Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2017

# Examining Gendered Patterns of Techniques of Neutralization Using Fictional Crime Dramas

Lauren Michel Vasquez

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td

Examining gendered patterns of techniques of neutralization using

fictional crime dramas

By

Lauren Michel Vasquez

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Sociology
in the Department of Sociology

Mississippi State, Mississippi

May 2017

www.manaraa.com

Examining Gendered Patterns of Techniques of Neutralization using Fictional Crime

Dramas

By

Lauren Michel Vasquez

Approved:

_____
Nicole E. Rader
(Major Professor)


_____
R. Gregory Dunaway
(Committee Member)


_____
Stacy H. Haynes
(Committee Member)


_____
Kimberly Kelly
(Committee Member)


_____
Rick Travis
Interim Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

Name: Lauren Michel Vasquez

Date of Degree: May 6, 2017

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Sociology

Major Professor: Nicole E. Rader

Title of Study:   Examining Gendered Patterns of Techniques of Neutralization using Fictional Crime Dramas

Pages in Study 180

Candidate for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The following dissertation uses fictional crime dramas to determine whether there are gendered patterns in the use of techniques of neutralization between and among male and female offenders.  It utilizes a mixed method approach to answer three separate research questions: (1) how techniques of neutralization are used in fictional crime dramas, (2) whether such portrayals vary between and among male and female offenders, and (3) how elements of doing gender play a role in the gendered nature of males and female offenders' techniques of neutralization. The sample included 124 episodes from four different fictional crime dramas and 383 individual offenses were used in the data. The quantitative data found that while both genders utilize the techniques in similar proportions, there are specific differences in their applicability.  One salient difference was that men tended to commit offenses without using a technique of neutralization to excuse their offense more often than were women.  The qualitative data showed several themes in how men and women utilized these techniques as well.  Women were not depicted speaking the technique used for their offense as often as were men.  Further, they were more likely to have someone else offer a technique on their behalf.  When

women did use a technique of neutralization they were likely to use more than one whereas, this was not found with men.  There were also specific variations that occurred within each technique that played off of how the gender of the offenders was portrayed in the shows.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my husband and to my committee. Thank you Eric for going through this process with me. You were there through my whole graduate school experience. You have been my favorite sounding board and without your unwavering support, even when I was ready to be done, I would not be here. In a way, this degree is yours, too. To Dr. Kelly, the very definition of a fierce female. I can only aspire to being a force like you. To Dr. Dunaway who cultivated my interest in criminology very early on in my college career. You helped me realize this field of study was for me. To Dr. Haynes, thank you for challenging me and forcing me to work hard every step of the way. You helped give me confidence. To Dr. Rader, who ultimately influenced me to pursue a graduate degree, without your guidance through this process this dissertation would never have come to fruition. You sacrificed your time and energy just as much as I did to make this happen. For that, I am grateful. You all have been here every step of the way and I could not imagine my dissertation without your four signatures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine gender based patterns in offenders'
neutralization of crime commission in fictional crime dramas. Specifically, this
dissertation will investigate (1) how techniques of neutralization (i.e., ways offenders
excuse or justify their illegal or deviant behavior) are used in fictional crime dramas, (2)
whether such portrayals vary between and among male and female offenders, and (3)
how elements of "doing gender" (i.e., gendered action, gendered behavior, gendered
accountability) play a role in the gendered nature of male and female offenders'
techniques of neutralization. In other words, are techniques of neutralization used as a
strategy for "doing gender" by male and female offenders in fictional crime dramas?

Techniques of neutralization theory has been an important theoretical perspective
in criminology since the 1950s. The idea behind techniques of neutralization is that
people neutralize bad behavior by excusing and justifying their behavior to themselves
and others. In Sykes and Matza's (1957) *Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of
Delinquency,* it was argued that offender's elicit guilt when engaging in an illegal or
socially unaccepted behavior.

Many early theories of crime and delinquency found that the origins of each were
rooted in the individual (Lombroso 1876; Garofalo 1886; Goring 1913). With a more
sociological influence, later works saw criminal and delinquent acts as a behavior that is

1

learned.  The dominant process by which this behavior occurred was through differential association (i.e. individuals learned the methods, motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes favorable to the violation of norms).  Sutherland's theory paved the way for other theorists, such as Albert Cohen, who argued that individuals engaged in delinquent acts because they subscribed to a set of norms and values that were the antithesis those required for a law abiding society (Cohen 1955).

Sykes and Matza (1957) expanded on this idea by proposing that juveniles who committed delinquent acts were, in fact, not committed to delinquent values as Cohen and others had suggested.  Sykes and Matza argued that although individuals hold the belief that delinquency is wrong, they can find justifications that warrant delinquency in certain circumstances.  In other words, they argued that delinquents did not actually define themselves as delinquents.  Instead, youths used justifications, or techniques of neutralization, which helped them cope with the guilt of engaging in delinquent acts.

This vein of research was further reinforced by Scott and Lyman (1968).  They expanded on neutralization research by introducing justifications of guilt to deviance, rather than offending.  Sykes and Matza's piece focused only on behavior that was against the law; this piece expanded the idea to behavior that simply ran counter to social norms.  In essence, they argued that deviants accept responsibility for the act but reject the wrongfulness of it.  This research further suggests that neutralization accounts are cultural and determined as legitimate by certain groups and subcultures.  If we combine the ideas that techniques are learned through social interaction and that certain groups attribute legitimacy to them, we can envision that not every group (e.g. sex, ethnic/racial group, age category) will have equal access to each technique.  For example, it is

2

generally accepted that men are more aggressive than women. If men are shown neutralizing behaviors because they 'lost their cool', other men will see it as permissible for them to do so as well.  However, this excuse will not translate to women, who are not supposed to act out in anger.

Although the theoretical ideas behind techniques of neutralization were historically celebrated by some in the field of criminology, such ideas have been examined with a more critical lens in recent years.  Specifically, many challenged the applicability of this framework to various types of offenders; that is, they questioned whether different groups or categories of offenders excuse and justify behaviors in similar ways.  In other words, do robbers and murderers utilize techniques of neutralization in similar ways?  This dissertation examines the differences between and among women and men rather than offense type—in the use of techniques of neutralization.  Those who consider gender in their research (Naffin 1985; West and Zimmerman 1987; Miller and Mullins 2006), have questioned whether previous theories can hold up in the face of gender. They ask whether men and women offenders will use the techniques in the same way and in the same frequencies. This dissertation seeks to answer that question as it pertains to techniques of neutralization.

There are several reasons one might assume that gender differences are important in the consideration of techniques of neutralization.  First, there are several limitations to the original application of techniques of neutralization from a gendered perspective. First, Sykes and Matza's sample consisted only of male juveniles.  This has become especially relevant since female's participation in crime has risen since the 1957 publication.  In 1995, females accounted for only 20% of all persons arrested, whereas in

3

2012 they accounted for 26% (Uniform Crime Report 2012).  So, examining both women and men is a worthy endeavor.  Second, many scholars have found that women and men commit crime for different reasons (Lombroso and Ferrero 1895; Pollack 1961; Adler 1975; Simon 1975; Heidensohn 1985; Leonard 1982; Belknap and Holsinger 1998).  It makes sense that men and women might justify or excuse their behavior in different ways.  Sykes and Matza's data cannot account for these differences.  Third, Sykes and Matza's data were collected with those juveniles already in the system, rather than with a more general population (those who might self-report crime but may not appear in official statistics).  For all of these reasons, the Sykes and Matza study is informative but lacking from a gender perspective.  Lastly, the current dissertation is important because researchers in criminology have not focused much attention on how women and girls justify and excuse criminal and/or delinquent behavior.  With few exceptions, this area is lacking in criminology literature and needs to be expanded (Brennan 1974; Copelton 2007; Heltsley and Calhoun 2003; Hong and Duff 1977; Thompson, Harred, and Burks 2003; Vieraitis et al 2012).  Moreover, the research that looks at women and girls' use of neutralization techniques does not compare it to that of men and boys.  Also, it does not investigate at a theoretical level whether all of the techniques presented originally are equally available to women and girls.

The current dissertation investigates criticisms of the theory by utilizing a sample that includes both male and female offenders.  Rather than examining self-report survey data with offenders, this dissertation employs a sample of offenders in fictional crime dramas on television.  Television is a widely used medium for data as it has become, "the socialization of most people into standardized roles and behavior" (Gerbner and Gross

4

1976:174). Meaning, what we view on television plays a larger role in shaping our socialization, including our gender socialization, than do other methods of social interaction. Statistically, few people will encounter crime in their lives so we rely on the media to shape our reality of crime (Rhineberger-Dunn and Rader 2008; Bailey and Hale 1998; Gerbner and Gross 1976). Data from the most popular crime shows on television from the years 2003-2010 are analyzed (n=124 episodes) to consider what techniques of neutralization are presented by offenders and whether these vary for men and women. With the potential information to be gleaned from fictional crime dramas we can get a good idea of what techniques of neutralization society feels are acceptable for men and women. Using the transcripts of popular crime dramas allows for noticeable patterns to show what neutralization techniques are deemed as appropriate by the writers. The writers try and make the characters relatable to the viewers and using techniques of neutralization as a means of displaying their gender is potentially useful. It gives a sense of what the writers feel is acceptable and unacceptable behavior of men and women characters.

Like most research, the inevitable question is to what end does it serve? This dissertation expands what has been done in the following ways; first, it applies the techniques of neutralization framework to the media, something that has rarely been done in the previous literature. This is important as the impact that media has on our socialization is becoming more apparent. The majority of studies that examine techniques of neutralization use self-report surveys with samples that are often not very representative of the general public (i.e., correctional settings; Khoo and Oakes 2000; Copes 2003, college samples; Ingram and Hinduja 2008; Piquero, Tibbetts, and

5

Blankenship 2005; Hinduja 2007). Using a sample that comes from a variety of shows covering different subject matters and appealing to different demographics allows for a greater diversity in offenders. Second, this dissertation examines various gendered dimensions of techniques of neutralization taken on by offenders, an understudied area in criminology (Vieraitis et al. 2012). Do men and women use different techniques of neutralization? Does this vary by crime type? Location type? Type of show? Many questions have been unanswered. Finally, this study uses a sociological lens to help explain how male and female offenders exemplify techniques of neutralization in fictional crime dramas. Using the doing gender framework allows researchers to examine the taken for granted cultural expectations men and women engage in and brings them to light as a media construction of gender. In this case, the general public may come to think that male and female offenders act in certain ways because it is natural for them to do so. Further, they may see offenders excuse behaviors in gendered ways which may contribute to how the general public perceives of male and female offenders in the real world. Finally, understanding how gender influences techniques of neutralization in fictional crime shows could have policy implications. With recent social issues rising (prison overcrowding, budgetary restraints, etc) we are starting to move away from a philosophy of retribution in corrections and considering more rehabilitative and restorative alternatives. Programs such as "Thinking for a Change" (Bush, Glick, and Taymans 1997), Reasoning and Rehabilitation (Ross and Fabiano 1985), and "Mind over Matters" (Tru-Thought 2000) all seek to ensure the guilt incurred from deviance is felt and accepted by the offender, which is more in line with restorative justice (Scheff 1998). This is accomplished by identifying and eliminating the way a person assigns blame for

their actions on any factor other than themselves. It is the belief of this dissertation that adherence to gender roles could be one of those factors. We can get men to see that engaging in violence because they had to protect their masculine image is not an acceptable excuse. The hope is to explore this possibility in an effort to, "provide more understanding about different forms of therapy that are appropriate for different groups of offenders." (McCarthy and Stewart 1998 p. 289).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

**Theoretical Perspective – Techniques of Neutralization**

Before explaining how the techniques of neutralization framework might apply to women and men in different ways, it is important to first talk about the original theoretical perspective. As mentioned above, Albert Cohen argued that delinquency was the result of status frustration among lower class boys. Unlike Merton, who thought lower class boys simply wanted monetary status, Cohen argued they wanted the status and respect given to middle class boys. Unable to reach this goal due to social barriers they created a subculture with a completely different set of norms and expectations that were accessible to them. There were four main points that Sykes and Matza presented as criticism of Cohen's assertion that those who engage in delinquency hold an inverted set of norms compared to law abiding members of society. First, if individuals believed that the actions they were taking were acceptable, they would not express guilt or remorse after engaging in them. Sykes and Matza pointed out that individuals did exhibit guilt or remorse and that these emotions were not only for the benefits of manipulation. Second, Sykes and Matza felt that if youth held separate moral codes they would see law abiding citizens as immoral. Again, they found this was not the case. Youth still admired people who 'did the right thing. Youth often displayed attachment to people such as parents who worked legal jobs to provide for their families and church members. If youth did in fact

8

hold a moral code or value system that ran counter to dominant society, they would not admire people who obeyed the law.

Third, Sykes and Matza suggested there were very distinct lines drawn by delinquents as to who can and cannot be victimized by their actions. They set some groups aside as those who are "untouchable." For example, delinquents rarely stole from friends. While such a maxim seems obvious, even to offenders, the subtle point that Sykes and Matza drew from this was that "supposedly valued behavior tends to be directed against disvalued social groups [it] hints that the wrongfulness of such delinquent behavior is more widely recognized by delinquents than the literature has indicated" (Sykes and Matza 1957:665). They explain here that if delinquent acts were socially valued as the subcultural literature suggests, they would not solely be directed against people who were not held in high regard such as rival neighborhood boys. Lastly, Sykes and Matza pointed out that while it can be assumed some people do generate delinquent norms and values based upon upbringing, it was far more probable that people internalized conforming behavior. One cannot ignore that deviant behavior can be punished in the home, at schools, and by the legal system. We know that people are more likely to be law abiding than not and no matter how involved one is in a delinquent state, they cannot escape the fact that the larger part of society condemns deviance.

It is from these points that Sykes and Matza argued that social learning research focused more on the *process* of what was learned rather than the *content* of what was learned by delinquents. They argued that at least in part, people were invested in the dominant norms and values of a society. What they learned was how to neutralize negative feelings when transgressing the boundaries of acceptable forms of behavior.

These neutralizations were simply types of Sutherland's "definitions favorable" to crime and delinquency (Akers and Sellers 2009). This point is clearly illustrated in the following: It is our argument that much delinquency is based on what is essentially an unrecognized extension of defenses to crime, in the forms of justifications of deviance that are seen as valid by the delinquent but not by the legal system or society at large (Sykes and Matza 1957:666)

In an effort to introduce content on neutralizations that were learned, Sykes and Matza introduced five techniques of neutralization that juveniles who subscribed to law abiding norms and values used when engaging in delinquent behavior. It was the learning of these techniques, rather than the learning of a subculture of inverted values that helped individuals become deviant (Sykes and Matza 1957).

**Five Techniques of Neutralization**

All five techniques hinged upon the belief that offenders do subscribe to the norms and values of the larger law-abiding society. Each technique showcased a specific manner in which the offender escaped the disapproval of society when they acted in defiance of these norms and values. The first technique introduced, *denial of responsibility*, occurred when an individual tried to lessen their responsibility in delinquent acts by saying they were affected by forces outside of their control. For example, their peers or their impoverished neighborhood. These instances resulted in less of a focus on agency within the individual. The individual was said to see themselves as "acted upon rather than acting" (Sykes and Matza 1957). This technique has also been called the "billiard ball" effect as the individual was pushed by forces outside of themselves.

10

The second technique described by the authors was the *denial of injury*. Here there was no attempt to deflect responsibility of an act. Rather, the individual focused on the immorality of the act itself. The legal system made distinctions between acts which were wrong in and of themselves and those that were wrong simply because they were illegal. If the law made such distinctions, the individual felt that they may as well. This left what is immoral up for interpretation and often times the person decided the wrongfulness of an act based on the resulting injury to another person. If they felt that no one would be injured by their actions, they did not view it as wrong. For example, if an offender stole a candy bar from a large grocery store, they could argue that the monetary value lost by the store is of no real consequence to the store even though their actions are technically against the law. As part of a law-abiding society, one could see these exceptions carried out by others and learn that "the qualifying of norms is an extension of common practice rather than a gesture of complete opposition" (Sykes and Matza 1957:665).

The third technique discussed was the *denial of the victim*. Like the previous technique, here, there was no deflection of responsibility by the individual. A person could accept full responsibility for their actions while at the same time calling attention to the circumstances of the act allowing them to avoid disapproval. The individual did this by placing the injured party into a place deserving of that injury. The individual could paint the injured party as the person who was wrong and thus deserving of what happened to them. An example would be a person who bullies peers at school and was subsequently beaten up by one of those peers. Another way that this technique is

11

interpreted is in instances of public order crimes or, what are referred to as victimless crimes, such as breaking curfew or prostitution.

*Condemnation of the condemners* was the fourth technique. In this technique, the user deflected responsibility from their own act by calling attention to the people who disapproved of their actions. Rather than excusing their own behavior by lack of responsibility or denying harm, they simply pointed out that their behavior is not unique to them and that those who are condemning them engage in the same, if not worse behavior. An example would be a driver who was ticketed for speeding and argued that the officer drove over the speed limit while off duty and was not punished for such actions.

Lastly, the technique of *appeal to high loyalties* occurred when an individual chose to knowingly violate the law when there was conflict between the norms of larger society and the norms of a smaller group to which they belonged. In an extreme example, an individual might steal food from a store to feed their family who has no money to buy the food. Here, the person is putting the needs of the family above the laws of larger society. Sykes and Matza carefully rebut thoughts that this technique represented a subculture by stating that the actor was not engaging in these acts because they rejected larger social norms, rather that they held other norms to be more important in the situation.

In sum, there are five techniques of neutralization that will be used in this dissertation which include denial of responsibility, denial or injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties. All of these techniques give examples of how people can hold dominant societal values and simultaneously act in

12

contradiction to those values from time to time. Overall, these techniques provide offenders temporary reprieve for their behaviors.

## Theoretical Perspective Gender and Crime

One of the key contributions of this dissertation is to investigate whether the techniques of neutralization framework is applicable to male *and* female offenders. In order to do so, the literature of both techniques of neutralization and gender and crime will be discussed. This section focuses on the status of gender in criminology from a theoretical level, as well as addresses offending patterns for men and women. Lastly, the 'doing gender' framework is discussed as a framework that will be used in the qualitative methods of this dissertation.

Since women were first studied in criminology, researchers have focused on several key areas of scholarship. These include, but are not limited to, the gender gap in offending (Zimmerman and Messner 2010), the gender gap in victimization (Lauritsen and Heimer 2008) and lastly theoretical and methodological changes (Naffin 1985; Miller and Mullins 2006; West and Zimmerman 1987).

### Gender Gap in Offending

The first area of scholarship focuses on the gender gap in offending. Since the literature discusses this gap using the terminology of men and women, as opposed to male and female, this section will as well. Men consistently commit more crimes than women accounting for 73.2% of all arrests in 2012 (Uniform Crime Report 2012). While women's participation in crime has been increasing, from 20% in 1995 to 26% in 2012, they still only make up 26.8% of total arrests (Uniform Crime Report 2012). When

13

examining the gender gap in offending, most researchers find that the predictors of offending between the two groups actually tend to be quite different.  What influences males to offend are not necessarily the same factors that influence females to offend and vice versa.  Moreover, some researchers believe that the differences in offending lie in the differential exposure to criminogenic environments (Mears et al 1998).  Another prominent finding is that females are more susceptible to influence from their violent peers than are males because what makes an individual more susceptible is not so much the amount of delinquent peers one has but rather the quality of those relationships (Zimmerman and Messener 2010).  Females tend to put more stock in their friends at a young age than do males.  Other reasons for lower crime commission in girls is that they have stronger bonds to family, they are more likely to be over supervised by parents and lawmakers, and they put less emphasis on economic and material success (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996).

Zimmerman and Messener also examined neighborhood context.  When examining a disadvantaged neighborhood, the differences between men and women decreased.  In other words, in an area with high rates of crime committed be men, there were likely to be high rates of crime committed by women as well; albeit still lower than men.  This information is telling in the sense that it strikes a chord with gendered lives (Daly 1998). Women are more invested in intimate relationships with their peers and this in turn puts their influence over them in high priority. In an area where crime rates are high, it would make sense that the chance of associating with delinquent peers is high as well. This could relate to appeal to higher loyalties as women could put the interests of their peers over the law.  Further, it could influence denial of responsibility as women

14

could be more likely to cite the influence of their peer groups in their decisions to engage in deviance or illegal behaviors. A theoretical push for more research into pathways to crime could be the best way to determine which factors are more influential for men's and women's crime commission (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996).

