.” The number of correct and incorrect answers participants selected on this portion of the survey measured how well they know their constitutional rights in regard to criminal interrogation. “Knowledge of constitutional rights” was measured by summing the number of correct answers a person got on this test ($\alpha = .77$). Following each rights evaluation, participants rated how confident they were in their answer on a 7-point Likert-type scale (where 1 = not at all confident; 7 = completely confident). The mean of these responses measured respondents’ overall total confidence in their knowledge of their constitutional rights ($\alpha = .95$).

Results

Frequencies were run on all television shows to help remove those that did not add statistical value to the study. The 1-7 scale participants used to indicate how much they had watched each show was converted to a 0-6 scale, where 0 indicated they had never seen the show. Shows with responses below 1.00 were removed from the analysis. This yielded 9 shows (Bones, Criminal Minds, CSI, CSI: Miami, Dexter, How to Get Away with Murder, Law & Order, Law & Order: SVU, and NCIS); see Appendix A for means and standard deviations for the final list.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the more crime television a person watches, the greater his/her knowledge of his/her constitutional rights will be. Number of correct answers ranged from 6-22 of 24 ($M = 17.98$; $SD = 2.27$). Using a Pearson product-moment correlation, I correlated the number of correct answers a person got on their civil rights knowledge test with the amount of crime television they watch. The relationship was positive with marginal significance, $r(168) =$

.15, $r^2 = .02$, $p = .05$. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, people who watch more crime shows are more knowledgeable about their constitutional rights.

Hypothesis 2 stated that people who watch more crime television would be more confident in their knowledge of their constitutional rights. This hypothesis was tested using a Pearson product-moment correlation, correlating the amount of crime shows participants reported watching and the confidence they reported having when answering questions about their constitutional rights. As predicted, this relationship was positively and significantly correlated, $r(167) = .19$, $r^2 = .04$, $p = .01$. After controlling for the respondents' civil rights knowledge, the correlation remained significant, $r(165) = .16$, $r^2 = .03$, $p = .04$.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the relationship between amount of crime television a person watches, that person's knowledge of their constitutional rights, and his/her confidence in that knowledge. Results revealed a marginally significant, positive correlation between the amount of crime television watched and respondents' knowledge of their constitutional rights. People who watched more crime television shows were more likely to correctly identify constitutional rights on a true-false test. The results also show a significant, positive correlation between the amount of crime television watched and their confidence in their knowledge of their constitutional rights. People who watch more crime television shows, specifically procedural shows that deal directly with constitutional rights, are more likely to believe they know their constitutional rights. This relationship holds even after controlling for knowledge of constitutional rights.

The first major finding suggests people do seem to be garnering some knowledge from the television they watch. Results for the test of H1 demonstrate implicit learning through

watching crime TV shows by the respondents' ability to recognize civil rights. It does not, however, demonstrate whether respondents could articulate these rights without cues to assist their recall. Knowledge that is garnered via implicit learning is often hard to access and articulate (Dienes & Berry, 1997), which is why I chose a recognition test instead of an open-ended response question. In this way, we cannot be sure that this knowledge was learned implicitly. Future research should give participants a chance to articulate their rights first, possibly followed by a recognition test for comparison to provide further support that this knowledge was arrived at implicitly.

Results for Hypothesis 2 showed a significant relationship between people's confidence in their knowledge of their constitutional rights and their proclivity to watch crime television. Because this relationship was stronger than the relationship between knowledge and amount of shows watched, and it remained when controlling for knowledge, it suggests the presence of a cultivation effect. People who watch more crime shows have more confidence that they know their constitutional rights, even though their test scores suggest only marginally more knowledge than those who watch less crime shows.

Because confidence is not tied to knowledge, but to viewing, it shows that viewers believe they know more about their rights by virtue of watching lots of crime shows. Studies about cultivation theory have shown relationships between watching crime shows and ideas about victimization, rate of crime, and even overall view of the meanness of the world (Mean World Syndrome). This study has added to that body by showing a relationship between amount of crime shows watched and confidence of viewers about their constitutional rights regardless of their actual level or knowledge. Future research could examine whether certain rights are more salient in viewers' minds, or if they view certain rights with more importance, based on how

these rights are depicted on television. A study like this would require more content analysis to investigate.