**Gender Gap in Victimization**

The second area of scholarship in the gender and crime literature is the gender gap in victimization. Just as the gender gap in offending is well documented, so too is the gender gap in victimization. We know that men are disproportionately more likely to be victims of crime compared to women. The gender gap in victimization is decreasing but there is division in the literature on whether or not this is due to increased victimization of women or decreases in the victimization of men (Lauritsen and Heimer 2008). A major focus of this topic is looking into the differences of the victim-offender relationship among different types of crimes. Stranger violence is more likely to involve male victims whereas when women are victimized it tends to be by an intimate or known offender. These gender specific trends are in line with gendered lives, how men and women organize their lives to fit their concept of masculinity and femininity, as men are more likely to be in situations that put them at risk for stranger violence. This is integral to this dissertation because it gives some background when looking at the accessibility of specific techniques of neutralization and how the relationship between the victim and offender influences these techniques. In their study, Lauritsen and Heimer call attention to the fact that as gender roles have changed over time, so too have these long standing patterns of victimization. As women have gained equality in the public sphere and are more prominently seen in the work place their presence has acted as "civilizing

15

influences" (Lauritsen and Heimer 2008). Another reason the research on victimization is essential to this dissertation is that prior victimization can be a factor that influences later criminality in women. For example, if a girl is victimized, she is more likely to run away from home. For an adult woman, this victimization can push her into a position of hardship just as other broader social trends like divorce, lower pay, and single motherhood (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996).

**Theoretical and Methodological Changes**

The most consistent finding in gender and crime research is that gender is a strong correlate of offending. As stated earlier, men engage in more crime and more violent crime than their women counter parts. Due to this finding, many early theorists in criminology based their theories of offending on men. These theories were conceptualized around the offending influences and behaviors of men and male samples were used to test them. Later, with interest in women's criminality in criminology, these theories were injudiciously applied to female offenders as well. This approach is called "add gender and stir" by feminist criminologists who caution researchers against doing so, either in terms of theories or methods, arguing that women have experiences that are unique to them and need to be recognized as such (Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988; Miller and Mullins 2006). Men and women's crime patterns are not interchangeable and at the very least, researchers argue that men and women's offending patterns should be examined as unique.

This issue was raised in the late 1980s by Naffin. She summarized the way that masculinity and femininity contributed to offending choices. Stepping away from biological sex, she argued, there were gendered roles that were socially defined as

16

masculine and feminine. The link between criminality and sex was actually mediated by the fact that males tended to have high masculinity and low femininity, based on the BEM scale (Naffin 1985). With many criminologists now again questioning if the driving forces behind offending are similar for males and females, a bigger push for theoretical re-evaluation was made (Miller and Mullins 2006).

Daly and Chesney-Lind reflect on how feminist thought has been burgeoning since the 1970's and yet the merging of feminism and criminology has not occurred. The authors also argue that females are discriminated against due to their sex in society at large and such discrimination helps to create certain acceptable standards of behavior among males and females. Another point of concern involved the standpoint of the theorists creating theories, namely those who took a white, upper class, and generally, male standpoint. Miller and Mullins argued that theorists who fell outside these groups offered insight on parts of behavior we have not yet examined. Doing so avoided the pitfalls of ignoring gender, which caused a failure to see how gender identity can influence behavior, like engaging in crime (Miller and Mullins 2006). As noted, gender does not occur in a vacuum and we are taught early on what behaviors are within an acceptable realm for our gender. For example, we are taught to place differential importance on certain bonds (Heimer et al 1996). Not only can the way gender is organized in daily life affect our behaviors but, sometimes engaging in crime commission can be a way in which gender is accomplished. This literature is helpful for this particular dissertation since most researchers that examine both male and female techniques of neutralization (as is done in this dissertation), have not put much stock in how gender, as a social position, influences offending or techniques of neutralization.

17

**The "Doing Gender" Framework**

More recent theoretical discussions about gender construction and behaviors have included "doing gender." In this framework, West and Zimmerman argued that gender is a social construct that must constantly be achieved by all. Scripts exist for men and women to follow in order to fit societal expectations for what it means to be a "real" man or a "real" woman. People follow these scripts and when they do not, they are held accountable by others (West and Zimmerman 1987). Doing gender is a process that, "involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micro-political activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine 'natures'" (West and Zimmerman 1987:126). In this way, gender is something that we actively do, rather than something we innately have. We use gendered action to claim our sex.

West and Zimmerman explain the process by which we all learn how to act in accordance with our sex. When young, we are rewarded for activities that distinguish us from being a 'baby'. We want to be recognized as socially competent and the way to achieve that is to act in accordance with what boys and girls do (Cahill 1986). This early lesson causes us to pay attention to exactly what it is that a boy or a girl might do so that we can emulate it. These 'gender displays' grant us authenticity in the eyes of society (audience). We learn what behaviors are appropriate by observing repeated social interactions. One can accomplish gender successfully in a variety of ways; wearing the right clothes, wearing or not wearing makeup, and learning the correct sex specific behaviors. It is not enough to say that women have been socialized to be feminine rather, that women, who want to be seen as such, work to achieve femininity every day (Connell 2002). The same is true of men. While scholars agree there is a spectrum of acceptable

18

variations of masculinity and femininity, the most desired in a particular context are known as "hegemonic" and "emphasized", respectively (Connell 1999).

What we originally learn as appropriate gender displays are usually idealized versions (Goffman 1976). We do not always hit the mark when trying to act in the ideal form of femininity and masculinity. This is acceptable as gender is also seen as something that is contextual, or in other words, what may be seen as masculine in one situation may not always translate to another (West and Zimmerman 1987). Crying is not normally considered masculine but if a man cries at the success of their son, it could be seen as being a good father, and by extension, a good man. Another important point about doing gender is that it links the structural and interactional levels. We learn gender roles from institutional arrangements like family and the media and act in accordance with these norms in our daily interactions. This dissertation uses the media to show how the way in which a person neutralizes their criminal actions can be seen as "doing gender". All of our behaviors are used to manage our gender and neutralization can be used in context as gender appropriate. For example, it may be appropriate for a man to say that he attacked someone else for talking badly about him. For men, physical violence is seen as acceptable and even necessary; this is not the same for women. Also, when men are angry, physical violence is acceptable whereas this is not the case for women; to act out physically is deemed unladylike, especially for women who are white (Belknap 2007).

Gender scholars advocate for making gender a central principle of studies, not only theoretically but also methodologically or in topic of study. When examining the gender crime relationship some researchers have pushed for a different methodological

approach. Criminology has long been dominated by quantitative methods. In order to better understand how people see their gender roles and how they achieve them in everyday life, it may be more appropriate to use qualitative methods. Gender is often conflated with sex in quantitative research and this tends to miss the non-biological aspects of gender (Cohen and Harvey 2006). A solution to this pitfall may be to use qualitative methods which are better suited to unpack the relationship between gender and crime and seeking to understand the narratives surrounding offending patterns for men and women. This type of research can show us if men and women describe their decisions to offend in ways that are uniquely masculine or feminine in nature.

The doing gender framework is used to overcome some of these shortcomings in the criminological literature. Upon doing an analysis of 137 articles, Cohen and Harvey found that less than one percent actually used a non-biological measure of gender. They point out that this could contribute to the fact that although we know things like men are more likely to be offenders, we know very little about why this is the case. Moreover, we know even less about why some men refrain from offending (Cohen and Harvey 2006). One of the main features of doing gender is accountability. We work to achieve our gender every day because we are held accountable by others as well as ourselves for being a man or a woman. One way we may respond to accountability is through the justifications of our actions, even criminal ones.

In this vein, this dissertation uses the actual transcripts from crime dramas to see how people do gender when excusing and/or justifying offending behavior. While offending behavior is often assumed to be seen as masculine it could very much be the case that when setting the stage for lawbreaking behavior, women tap into their feminine

20

roles to justify their actions. Klenowsi et al used a traditional theory in criminology and saw how this process worked among male and female white collar offenders. They found that men and women utilized techniques of neutralization in very different ways and that these nuances would not be found without the use of narratives. Even in this typically masculine behavior, "offenders draw on gendered themes to align their actions with cultural expectations of masculinity and femininity" (Klenowski et al 2011). By following this example, this dissertation responds to Sykes and Matza's suggestion that, "there is need for more knowledge concerning the differential distribution of techniques of neutralization, as operative patterns of thought, by age, *sex*, social class, and ethnic group, etc (Sykes and Matza 1957:670). Specifically, it seeks to address the distribution across and between groups of male and female fictional offenders. As Miller and Mullins (2006) suggested, gender differences in offending have not been considered at the level that is needed. As they pointed out, studies that have only examined men's offending patterns are often haphazardly applied to women, who may commit crime for different reasons and under different circumstances. This is the case in the techniques of neutralization literature, where women are virtually ignored, are explained using studies that only examine men, or have small sub-samples of women that are difficult to generalize from in the research. The current dissertation addresses these shortcomings by utilizing Sykes and Matza's techniques of neutralization with a more diverse sample than the original study. What follows is a current breakdown of how gender is addressed in the techniques of neutralization literature.

## Gender and Techniques of Neutralization

It has always been of concern that the original piece on techniques of neutralization utilized a very homogenous sample. This is an especially important criticism since the theory has been widely applied to diverse samples since that piece. In reference to gender and techniques of neutralization literature, most research fits into one of three categories, those that used an exclusively female sample (Hong & Duff 1977; Heltsey and Calhoun 2003; Copelton 2007; Thompson, Harred and Burks 2003; Brennan 1974); those that used an exclusively male sample (Forsythe and Evans 2000; Levi 1981; Sefiha 2012), and those that used sex as a control variable (Hinduja 2007; Evans and Porche 2005; Gauthier 2001; Cromwell and Thurman 2003). Examples of each of these three types of samples are reviewed below to establish trends in use of techniques within each group as well as to reference pertinent information for the current dissertation.

### Female Only Samples

In reference to the female only samples, techniques of neutralization are explored with taxi dancers (Hong and Doff 1977), abortion (Brennan 1974), maternal deviance (Copelton 2007), topless dancing (Thompson Harred and Burks 2003), and pageant mothering (Heltsley and Calhoun 2003). Although this is a limited subset of the literature, the fact that the samples are all female does help to build a starting point for trends in gendered uses of the techniques.

In the Hong and Duff (1977) piece, women who decided to become taxi dancers (female dance partners at clubs or bars) were observed and interviewed regarding why they chose and remained in the profession. The sample included seventy dancers in Los Angeles over a four year period. One key finding in this study was that the techniques

22

these women used were learned on the job.  Women who did not learn such neutralizations were not likely to cope with and remain in the job.  For example, when newer dancers expressed guilt that their flirting would give men false hope of a relationship, more experienced women would tell them, "Don't feel bad about it.  I do it all the time.  They know about it.  They are not that foolish" (Hong and Duff 1977:334).  They tried to minimalize the new comers' guilt by the denial of any injury that was done by flirting.  In reaction to the same guilt, other women were quick to use denial of the victim stating that the men "deserved it" and all they wanted was "to go to bed with you."  Denial of responsibility was the most common technique used to cope with guilt.  There was a shared sentiment that no matter what job a woman chose, as long as there were men who attended clubs or bars, there would be women who would be propositioned.

In Copelton's (2007) piece, she examined the violation of nutritional norms during pregnancy.  Fifty-five women were interviewed and asked about their diet during pregnancy.  The link between being a good mother and having a good diet was inextricable for these women.  Often times it proved to be so strongly linked that even if other people did not agree with the nutritional norms, the pregnant woman still did.  The most commonly used technique was justifying the eating of bad food via pregnancy cravings.  The women interviewed felt that the guilt associated with eating "bad" food was alleviated if their body was telling them they needed it, thus denying responsibility.  The denial of injury was also used by the mothers in which they claimed that eating a poor diet was "not enough to cause harm" or that they had "done enough to ensure a healthy pregnancy" (Copelton 2007:481).

23

Condemnation of condemners was also used frequently by women who said they knew women who ate far less nutritionally than they did. Also, that the norms were too restrictive for anyone to maintain. Noticeably absent from the given techniques was the denial of the victim. Generally in the literature this is missing from women's used techniques but, this article presents a unique issue. To use the denial of the victim would call into question the baby itself. To do so allowed third parties to question the "goodness" of the mothers, which is exactly what they were trying to avoid. The other techniques allowed them to pull the focus on them, not as mothers, but as humans, whereas denial of the victim did not allow them to do so. A last important note from this article involves the methodology used. While less structured interviews were used, the conversations of the mothers were looked at as narratives. The researchers paid attention to women's impression management through narratives (Goffman 1959). It is important that these women were seen as good mothers even if they acted in ways that would imply otherwise. The present dissertation uses transcripts of the shows and in so far as the language choice is important, they can be seen as narratives as well. "Language or narrative is a central component of the negotiation of identity" (Copelton 2007:471).

In a study looking at topless dancers (Thompson et al 2003), respondents were found in five different "gentlemen's clubs" in a large city in the Southwest. The women were mostly white, had an average age of twenty-two and a half, and had been dancing between six months and two years. Participants were interviewed and asked how they managed the stigma of their chosen profession. Three techniques appeared in their interviews: denial of injury, condemnation of condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties. For the former, the women said things as simple as, 'What we do is perfectly legal and it

24

doesn't hurt anybody' all the way to comparing it to other things that go on in the world daily like murder and robbery and saying what they do causes no such harm (Thompson et al 2003:562). For condemnation of condemners, the dancers drew focus away from themselves and said that the people who slander them were mostly politicians and police officers. They said that politicians and police enjoyed dancers and often times when the police came to "bust people" they watched the women dance for an hour before arresting anyone (Thompson 2003). Lastly, the women utilized appeal to higher loyalties by saying that they did this job because it provided them with enough money to efficiently take care of their families. This lends itself towards the belief in this dissertation that the family unit, specifically children, will be the 'higher loyalty' most women refer to when employing this technique. Again, this would not be something that could not be discovered in strictly quantitative data. Using the transcripts gives access to the actual quotes used by the offenders when using appeal to higher loyalties. This qualitative approach adds texture to the data by allowing us to not only compare if men and women use appeal to higher loyalties at the same rates, but determines which groups or institutions are held in higher regard.

The last article of note that examined an all-female sample is about pageant mothers. This group of women was one that faced scrutiny in the decision to enter their children in beauty pageants especially in the years following the Jon Benet Ramsey case. The sample included 43 mothers who had children under the age of sixteen entered into one of six national 'southern style' pageants. Participants were asked to respond to two questions, what did they like best about pageants and what did they like least. Techniques of neutralization were considered. The most commonly seen technique was

condemnation of the condemners (46.5%). Specifically, when this technique arose it was in reference to women who were being called out for "sexualizing" their daughters. Mothers deflected this by stating that anyone who looked at children in that way were the ones who were sick, not them (Heltsley 1997). They also used denial of injury frequently (25.6%). This was achieved by saying that their daughters loved the pageants and that they were the ones who begged to continue with the pageant lifestyle. Lastly, no one used the denial of the victim technique. Potentially, this technique could be subsumed into denial of injury here as to deny that there was no injury to the child was to set them up as not being a victim. When participants stated that the daughters loved the pageants and the lifestyle, they negated the victim status in this circumstance.

Although there are not many studies with female only samples, there are general findings of note. Studies that focused on all female samples and the use of techniques of neutralization found that the most common technique used by participants was denial of injury (Hong and Duff 1977; Heltsley and Calhoun 2003; Copelton 2007; Thompson, Harred, and Burks 2003). This sets up the potential that females who are trying to achieve status as women do so in an attempt to dismiss their ability to hurt someone. Be it violent or not, women are supposed to be nurturing and causing harm to others is in contrast to this ideal. The second most commonly utilized technique was condemnation of the condemners (Heltsley and Calhoun 2003; Copelton 2007; Thompson, Harred, and Burks 2003). Also of note, the denial of the victim technique was only used by women in one of the articles (Hong and Duff 1977). Potentially, this indicates passivity as a characteristic stereotypical of women. Denial of the victim requires one to accept responsibility of an act and simultaneously place the victim in a position deserving of

26

their fate.  This is a very active set of behaviors that may be outside the normal range available to women in society.  These findings allow for general patterns to be examined and used to create hypotheses for this dissertation.

**Male Only Samples**

There are also several studies that used male only samples to examine techniques of neutralization.  The studies included here were selected not only to identify the trends in male only samples, but to demonstrate the importance of this dissertation as well as showcase pertinent theoretical points made in the original piece by Sykes and Matza.  In the articles the techniques of neutralization were explored with drug usage among cyclists, dog fighters, human traffickers, and a hitman.  In one such study, Sefiha (2012) found that cyclists used condemnation of condemners and appeal to higher loyalties to explain their use of performance enhancing drugs (PED).   For the latter technique, Sefiha found that the cyclists held the sport in such a high regard that they were willing to dope in order to be the best they could possibly be.  For instance, one interviewee stated, "It wasn't an ethical question to dope or not, it was more, what are you willing to do to become a great cyclist (Sefiha 2012: 231)."  For the former, cyclists claimed that people who deemed their PED use as unhealthy are themselves unhealthy, albeit in different ways.  One interview claimed that the ones passing judgement on them were usually, "fat guys who just watch football and smoke" (Sefiha 2012: 227).  By putting the condemners on an equal playing field, the cyclists were allowed to push their judgements to the side. This study highlights Sykes and Matza's original assertion that whether the accounts given are valid or not is not essential; all that matters is the actor is able to retain their desired identity without guilt.

27

The next piece interviewed "dogmen", people who fight their pit bulls for money. The authors asserted that this practice is becoming more prevalent in the media and as such is becoming more socially unacceptable. Forsythe and Evans were interested in how dogmen managed stigma. Forsythe and Evans interviewed thirty-one individuals who were or had been involved in dog fighting. A snowball sampling method was used. The results showed that participants utilized three of the original techniques of neutralization: denial of injury, condemnation of the condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties. For denial of injury, the participants insisted that the public had misconceptions about the fights. They said that the dogs were matched appropriately and if they saw dogs were beaten, they pulled them out of fights. Also, some fighters claimed that dogs were aggressive and the fighting was almost therapeutic for them. Appeal to higher loyalties was found when framing dog fighting as a long standing American tradition, something the police should not try to stop. In this way, they pitted the well-being of the dogs, what seems to be the biggest issue for society, against the tradition and culture of the fights themselves. In their minds, the latter is held in higher regards. Lastly, participants neutralized their actions by saying that those who looked down on them were not law-abiding citizens all the time. The authors pointed out that using interviews allowed them to 'frame' the discussions of dogmen using the techniques of neutralization. This relates to the present dissertation as the transcripts of crime dramas are used to frame the dialog of the offenders in the show.

One study examined how men who traffic women in Greece neutralized their behaviors (Antonopulos and Winterdyk 2005). Using thirty six interviews the authors found that four of the original techniques were used. Appeal to higher loyalties was not

28

used. Men who traffic women denied that they were victims, stating that these women were usually already prostitutes and knew what they were getting into beforehand. They denied having responsibility for trafficked women stating that the economic pressures were great and they needed money to survive. Participants denied injury by comparing trafficking to things like drinking suggesting it was simply a part of the nighttime economy and everyone was happy with the exchange of goods. Condemnation of condemners was found in the form of traffickers claiming that paying for sex is such common practice in Greece that everyone engages in it in some form. This particular article, with its near equal distribution of techniques used, mirrors the larger trend in male only samples.

Lastly, one article used a case study method, with only one respondent. Where, most studies, including the ones discussed here, look at arguably mild deviance, Levi sought out to see if techniques of neutralization could be used when concerned with serious forms of deviance, for example, professional hit men. While Levi's sample size was arguably a limitation of this study, he identified the uses of certain techniques of neutralization in his interviews. He found that being a hit man was viewed as an occupation where hitmen enter into contracts when they are hired. 'Pete', the hit man interviewed, stated that this contract was the most important thing about his job. When he agreed to take on a hit, he saw it through. The hiring party and their interests were held in higher regard than that of the mark (appeal to higher loyalties). Pete also said that sometimes if you failed to complete a contract, you could be killed yourself. This set up a situation where the hit man denied responsibility by pleading self-defense. One of the things Levi highlighted with his discussion on things like contracts is that being a hit

29

man, despite the nature of it, was much like a regular occupation. There was an exchange of money for services rendered. When Pete described the job in this way, he set up the denial of injury argument. By seeing the hits as only fulfilling what he was paid to do, the act of killing was made as innocuous as any other business transaction. Lastly, the hit man denied the victim as usually the hit was one of retaliation and the mark was not seen as totally innocent of their situation. This research is helpful to the dissertation at hand as the offenses covered across the shows in the sample run the gamut of severity. Knowing that even the guilt of murder can be neutralized with the original techniques put forth by Sykes and Matza is useful. Further, using a case study allowed for a richness of data similar to what can be found in the transcripts. This study shows us intricate descriptions of the techniques being used and can offer insight into *how* they are used by men, not just if they are used by men.

In sum, studies that use male only samples have found that there is no technique that is utilized more than others. The most common techniques used are appeal to higher loyalties (Sefiha 2012; Levi 1981; Forsythe and Evans 1998), condemnation of condemners (Sefiha 2012; Forsythe and Evans, 1998; Antonopulos and Winterdyk 2005), and denial of injury (Antonopulos and Winterdyk 2005; Levi 1981; Forsythe and Evans 1998). Potentially, this trend of equal usage indicates that the techniques were based on a group of males and thus they are equally used by them. Albeit a small sample, the female only studies show that there are differences in which techniques are used the most. Only one study mentioned the use of denial of responsibility among male only samples. This finding makes sense in that males who seek to achieve status as men are taught to be

30

assertive and dominant.  Denying responsibility of their actions would run counter to this ideal.

**Sex as a Control**

The next subset of the techniques of neutralization literature discussed is studies that use a mixed sample and use sex as a control. This encompasses the vast majority of studies that investigate techniques of neutralization. They have men and women in their sample but rarely discuss distinct differences across the two groups.  This makes a detailed discussion of this literature outside the scope of this dissertation, it is important to note however, that these studies collectively demonstrate the scope of deviant and illegal acts that techniques of neutralization are used to study.  The theory is successfully studied across an extremely broad range of behaviors including cheating on tests (LaBeff et al 1990), software and music piracy (Hinduja 2007; Ingram and Hinduja 2008), shoplifting (Cromwell and Thurman 2003), deer poaching (Eliason and Dodder 1999), and even positive deviance (Shoenberger, Heckert, and Heckert 2012).  This last study is particularly interesting as while other studies investigate negative deviance, this one looks at students who strain to overachieve in school.  While they are eliciting a positively valued behavior, they are still deviating from norms.  This reaffirms Sykes and Matza's original contention that people who act against norms, here being of average achievement in school, are not necessarily demonstrating that they do not hold those norms in the same regard as everyone else.  Students often worked to minimize the guilt they incurred through overachieving by downplaying their efforts.  They distanced themselves from high achievement by simply saying they were doing the best they can. (Shoenberger et al 2012:782)."

31

Studies in this group also showed the breath of occupational deviance studied. For example, work place theft (Shigihara 2012), Medicare/Medicaid fraud (Evans and Porche 2005), veterinarian fraud (Gauthier 2001), and pharmaceutical fraud (Piquero, Tibbets, and Blankenship 2004). Collectively, these studies further the understanding that deviants hold conventional values as opposed to deviant ones. Specifically, this can be seen in the fact that the workers drew on social values like merit, wanting the respect of coworkers and customers, and even helping the business at large, when neutralizing deviance in the work place.

In sum, these studies show that techniques of neutralization are well researched along a continuum of types of deviance. They focus on all forms of seriousness and situations as well as reiterate the guiding principle that people who engage in deviance drift in and out episodically and do not hold values oppositional to mainstream culture. The former is important to my dissertation as the medium I use to collect data is fictional crime dramas. Within the four shows analyzed in this dissertation there were 124 episodes watched. I needed to make sure that there was evidence the techniques could come up in the inevitable breath of crimes used. There was variety in the severity of deviance, the type of deviance, and even among positive deviance. Further, it was beneficial to see how each study defined each technique. Looking for each technique in the transcripts of each show will undoubtedly show variation in the word choice used to illustrate each technique. Having this literature to build from made perusing the transcripts to identify the various ways a technique was used easier.

It is also important to note that most techniques were shown to be equally available across the spectrum of behaviors. This helps me specifically as it establishes

32

without reference to gender, that techniques are accessible to the range of behaviors. This is one less factor that should influence them and sets the stage for how much the gender of the offender may matter. However, it is of note that in the studies examined, the most popularly used technique was denial of responsibility. It is important to know which technique was utilized the most in general. This may help in the analysis phase. If there are no differences in gender usage for this technique it may be that its applicability to most crimes and forms of deviance make it evenly available to both men and women. The same goes for the least used, which in the studies reviewed was denial of the victim. The next question to be evaluated is if they remain equally available when the users of the techniques, rather than the behaviors, are examined.

**Exploring Sex Differences across Techniques of Neutralization**

With few exceptions, studies have not exclusively explored gender differences in use of the techniques of neutralization. As this is the main departure point for my dissertation, it is important to discuss the literature that does examine this. One study is 'Do Women and Men Differ in Their Neutralizations of Corporate Crimes?' a study conducted by Vieraitis et al. in 2012. This article specifically set out to see if men and women had different patterns in their usage of neutralization for the distribution of a hypothetical drug that was found harmful in clinical trials. The authors used vignettes to see how respondents would proceed in a given scenario. Respondents were given potential thought processes that corresponded to each of the techniques and asked to rank how much they agreed with each technique. They found that in general, men were more likely to indicate their intentions to commit corporate crime than women. Women were more likely to recall the drug. However, among women who would sell the drug, appeal

to higher loyalties, condemnation of condemners, and denial of injury were used.  In the initial bivariate analysis, three of the techniques showed no differences between men and women.  For the two that did show differences, men most used denial of injury and women most used condemnation of condemners; which, interestingly, were also in line with what female only sample studies found.  The authors also used a split sex analysis that delved deeper into the relationship between the used technique and the intention of actually selling the drug (the deviant act).  They found that for both men and women, denial of injury was related to the decision to sell the drug.  The most significant predictor of selling the drug for men was appeal to higher loyalties and for women, denial of responsibility.  The conclusion of this article was that despite minor mean level differences, usages of techniques of neutralization for corporate crime was gender neutral.

**Methodological Approaches: The Role of Media**

Moving on from a review of the different ways the sex of respondents are used, it is important to review the different methodologies used in the techniques of neutralization literature.  The techniques of neutralization framework has been empirically tested in the criminology literature through a variety of methods. Studies have used vignettes (Piquero, Tibbetts, and Blankenship 2005; Khoo and Oakes 2000), interviews (Shigihara 2012; Shoenberger, Heckert, and Heckert 2012; Sefiha 2012; Forsythe and Evans 1997; Levi 1981; Heltsley and Calhoun 2002; Hong and Duff 1977; Copelton 2007; Thompson, Harred, and Burks 2003), surveys (Ingram and Hinduja 2007; Minor 1980; Hinduja 2007; Evans and Porche 2004), case studies (Antonopoulos and Winterdyk 2005), narrative analysis (Green, South, and Smith 2005), existing data

sources (Durkin and Bryant 1999; Costello 1999), content analysis (Liddick 2012) and focus groups (Piacentini, Chatzidakis, and Banister 2012). Most of these studies are mentioned in the above sections. What is absent from these studies is an analysis of media.

This is even more pertinent as there have been several technological advances in the media in recent years. Most people's knowledge of crime and crime trends is now being gathered through different media outlets (Dowler et al 2006). Moreover, we have reached a point where most people get their information about crime from mass media rather than direct experience (Surette 2007). The popular forms of mass media that people receive information from are news media, fictional crime dramas, movies, and video games.

News media is often the focus of crime research as reports on crime make up a substantial portion of the news (Reiner 2007). Proliferation of violence in headlines is common place. Media studies that use entertainment sources such as movies and video games are also commonly used. These data sources are representative of popular media and have a special offering in the fact that they serve as a preference to what viewers and gamers like to watch. Specifically, video games are one of the most popular forms of media in the US and about 70% of households contain at least one console (Miller and Summers 2007). These studies can be useful when discussing socialization, especially to children as, "…previous research indicates that youth often consider fictional characters to be role models (Miller and Summers 2007:733). Another source of fictional characters is television. While sitcoms have been used for previous research, fictional crime dramas have been less utilized (Lavigne 2009). This is a rich data source as there are multiple

35

shows of this nature on television and they are consistently among the highest viewed shows.  As media has been identified as an agent of socialization for quite some time and, these are the shows that are being watched, it makes sense to examine them as data (Bandura 1986; Blumer and Hauser 1933; Gerbner 1970).  Further, fictional crime dramas offer specific insight into gender and crime that need to be investigated.  They, "[aren't] just about the containment of crime; it's also about family values, patriarchal structures, and sexual stereotypes (Lavigne 2009:384).'' The generalized findings of the news media, movies and video games, as well as fictional crime dramas are discussed below.  All three serve as agents of socialization and affect viewer's attitudes towards crime and gender.

**News Media**

One source of information is the news.  The news is salient to media studies as there is exposure to all class groups of society and the news would appear to be a valid source of information concerning crime knowledge.  One study by Chiricos et al looked at news viewing and its effects on viewers. They found that fear of crime was influenced by the frequency of both local and national news consumption, the crime rates in the viewers areas, and their personal experience with crime.  However, the frequency with which viewers watched local news was responsible for increased fear of crime even while controlling for area crime rates.  Most news segments open with a crime story and sensationalize it by referring to it throughout the broadcast (Chiricos et al 2000).  Further, when people watched these stories, it heightened their fear of crime, regardless of having low risk factors for victimization.  It was also found that watching local news had a larger effect on fear of crime among viewers than did national news outlets (Chiricos et al

2000). The effect of media consumption on the fear of crime is prominent in research. Callanan concurred when she found that news programs influenced perception of crime in one's neighborhood. However, she found little evidence that crime dramas did the same (Callanan 2012).

When looking specifically at a sample of university students, Kohm et al. (2012) expanded the research by including a sample in Canada as well as the United States. They found that while traditional predictors of crime, such as gender, were prominent, the viewing of crime on television heighted fear of crime disproportionately among Canadians (Kohm et al 2012). This finding remained even when controlling for the local crime rate. Taking these studies into consideration it is easy to see how fear of crime can be influenced by media, especially news outlets. They even have the ability to override the fact that viewers are not at a high risk of victimization.

**Movies and Video Games**

As exposure to news can influence people's perceptions of crime, exposure to movies and video games can influence viewer's perceptions of gender. The impact of gender in movies (Smith et al 2010; Taylor and Setters 2011; Gilpatric 2010) and video games (Miller and Summers 2007) has also been considered. The effect of media as a socializing agent is widely studied. One meta-analysis found that exposure to media reinforced gender stereotypes for both males and females (Opplinger 2007) and another found that media actually had more influence on gender role expectations than family and friends (Katz and Boswell 1986). Moreover, people learn about the world and their accepted roles in it through vicarious learning, which includes the media (Bandura 2002).

37

Knowing that popular media can be integral to learning, it calls for more research on what is being shown to viewers.

When looking at movies, several genres have been examined. Looking at seemingly non-traditional roles for women, Gilpatric (2010) looked at female action roles. In her study she set out to see if these women were still portrayed in feminine roles despite their placement in a typically male dominated genre. There are several notable findings here. First off, Gilpatric found that having a main heroine who was female was extremely rare. When there was a male action figure involved, female action heroes were most often romantically involved with the male action figure. Within this relationship, female action heroes demonstrated traditionally feminine traits, including sacrificing their life for male heroes as part of "submissive affection" (Gilpatric 2010). Interestingly, it was found that the violence engaged in by the female action character was masculine in nature. Violence involved the use of weapons and violence between strangers, both of which are typical of real world violence with men. What is interesting about this, is that even though they are portrayed doing things typical of males, the reasons for doing so are expressly feminine in nature.

Another study that picked up on this phenomenon was by Taylor and Setters who looked at aggressive female protagonists in movies. They found that these roles both, "challenged and reinforced gender stereotypes" (Taylor and Setters 2011: 35). This study examined respondents' perceptions of female protagonists as being good or bad role models for women. They found that attractiveness had a lot to do with whether or not participants thought the characters were good role models. More importantly, however, the aggression that was displayed by female protagonists was more likely to make them

38

appropriate role models when that aggression was deemed as justified. This is important as what is considered justified can vary. When the reasons for aggressive acts were discussed, aggression was more likely to be accepted as justified when it fit the expectations of the actors' gender. For example, a female protagonist who killed someone who had threatened her family was deemed acceptable based on her role as a mother. Whereas, a male protagonist who blamed his actions on the influence of his friends may not be as appropriate since hegemonic masculinity dictates men are in control of their own actions (Connell 2005). After viewing these films, respondents of both sexes felt that female protagonists should be both more "independent and ambitious." The authors found this problematic as the increased expectations of women can lead to role stress.

In a departure from action films, another study examines G-rated films. This sample is important because films made for children can appear to be innocuous and yet often have extremely gendered portrayals of characters. Smith et al found (2010) that in a sample of these films, male characters outnumbered female characters and that this has remained unchanged for 15 years. This is extremely important as we know that females make up more than half the population and yet they do not see themselves reflected in media. When female characters are reflected they also tend to be depicted in more stereotypical roles and occupations for their gender (Smith et al 2010). We know that in the young adolescent years the learning of gender roles is strong and the viewing of these films can influence how we think we are and are not supposed to act. Just as media has documented effects on viewers, females who watch television when they are young held traditionally sexist beliefs when studied years later (Morgan 1982).

Video games have become a recent media platform to be studied. This is a growing source of media and the ownership of game consoles in increasing (Miller and Summers 2007). A key finding of this study is that there are more male characters than female characters in video games. Even in games that had more females, they were less likely to be playable characters. When females are portrayed in games, they are more likely to be sexualized in clothing and body type. This portrayal of women can be very influential as some studies have found these fictional characters to be considered role models by the young people who play them (McDonald and Kim 2001).

**Fictional Crime Dramas**

While television remains the most studied media source, recent criminological studies have paid specific attention to the fictional crime drama (Lavigne 2009; Lee et al 2011Rader; Rhineberger, Williams 2008; Rader Rhineberger-Dunn 2010; Kort Butler 2011; Eschotlz 2004; Desmarais et al 2008; Savage 2008). These studies are important to review here as this dissertation also uses fictional crime dramas as the media being studied. These shows are consistently found in top rated spots on television networks and this makes them essential to study (Neilsen 2011).

*Examining Gender of Characters and Audience*

Lavigne (2009) examined gender and crime in her research on the popular crime drama – CSI. She examined how women and sexual subcultures are portrayed on this show. Her findings were not positive in the sense that she found that women are under portrayed and when they are portrayed, there were not shown in a positive light. As far as criminal justice professionals, there were more men with recurring roles and more men

in positions of power (Lavigne, 2009). There were even differences in the portrayal of male and female offenders. If a female was a potential suspect, their sexual history or role as a mother was consistently brought up (Lavigne, 2009). When the victim was a female, she was often pictured dressed provocatively if wearing clothes at all (Lavigne, 2009). While criticizing the show, Lavigne also found that given the mystery nature of the show and the time constraints of television, there is little opportunity to develop extra characters' "stories." This could be remedied with the increased presence of female recurring characters.

Lee et al (2011) looked at whether or not shows that included sexual or physical violence towards women influenced the enjoyment of viewers. This study also examined whether these shows reflected rape myth and gender stereotype acceptance. They found that men who saw clips that involved sexual violence against women were less likely to hold traditional gender roles (Lee et al 2011). Men were also more likely to enjoy the clips that contained physical violence. As far as women viewers were concerned, they were less likely to find the clip enjoyable if it depicted sexual violence against women. Rape myth acceptance was higher among men than women but went down when exposed to clips with any type of violence (Lee et al 2011). A limitation of this study is the fact that only portions of the episodes were seen by participants. This could be detrimental as it may leave out the motivations of the violence shown in the clips. In addition, it is limited by using college students, a group that may differ significantly from other types of viewers. In the present dissertation the entirety of the episode is considered.

In addition to studies that look at offender portrayals and impact on viewers, there are studies that examine the way victims are depicted. Rader and Rhineberger- Dunn

41

(2010) examine victim blame in fictional crime dramas. They find that victims are often shown to be white, young, and victimized by a stranger. They point out that this is an example of misinformation present in these shows. Often when women are victimized, it is by someone that they know (Belknap 2007). Another inconsistency depicted in data from fictional crime dramas is the over-representation of male victims (Rader, Rhineberger-Dunn, Vasquez 2015).

While crime and media is largely discussed in academia, some researchers point out that the majority of people who publish articles in this vein are not specifically criminologists (Savage 2008). The bulk of publications lie in the realm of media studies, psychology, and sociology broadly. This matters as Savage points out it could cause potentially misleading information. One particular fact examined is the link between violent behavior and exposure to violent media (Savage 2008). Savage conducted a review of recent literature and concluded that exposure to violence in media is less responsible for violent behaviors than traditional risk factors of violence (e.g., poverty, parenting, child abuse). She cites the need for more criminologist involvement in the discussion of media effects on the behavior of people as they have a specific theoretical background that adds needed insight to the body of research.

**Examining Media Effects on the Criminal Justice System**

Another subject of crime and media research is the influence that the media has on people's satisfaction with the criminal justice system. This is important to discuss as it shows another way media can influence viewers aside from gender socialization. In their study, Kort-Butler and Hartshorn (2011) found that increased viewing of fictional crime dramas actually lowered people's view of the criminal justice system. Interestingly

42

enough, despite their disapproval of the system they also supported a push for more punitive policies (Kort-Butler and Hartshorn 2011). A similar study by Eschholz et al (2004) looked specifically at fictional crime dramas and their influences on viewers opinions of the criminal justice system. Their study is important in that it brings to the forefront that shows, although fictional, do draw upon real stories that have been presented to the public. Problems that are pointed out are that African Americans are shown more as offenders than their white counter parts and females are underrepresented in all aspects (Eschholz et al 2004). In a time where crime rates are steadily decreasing it is also important to mention that most people in society still think crime is rampant. This is found to be related to the idea that crime rates are misrepresented in fictional crime dramas (Eschholz et al 2004).

Another documented effect on the saturation of crime shows available is the CSI effect. The CSI effect is a phenomenon that occurs when people who sit as jurors have come to expect the use of forensic evidence in trials. This is influenced by this type of evidence presented as common in fictional crime dramas even though this is not often available in real life. Similarly, research has addressed eye witness testimony. In their study, Desmarais et al (2008) looked at how eye witness testimony was portrayed on television crime dramas and how this influenced viewers' perceptions of the validity it offers. Because of their prevalence on television, the impact that these shows have on viewers is paramount as this is something that they take with them should they ever be asked to serve as a juror. Most shows depict eye witness testimony as having far more credibility than many experts agree upon which leads people to believe should an eye witness be presented, their testimony should be given more weight (Desmarais et al

43

2008).  This is despite the fact that the shows also had increasingly pointed out the flaws in eye witness testimony such as witness stress, elderly witnesses, and memory recall (Desmarais et al 2008).  This can have the same effect on people as the more documented CSI effect.

In sum, when examining the current state of media studies and gender roles in criminology, several important issues arise.  One blaring issue is the under representation of women in the media.  We can look to studies on race to see why this is important.  It has been found that African Americans and Whites are equally likely to identify with white characters but that white viewers are not likely to identify with African American characters (Greenberg and Atkin 1982).  This implies that the absence of someone like yourself to identify with may cause you to identify with what is shown as the "generalized person."  A consequence of this that directly relates to this dissertation is that female viewers could learn what is and is not a justifiable excuse for engaging in crime from watching male characters on the show.  This would happen because of the lack of female characters that could make viewers see males as this generalized person. While one may find that there are a viable amount of female characters on the show for viewers to identify with, there is still a lack of studies that speak specifically to how they and their male counterparts use techniques of neutralization.  This dissertation adds to these bodies of research in several ways.  It examines fictional crime drama data to further explore how and why male and female offenders justifies and excuses their criminal behaviors, it seeks to examine if there are inconsistencies in patterns and trends involving crime (in occurrence and who are offenders).  Moreover, it helps to bring media studies into the realm of theoretical research.

44

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The primary objective of this dissertation is to investigate how male and female offenders in fictional crime dramas use techniques of neutralization. Specifically, this dissertation examines (1) how techniques of neutralization are used to excuse and justify male and female offenders' behaviors in fictional crime dramas, (2) whether portrayals vary between and among male and female offenders, and (3) how elements of "doing gender" (i.e., gendered action, gendered behavior, gendered accountability) play a role in the gendered nature of male and female offenders' techniques of neutralization. Doing so serves several purposes. First, this dissertation extends the previous criminological research on techniques of neutralization to women. As stated earlier, this has rarely been done. Second, this study extends previous work by using gendered theory to make sense of women's and men's techniques of neutralization. Third, this dissertation uses television media to understand what techniques of neutralization are presented to the general public, something that has not been done to date. This is important as it allows us to see if those techniques of neutralization shown are in line with gendered expectations of the offenders.

Specifically, I use data collected from four fictional crime dramas over a seven year period. This allows for comparison between and among male and female offenders'

45

usage of the original five techniques of neutralization over a variety of types of crime shows and over time.

## Data

The data for this research came from a larger project collected by Nicole Rader and Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn, and in part by me.  I assisted in transcribing of one-third of the episodes (described below) and created codebooks for each of these episodes.  Rader and Rhineberger-Dunn did the same for the remaining two-thirds of the episodes.  As stated above, information about offender demographics were collected as part of the larger project (see Rhineberger-Dunn and Rader 2008; Rhineberger-Dunn and Rader 2010; Rader, Rhineberger-Dunn, Vasquez 2015).  However, the majority of the information used in this dissertation, specifically the data used for the research questions (i.e., data used to answer all questions including techniques of neutralization and doing gender information) was collected only by me, without the assistance of Drs. Rader and Rhineberger-Dunn.