This study had several limitations. First, the civil rights test given to participants had a 4:1 ratio of true to false answers. This increased the likelihood of getting a correct answer by chance alone. However, the correlation between total viewing and knowledge of constitutional rights suggests this was not too great a problem. Nevertheless, if this study were repeated, more false answers should be included. Second, participants in this study were very young ($M = 20.43$; $SD = 2.66$), so the length of time during which they have been viewing crime shows is probably somewhat short relative to what is typical in the larger, more age-diverse population. Instead of looking at a lifetime of viewing, or even a decade, participants in this study provided data for a limited amount of crime television exposure. A larger age range could produce a greater effect size, as the hypothesized effects have had longer to cultivate. A larger age range could mean more exposure to the legal system beyond television viewing. In the latter case, we could investigate the extent to which crime show viewing and life experience contributes to knowledge of one's civil rights.

Previous research in cultivation has looked thoroughly at variables such as Mean World Syndrome, victimization, and perceived rates of crime; while previous research on implicit learning has focused mainly on recognizing grammatical patterns. This study aimed to add to both of these bodies of work, by expanding on crime shows cultivation effects, and adding more practical application to literature on implicit learning. This study was designed to test the relationship between the amount of crime television a person watches, their knowledge of their constitutional rights, and their confidence in that knowledge. Results show that people who watch more crime TV shows are more likely to know their constitutional rights, and also be more

confident in that knowledge. Results are indicative of an implicit learning process that influences viewers' understandings of their constitutional rights. This study shows us that our television viewing habits are having some effect on us, both by teaching us and by instilling in us a confidence regarding our knowledge that is not necessarily tied to our actual knowledge. It provides important implications for the body of research on both implicit knowledge and cultivation theory, and suggests interesting avenues for future research.

Appendix A

Crime Television Shows

Please indicate how many episodes you've seen of each of the following television shows on a 1-7 scale*.

- 1- Never watched
- 2- Watched a couple of episodes but did not get into it
- 3- Saw a few episodes/most of a season
- 4- Saw quite a few episodes and really followed the show
- 5- Watched multiple seasons
- 6- Tried to watch the whole series
- 7- Watched every episode

*Values were later recoded from 0-6 for analysis, where 0 = Never watched, and 6 = Watched every episode.

<u>Television Show</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
American Crime Story	.55	1.55
Better Call Saul	.21	.81
The Bill	.02	.22
Billions	.02	.19
Blacklist	.52	1.39
Bones	1.15	1.75
Bosch	.03	.20
Bull	.19	.80
Castle	.58	1.49

Century City	.01	.15
The Closer	.14	.75
Cold Case	.37	.90
Criminal Minds	1.86	2.10
CSI	1.29	1.69
CSI: Miami	1.13	1.60
CSI: NY	.76	1.34
Damages	.01	.15
Dexter	1.21	2.02
Elementary	.37	1.08
First Monday	.01	.08
Franklin & Bash	.09	.66
The Glades	.05	.48
The Good Wife	.27	.84
How to Get Away with Murder	1.38	2.12
iZombie	.59	1.42
Law & Order	1.26	1.68
Law & Order: Criminal Intent	.77	1.41
Law & Order: SVU	1.90	2.21
Major Crimes	.08	.45
Mentalist	.35	1.21
Narcos	.74	1.60
NCIS	1.13	1.78

NCIS: Los Angeles	.72	1.47
NCIS: New Orleans	.34	.91
Numbers	.23	.72
Psych	.88	1.82
Shades of Blue	.08	.44
Southland	.10	.58
Suits	.58	1.41
The Wire	.07	.43

Shows that were retained for analysis are indicated in bold.

Appendix B

Civil Rights Test

Please indicate whether or not the following statements are rights or protections afforded to you by the U.S. Constitution. Following each answer, please rate your confidence in your response on a 1-7 scale, where 1 is “not at all confident” and 7 is “completely confident”.