The larger project involved collecting transcripts of fictional crime dramas and basic demographic information about all offenders, victims, and criminal justice professionals in each episode.  While I used  this pre-collected information for offenders' demographic characteristics, I also collected new information from the selected crime shows to answer the research questions pertaining to techniques of neutralization and the ways gender plays a part in this process. In the original project Drs. Rader and Rhineberger-Dunn created a sample that was representative of popular public access fictional crime dramas during the time period.  This meant they looked at shows that came on regular cable and would be accessible to the largest amount of people.  The

46

2003-2004 season is the beginning of the time frame. While the original project wanted to start at the beginning of the 2000s, the decision was made to begin post-September 11th, 2001. The researchers wanted to avoid the potential effects this tragedy would have on the content of the shows. Specifically, a saturation of episodes on terrorism that would have limited the diversity of the data. To this end, the two seasons after the events of September 11th were not used to give ample time for diversity of content to return. The end of the time frame is the 2009-2010 season, when the original data collection concluded. This time frame allowed for seven seasons to be included in the analysis.

The next step was to select which fictional crime dramas would be included in the analysis. In order to do this, the Nielsen ratings (2011) were consulted to assess the popularity of all the shows currently on television. The Nielsen ratings are compiled every year in an attempt to measure which shows are viewed the most and identify viewer trends by different groupings. There are two main ways in which data are collected by issuing a "Nielsen box" to people who in turn connect them to their televisions. First, it allows individuals' viewing choices to be reviewed and recorded. Second, a target group is selected and then issued viewer diaries in which they record, for themselves, what they are watching (Nielson, (2011). Using the information collected from Nielson, the top twenty shows from each season in the study (2003-2004 through 2009-2010) were consulted. There were several non-crime shows that made the list. Since they were not relevant to the study at hand, these were not included. There were a variety of crime dramas included in this list including the following: CSI, CSI Miami, Without a trace, Law & Order, Cold Case, NCIS, Law & Order: Special Victims Unit, CSI New York, and Criminal Minds. Once the time frame was established and the most

47

popular crime shows were compiled, the next decision was which of these shows would be included in the final sample.

The researchers, for the purposes of variation, decided that only one show per franchise would be used. For example, CSI was included in the final sample and CSI Miami and CSI New York were not. This decision was made as the original show had been on air for the longest amount of time. The only other franchise that presented this issue was Law & Order. Even though the original show cracked the top twenty and had been on air longer, the researchers chose to use Law & Order Special Victims Unit instead as its focus on a specific group of victims (children and the elderly) and specific crimes (sexual assault, child pornography, etc) allowed for greater variation in the data. Both of the selected shows aired each season in the time frame and where accessible to the researchers. This data was collected via DVD and the streaming of netflix. Cold Case was not included in the final population because the seasons that were needed were not available to rent, purchase, or view and therefore, would not be complete if used. NCIS is a show about military courts, and because it was so different in content, it was not included in the analysis. With these decisions, this left CSI, Law & Order Special Victims Unit, Criminal Minds, and Without a Trace. CSI was in its fourth season at the opening time frame for the study and in its tenth at the close. Law and Order Special Victims Unit was in its fifth season at the beginning of the study and in the eleventh at the end. Criminal Minds was not aired during the 2003-2004 or 2004-2005 seasons. This means that in the time frame there were only five seasons. These seasons are included in the population. Without a Trace was the last show that was included in the data collection. Its inaugural season was 2002-2003 so the second season was the

48

starting point in the time frame for the study.  The show concluded in the 2008-2009 season and, as such, there was not a season for the last two years of the time frame.  This was not determined problematic by the original researchers as the content offered by Without a Trace was diverse enough to overcome the fact that it included less overall episodes.  Of the remaining three seasons within the time frame, all were available to the researchers and were included in the population.

Once the shows included in the population were identified, the number of episodes to be analyzed were considered.  There were 502 episodes in the population. The researchers used a stratified sampling technique, taking every fourth episode to sample.  While this sample was not a random sample, the researchers used the formula $n=.25(z/B)^2$ to find out every nth episode that would need to be included in order to stay within the desired sampling error.  The formula looked like this: $.25(1.96/.08)^2 = 150.06$. When dividing 150.06 by 502, the final number of episodes would have been 3.34 (Agresti & Finlay 2008).  As this decimal does not make practical sense, every fourth episode of these shows was included in the analysis.  The table below illustrates the breakdown of the episodes to be included in the sample.

Table 1        Sampled Episodes for each Crime Drama 03-04/09-10 Seasons

| CRIME SHOW | TOTAL # OF EPISODES | SAMPLE # OF EPISODES |
|---|---|---|
| Crime Scene Investigators | 160 | 40 |
| Special Victims Unit | 157 | 39 |
| Criminal Minds | 114 | 28 |
| Without a Trace | 71 | 17 |
| TOTAL | 502 | 124 |

The next issue tackled was inter-coder reliability.  As there were multiple

researchers working on the collection of the data, it is imperative that this was given due

attention.  The process used to determine how many episodes would need to be coded by

two separate researchers to ensure reliability in the data was given careful consideration.

As there are different sample sizes from each show (different number of available

episodes because of the years the show was available and/or on air), 25% were required

to be coded by two researchers.  Media studies have no standard rate for inter-coder

reliability. Some studies indicate you should use 100% of cases to assess inter-coder

reliability while others report using 5% of cases.  The researchers made the decision that

using one quarter was enough data to code twice.  Thus, the original project used 25% of

the sample for inter-coder reliability purposes.  For these episodes, a completely

independent viewer (undergraduate student) watched and completed a codebook. The

codebooks from the original researcher and the independent viewer were then compared and the inter-coder reliability was assessed from this process. The researchers looked to see that the same selections were made for each question asked in the codebook. The inter-coder reliability was kept above the minimally advised standard of 70% (Lombard et al. 2002). The following table depicts the episodes that were coded by two researchers.

Table 2        Sampled Episodes and Inter-coder reliability

| CRIME SHOW | SAMPLED # OF EPISODES | 25% FOR SECOND CODER |
|---|---|---|
| Crime Scene Investigators | 40 | 10 |
| Special Victims Unit | 39 | 10 |
| Criminal Minds | 28 | 7 |
| Without a Trace | 17 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 124 | 32 |

**The Codebook**

Now that the sample has been established, the next task is to discuss the codebook itself. The original codebook created by Rader and Rhineberger-Dunn consisted of four distinct sections. The original codebook included (1) show information (2) victim information, (3) offender information, and (4) criminal justice professional information (See Appendix A for an example of the complete original codebook). Since I am using only parts one and three of the codebook for this dissertation, and adding more

51

information in for my codebook, I only talk about what I include for this dissertation from this point forward.

For my codebook (see Appendix B for my codebook), I cut and pasted the relevant information from the original codebook (i.e., show information and offender information) and also added the information that I collected for this dissertation (i.e., techniques of neutralization, doing gender). Specifically, show information was collected for each codebook. This included the name of the show, the name of the episode, and the year it aired. Offender information was also collected for each codebook for all the offenders portrayed in the show. The following information is included: name, victim's name, offense committed, offender demographics (gender, race, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, education, employment, marital status, and parental status), injury status, the location of the offense, the relationship between offender and victim, and the legal consequences (if any) for the offender's actions. Also, there is a question asking about the offender typology. There are four categories to select from and they are as follows: sympathetic (portrayed as relatable), unlikeable (portrayed as having major personality flaws), manipulative (portrayed as manipulating or lying to victims or criminal justice professionals), and predators (portrayed as committing a particularly vicious crime). Each category has a distinct description in the codebook and the researchers selected which category best embodied the character overall. Lastly, there are subsections of credibility questions that will remain from the original codebook. The following demographics credibility questions were kept: gender, marital status, children, victim-offender relationship, and vices. The first three are pertinent to information for the doing gender questions as they ask whether or not the offenders' status as a

52

man/woman, husband/wife, and father/mother are used to depict the offender as either a good or bad person.

The information on offenders that has already been pre-collected for the original project were used in this dissertation to provide demographic information for each offender. Some information about the crimes committed (i.e., crime type, location of offense, victim offender relationship) may also be used for control variables in the models.

Regarding my specific contribution to this body of literature, I hope to add to it by focusing on techniques of neutralization and doing gender among male and female characters in fictional crime dramas. The codebook will contain two main sections: techniques of neutralization and doing gender. For the first section I noted whether each offender used any techniques of neutralization in the episode. Specifically, I asked if one of the following techniques was employed to defend or justify the specific criminal act. The unit of analysis is the offense, not the offender as offenders may commit multiple offenses. For offenders with multiple offenses, techniques of neutralization were noted for each particular crime and each is its own data point. I determined which, if any, of the five techniques are used to justify or excuse the offender's behavior by reading the transcripts and identifying the techniques in the dialogue.

All five techniques are listed in the codebook with a description. *Denial of responsibility* was selected if a character states that they perceived the offender did not have control over the circumstances that pushed them into crime commission. *Denial of injury* was selected if it is discussed or viewed by a character that no harm was caused by the act. *Denial of the victim* was noted if a character claims the person affected by the act

53

deserved what they got. *Condemnation of condemners* was marked if a character claimed that it is not fair to pass judgment on the offender because those that judge the act may be guilty of similar actions themselves. Lastly, *appeal to higher loyalties* was marked if a character identified the offender as acting for some greater good or benefiting some group or person they hold in higher importance than the law. Additionally, the person or group they identify as being in higher regard than the law was noted. This was used for analysis in the qualitative section to find any difference patterns between men and women. In order to maintain consistency and validity, not only was 'yes' checked for the correct technique(s), I also cut and pasted all relevant quotes in this section to corroborate the choices made. These quotes were used in the qualitative portion of this dissertation. In addition, I added who used the technique. Once the technique is marked as being used it was also noted whether the offenders themselves, a family member, a friend, or a criminal justice worker, used the technique. This was analyzed in the qualitative section to identify patterns that emerged between male and female offenders.

Next, the codebook asked a variety of questions about how (if at all) offenders "do gender." First, I analyzed the transcript and viewed the episode for signs of the offender "doing gender." This included behaviors taken on by the offender that are traditional for their gender or behaviors that go against what their gender behaviors typically consist of. In addition, I noted if other characters comment on the "doing gender" behaviors by the offender. Third, I noted if the offender is held accountable by any character for the ways they "do gender." Finally, I will note if the offender seems to feel held accountable for their gendered behavior. Any relevant quotes or signs of "doing gender" were cut and pasted into the codebook for use in for the qualitative portion of the

54

dissertation. In order to accomplish this, "yes" or "no" options were created in the codebook for the following questions: Does the offender act in a way that would be deemed "appropriate" for their gender? Does the offender act in a way that would be deemed "inappropriate" for their gender? Is the offender held accountable for their gender? If yes, by whom? Is there any indication that the offender feels they are accountable for doing gender?

In order to fill out the codebook, I took several steps. First, a transcript of every episode in the sample is available to analyze. I first read through all episodes. In addition, I consulted each pre-existing codebook for offender information. I also watched each episode that has offenders of interest to see if any information is relevant to the codebook. Using these methods (transcripts, pre-existing codebooks, watching episodes) I filled out a codebook for each offender presented in all episodes making sure to record all offenses committed.

## Data Analysis

This dissertation uses a mixed methods approach that involves both quantitative analzses and a qualitative content analysis. The quantitative portion of this dissertation describes the offenders and provides information about how often and what types of technique of neutralization are used. Additionally, it considers how elements of doing gender are used in the fictional crime dramas and whether they predict techniques of neutralization, controlling for other variables. For the quantitative section, all information compiled within the codebooks was input into SPSS for statistical analysis. The data was cleaned and variables were created. Summary statistics were run to describe the data set. Crosstabs were conducted to see within group differences and chi square

tests were also conducted to determine if variables such as offense type, location of offense, injury status of victim, and technique of neutralization were dependently related to sex of the offender. Finally, logistic regression models were used in order to determine the odds that a specific technique of neutralization was used, given a variety of independent and control variables.

There were five dependent variables in this dissertation, each a type of technique of neutralization. Each dependent variable was dummy coded so that 1 meant that the technique of neutralization was used for that offense and 0 meant that the technique of neutralization was not used for that offense. There were also several other independent variables. "Show Type" was coded into four dummy variables. Criminal Minds, Without a Trace, and CSI were coded into four dummy variables, with 1 being the title show and 0 being everything else. SVU was coded in the same manner, but left out of the models as a reference group. Variables associated with the offense included offense type which includes drug offense, homicide, sexual assault, kidnapping, general assault, and other (1=offense type, 0=everything else; homicide was left out as a reference group), location of the offense (1=public, 0=all other locations), the relationship between the victim and the offender (1=strangers, 0=all other relationships), injury status of the offender whether it was injured, dead, or uninjured (1=injury status, 0=else; uninjured was left out as a reference group), and legal consequences (1=punished, 0=notpunished). In this last variable, any legal action taken against the offender, including arrest, was marked as punished. Variables associated with the offender's behavior included offender's financial status (1=unstable, 0=else), mental status (1=illness, 0=else), drug use (1=drugs, 0=no drugs), alcohol use (1=alcohol use, 0=no alcohol use), good

56

personality (1=good, 0=else), and bad personality (1=good, 0=else). Financial and mental status were marked if it is discussed in the dialog that the offender is poor, struggling to makes ends meet, etc and if they are referred to as having a mental illness or being mentally unstable, respectively. Drugs and alcohol are indicated if the offenders are shown using either or it is stated that they used them in the past. This variable is just concerned with usage of either, even if it is just shown once. There are other variables that ask if the drug or alcohol use is linked to the commission of the offense. The last two variables are indicated if the offender is depicted as having a good or bad personality as perceived by the researcher based on their interactions with other characters and other characters comments about them. Finally, a variable that analyzed how the show depicted the culpability of the offender was originally coded by Drs. Rader and Rhineberger-Dunn as sympathetic, manipulative, unlikable, and predator. For logistic regression, each of these categories were dummy coded (1=personality type, 0=else; sympathetic was left out as the reference group). Finally, offender demographic variables included sex (1=male, 0=else), race (1=white, 0=else), ethnicity (1=Hispanic, 0=else), and age (0=under 20, 1=20-29, 2=30-39, 3=40-49, 4=50-59, 5=over 60,). Since age has over five categories it is approximated as a continuous variable in SPSS (Norusis 2006). The demographic variables of socioeconomic status, employment, parental status, marital status, and education were recorded in the original data but since all had a higher than 20% missing, they were excluded from the models so as to not lose cases.

Because the variables are nominal, logistic regression was used in the dissertation. Using the variables above, I conducted three models. The first model examines sex, race, and age on each technique of neutralization. The second model adds in offense related

57

variables including location of offense, offense type (IPV, sexual assault, kidnaping, assault), victim-offender relationship, injury status, and legal consequences given to the offender, if any (not evident, rehabilitative/medical treatment, jail, acquittal, prison, and probation, all dummy coded). In the third model, offender related variables were added to the model one demographics. They included, financial status, mental status, good personality, bad personality, personality type (unlikable, manipulative, predator), drug use, and alcohol use.

In addition to using sex as a control variable in the above described models, I also ran the above models for men and for women only. This allowed me to examine all variables by sex specifically rather than only controlling for sex in each model. These models helped to parse out the relationship between sex and the techniques more clearly.

In addition, qualitative analyses were conducted to answer the three research questions (1) how techniques of neutralization are used to excuse and justify male and female offenders' behaviors in fictional crime dramas, (2) if such portrayals vary between and among male and female offenders, and (3) how elements of "doing gender" (i.e., gendered action, gendered behavior, gendered accountability) play a role in the gendered nature of male and female offenders' techniques of neutralization. Using transcripts, a line by line analysis of each transcript was conducted and all phrases dealing with techniques of neutralization or showing elements of "doing gender" (e.g., discussions of the offenders' sex, descriptions of gender displays, discuss accountability based on gender, or anything discussing gender identity) were cut and pasted into a Word document. This process continued until themes emerged from the data (Corbin and

Strauss 2008).  Themes were found after becoming familiar with the data and pinpointing patterns, among other things, in gender and techniques of neutralization use.

In conclusion, this dissertation uses fictional crime dramas to explore the relationship between doing gender and use of techniques of neutralization.  This is an underutilized medium in criminology and contains a wealth of data.  It sought to answer questions about cultural expectations of men and women and how they are presented through media.  Specifically, the mechanisms that allow us to engage in crime commission by successfully deflecting guilt for our actions.  Discovering how men and women differ in this respect will allow us to better deal with this issue on a practical policy level.

Using both quantitative and qualitative data, this dissertation determined whether there are patterns of use of the techniques, but also provided examples of how men and women interpret techniques.  Defending our criminal actions can be another way in which we affirm our gender to others and these highly followed shows give us insight into how that is done.

59

# CHAPTER IV

## QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

**Descriptive Statistics**

This dissertation uses a mixed methods approach.  The first section discusses quantitative results.  The final data set includes 383 individual offenses that were recorded from 124 episodes across four different fictional crime dramas.  The offenses came from the shows in the following proportions: Law and Order: Special Victims Unit (36%), Crime Scene Investigators (27.2%), Criminal Minds (25.6%), and Without a Trace (11.2%).  While all are broadly fictional crime dramas, it is important to note that CSI, Criminal Minds, and Without a Trace are police dramas which focus on the work of the initial process of solving crimes and discovering the offender.  While SVU has elements of this it also has an element of court room procedure.  The potential ways these shows shape what is found in the data are discussed later.  The first group of descriptions pertain to all offenses in the data set as a whole.

Table 3    Breakdown of Crime Shows

| Crime Show | Offenses by Show | Offenses by Sex | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Male offenders | Female offenders |
| Law & Order: SVU | 36% (138) | 33.9% (101) | 44.04% (37) |
| Crime Scene Investigators | 27.2% (104) | 25.8% (77) | 30.95% (26) |
| Without a Trace | 11.2% (43) | 11.1% (33) | 11.9% (10) |
| Criminal Minds | 25.6 (98) | 29.2% (87) | 13.1% (11) |
| **Total** | **383** | **298** | **84** |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

## Demographic Variables

Demographic variables were recorded for all offenders present in the shows. In this data set the vast majority of offenders depicted were White (92.2%). While official data from the 2013 UCR shows that the majority of all individuals arrested were white (68.9%), this statistic shows an over-representation of white offenders (Crime in the United States 2013). Black offenders were shown in 4.2% of offenses and 3.4% of offenders were marked as 'other race'. The ethnicity of offenders was also recorded. The vast majority of offenders were marked as non-Hispanic (96.1%). There are a few reasons this number was high. An offender was only marked Hispanic if this was clearly stated or discussed by a character on the show. Also, in general Hispanic people are statistically absent from most television shows (Latino Media Gap, CSER, 2014).

The age of offenders was broken down by decades for coding purposes, with the exception of an under 20 and over 60 category. Official crime statistics do not record the age of offenders in this manner. However, the majority of offenses in the data set are

committed by offenders in the crime prone age group under 30 (32.4%). As offenders age, the percentage of offenders depicted on the shows declines as well. This is also consistent with official data.

In order to keep the largest number of cases in my data set, variables with above 20% missing values were not included in the statistical models. These variables included socioeconomic status, employment status, education, and parental and marital status of offenders. Of the available data, the offenders were most likely to be full-time employees (43.1%), to be members of the middle class (30.8%), to have completed less than high school (13.8%; although 60% of this variable was missing), to be single or never married (40.5%), and to be parents (41%). The last demographic variable, and the most pertinent for this dissertation, was sex of the offender. The data set mimics the distribution of offenders in the US at large, with 77.8% male offenders and 21.9% female offenders (Crime in the United States 2013).

Table 4     Offender Demographics

| Offender Demographics | Number of total | % of total |
|---|---|---|
| **RACE** | | |
| White | 353 | 92.2 |
| Black | 16 | 4.2 |
| Other | 13 | 3.4 |
| | | |
| **ETHNICITY** | | |
| Hispanic | 10 | 2.6 |
| Non-Hispanic | 368 | 96.1 |
| | | |
| **AGE** | | |
| <20 | 62 | 16.2 |
| 21-29 | 62 | 16.2 |
| 30-39 | 87 | 22.7 |
| 40-49 | 105 | 27.4 |
| 50-59 | 46 | 12 |
| >60 | 18 | 4.7 |
| | | |
| **SES** | | |
| Lower | 14 | 3.7 |
| Lower Middle | 38 | 9.9 |
| Middle | 118 | 30.8 |
| Middle Upper | 51 | 13.3 |
| Upper | 50 | 13.1 |
| | | |
| **EMPLOYMENT STATUS** | | |
| Unemployed | 72 | 18.8 |
| Part time | 30 | 7.8 |
| Full time | 165 | 43.1 |
| | | |
| **PARENTAL** | | |
| Parent | 134 | 35 |
| Non-parent | 157 | 41 |
| | | |
| **MARITAL** | | |
| Married | 83 | 21.7 |
| Divorced | 26 | 6.8 |
| Widowed | 29 | 7.6 |
| Single/Never married | 155 | 40.5 |
| | | |
| **SEX** | | |
| Male | 298 | 77.8 |
| Female | 84 | 21.9 |

**Offense Related Variables**

Offense related variables were added to determine whether any contextual elements for the offense, such offense location or injury status of the offender, predicted the technique of neutralization utilized by the offenders. Offense related variables included offense type, location of offense, victim-offender relationship, injury status of offender, and legal consequences. Regarding offense type, there were a total of nine offense categories independently coded in the data. Almost half of the offenses recorded were homicides (48%). The remaining offenses were other (19.6%), sexual assault (12%), assault (8.4%), kidnapping (7.3%), IPV (2.9%), drug offenses (1%), and stalking (.8%).

In terms of offense location and the victim-offender relationship, most offenses took place in mostly private locations (59.8%) and more than one-third of offenders were strangers (39.2%). The remaining categories encompass relationships in which the victim and offender know each other (acquaintances, family members, partners/spouses, and friends) and account for more than half of the offenses (52.1%). This mirrors the normal victim-offender relationship (Rader and Rhineberger-Dunn 2010).

Injury status of the offender showed that the majority of offenders were uninjured throughout the episode (60.6%). However, 15.4% of offenses were committed by offenders who sustained an injury during the offense and 24% of offenses were committed by offenders who ultimately died in the episode. The last variable in this category is the legal consequences from the offense. This category included six potential legal consequences (medical treatment .3%, jail 1.3%, acquitted 4.7%, probation 1%, prison 6%, and arrested 31.6%) as well as a 'not evident from episode category' (30.3%)

64

and an 'other' (24.8%) category that included circumstances such as the offender died prior to legal proceedings.  These categories were converted to dummy variables in which there were two categories, punished and not punished.  The former included all forms of legal consequences while the latter included instances where the offender was given no consequences in the episode.

Table 5    Offense Related Variables

| Offense Related Variable | Number of total | % of total |
|---|---|---|
| **OFFENSE TYPE** | | |
| Drug Offense | 4 | 1 |
| Homicide | 184 | 48 |
| Stalking | 3 | .8 |
| Intimate Partner Violence | 11 | 2.9 |
| Sexual Assault | 46 | 12 |
| Kidnapping | 28 | 7.3 |
| Assault | 32 | 8.4 |
| Other | 75 | 19.6 |
| | | |
| **LOCATION** | | |
| Private | 229 | 59.8 |
| Public | 150 | 39.2 |
| | | |
| **VICTIM OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP** | | |
| Strangers | 150 | 39.2 |
| Family members | 45 | 11.7 |
| Acquaintances | 97 | 25.3 |
| Partner/Spouse | 45 | 11.7 |
| Friends | 13 | 3.4 |
| | | |
| **INJURY STATUS** | | |
| Dead | 92 | 24 |
| Injured | 59 | 15.4 |
| Uninjured | 232 | 60.6 |
| | | |
| **LEGAL CONSEQUENCES** | | |
| Not evident | 116 | 30.3 |
| Medical treatment | 1 | .3 |
| Jail | 5 | 1.3 |
| Acquitted | 18 | 4.7 |
| Probation | 4 | 1 |
| Prison | 23 | 6 |
| Arrested | 121 | 31.6 |
| Other | 95 | 24.8 |

66

## Offender Related Variables

Next are variables related to the way in which offenders are portrayed on the show. These variables contribute to the overall credibility of the offenders as they indicate if the offender has any vices. They were added in the third model to determine whether they predicted what technique of neutralization was employed. The drug and alcohol use of each offender were recorded. The majority of offenders were not stated to be users of or shown in the episodes using drugs (96.6%) or alcohol (92.7%).

Whether or not the personality traits of offenders were used to portray them as having a good or bad personality were recorded. If a character was described by another as a good or bad person, they were marked as having a good or bad personality, respectively. These two factors were of importance, specifically to women, as there is a documented assumption on the part of police officers that women are seen as deceitful and less credible (Jordan 2004). The majority of offenders were referred to by others as having a bad personality (72.3%). There were also four categories of overall personality types assigned to the offenders. These categories were formed from an analysis of the original data in which themes emerged in the descriptions of the offenders. The breakdown is as follows: 38.1% were seen as unlikable, 24.5% were seen as sympathetic, 23.2% were seen as manipulative, and 14.1% were seen as predators. The mental status of offenders were also noted in the codebooks. Most offenders were not referred to as having a mental illness (81.7%). Lastly, the financial status of offenders was thought to be a potential motivator for engaging in crime, so whether or not the offender is said to be financially unstable was observed. The data did not support this argument as less than

ten percent of offenders are described or shown to be financially unstable, making this not a likely motive for their offenses.

Table 6        Offender Related Variables

| Offender Related Variables | # of total | % of total |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DRUGS** | | |
| Drug use | 13 | 3.4 |
| No drug use | 370 | 96.6 |
| | | |
| **ALCOHOL** | | |
| Alcohol use | 28 | 7.3 |
| No alcohol use | 355 | 92.7 |
| | | |
| **MENTAL STATUS** | | |
| Mental illness | 70 | 18.3 |
| No mental illness | 313 | 81.7 |
| | | |
| **FINANCIAL STATUS** | | |
| Financially unstable | 36 | 9.4 |
| Not financially unstable | 347 | 90.6 |
| | | |
| **DRUGS** | | |
| Drug use | 13 | 3.4 |
| No drug use | 370 | 96.6 |
| | | |
| **ALCOHOL** | | |
| Alcohol use | 28 | 7.3 |
| No alcohol use | 355 | 92.7 |

**Credibility Related Variables (Offender related)**

The last group of variables that I will describe are those surrounding the credibility of each offender as it pertains to their sex and parental and marital status. The data included a record of whether or not these three statuses were used in the episodes to portray the offenders in a positive or negative way. To best describe these variables,

68

frequencies were run in split cases by sex and on the data set as a whole. This allowed me to see if the numbers were coming more from the females or the males in the overall sample. I found that these statuses were rarely used to depict the offenders as either good or bad people.  Sex was only used to describe the offender as a good person 2.6% of the time and a bad person 4.7% of the time.  Marital status was only used to depict the offender as a good person 6% of the time and a bad person 14.4% of the time.  Lastly, parental status was only used to show the offender as a good person 14.6% of the time and a bad person 14.1% of the time. There were no significant differences between male and female offenders.

Table 7    Offender Credibility Related Variables

| Offender Credibility Related Variables | # of total | % of total |
|---|---|---|
| **GOOD PERSONALITY** | | |
| Seen as having good traits | 83 | 21.7 |
| Not seen as having good traits | 300 | 78.3 |
| | | |
| **BAD PERSONALITY** | | |
| Seen as having bad traits | 277 | 72.3 |
| Not seen as having bad traits | 106 | 27.2 |
| | | |
| **PERSONALITY TYPE** | | |
| Sympathetic | 94 | 24.5 |
| Unlikeable | 146 | 38.1 |
| Manipulative | 89 | 23.2 |
| Predator | 54 | 14.1 |
| | | |
| **PARENTAL STATUS AS GOOD PERSON** | | |
| Used to show as a good person | 56 | 14.6 |
| Not used to show as a good person | 327 | 85.4 |
| | | |
| **PARENTAL STATUS AS A BAD PERSON** | | |
| Used to show as a bad person | 54 | 14.1 |
| Not used to show as a bad person | 329 | 85.9 |
| | | |
| **MARITAL STATUS AS GOOD PERSON** | | |
| Used to show as a good person | 23 | 6 |
| Not used to show as a good person | 360 | 94 |
| | | |
| **MARITAL STATUS AS A BAD PERSON** | | |
| Used to show as a bad person | 55 | 14.4 |
| Not used to show as a bad person | 328 | 85.6 |

My dependent variable in all three models are the techniques of neutralization. Each model will be run using each of the five techniques. They will all be dummy coded (1=technique is used for the offense, 0=otherwise) and the previously mentioned variables are used as independent variables. Of the techniques used, 18.5% used denial of responsibility, 8.4% used denial of injury, 24% used denial of the victim, 1.3% used

70

condemnation of condemners, and 37.1% used appeal to higher loyalties. There were

also 10.7% of offenses where no technique was used.

## Chi Squares

Cross tabs and chi-square analyses were also used to examine whether there was a

relationship between two categorical variables. This type of analysis helps to answer my

research questions about potential sex group differences in my data set. Specifically, the

first research question posed is whether or not there are differences in how male and

female offenders utilize techniques of neutralization. Below is the table that summarizes

the percentages of techniques of neutralization within each sex group.

Table 8        Techniques of Neutralization by Sex of Offender

| Technique of Neutralization | Male | Female | Unknown | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Denial of Responsibility | 18.5% (55) | 19% (16) | 0% (0) | 37.5% (71) |
| Denial of Injury | 8.1% (24) | 9.5% (8) | 0% (0) | 17.6% (32) |
| Denial of Victim | 23.5% (71) | 25% (21) | 0% (0) | 48.5% (92 |
| Condemnation of Condemners | 1.7% (5) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 1.7% (5) |
| Appeal to Higher Loyalties | 34.9% (104) | 44% (37) | .7% (1) | 78.9% (142) |
| None Used | 13.1% (39) | 2.4% (2) | 0% (0) | 15.5% (41) |
| Chi-Square Value: 11.83        Significance: .297 | | | | |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

Table six shows a chi-squared value of 11.83 with a significance of p=.297.

Therefore, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that sex and utilization of techniques of

neutralization are independent. This tells us that based on the distribution of the present

71

data, we cannot confidently say that there is actually a statistical relationship between the sex of the offender and the technique of neutralization used. Specifically, we do not have enough evidence to say that sex affects technique of neutralization use.

As sex differences are a major topic in this dissertation, a series of chi-square tests were conducted to determine what relationship may exist between sex and several other variables. The first set of variables used are those pertaining to the offense related variables. These variables include the following: offense type, location of offense, victim offender relationship, injury status of offender, and legal consequences. The tables below reflect the relationships found. The following table shows two percentages, the first shows the distribution of all crimes committed by male and female offenders and the second shows what percentage of each offense was committed by males and females. For the latter category, the missing percentage totals indicate an offense labeled 'other'.

Table 9     Offense Type by Sex of Offender (Within Sex differences)

| Offense Type | Males | Females | Unknown | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drug Offense | 1.3% (4) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100% (4) |
| Homicide | 46% (137) | 54.8% (46) | 100% (1) | 100% (184) |
| Stalking | 1% (3) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100% (3) |
| Intimate Partner Violence | 3.4% (10) | 1.2% (1) | 0% (0) | 100% (11) |
| Sexual Assault | 14.4% (43) | 3.6% (3) | 0% (0) | 100% (46) |
| Kidnapping | 9.1% (27) | 1.2% (1) | 0% (0) | 100% (28) |
| General Assault | 6.7% (20) | 14.3% (12) | 0% (0) | 100% (32) |
| Chi-Square Value: 23.25 | Significance: .05 | | | |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

72

Table 10    Offense Type by Sex of Offender (Within Offense type differences)

| Offense Type | Males | Females | Unknown | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drug Offense | 100% (4) | 0% (0) | 0%(0) | 100%(4) |
| Homicide | 74.5% (137) | 25% (46) | .5% (1) | 100%(184) |
| Stalking | 100% (3) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100%(3) |
| Intimate Partner Violence | 90.9% (10) | 9.1% (1) | 0% (0) | 100%(11) |
| Sexual Assault | 93.5% (43) | 6.5% (3) | 0% (0) | 100%(46) |
| Kidnapping | 96.4% (27) | 3.6% (1) | 0% (0) | 100%(28) |
| General Assault | 62.5% (20) | 37.5% (12) | 0% (0) | 100%(32) |
| Chi-Square Value: 23.25 | Significance: .05 | | | |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

Table eight shows a chi-squared value with a significance of p=.05 so we can reject the null hypothesis that sex and offense type are independent. This means that the data represented here show us that the sex of the offender does affect the offense type committed.

Table 11    Location of Offense by Sex of Offender

| Sex of Offender | Private | Public | Missing | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 59.7% (178) | 39.3% (117) | 1% (3) | 100% (298) |
| Female | 60.7% (51) | 39.3% (33) | 0% (0) | 100% (84) |
| Unknown | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100% (1) | 100% (1) |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

I was also interested in understanding whether the location of the offense type had a relationship with sex. Table nine shows a chi-squared value with a significance of p=.000 so we can reject the null hypothesis that sex of the offender and location of the

73

offense are independent. This indicates that there is a relationship between sex of the offender and location of the offense. Meaning the location of the offense is affected by the sex of the offender. The table shows us that both sexes of offenders were more likely to commit their offense in a private location.

Table 12      Victim-Offender Relationship by Sex of Offender

| Sex of Offender | Strangers | Family Members | Acquaintances | Partners | Friends | Missing | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 41.6% (124) | 9.4% (28) | 26.2% (78) | 10.4% (31) | 4% (12) | 8.4% (25) | 100% (298) |
| Female | 31% (26) | 20.2% (17) | 22.6% (19) | 16.7% (14) | 1.2% (1) | 8.3% (7) | 100% (84) |
| Unknown | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100% (1) | 100% (1) |
| Total | 39.2% (150) | 11.7% (45) | 25.3% (97) | 11.7% (45) | 3.4% (13) | 8.6% (33) | 100% (383) |
| Chi-Square value: 23.16      Significance: .010 | | | | | | | |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

Next, I was interested in whether sex had a relationship with the victim-offender relationship. Table ten shows a chi-square value of 23.16 with a p-value of .010 we can reject the null hypothesis that sex of the offender and victim-offender relationship are independent. This means that for this relationship we have enough statistical evidence to support a relationship between sex of the offender and victim-offender relationship. This table tells us that while stranger relationships were the largest category of measured relationship for both sexes, both groups were more likely to offend against someone that they knew. Also, it is interesting to note, that while not significant, when the offender is a female the victim is an intimate partner more often than when the offender is a male.

74

Table 13    Injury Status of Offender by Sex of Offender

| Sex of Offender | Dead | Injured | Missing | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 27.5% (82) | 14.4% (43) | 58.1% (173) | 100% (298) |
| Female | 11.9% (10) | 19% (16) | 69% (58) | 100% (84) |
| Unknown | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100% (1) | 100% (1) |
| Total | 24% (92) | 15.4% (59) | 60.6% (232) | 100% (383) |
| Chi-Square Value: 9.52 | Significance: .05 | | | |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

Finally, when examining injury status and sex of the offender, table eleven shows a chi-square value of 9.52 with a significance of .05 so at the 95% confidence interval we can reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to suggest that the sex of the offender affects the injury status shown of the offender.

Table 14    Offense Type by Technique of Neutralization Used

| Offense Type | DOR | DOI | DOV | COC | AHL | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drug Offense | 0%(0) | 25%(1) | 0%(0) | 25%(1) | 50%(2) | 0%(0) |
| Homicide | 19%(35) | 5.4%(10) | 31.5%(58) | .5%(1) | 37.5%(69) | 6%(11) |
| Stalking | 33.3%(1) | 0%(0) | 33.3%(1) | 0%(0) | 33.3%(1) | 0%(0) |
| Intimate Partner Violence | 54.5%(6) | 9.1%(1) | 0%(0) | 0%(0) | 0%(0) | 36.4%(4) |
| Sexual Assault | 21.7%(10) | 19.6%(9) | 23.9%(11) | 2.2%(1) | 2.2%(1) | 17.4%(8) |
| Kidnapping | 7.1%(2) | 0%(0) | 3.6%(1) | 0%(0) | 71.4%(20) | 17.9%(5) |
| General Assault | 15.6%(5) | 9.4%(3) | 40.6%(13) | 0%(0) | 18.8%(6) | 15.6%(5) |
| Chi-Square Value: 107.52 | Significance: .000 | | | | | |

*Note:* Numbers in parenthesis are frequencies

75

Table twelve does not include sex.  I wanted to determine whether there was a relationship between the technique used and the type of offense.  The chi-square value for table twelve is 107.52 with a p=.000 so we can conclude that there is a relationship between the two variables.  Rejecting the null hypothesis tells us that the relationship between these two variable is not due to chance.  Denial of responsibility was used the most for intimate partner violence. The highest percentage of offenses that used denial of injury were drug offenses.  It should be noted, though, that this was only one offense.  General assault carried the largest use of denial of the victim, while appeal to higher loyalties was used the most for kidnapping.  Condemnation of the condemners was the technique that was utilized the least of the five and was used the most for drug offenses.

In sum, when looking at the descriptive analyses, I found that sex had a significant relationship with offense type, location of offense, victim-offender relationship, and injury status.  Within offense type, males committed more of every offense measured and the highest category for women was general assault.  Both sexes were substantially more likely to commit their offenses in private locations.  Committing offenses against a known person was more common for both male and female offenders.  Lastly, there was a significant relationship between techniques of neutralization and offense type.

**Logistic Regression Models (Full Sample)**

The following are a discussion of the results found from the logistic regression models.  Four models of regressions were run for each of the five techniques of neutralizations.  Model one consisted of the demographic variables of age, sex (male), and race (white).  Model two added offense related variables to the demographic

variables from model one. These variables included location of offense, offense type, victim-offender relationship, injury status, and legal consequences. In the third model, offender related variables were added to the demographic variables from model one. These variables included financial status, good personality, bad personality, mental status, personality type, drug use, and alcohol use. Lastly, the full model contained demographic, offender related, and offense related variables. These predictor variables were run for all five techniques of neutralization.

**Denial of Responsibility**

There were no significant findings for this technique in model one. Models two and three each had one finding of note. These findings can be seen below in table thirteen. In the second model, the odds of an offense having denial of responsibility used were 26.425 times larger when it was intimate partner violence, compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables. In the third model, the odds of an offense committed by an offender with a mental illness denial of responsibility used were 3.441 times larger than those without a mental illness, controlling for all other variables. In the fourth model, there were three significant findings. The odds of denial of responsibility being used for an offense are 79.4% less likely when the offender is seen as financially unstable as an offender who is not, controlling for all other variables. The odds of an offense committed by an offender with a mental illness were 3.243 times larger than for those without a mental illness, controlling for all other variables. When the offense was intimate partner violence, the odds of an offender using denial of responsibility was 17.336 times higher verses homicide, controlling for all other variables.

77

Table 15    Logistic Regression for Denial of Responsibility (Full Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | .179 | .321 | 1.196 | -.238 | .392 | .788 | -.053 | .350 | .948 | -.425 | .428 | .654 |
| Age | .589 | .559 | 1.803 | -.040 | .125 | .961 | -.071 | .104 | .932 | .027 | .131 | 1.027 |
| White | -.110 | .095 | .895 | .339 | .621 | 1.404 | .251 | .579 | 1.285 | .057 | .660 | 1.058 |
| Public | | | | .302 | .359 | 1.352 | | | | .377 | .384 | 1.458 |
| IPV | | | | 3.27 | 1.19 | 26.43* | | | | 2.853 | 1.226 | 17.34** |
| SA | | | | .263 | .512 | 1.30 | | | | .443 | .554 | 1.56 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -.533 | .815 | .587 | | | | -.288 | .861 | .749 |
| Assault | | | | -.200 | .588 | .819 | | | | -.020 | .674 | .980 |
| Other | | | | .163 | .445 | 1.18 | | | | .283 | .476 | 1.33 |
| Strangers | | | | .430 | .334 | 1.54 | | | | .481 | .372 | 1.62 |
| Dead | | | | -.175 | .620 | .840 | | | | -.196 | .722 | .822 |
| Injured | | | | .167 | .431 | 1.18 | | | | -.011 | .466 | .989 |
| Punished | | | | .425 | .336 | 1.53 | | | | .285 | .374 | 1.33 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -3.59 | .534 | .698 | -1.58 | .534 | .206* |
| Good | | | | | | | -.519 | .383 | .595 | .200 | .383 | 1.22 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -.095 | .353 | .910 | -.088 | .353 | .915 |
| Illness | | | | | | | 1.236 | .330 | 3.441*** | 1.176 | .330 | 3.24*** |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | .148 | .417 | 1.159 | -.144 | .417 | .866 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | .564 | .441 | 1.758 | .095 | .441 | 1.10 |
| Predator | | | | | | | .734 | .569 | 2.084 | -.188 | .569 | .829 |
| Drug | | | | | | | -.289 | .838 | .749 | -.126 | .838 | .882 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | .270 | .537 | 1.310 | .294 | .537 | 1.34 |

### Denial of Injury

There were no significant findings in model one for this technique.  Model two yielded four findings of note.  From offense type, the odds of using denial of injury were higher for sexual assault (6.882), assault (4.092), and other offenses (3.337) when compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables.  Also, when an offender was legally punished, the odds of using this technique were 67.8% less likely than when they were not legally punished, controlling for all other variables.  In the third model, there

78

were two significant findings.  The odds of an offender shown with a good personality using this technique were 2.205 times higher than offenders not shown with a good personality, controlling for all other variables.  When an offender is depicted as unlikeable,, the odds of them using denial of injury are 3.187 times larger than when they are shown as sympathetic, controlling for all other variables.  In the full model, there were four findings of note.  From offense type, the odds of offenders using denial of injury were larger for sexual assault (5.623) and assault (5.942) when compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables.   When an offender is shown as unlikeable the odds of them using this technique are 5.647 times higher than when they are shown as sympathetic, controlling for all other variables.  Lastly, when an offender is legally punished they are 73.6% less likely to use denial of injury than when the offender is not legally punished.