1. You have the right to present your defense (testimony, witnesses, evidence).
2. You have the right to a quick and public trial.
3. You have the right to a jury of your peers.*
4. You have the right to be secure in your person, against unreasonable search and seizure.
5. You have the right to an attorney.
6. You have the right to confess voluntarily.
7. You have the right to not be tortured nor coerced.
8. You are innocent until proven guilty.*
9. Warrants shall only be issued on probable cause.
10. Your rights under the Constitution cannot be overridden by individual states.
11. You have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.*
12. You have the right to a trial by jury (judge, judges, peers).
13. You have the right to cross-examine witnesses.
14. You have the right to understand why you are being arrested or interrogated.
15. You have the right to remain silent.
16. An officer of the law cannot dictate what happens in your home.
17. You cannot be arrested in a place of worship.*

- 18. You have the right to a fair and public trial conducted in a competent manner.
- 19. As long as a warrant is signed by a judge, it does not have to explicitly say what will be searched and seized.*
- 20. Evidence that has been illegally seized cannot be used in a court of law.
- 21. An officer of the law cannot enter your home without a warrant/probable cause.
- 22. You have the right to legal representation.
- 23. You have the right to freedom of speech.
- 24. Undercover officers must identify themselves before interrogation occurs.*

*All incorrect statements are marked with an asterisk.

<u>Question</u>	<u>Correct %</u>	<u>Incorrect %</u>	<u>Mean Confidence</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
1	94.0	6.0	4.92	1.68
2	83.9	16.1	4.60	1.79
3	43.5	56.5	4.80	1.87
4	79.2	20.8	4.75	1.83
5	98.2	1.8	6.43	1.22
6	91.7	8.3	5.38	1.79
7	81.5	18.5	5.33	1.85
8	4.2	95.8	6.29	1.42
9	89.9	10.1	5.03	1.78
10	70.8	29.2	4.32	1.73
11	7.1	92.9	5.98	1.53
12	94.6	5.4	5.39	1.72
13	65.9	34.1	4.36	1.78

CRIME SHOWS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

27

14	95.2	4.8	5.66	1.63
15	98.2	1.8	6.43	1.27
16	66.7	33.3	4.34	1.59
17	76.2	23.8	4.29	1.79
18	94.0	6.0	5.04	1.69
19	58.3	41.7	4.28	1.65
20	82.1	17.9	5.18	1.77
21	88.7	11.3	5.69	1.53
22	96.4	3.6	5.83	1.58
23	96.4	3.6	6.27	1.39
24	42.9	57.1	4.54	1.69

Appendix C

Constitutional Amendments

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment XIV

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a state, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such state, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such state.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion

against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Appendix D

Participant Consent Form

Aloha! My name is Katie Smith and you are invited to take part in a research study. I am a researcher at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in the Department of Communicology. I am doing a research project. The purpose of my project is to examine the relationship between the amount of crime television a person watches and their knowledge of their constitutional rights relating to criminal interrogation.

Project Description – Activities and Time Commitment: If you decide to take part in this project, you will be asked to fill out a survey, as well as basic demographic information. The survey questions are mainly on a scale of 1-7. Completing the survey will take approximately 30 minutes.

Benefits and Risks: There will be no direct benefit to you for taking part in this project. The findings from this project may help create a better understanding of how television viewing affects our knowledge. There is little risk to you for participating in this project, except a possibility of negative feelings when thinking about crime television.

Confidentiality and Privacy: I will not ask you for any personal information, such as your name or address. Please do not include any personal information in your survey responses.

Voluntary Participation: You can freely choose to take part or to not take part in this survey. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits for either decision. If you do agree to participate, you can stop at any time.

Questions: If you have any questions about this study, please email me at smithk2@hawaii.edu. You may contact the UH Human Studies Program at 808.956.5007 or uhirb@hawaii.edu to discuss problems, concerns and questions; obtain information; or offer input with an informed individual who is unaffiliated with the specific research protocol. Please visit <https://www.hawaii.edu/researchcompliance/information-research-participants> for more information on your rights as a research participant.

By clicking “I wish to participate in this survey”, and starting the survey, this signifies your approval to participate in this study. If you do not wish to participate, you may press “I do not wish to participate,” or simply exit this screen.

Please print a copy of this page for your reference.

Mahalo!