Table 16    Logistic Regression for Denial of Injury (Full Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | -.036 | .434 | .965 | .679 | .589 | 1.972 | -.020 | .459 | .980 | .775 | .640 | 2.17 |
| Age | -.003 | .132 | .997 | -.043 | .169 | .958 | -.052 | .136 | .950 | -.036 | .186 | .965 |
| White | .357 | .762 | .220 | .208 | .890 | 1.232 | .441 | .785 | 1.56 | .574 | .974 | 1.776 |
| Public | | | | -.558 | .532 | .573 | | | | -.667 | .589 | .513 |
| IPV | | | | .919 | 1.312 | 2.506 | | | | .736 | 1.39 | 2.09 |
| SA | | | | 1.929 | .613 | 6.882*** | | | | 1.73 | .645 | 5.62*** |
| Kidnapping | | | | -18.242 | 10531.9 | .000 | | | | -17.96 | 10298 | .00 |
| Assault | | | | 1.409 | .816 | 4.092* | | | | 1.78 | .923 | 5.94** |
| Other | | | | 1.205 | .641 | 3.337* | | | | 1.11 | .691 | 3.02 |
| Strangers | | | | .351 | .481 | 1.421 | | | | .245 | .561 | 1.28 |
| Dead | | | | .336 | .788 | 1.399 | | | | .021 | .970 | 1.02 |
| Injured | | | | -.887 | .726 | .412 | | | | -.923 | .786 | .397 |
| Punished | | | | -1.197 | .503 | .302** | | | | -1.33 | .561 | .264** |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -.225 | .663 | .799 | .517 | 1.02 | 1.68 |
| Good | | | | | | | .791 | .459 | 2.205* | .151 | .677 | 1.16 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -.380 | .484 | .684 | -.296 | .740 | .744 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -.515 | .576 | .597 | -.002 | .741 | .998 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | 1.16 | .630 | 3.187* | 1.73 | .974 | 5.65* |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | .845 | .666 | 2.328 | 1.54 | 1.02 | 4.67 |
| Predator | | | | | | | 1.124 | .820 | 3.076 | 1.96 | 1.23 | 7.11 |
| Drug | | | | | | | -18. | 11928 | .000 | -18.8 | 19318 | .00 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | -3.206 | .965 | .041 | .138 | .944 | 1.15 |

**Denial of the Victim**

There were no significant findings from model one for this technique.  In model

two, the odds of someone using denial of the victim were lower when the offense was

kidnapping (87.3%) and other offenses (61.6%) when compared to homicide, controlling

for all other variables.  When an offense was committed by a stranger the odds of using

this technique decreased by 41%, compared to when the offender was known, controlling

for all other variables.  In model three, I found that the odds of an offender using denial

of the victim decreased by 61.4% when they are shown as manipulative compared to

when they are shown as sympathetic, controlling for all other variables.  In the full

model, there were seven significant findings.  For every increase in age of the offender

80

the odds of using denial of the victim decreased by 19.8%, controlling for all other variables. The odds of this technique being used were 92.5% lower when the offense was kidnapping and 62.8% lower for other offenses when compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables. When the offender has a mental illness this technique was 63.2% less likely to be used than when the offender did not have a mental illness, controlling for all other variables. The odds of using denial of the victim were 1.919 times larger when the offender was legally punished than when they were not, controlling for all other variables. When the offender was manipulative it was 72.8% less likely that this technique was used compared to those who were sympathetic, controlling for all other variables. When an offender was a stranger to the victim the odds of using denial of the victim decreased by 44.9% compared to when the offender was known, controlling for all other variables.

Table 17    Logistic Regression for Denial of the Victim (Full Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | .118 | .293 | 1.125 | .281 | .359 | 1.325 | .249 | .311 | 1.282 | .358 | .389 | 1.43 |
| Age | -.096 | .087 | .909 | -.154 | .108 | 2.029 | -.139 | .092 | .871 | -.221 | .117 | .802** |
| White | -.177 | .425 | .838 | .390 | .539 | 1.477 | .047 | .444 | 1.048 | .728 | .598 | 2.07 |
| Public | | | | .316 | .321 | 1.372 | | | | .492 | .357 | 1.64 |
| IPV | | | | 0.554 | 17882 | .000 | | | | -19.76 | 17589 | .00 |
| SA | | | | -.176 | .457 | .839 | | | | .064 | .498 | 1.07 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -2.061 | 1.062 | .127** | | | | -2.59 | 1.09 | .075*** |
| Assault | | | | .307 | .488 | 1.360 | | | | .441 | .564 | 1.55 |
| Other | | | | -.957 | .473 | .384** | | | | -1.017 | .506 | .362** |
| Strangers | | | | -.528 | .306 | .590* | | | | -.595 | .342 | .551* |
| Dead | | | | -.214 | .544 | .807 | | | | -.096 | .631 | .908 |
| Injured | | | | -.177 | .397 | .838 | | | | -.128 | .435 | .880 |
| Punished | | | | .407 | .311 | 1.502 | | | | .652 | .349 | 1.92* |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -.218 | .448 | .804 | .142 | .612 | 1.15 |
| Good | | | | | | | -.250 | .329 | .779 | -.507 | .444 | .602 |
| Bad | | | | | | | .392 | .313 | 1.48 | -.156 | .447 | .856 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -.536 | .349 | .585 | -.998 | .480 | .368** |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | -.370 | .352 | .691 | -.674 | .467 | .510 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | 951 | .416 | .386** | -1.30 | .549 | .272*** |
| Predator | | | | | | | -.549 | .521 | .578 | -.324 | .719 | .723 |
| Drug | | | | | | | -1.69 | 1.08 | .185 | -.806 | 1.36 | .447 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | -.568 | .556 | .700 | -.125 | .676 | .882 |

**Condemnation of Condemners**

This technique did not have any significant findings in the first or the full models. In the second model, the odds of using this technique were 13.987 times larger for other offenses compared to homicides, when controlling for all other variables.  In model three, there were two important findings.  When offenders were shown with a bad personality condemnation of condemners was 91.8% less likely to be used than when offenders were not shown this way, controlling for all other variables.  Lastly, for drug offenses the odds of an offender using this technique were 400.928 times larger than homicide offenses, controlling for all other variables.

Table 18    Logistic Regression for Condemnation of Condemners (Full Sample)

| Variables | Model One B | Model One Exp(B) | Model Two B | Model Two Exp(B) | Model Three B | Model Three Exp(B) | Full Model B | Full Model Exp(B) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 17.322 | 3.33E+7 | 16.4 | 1.3E+7 | 16.027 | 9.1E+6 | 16.27 | 1.1E+7 |
| Age | -.440 | .644 | -1.843 | .158 | -.074 | .928 | -.265 | .767 |
| White | -.772 | .462 | -3.607 | .027 | -2.333 | .097 | .654 | 1.92 |
| Public | | | -.451 | .637 | | | 16.43 | 1.3E+7 |
| IPV | | | -10.7 | .000 | | | 18.94 | 1.E+7 |
| SA | | | -18.195 | .000 | | | -16.8 | .000 |
| Kidnapping | | | -15.783 | .000 | | | -16.5 | .000 |
| Assault | | | -17.336 | .000 | | | -35.3 | .000 |
| Other | | | 2.638 | 13.987* | | | 16.05 | 9.3E+6 |
| Strangers | | | 2.347 | 10.457 | | | 16.582 | 1.5E+7 |
| Dead | | | -13.571 | .000 | | | 1.3 | 3.68 |
| Injured | | | -17.940 | .000 | | | -15.9 | .000 |
| Punished | | | 1.82 | 6.193 | | | 16.2 | 1.E+7 |
| Unstable | | | | | -18.310 | .000 | -42.2 | .000 |
| Good | | | | | 2.003 | 7.413 | 12.12 | 191100 |
| Bad | | | | | -2.498 | .082* | -.865 | .421 |
| Illness | | | | | .351 | 1.42 | -30.87 | .000 |
| Unlikable | | | | | .650 | 1.92 | .98 | 2.66 |
| Manipulative | | | | | 3.5 | 33.05 | 2.36 | 10.55 |
| Predator | | | | | -13.45 | .000 | -30.05 | .000 |
| Drug | | | | | 5.99 | 400.9*** | 55.7 | 1.541E+24 |
| Alcohol | | | | | -16.624 | .000 | -10.21 | .000 |

**Appeal to Higher Loyalties**

For this technique, age was significant in all four models.  In model one, for every increase in the age of the offender, the odds of using this technique increased by 1.199 times, controlling for all other variables.  In model two, for every increase in age, the odds of using this technique increased by 1.310 times, controlling for all other variables.  The other two important findings from this model come from offense type.  The odds of an someone using appeal to higher loyalties increases by 7.983 times when the offense is kidnapping and decrease by 76.1% when the offense is sexual assault when compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables.  In model three, for every increase in age of the offender the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties increases by 1.199 times,

83

controlling for all other variables. In the full model, for every increase in age of the offender the odds of using this technique increase by 1.303 times, controlling for all other variables. When an offense is committed in public, the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties decreases by 45.5%, compared to when the offense is committed in a private location, controlling for all other variables. For offense type, the odds of using this technique decrease by 80.7% when the offense is sexual assault and are 10.298 times larger when the offense is a kidnapping, compared to a homicide, controlling for all other variables.

Table 19     Logistic Regression for Appeal to higher Loyalties (Full Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | -.293 | .261 | .746 | -.567 | .364 | .567 | -.242 | .276 | .785 | -.548 | .389 | .578 |
| Age | .181 | .080 | 1.199** | .270 | .117 | 1.310** | .181 | .084 | 1.19** | .265 | .126 | 1.303** |
| White | -.248 | .396 | .781 | -.652 | .533 | .521 | -2.16 | .410 | .805 | -.713 | .579 | .490 |
| Public | | | | -.482 | .337 | .617 | | | | -.608 | .360 | .545* |
| IPV | | | | -21.0 | 17864 | .000 | | | | -21.16 | 17775 | .00 |
| SA | | | | -1.432 | .660 | .239** | | | | -1.647 | .688 | .193** |
| Kidnapping | | | | 2.077 | .711 | 7.983* | | | | 2.33 | .748 | 10.298*** |
| Assault | | | | -.723 | .543 | .485 | | | | -.832 | .620 | .435 |
| Other | | | | .023 | .403 | 1.023 | | | | -.031 | .429 | .969 |
| Strangers | | | | -.019 | .314 | .981 | | | | .062 | .343 | 1.064 |
| Dead | | | | .211 | .517 | 1.234 | | | | .138 | .595 | 1.148 |
| Injured | | | | .484 | .416 | 1.623 | | | | .582 | .457 | 1.79 |
| Punished | | | | -.279 | .314 | .756 | | | | -.379 | .338 | .684 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | .521 | .379 | 1.68 | .766 | .566 | 2.151 |
| Good | | | | | | | .087 | .287 | 1.09 | .044 | .461 | 1.045 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -.070 | .280 | .933 | .451 | .430 | 1.57 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -.454 | .307 | .635 | -.247 | .459 | .781 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | -.154 | .323 | .857 | .215 | .444 | 1.24 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | .021 | .350 | 1.02 | .643 | .490 | 1.903 |
| Predator | | | | | | | -.397 | .490 | .673 | -.154 | .777 | .858 |
| Drug | | | | | | | .981 | .656 | 2.67 | -.029 | 1.375 | .971 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | .032 | .470 | 1.03 | -.247 | .642 | .782 |

**Logistic Regression Models (Split Sex Sample)**

In addition to running the models on the full data set, I ran female only and male only models. Besides excluding sex in the models (since the sample was split by sex), I ran the same models above. The following findings are from the female only sample of offenders.

*Denial of Responsibility*

There were no significant findings for the first or third models. In the second and full models age was significant. In the second model, for every increase in age, there was a 54.8% decrease in the odds of denial of responsibility being used. In the full model there was a 71.1% decrease in the odds of an offender using denial of responsibility.

Table 20     Logistic Regression for Denial of Responsibility (Female Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | -0.356 | 0.224 | 0.701 | -0.794 | 0.417 | 0.452** | -0.329 | 0.249 | 0.719 | -1.241 | 0.637 | 0.289** |
| White | 20.22 | 23152 | 6.1E+9 | 19.954 | 40192 | 4.6E+08 | 20.008 | 22897 | 4.9E+08 | 19.280 | 40192 | 2.4E+08 |
| Public | | | | 0.699 | 1.078 | 2.011 | | | | 1.231 | 1.558 | 3.424 |
| IPV | | | | 25.528 | 40192 | 1.2E+11 | | | | 28.427 | 40192 | 2.2E+12 |
| SA | | | | 2.552 | 1.827 | 12.830 | | | | -14.771 | 28420 | 0.000 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -21.022 | 40192 | 0.000 | | | | -21.783 | 40192 | 0.000 |
| Assault | | | | -0.799 | 1.297 | 0.450 | | | | -0.892 | 2.880 | 0.410 |
| Other | | | | 0.056 | 1.063 | 1.058 | | | | 1.375 | 1.688 | 3.955 |
| Strangers | | | | 0.919 | 0.815 | 2.507 | | | | 0.829 | 1.198 | 2.290 |
| Dead | | | | -1.536 | 1.544 | 0.215 | | | | -3.637 | 2.546 | 0.026 |
| Injured | | | | 0.198 | 1.322 | 1.219 | | | | 0.581 | 2.486 | 1.788 |
| Punished | | | | -1.063 | 0.928 | 0.345 | | | | -2.245 | 1.447 | 0.106 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | 0.713 | 1.607 | 2.040 | -3.615 | 3.363 | 0.027 |
| Good | | | | | | | 0.176 | 0.961 | 1.193 | 0.764 | 1.847 | 2.146 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -0.387 | 0.960 | 0.679 | -0.897 | 1.455 | 0.408 |
| Illness | | | | | | | 0.441 | 1.050 | 1.554 | 3.557 | 3.199 | 35.061 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | 1.112 | 1.051 | 3.039 | 1.055 | 1.470 | 2.871 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | -0.144 | 1.079 | 0.866 | 0.607 | 1.943 | 1.834 |
| Predator | | | | | | | 23.522 | 40192 | 1.6E+10 | 41.008 | 49226 | 6.5E+17 |
| Drug | | | | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | 1.969 | 1.202 | 7.165 | 2.580 | 2.455 | 13.192 |

## *Denial of Injury*

There were no significant findings for this technique in the second, third, or full models.  The only significant finding came from the first model and it showed that for every increase in age the odds of denial of injury being used increased by 1.810 times, controlling for all other variables.

86

Table 21    Logistic Regression for Denial of Injury (Female Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | 0.593 | 0.326 | 1.810* | 0.785 | 1.033 | 2.194 | 0.459 | 0.336 | 1.583 | 0.029 | 7584 | 1.029 |
| White | 18.08 | 23097 | 7.1E+7 | 19.685 | 40192 | 3.5E+08 | 34.250 | 24194 | 7.5E+14 | 8.128 | 62944 | 3389.097 |
| Public | | | | 1.594 | 1.538 | 4.923 | | | | 18.675 | 7973 | 1.3E+08 |
| IPV | | | | -1.237 | 40761 | 0.290 | | | | -1.941 | 46157 | 0.144 |
| SA | | | | 20.295 | 6781 | 6.5E+08 | | | | 25.616 | 27549 | 1.3E+11 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -0.220 | 40761 | 0.803 | | | | -0.811 | 50231 | 0.444 |
| Assault | | | | 19.996 | 6781 | 4.8E+08 | | | | -12.373 | 49838 | 0.000 |
| Other | | | | 19.170 | 6781 | 2.1E+08 | | | | 0.644 | 12301 | 1.905 |
| Strangers | | | | -1.811 | 2.670 | 0.164 | | | | 14.342 | 35945 | 1.7E+06 |
| Dead | | | | 22.350 | 6781 | 5.1E+09 | | | | 38.863 | 20374 | 7.6E+16 |
| Injured | | | | -19.410 | 11791 | 0.000 | | | | -31.073 | 23273 | 0.000 |
| Punished | | | | 0.255 | 1.945 | 1.290 | | | | 18.463 | 14510 | 1.0E+08 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | 17.074 | 13057 | 2.6E+07 | 25.502 | 51850 | 1.2E+11 |
| Good | | | | | | | 1.064 | 0.948 | 2.898 | 16.417 | 29282 | 1.4E+07 |
| Bad | | | | | | | 0.077 | 1.177 | 1.080 | 16.058 | 38446 | 9.4E+06 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -17.189 | 13057 | 0.000 | 0.822 | 47722 | 2.274 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | 1.247 | 1.348 | 3.478 | 1.615 | 38524 | 5.030 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | 0.691 | 1.236 | 1.996 | -4.710 | 40876 | 0.009 |
| Predator | | | | | | | -18.994 | 40192 | 0.000 | -42.301 | 71257 | 0.000 |
| Drug | | | | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | 17.074 | 13057 | 2.6E+07 | -29.407 | 44711 | 0.000 |

### *Denial of the Victim*

Table twenty below shows the results for denial of the victim within the female only sample.  There were no drug offenses committed by females in the sample.  There were no significant findings for this technique in the first, third, or full models.  In the second model, when an offense occurred in a public place the odds of an offender using denial of the victim increased by 4.270 times, controlling for all other variables.

Table 22    Logistic Regression for Denial of the Victim (Female Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | -0.151 | 0.198 | 0.860 | -0.303 | 0.313 | 0.739 | -0.186 | 0.211 | 0.830 | -0.387 | 0.429 | 0.679 |
| White | -0.209 | 1.272 | 0.811 | -20.525 | 40192 | 0.000 | 0.068 | 1.383 | 1.070 | -19.375 | 40193 | 0.000 |
| Public | | | | 1.452 | 0.822 | 4.270* | | | | 1.911 | 1.177 | 6.757 |
| IPV | | | | -19.969 | 40192 | 0.000 | | | | -19.396 | 40192 | 0.000 |
| SA | | | | -20.379 | 23163 | 0.000 | | | | -20.834 | 28420 | 0.000 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -22.169 | 40192 | 0.000 | | | | -22.865 | 40192 | 0.000 |
| Assault | | | | -0.751 | 1.010 | 0.472 | | | | 0.178 | 1.799 | 1.194 |
| Other | | | | -0.743 | 0.851 | 0.476 | | | | -1.024 | 1.179 | 0.359 |
| Strangers | | | | -0.686 | 0.715 | 0.504 | | | | -0.627 | 0.980 | 0.534 |
| Dead | | | | -0.214 | 1.317 | 0.807 | | | | 0.725 | 1.628 | 2.066 |
| Injured | | | | -1.014 | 1.106 | 0.363 | | | | -2.700 | 2.113 | 0.067 |
| Punished | | | | 0.160 | 0.693 | 1.173 | | | | 0.617 | 0.883 | 1.853 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | 0.515 | 1.426 | 1.674 | 21.066 | 27558 | 1.4E+09 |
| Good | | | | | | | -0.127 | 0.719 | 0.881 | -0.477 | 1.295 | 0.621 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -0.397 | 0.744 | 0.672 | -1.085 | 1.451 | 0.338 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -0.582 | 1.027 | 0.559 | -20.033 | 27558 | 0.000 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | 0.097 | 0.825 | 1.102 | -0.407 | 1.500 | 0.666 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | -0.109 | 0.820 | 0.897 | 0.645 | 1.634 | 1.906 |
| Predator | | | | | | | -19.908 | 40192 | 0.000 | 0.735 | 49226 | 2.085 |
| Drug | | | | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | 0.227 | 1.082 | 1.255 | -1.525 | 2.261 | 0.218 |

### *Condemnation of Condemners*

There were no female offenders in the sample who used this technique.

### *Appeal to Higher Loyalties*

There were no significant findings for this technique in the first or third models. In the second model, for every increase in age the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties increased by 1.778 times, controlling for all other variables. When the offense was committed in a public place, the odds of using this technique were 86.4% less likely than when the offense occurred in a private place, controlling for all other variables. In the full model, for every increase in age the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties increased by 2.077, controlling for all other variables. Also, when the offense was committed in a

88

public place, the odds of using this technique were 93.5% less likely than when the

offense occurred in a private place, controlling for all other variables.

Table 23    Logistic Regression for Appeal to higher Loyalties (Female Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | 0.142 | 0.174 | 1.152 | 0.575 | 0.310 | 1.778** | 0.157 | 0.187 | 1.170 | 0.731 | 0.432 | 2.077** |
| White | -1.101 | 1.266 | 0.332 | 18.290 | 40192 | 8.8E+07 | -1.177 | 1.380 | 0.308 | 17.686 | 40192 | 4.80E+07 |
| Public | | | | -1.997 | 0.912 | 0.136* | | | | -2.731 | 1.252 | 0.065* |
| IPV | | | | -22.196 | 40192 | 0.000 | | | | -22.799 | 40192 | 0.000 |
| SA | | | | -0.932 | 1.472 | 0.394 | | | | -0.922 | 1.916 | 0.398 |
| Kidnapping | | | | 23.953 | 40192 | 2.5E+10 | | | | 25.290 | 40192 | 9.62E+10 |
| Assault | | | | 0.394 | 0.950 | 1.483 | | | | 0.542 | 1.865 | 1.719 |
| Other | | | | 0.171 | 0.802 | 1.186 | | | | 0.824 | 1.151 | 2.279 |
| Strangers | | | | 0.492 | 0.700 | 1.636 | | | | 0.282 | 0.968 | 1.326 |
| Dead | | | | -0.644 | 1.327 | 0.525 | | | | -1.668 | 1.610 | 0.189 |
| Injured | | | | 1.673 | 1.101 | 5.328 | | | | 3.133 | 2.001 | 22.934 |
| Punished | | | | 0.019 | 0.674 | 1.019 | | | | -0.334 | 0.827 | 0.716 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -0.695 | 1.251 | 0.499 | -0.676 | 2.238 | 0.509 |
| Good | | | | | | | -0.386 | 0.627 | 0.680 | -0.311 | 1.430 | 0.733 |
| Bad | | | | | | | 0.533 | 0.676 | 1.704 | 1.508 | 1.231 | 4.517 |
| Illness | | | | | | | 0.150 | 0.915 | 1.162 | -1.195 | 2.068 | 0.303 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | -1.148 | 0.753 | 0.317 | -0.725 | 1.366 | 0.484 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | -0.057 | 0.703 | 0.944 | -0.668 | 1.536 | 0.513 |
| Predator | | | | | | | -21.482 | 40192 | 0.000 | -20.829 | 40192 | 0.000 |
| Drug | | | | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | -1.369 | 1.017 | 0.254 | 1.115 | 1.780 | 3.051 |

The following findings come from the male only sample.

### *Denial of Responsibility*

There were no significant findings from the male only sample for model one.  In

model two, when intimate partner violence was committed, the odds of using denial of

responsibility increased by 28.074 times when compared to homicide, controlling for all

other variables.  Also, when an offender is legally punished the odds of using this

technique increase by 2.032 times compared to when there is no legal punishment,

controlling for all other variables.  In the third model, when an offender has a mental

89

illness the odds of them using denial of responsibility are 3.557 times larger than when

they do not have a mental illness, controlling for all other variables.  In the full model,

when an intimate partner violence offense occurs, the odds of using this technique

increase by 13.430 times when compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables.

Table 24       Logistic Regression for Denial of Responsibility (Male Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | -0.057 | 0.106 | 0.945 | 0.087 | 0.147 | 1.091 | -0.035 | 0.118 | 0.966 | 0.165 | 0.161 | 1.180 |
| White | 0.444 | 0.567 | 1.558 | 0.390 | 0.640 | 1.476 | 0.161 | 0.597 | 1.175 | 0.426 | 0.698 | 1.531 |
| Public | | | | 0.532 | 0.440 | 1.703 | | | | 0.561 | 0.491 | 1.753 |
| IPV | | | | 3.335 | 1.292 | 28.074* | | | | 2.597 | 1.368 | 13.430** |
| SA | | | | 0.387 | 0.569 | 1.472 | | | | 0.447 | 0.617 | 1.564 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -0.428 | 0.836 | 0.652 | | | | -0.353 | 0.913 | 0.703 |
| Assault | | | | -0.238 | 0.846 | 0.788 | | | | -0.202 | 0.973 | 0.817 |
| Other | | | | 0.548 | 0.519 | 1.729 | | | | 0.610 | 0.579 | 1.841 |
| Strangers | | | | 0.331 | 0.404 | 1.392 | | | | 0.437 | 0.462 | 1.549 |
| Dead | | | | -0.378 | 0.722 | 0.685 | | | | 0.004 | 0.885 | 1.004 |
| Injured | | | | 0.075 | 0.491 | 1.078 | | | | -0.162 | 0.555 | 0.851 |
| Punished | | | | 0.709 | 0.420 | 2.032* | | | | 0.750 | 0.517 | 2.116 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -0.389 | 0.678 | 0.678 | -20.386 | 10408 | 0.000 |
| Good | | | | | | | -0.742 | 0.457 | 0.476 | 0.014 | 0.580 | 1.014 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -0.167 | 0.407 | 0.847 | -0.455 | 0.617 | 0.635 |
| Illness | | | | | | | 1.269 | 0.379 | 3.557* | 0.883 | 0.539 | 2.418 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | -0.020 | 0.479 | 0.980 | 0.039 | 0.668 | 1.039 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | 0.595 | 0.515 | 1.813 | 0.406 | 0.738 | 1.501 |
| Predator | | | | | | | 0.577 | 0.614 | 1.780 | -0.471 | 1.001 | 0.624 |
| Drug | | | | | | | -0.148 | 0.858 | 0.863 | 0.596 | 1.536 | 1.815 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | 0.038 | 0.711 | 1.039 | -0.204 | 1.161 | 0.816 |

## *Denial of Injury*

There are no significant findings for this technique in the first or third models.  In

the second model, there are two findings of note.  When the offense is sexual assault, the

odds of using denial of injury increase by 5.275 times when compared to homicides,

controlling for all other variables.  When an offender is legally punished the odds of

using this technique decrease by 78.8% compared to when they are not, controlling for all

90

other variables. In the full model, there were four significant findings. The odds of using denial of injury increase when the offense is sexual assault (5.177) or an assault (8.889) when compared to a homicide, controlling for all other variables. When the offender is shown as a predator, the odds of using this technique increase by 13.038 times compared to when the offender is shown as sympathetic, controlling for all other variables. Lastly, when an offender is punished, the odds of using denial of injury decrease by 90.5% compared to when there is no legal punishment, controlling for all other variables.

Table 25      Logistic Regression for Denial of Injury (Male Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | -0.159 | 0.151 | 0.853 | -0.156 | 0.198 | 0.856 | -0.196 | 0.157 | 0.822 | -0.105 | 0.227 | 0.901 |
| White | 0.252 | 0.771 | 1.287 | -0.129 | 0.953 | 0.879 | 0.393 | 0.807 | 1.481 | -0.059 | 1.110 | 0.942 |
| Public | | | | -0.963 | 0.654 | 0.382 | | | | -0.806 | 0.777 | 0.447 |
| IPV | | | | 1.262 | 1.405 | 3.531 | | | | 0.983 | 1.541 | 2.672 |
| SA | | | | 1.663 | 0.663 | 5.275* | | | | 1.644 | 0.747 | 5.177** |
| Kidnapping | | | | -18.20 | 10789 | 0.000 | | | | -17.627 | 10308 | 0.000 |
| Assault | | | | 1.350 | 1.012 | 3.858 | | | | 2.185 | 1.264 | 8.889* |
| Other | | | | 1.009 | 0.767 | 2.743 | | | | 1.033 | 0.823 | 2.811 |
| Strangers | | | | 0.706 | 0.562 | 2.025 | | | | 0.456 | 0.686 | 1.577 |
| Dead | | | | -0.083 | 1.008 | 0.920 | | | | -1.060 | 1.359 | 0.347 |
| Injured | | | | -0.726 | 0.744 | 0.484 | | | | -1.010 | 0.873 | 0.364 |
| Punished | | | | -1.552 | 0.586 | 0.212* | | | | -2.349 | 0.940 | 0.095*** |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -0.450 | 0.826 | 0.638 | 1.300 | 1.417 | 3.670 |
| Good | | | | | | | 0.642 | 0.557 | 1.901 | 0.706 | 0.828 | 2.026 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -0.495 | 0.562 | 0.610 | 0.052 | 0.905 | 1.053 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -0.656 | 0.681 | 0.519 | 0.589 | 0.994 | 1.802 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | 0.997 | 0.778 | 2.710 | 1.560 | 1.193 | 4.760 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | 0.921 | 0.822 | 2.512* | 1.573 | 1.251 | 4.820 |
| Predator | | | | | | | 1.125 | 0.926 | 3.081 | 2.568 | 1.503 | 13.038* |
| Drug | | | | | | | -19.163 | 11751 | 0.000 | -19.165 | 19456 | 0.000 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | 0.705 | 0.733 | 2.023 | 0.342 | 1.070 | 1.408 |

### *Denial of the Victim*

There are no significant findings for this technique from the first model. In the second model, both significant findings come from offense type. The odds of an offender

using denial of the victim decreases by 85.3% when the offense is a kidnapping and by 66.4% for other offenses when compared to a homicide, controlling for all other variables. In the third model, the odds of an offender using this technique decrease by 71.7% when the offender is shown as manipulative compared to offenders shown as sympathetic, controlling for all other variables. In the full model, there were six findings of note for denial of the victim. For every increase in age, the odds of an offender using denial of the victim decrease by 22%, controlling for all other variables. The odds of an offender using this technique decrease by 91.8% when the offense is a kidnapping and 69.5% when it is marked as other offense compared to a homicide, controlling for all other variables. When an offender is shown as manipulative the odds of using this technique are 80.5% lower than when the offender is shown as sympathetic, controlling for all other variables. If the offender is legally punished, the odds of using denial of the victim are 2.114 times higher than if they are not legally punished, controlling for all other variables. Lastly, if the offense is committed by a stranger the odds of using this technique decrease by 49.1% when compared to a known offender, controlling for all other variables. This is likely due to the fact that if an offender knows the person they victimize they are also familiar with their flaws and can easily put the victim in a deserving position for their fate.

92

Table 26    Logistic Regression for Denial of the Victim (Male Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | -0.081 | 0.097 | 0.922 | -0.163 | 0.125 | 0.850 | -0.133 | 0.104 | 0.875 | -0.248 | 0.138 | 0.780* |
| White | -0.167 | 0.451 | 0.846 | 0.498 | 0.583 | 1.645 | 0.078 | 0.483 | 1.081 | 0.773 | 0.659 | 2.166 |
| Public | | | | 0.179 | 0.381 | 1.196 | | | | 0.262 | 0.435 | 1.299 |
| IPV | | | | -20.53 | 19971.12 | 0.000 | | | | -19.433 | 19960 | 0.000 |
| SA | | | | 0.054 | 0.483 | 1.056 | | | | 0.324 | 0.538 | 1.383 |
| Kidnapping | | | | -1.914 | 1.073 | 0.147* | | | | -2.500 | 1.122 | 0.082* |
| Assault | | | | 0.728 | 0.652 | 2.071 | | | | 0.528 | 0.741 | 1.695 |
| Other | | | | -1.091 | 0.601 | 0.336* | | | | -1.186 | 0.652 | 0.305* |
| Strangers | | | | -0.544 | 0.354 | 0.581 | | | | -0.676 | 0.403 | 0.509* |
| Dead | | | | -0.137 | 0.619 | 0.872 | | | | -0.160 | 0.745 | 0.852 |
| Injured | | | | 0.051 | 0.436 | 1.053 | | | | -0.070 | 0.480 | 0.932 |
| Punished | | | | 0.461 | 0.369 | 1.585 | | | | 0.749 | 0.452 | 2.114* |
| Unstable | | | | | | | -0.351 | 0.528 | 0.704 | 0.292 | 0.743 | 1.339 |
| Good | | | | | | | -0.274 | 0.388 | 0.761 | -0.619 | 0.532 | 0.538 |
| Bad | | | | | | | 0.568 | 0.364 | 1.765 | -0.045 | 0.551 | 0.956 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -0.620 | 0.402 | 0.538 | -0.914 | 0.559 | 0.401 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | -0.408 | 0.407 | 0.665 | -0.751 | 0.547 | 0.472 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | -1.264 | 0.498 | 0.283 | -1.635 | 0.659 | 0.195* |
| Predator | | | | | | | -0.630 | 0.550 | 0.533 | -0.383 | 0.781 | 0.682 |
| Drug | | | | | | | -1.736 | 1.089 | 0.176 | -0.920 | 1.435 | 0.399 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | -0.755 | 0.688 | 0.470 | -0.558 | 0.927 | 0.573 |

### Condemnation of Condemners

There are no significant findings for this technique in the first or full models.  In the second model, offenses in the other category increase the odds of using this technique by 13.987 times when compared to homicide, controlling for all other variables.  In model three, when an offender is shown with a bad personality, they are 91.8% less likely to use condemnation of condemners than those not shown with a bad personality.  When the offense was drug related this odds of using this technique were 400.928 times larger than when compared to homicides, controlling for all other variables.

93

Table 27       Logistic Regression for Condemnation of Condemners (Male Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One B | Model One Exp(B) | Model Two B | Model Two Exp(B) | Model Three B | Model Three Exp(B) | Full Model B | Full Model Exp(B) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | | | | | | | | |
| Age | -0.440 | 0.644 | -1.843 | 0.158 | -0.074 | 0.928 | -0.225 | 0.799 |
| White | -0.772 | 0.462 | -3.607 | 0.027 | -2.333 | 0.097 | 0.735 | 2.085 |
| Public | | | -0.451 | 0.637 | | | 14.480 | 1.94E+06 |
| IPV | | | -10.990 | 0.000 | | | 21.519 | 2.22E+09 |
| SA | | | -18.332 | 0.000 | | | -16.997 | 0.000 |
| Kidnapping | | | -15.864 | 0.000 | | | -17.730 | 0.000 |
| Assault | | | -18.118 | 0.000 | | | -35.285 | 0.000 |
| Other | | | 2.638 | 13.987* | | | 15.720 | 6.71E+06 |
| Strangers | | | 2.347 | 10.457 | | | 18.465 | 1.05E+08 |
| Dead | | | -13.790 | 0.000 | | | -1.860 | 0.156 |
| Injured | | | -18.262 | 0.000 | | | -16.164 | 0.000 |
| Punished | | | 1.823 | 6.193 | | | 17.757 | 5.15E+07 |
| Unstable | | | | | -18.645 | 0.000 | -41.214 | 0.000 |
| Good | | | | | 2.003 | 7.413 | 10.767 | 47450.82 |
| Bad | | | | | -2.498 | 0.082* | -1.900 | 0.150 |
| Illness | | | | | 0.351 | 1.420 | -31.683 | 0.000 |
| Unlikable | | | | | 0.650 | 1.916 | 1.823 | 6.188 |
| Manipulative | | | | | 3.498 | 33.049 | 2.340 | 10.377 |
| Predator | | | | | -13.491 | 0.000 | -29.911 | 0.000 |
| Drug | | | | | 5.994 | 400.928* | 59.048 | 4.41E+25 |
| Alcohol | | | | | -17.002 | 0.000 | -10.198 | 0.000 |

### *Appeal to Higher Loyalties*

All models found significant findings for this technique.  In model one, for every increase in age the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties increased by 1.218 times, controlling for all other variables.  In model two, for every increase in age the odds of using this technique increased by 1.273 times, controlling for all other variables.  From offense type, if the offense was a kidnapping the odds of using this technique increased by 6.703 times and it decreased by 82.7% when the offense was a sexual assault when compared to homicides, controlling for all other variables.  In model three, for every increase in age the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties increases by 1.238 times,

94

controlling for all other variables.  In the full model there were three findings of note.  If the offender was shown as financially unstable the odds of using this techniques increased by 3.470 times compared to stable offenders, controlling for all other variables.  When the offense was a kidnapping, the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties increased by 11.299 times when compared to a homicide, controlling for all other variables.  Lastly, when the offense was a sexual assault, the odds of using appeal to higher loyalties decreased by 85.2% compared to homicides, controlling for all other variables.

Table 28      Logistic Regression for Appeal to Higher Loyalties (Male Only Sample)

| Variables | Model One | | | Model Two | | | Model Three | | | Full Model | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) | B | SE | Exp(B) |
| Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | 0.197 | 0.090 | 1.218* | 0.241 | 0.139 | 1.273* | 0.213 | 0.096 | 1.238* | 0.255 | 0.160 | 1.290 |
| White | -0.139 | 0.423 | 0.870 | -0.689 | 0.563 | 0.502 | -0.176 | 0.444 | 0.839 | -0.913 | 0.635 | 0.401 |
| Public | | | | -0.337 | 0.413 | 0.714 | | | | -0.411 | 0.464 | 0.663 |
| IPV | | | | -21.138 | 19927 | 0.000 | | | | -21.493 | 19854 | 0.000 |
| SA | | | | -1.755 | 0.785 | 0.173* | | | | -1.908 | 0.807 | 0.148* |
| Kidnapping | | | | 1.903 | 0.730 | 6.703* | | | | 2.425 | 0.812 | 11.299* |
| Assault | | | | -1.332 | 0.856 | 0.264 | | | | -1.024 | 0.926 | 0.359 |
| Other | | | | -0.221 | 0.503 | 0.801 | | | | -0.235 | 0.523 | 0.790 |
| Strangers | | | | -0.059 | 0.377 | 0.943 | | | | 0.004 | 0.421 | 1.004 |
| Dead | | | | 0.391 | 0.599 | 1.479 | | | | 0.367 | 0.749 | 1.444 |
| Injured | | | | 0.298 | 0.464 | 1.347 | | | | 0.494 | 0.516 | 1.639 |
| Punished | | | | -0.399 | 0.379 | 0.671 | | | | -0.747 | 0.474 | 0.474 |
| Unstable | | | | | | | 0.602 | 0.451 | 1.826 | 1.244 | 0.710 | 3.470* |
| Good | | | | | | | 0.272 | 0.337 | 1.313 | 0.192 | 0.574 | 1.212 |
| Bad | | | | | | | -0.135 | 0.329 | 0.874 | 0.611 | 0.570 | 1.841 |
| Illness | | | | | | | -0.414 | 0.359 | 0.661 | 0.078 | 0.578 | 1.081 |
| Unlikable | | | | | | | 0.081 | 0.380 | 1.084 | 0.320 | 0.544 | 1.377 |
| Manipulative | | | | | | | 0.184 | 0.419 | 1.201 | 0.914 | 0.614 | 2.495 |
| Predator | | | | | | | -0.186 | 0.521 | 0.830 | 0.094 | 0.868 | 1.098 |
| Drug | | | | | | | 0.986 | 0.668 | 2.681 | -0.220 | 1.535 | 0.803 |
| Alcohol | | | | | | | 0.328 | 0.563 | 1.388 | 0.118 | 0.835 | 1.125 |

95

CHAPTER V

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This section of data analysis is guided by three main research questions: (1) how techniques of neutralization are used to excuse and justify male and female offenders' behaviors in fictional crime dramas, (2) if such portrayals vary between and among male and female offenders, and (3) how elements of 'doing gender' (i.e., gendered action, gendered accountability) play a role in the gendered nature of male and female offenders' techniques of neutralization. To this end, an analysis was conducted on the transcripts until themes emerged from the data. Specifically, I conducted a line by line analysis (Corbin and Strauss 2008), looking for words and phrases that answered the research questions. Next, I examined the pulled out information and did the same thing, conducting a line by line analysis again, and repeated, until themes emerged. The information is presented in two main sections, one for techniques of neutralization and one for doing gender.

**Techniques of Neutralization**

The quantitative findings examined the percentage of usage of each technique of neutralization for male and female offenders. Doing so answered in part, research question numbers one and two about patterns of usage and variations for male and female offenders. Overall, these findings suggested that males and females in the data set tend to use techniques of neutralization in similar proportions. Both groups use the techniques in

the following order from most to least: appeal to higher loyalties, denial of the victim, denial of responsibility, denial of injury, and condemnation of condemners. However, no females used the latter technique to excuse their offense. Also of note is that fact that males were more likely to commit an offense and not offer a technique. This was only seen with one female offender. The qualitative results, however, delve deeper into answering these research questions by examining common patterns and eventually themes that answer the research questions. In regards to questions number one and two, there were three primary themes including (1) the voice of the speaker of the technique of neutralization, (2) the use of multiple techniques by female offenders and, (3) the gendered nature of the portrayal of offenders who used each technique.