References

- Berry, D. C. & Dienes, Z. (1991). The relationship between implicit memory and implicit learning. *British Journal of Psychology*, 82, 359-373. doi:10.1080/713755772
- Callanan, V. J. (2012). Media consumption, perceptions of crime risk and fear of crime: Examining race/ethnic differences. *Sociological Perspectives*, 55(1), 93-115. doi:10.1525/sop.2012.55.1.93.
- Chung, J. E. (2014). Medical dramas and viewer perception of health: Testing cultivation effects. *Human Communication Research*, 40, 333-349. doi:10.1111/hcre.12026
- Cohen, J., & Weimann, G. (2000). Cultivation revisited: Some genres have some effects on some viewers. *Communication Reports*, 13(2), 99-114. doi:10.1080/08934210009367728
- Dienes, Z. & Berry, D. (1997). Implicit learning: Below the subjective threshold. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 4(1), 3-23. doi:10.3758/BF03210769
- Dienes, Z., Broadbent, D., & Berry, D. (1991). Implicit and explicit knowledge bases in artificial grammar learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 17(5), 875-887. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.17.5.875
- Eschholz, S., Mallard, M., & Flynn, S. (2004). Images of prime time justice: A content analysis of "NYPD Blue" and "Law & Order". *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 10(3), 161-180.
- Gerbner, G. & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication* 26(2), 172-199. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01397.x
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1980). The "mainstreaming" of America: Violence profile no. 11. *Journal of Communication*, 30(3), 10-29. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1980.tb01987.x

- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli N. (1986). Living with television: The dynamics of the cultivation process. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Perspectives on media effects*, (pp. 17-40). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, (pp. 43-67). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Harris, H. & Romero, A. (2017, September). Our favorite crime shows of all time. Retrieved from <https://www.refinery29.com/2016/07/117987/best-crime-shows-on-tv?bucketed=true>
- Hawkins, R. P., & Pingree, S. (1981). Using television to construct social reality. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 25(4), 347-364. doi:10.1080/08838158109386459
- Hicks, R. H. (2001). *Understanding audiences: Learning to use the media constructively*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Holbert, R. L., Shah, D. V., & Kwak, N. (2004). Fear, authority, and justice: Crime-related TV viewing and endorsements of capital punishment and gun ownership. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 343-363. doi:10.1177/107769900408100208
- Holmes, B. M. (2007). In search of my “one-and-only”: Romance-related media and beliefs in romantic relationships destiny. *The Electric Journal of Communication*, 17(3&4).
- Kershaw, C., Budd, T., Kinshott, G., Mattinson, J., Mayhew, P., & Myhill, A. (2000). *The British crime survey*. London, England: HMSO.

- Lee, C., & Niederdeppe, J. (2011). Genre-specific cultivation effects: Lagged associations between overall TV viewing, local TV news viewing, and fatalistic beliefs about cancer prevention. *Communication Research*, 38(6), 731-753. doi:10.1177/0093650210384990
- Mathews, R. C., Buss, R. R., Stanley, W. B., Blanchard-Fields, F., Cho, J. R., & Druhan, B. (1989). Role of implicit and explicit processes in learning from examples: A synergistic effect. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 15(6), 1083. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.15.6.1083
- Morgan, M., & Shanahan, J. (2010). The state of cultivation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 54(2), 337-355. doi:10.1080/08838151003735018
- Nielsen. (2016, August 26). *Nielsen estimates 118.4 million TV homes in the U.S. for the 2016-17 season*. Retrieved from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2016/nielsen-estimates-118-4-million-tv-homes-in-the-us--for-the-2016-17-season.html>.
- Quick, B.L. (2009). The effects of viewing Grey's Anatomy on perceptions of doctors and patient satisfaction. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(1), 38-55. doi:10.1080/08838150802643563
- Ranker. (2017, September). The best ever police procedural shows. [Online voting forum]. Retrieved from <https://www.ranker.com/list/police-procedural-tv-shows-and-series/reference>
- Reber, A. S. (1967). Implicit learning of Artificial Grammars. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviors*, 6, 855-863. doi:10.1016/S0022-5371(67)80149-X

- Reber, A. S. (1976). Implicit learning of synthetic languages: The role of instructional set. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 2(1), 88. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.2.1.88
- Reber, A. S. (1989). Implicit learning and tacit knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology General*, 118(3), 219-235. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.118.3.219
- Reber, A. S., & Allen, R. (1978). Analogic and abstraction strategies in synthetic grammar learning: A functionalist interpretation. *Cognition*, 6(3), 189-221. doi:10.1016/0010-0277(78)90013-6
- Robards, B. (1985). The police show. In B. G. Rose (Ed.), *TV genres: A handbook and reference guide* (pp. 11-32). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- TV Tropes. (2017). Law procedural. Retrieved from <http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/LawProcedural>
- TV Tropes. (2017). Police procedural. Retrieved from <http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/PoliceProcedural>
- Woo, H. & Dominick, J. R. (2001). Daytime television talk shows and the cultivation effect among U.S. and international students. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45(4), 598-614. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4504_4