**Voice of the Speaker of the Technique**

The person who offered each technique in the episode (e.g., offender themselves, someone else on the offender's behalf) was the first theme that emerged from the data concerning techniques of neutralization. While the original theory posits that the offender must offer the technique, for this project, I analyzed every time a technique was used in the transcripts. Interestingly, I found there were differences in who gave the technique, and this distinction had gendered connotations. While both male and female offenders used their own voice, when examining instances where techniques of neutralization were given on behalf of the offender, this was more common for female offenders. In other words, female offenders were more likely to have techniques given on their behalf.

For instance, in Without a Trace episode 'Shadows,' Bonnie, a retired nurse, is assisting in the medical suicide of terminal cancer patients. Before ever hearing from

97

Bonnie about her role in the deaths, a friend offers appeal to higher loyalties on her behalf,

> *Joel: But dying is a part of living, Bonnie, what you do for these people is incredible. You help them pass on without being poked and prodded and humiliate. You give them dignity and peace.*

A second example comes from Special Victims Unit episode 'Quickie.' Offender Rebecca Ellison is charged with assaulting a man who knowingly infected her, among hundreds of other women, with HIV. A technique is offered on her behalf by the man's own grandfather.

> *Mr. Butler: What Rebecca did isn't her fault. Why are you prosecuting her?*
> *DA Cabot: Mr. Butler, she seriously injured your grandson, I can't just ignore that.*
> *Mr. Butler: Then put me on the stand, I want to tell everyone what my grandson did to her.*

A third example comes from the Crime Scene Investigators episode 'The Unusual Suspect.' Here there is a young girl, Hannah, who is bullied at school due to her high level of intelligence. One female student in particular drives Hannah to emotional turmoil. Seeing this, Hannah's brother tries to prank the girl in retaliation. The prank goes awry and the student ends up dying as a result. Through the course of the trial Hannah states under oath that she is the one who executed the faulty prank. Due to this perjury, she is an offender. After a mistrial is declared, we find out that the brother is in fact the one who killed the classmate. Prior to hearing Hannah confess to CSI agent Sarah, the following exchange takes place.

> *Sally: She's an Indigo Child.*
> *Sofia: Indigo Child?*
> *Sally: A new breed. Hannah doesn't just see the world, she sees through it, with an intuition none of us can comprehend. She's compelled to help others, whether they're worth helping or not.*

While there are several instances of other characters offering techniques for female offenders, this is not the case with male offenders. Male offenders are more likely to be allowed to use their own voice to give justification for their behaviors.

For example, in the Criminal Minds episode 'Identity,' the agents pursue a man who is kidnapping women. Later in the episode the offender, Goehring, offers an explanation.

> *Goehring: First, I will build a compound, a kingdom. Second, I will are, protect, and fortify my kingdom. Third, I will keep women as serfs to serve my every need. This is my right. As a man with free will in America, I will make my Kingdom a reality.*

In Without a Trace episode 'Upstairs, Downstairs,' Lawrence Pierce lies about the kidnapping of his daughter. Lawrence tells police that the family's nanny run away with the child when in fact his wife accidently killed the child while breastfeeding. When the deception comes to light, he is arrested for obstruction of justice. He is allowed to offer an explanation of this offense.

> *Agent Malone: You thought we wouldn't suspect you and if we did, you could just hire a high powered lawyer.*
> *Lawrence: No, no. This is not what this is about.*
> *Agent Malone: Then what is this about?*
> *Lawrence: I could not let Terri live with what she did. She would kill herself.*
> *Agent Malone: Ultimately, Mr. Pierce, I am going to have to speak to your wife.*
> *Lawrence: Please let me. We are not going to make it through this. Please just let me do this one last thing for her.*

A final example of men using their own voices can be found in 'Closet,' an episode of Special Victims Unit. In this episode Gary Leslie, an agent of a professional football player, is arrested for murdering the player's boyfriend. When confronted with evidence that suggests Gary was lying about earlier comments to the SVU agents, he unravels.

99

*Gary: SCREW LOVE! He's a football player. He's a piece of meat that I sell to the highest bidder. How many good years do you think he's got left? Five? Ten, if there's a miracle. I just, why couldn't he wait a couple of years? I begged him to give Lincoln up. And then do you know what he tells me? He tells me that they are going to get married. He tells me that they are going to have this huge party and they're just going to come out to everyone this summer. Then he tells me to go out and find a new cash cow because Lincolns retiring. I worked my ass off for years getting him promotional deals, commercials, salary increases, and his freaking boyfriend wanted to take it all away.*

Through these examples we can see that women are not depicted as active as men when it comes to justifying their offenses. This could be due to the fact that techniques of neutralization came from a sample of only males and as such have been utilized by them more often. Meaning, it is not so much that men are more *likely* to use the techniques than women, but rather they are more *able* to than women.

**Self through Others**

There is another interesting pattern that comes from the speaker of the technique. In addition to others offering techniques on behalf of female offenders, there are instances where techniques given by the female offenders themselves are actually verbally delivered by other characters. Instead of trying to justify the females' actions in their own words, characters actually recount the offenders' words for them. I call this delivery method 'self through others'. This was almost exclusive to female offenders. In these cases, we never actually *see* the female offenders give the techniques, rather, the quotes come from other characters factually recounting a conversation with the offender. To explain more clearly, consider the following examples. In a Special Victims Unit episode, 'Fat,' Mia Buxton tells the detectives of a conversation she had with Jessica, the girl who helped beat up her brother.

> *Mia: She said that she took the cap off this fat slob that was stinking up the park bench. And that's when I knew.*
> *Stabler: Knew what?*
> *Mia: That she was one of the people who beat up my brother.*

Although Jessica, later confesses to the assault and backstory discusses her distaste for overweight people, we never see Jessica recount the conversation with Mia.

Another example comes from the Criminal Minds episode 'Jones.' The main offender in the episode is Sarah, a female who is luring men home with her and killing them. The viewers do not see her until the close of the episode but she communicates via letters with the detectives on the show. Portions of her letters read:

> *Prentiss: (reading letter) "Dear boss, by now I have rid the world of one more. So many men, so little time. I hope you don't mind the mess. They make it so easy; I just can't help myself."*

> *Hotchner: (reading letter) The last guy made it so easy, being out so late, and stumbling home drunk. He was asking to be ripped, don't you think boss?*

> *Gideon: (reading letter) Dear boss, he wanted it, with that sharp tongue and vulgar hand. Thought you'd like to know, another one will soon get what he deserves. Yours truly.*

Self through others can also be seen in 'Home,' an episode of Special Victims Unit where an offender, Adam, kills his younger brother, Jacob, in order to protect him. Adam and Jacob were home schooled by a controlling mother who rarely let them interact with people outside of the home. The mother is ultimately charged with facilitation of a homicide based on the Adam's testimony.

> *Adam: When mom brought Jacob home after he ran away, she was so mad. She kept yelling that we were going to foster care and that we were going to be raped and beaten to death, just like Daniel. She said if I was really brave I could stop it from happening. She went to her room and came back with the gun. She said it was up to me. She said that we wouldn't suffer and that we'd be together in heaven with Dad and Daniel…. I believed her…and I shot him.*

When this method is used, the offense is a particularly violent crime and may serve as to distance the violent act from an otherwise femininely portrayed character.  Sarah, the woman from Criminal Minds is portrayed as attractive and seductive.  Jessica, from Special Victims Unit is referred to as pretty, as well.  Marilyn, Adam's mother is referred to by numerous characters on the show as a loving and capable mother.  By allowing these techniques to come from the mouths of other characters, their femininity is not have to be juxtaposed next to vicious crimes.  Taking the finding of 'self through others' and couple it with the heavy reliance of other characters offering techniques on behalf of female offenders, it is clear that the voices of female offenders are not as often heard on the shows, even when it comes to justifying their own behavior.  This indicates to viewers that men are more in charge of their own excuse and meaning making than women.

**Multiple Techniques**

This second theme refers to a pattern discovered with female offenders.  While it was more common for both groups of offenders to offer a technique than to not, males usually only offer a singular technique.  Meaning, for example, they either deny responsibility or deny any injury was caused, but not both.  Multiple usage happens for men, but it is not the majority.  It only occurs 15% of the time.  Further, when it does happen, there are only two techniques used at once.  This is not the case with female offenders.  Over 50% of the time, when a female offender gives an excuse for her crimes, she gives more than one technique.  It is also not uncommon that three of the five techniques be used for the same offense.

102

As an example, in the Criminal Minds episode, 'The Tribe,' the episode follows a young woman in college who is kidnapped, Ingrid Griesen. Ingrid was kidnapped by men her father hired to get her away from a man he believed brainwashed her. This man was teaching followers that the land they occupied rightfully belonged to an Indian tribe in the area and was encouraging them to enact vengeance on them. Through her own accounts, Ingrid displays the techniques of denial of the victim and appeal to higher loyalties. Additionally, denial of responsibility is offered on her behalf.

> *Sheriff: Come with me [grabbing the girl]. My friend wants to show you something.*
> *John: Ingrid, my name is John Blackwolf.*
> *Ingrid: I know who you are. You're the son of Benjamin Blackwolf. The Chiricahua Apache.*
> *John: Come with me. [shows her the girls room with blood all over the room] What do you think happened here, Ingrid.*
> *Ingrid: I think three little trespassers met the vengeful blade of the tribe. **(Denial of the victim)***
> *Hotch: What tribe would that be?*
> *Ingrid: There are only two people. The Apache and those who trespass against us.*
> *John: You're not Apache, Ingrid.*
> *Ingrid: No, you are not apache. Not anymore. Grandfather tested me. He sent me to the desert mountains to be blessed by the Ga'he. The Ga'he have brought grandfather back to us to build his new tribe. To reclaim the sacred land for the apache. **(Appeal to higher loyalties)***
>
> *Hotchner: What we do know is that you've been manipulated and exploited by a very disturbed individual. **(Denial of responsibility)***

Another example comes from 'Hooked,' an episode of Special Victim's Unit. In this episode, Angela Agnelli, a girl in high school, is discovered to be engaging in prostitution and pornography. Angela confronts a John who has video of her she wants back, when she tries to recover it, she ends up killing him in the process. When discussing the

103

offense, Angela offers appeal to higher loyalties and denial of responsibility herself and denial of the victim was offered from other characters on the show.

> *Benson: Angela, you have lied to us about everything. We're trying to catch the person who murdered your best friend, and you just keep lying. (**Denial of the victim**)*
> *Angela: Because I didn't want you to find out what I did.*
>
> *Stabler: For once, don't lie to me.*
> *Angela: I swear.*
> *Stabler: There's gunshot residue on the tape. Your fingerprint is in the residue. You went to Dr. Tanner's apartment. You took your father's gun. Why'd you shoot him?*
> *Angela: I asked him to give me the tape. He said he couldn't because he would go to jail. All I kept thinking was that somebody would see it, and my life would be ruined. (**Appeal to higher loyalties**) I pointed the gun at him. He grabbed it, and it went off. I didn't mean to (crying) I'm so sorry. (**Denial of responsibility**) I just wanted my life back.*

The last example of this theme can be seen in another episode of Special Victims Unit, 'Obscene.'  In the episode, Carolyn Spencer works for an organization which fights for family friendly media.  After learning that her own son, Danny, has fallen victim to the goading of a shock jockey, she decides to shoot the jockey in a highly public place so as to call attention to the damage people like him can cause.  Through her own admission, she displays three techniques when speaking with DA Novak: appeal to higher loyalties, denial of the victim, and denial of injury.

> *Danny: You planned it? Why?*
> *Novak: So the whole world would see her as a martyr for her cause.*
> *Danny: It was just a publicity stunt?*
> *Carolyn: No. No, don't listen to her. I did it for you.*
> *Danny: You're so full of it. I want to testify. I'll tell them she didn't shoot BJ because of me. I'll tell them she just wanted to get her stupid crusade on the news.*
> *Carolyn: NO, I did it because I love you. (**Appeal to higher loyalties**)*
> *Danny: I want to go back to my cell.*
> *Carolyn: Danny, no, wait…Wait, Danny. Wait, Danny.*
> *Novak: Last chance. (to Seaver) I'll drop the attempted murder if she pleads guilty to assault.*

104

*Carolyn: I didn't do anything wrong. (Denial of injury)*

*Novak: I'll rephrase. Do you put your work with N.I.C.E ahead of raising your children?*
*Carolyn: No, my job is about protecting my children.*
*Novak: But isn't it true that you shot BJ Cameron, not because he ruined your son's life, but because he made a mockery of your crusade to rid the world of filth?*
*Carolyn: People like BJ have taken over television, the Internet, movies, music.*
*Novak: And you want to silence them?*
*Carolyn: I want my children to have a childhood. I'm all alone raising two kids, and it is almost impossible to keep that obscenity away from them.*
*Novak: And that justifies shooting BJ?*
*Carolyn: That man took away everything I believe in. He took…he took away my family, my baby's future, and I had to stop him. I didn't know what else to do.*
*(Denial of the victim)*

All of the female offenders above have at least three techniques used to justify their actions. This is not seen with male offenders. Potentially, the multiple uses are needed for female offenders to strengthen the conception that women do not normally transgress the lines of the law. When it does happen, we as viewers need to be able to make sense of this and have to see circumstances that would drive them to that point, especially in the case of violent offenses such as murder and assault, which are both seen through these examples.

**Gendered Nature of Portrayals**

When coding the data, another theme that emerged involved differences of offender characteristics based on the sex of the offender. This was fairly different depending on each technique of neutralization, thus I will discuss these differences by each technique. For *denial of responsibility*, both male and female offenders were presented similarly by the show as not being the fault of the offender or as accidental. However, for female offenders, a way this technique was utilized that was not utilized for

105

males involved mental capacity.  Two such examples are provided.  In 'Intoxicated,' an episode of Special Victim's Unit, Carrie is on trial for killing her mother.  Her lawyer pursues a psychological defense, claiming she has the condition known as Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder.  Carrie is evaluated by SVU's Psychiatrist, Dr. Huang who then discusses her condition with DA Novak.

> *Huang: Did she love you?*
> *Carrie: I don't know. Do you think that's why I killed her?*
> *Huang: What do you remember?*
> *Carrie: Nothing. One second we were talking, and the next she was lying on the floor and was covered in blood. I started crying. I called Justin on the webcam, and I felt so sleepy.*
>
> *Novak: So do you believe her story?*
> *Huang: It's consistent with PMDD. It could've triggered a manic outburst.*
> *Novak: What about the calm after the storm?*
> *Huang: Carrie was dissociating. I read her medical reports. Heavy cramping and migraines are documented. If you add to that the mood swings and the fact she was premenstrual when she killed her mother, then it's classic PMDD.*

Another example, also from Special Victims Unit, comes from an episode entitled 'Quickie,' discussed previously.  In the episode, Rebecca Ellison's lawyer, Mr. Owens, decides to pursue a psychological defense as well.

> *Owens:  In that case, I'm giving you warning that we're pursuing an affirmative defense.  Mental disease or defect.*
> *DA Cabot:  Ms. Ellison has HIV, she's not mentally ill.*
> *Owens:  My client has AIDS and has been sick for months, she can't afford retro virials and she had a recent bout with cryptococcal meningitis, which had a deleterious effect on her mental stability.*

There were no similar incidents of male offenders' crimes being excused via diminished mental capacity within this technique.  In fact, the only time male offenders' mental states at the time of the offense were referenced at all was in the case of addiction whether it be drugs or sex.  Neither of those were present for females.

On the male offender side, there was one unique theme as well. Often, denial of responsibility was used for males to excuse a fit of rage. As an example, in an episode of Without a Trace, 'Honor Bound,' Jin Kim is the main offender and is charged with the murder of his sister, Wendy. As the episode progresses, we discover that Wendy's online dating is perceived as promiscuous by Jin. After Jin discovers an online escort page for Wendy (which ends up to be a fake) he confronts her about it and her lack of help with the family store.

> *Wendy: You want to die a slow death like dad? Fine, you can stay. Rot away selling lotto tickets and 40s for the rest of your life. But I'm done.*
> *Jin: Oh. You're done? I have to work in that store every day. Every day! It doesn't matter if it's the last place on earth that I want to go. I take care of my family. I do my job, and it's your duty to help me!*
> *Wendy: No, it's not.*
> *Jin: Now, this is where you belong. Right here with all this trash.*
> *(She slaps him and he falls to the ground. She turns and walks away. JIN picks up a broken piece of wood lying next to him on the ground. In a fit of rage, he hits WENDY across the side of the head. She falls to the ground.)*
> *Jin: Sun. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.*
> *END FLASHBACK. RESUME TO PRESENT.*
> *Jin: (sobbing) It happened so fast. I didn't mean to hurt her, I swear. Why did she have to lie to me about that ad?*

Another example comes from the previously mentioned Special Victims Unit episode 'Fat.' Rubi, a boy who was beaten by a group of kids for being overweight, later shoots and kills one of his attackers. He reveals this when asked by his lawyer.

> *Waldron: Why did you shoot Tommy Strahan?*
> *Rubi: I was so mad. It was like I was blind with rage because of what he has done to me and my family. He was just gonna walk away.*

This expression of violence to deny responsibility was noticeably absent among female offenders.

107

For *denial of injury*, the main commonalities were that the offenders were trying to help the victim in the situation, or that they were in fact, doing nothing wrong. There were not many differences in how this technique was used by either group. However, one important distinction did come up with what crime this technique was used to excuse. For males, this technique was used mostly for sexual assault. For example, in an episode of Special Victims Unit, 'Brotherhood,' a fraternity member is murdered. Throughout the episode we discovered that the killer, Will, was subjected to particularly rough hazing. While pledging to the fraternity, Will was sodomized repeatedly by the class pledge master, Tyler and a few other brothers. When confronted about the violence that was inflicted on Will, the brothers denied they did anything of substantial injury.

> *Rob: Weren't you people ever young? Don't you know the difference between a harmless prank and sexual assault?*

Another example of male offenders using denial of injury for sexual assault comes from 'Turn, Turn, Turn,' an episode of CSI. In this episode, there is a side plot that involves two high school students. Dave is accused of drugging and attempting to rape his girlfriend. When questioned by CSI agent Stokes, Dave denies that he did anything harmful on two fronts.

> *Stokes: What about Bre?*
> *Dave: What about her? She's my girlfriend. It is what it is.*
> *Stokes: I want you to listen to me now. I know she was with you. Now, if you want me to match the muddy shoe impressions all over your passenger side floor mat, I will. You're 18, man. You'll go to jail.*
> *Dave: I didn't do anything.*
> *Stokes: You drugged her, you assaulted her.*
> *Dave: I didn't get a chance to do anything. I never do with Bre. She keeps saying she's saving herself, but half the dugout has been saying that Trey Gallo, the pitcher, he's been hitting her. They even got a motel room. Figured no point in letting that go to waste, especially if Trey paid for it. And that GHB, that stuff barely has an effect.*

There was only one female offender who used this technique for a sexual assault and she did so by calling attention to the fact that she was in love with the victim (who was a minor). The concept of romantic love was noticeably absent from male offenders who used this technique.

For *denial of the victim*, there were two main patterns.

**Revenge based**

Both sexes used this technique mainly to convey that their offense was revenge based. The biggest difference within this reason was that when female offenders used this technique, it was an almost even split between revenge for themselves and revenge for their families. The latter was slightly more prominent and is illustrated in the following two examples. The main story in 'Turn, Turn, Turn' is that of Nichole Jones. Nichole is a mother whose daughter was negligently killed by a baby sitter, Tonya, when she was a young child. Decades later, upon release from prison, Tonya seeks out Nichole and her husband, who are now the legal guardians of Tonya's daughter. After Tonya is found dead at the hotel Nichole and her husband own, evidence leads to Nichole as the killer. She describes what happened to CSI agent Stokes. Nichole enacts revenge on Tonya for killing her child years ago.

> *Stokes: I talked to Haley's boyfriend. He told us about the stash of Meth Haley was holding for him. T was hidden in her room. And when it with missing, they figured you'd found it and flushed it. But you didn't flush it, did you Ms. Jones? Zach volunteered a sample of his meth and we'll match it to the drugs that were found in Tonya's stomach the night she was killed. And I have an eyewitness that saw you toss two cups of coffee into the dumpster that night, one of which was laced with meth. How'd you get her to drink it, Nichole? Was it a peace offering?*
> *Ms. Jones: She had no right to just show up.*
> *Stokes: So you killed her.*

109

*Ms. Jones:  Yea.*
*Stokes:  And when Haley looked exactly like Tonya at 16, you killed her again.*
*Ms. Jones: I never wanted her.  Mark brought her into our home.  I had a daughter; she was murdered.*

Another example can be seen in 'Obscene,' an episode of Special Victims Unit, previously discussed.  Carolyn Spencer is the head of an organization that protests obscenity in the media, specifically shows that are unfriendly to family viewing.  Her son is accused of raping one of the stars on a show the group protests.  Carolyn discovers that her son has been listening to a popular talk radio show behind her back and blames the host, who is known for his vulgarity for leading her son down this path.  She waits for him outside of his studio and shoots him in retaliation, which she tells detective Stabler.

*Carolyn:  He should be dead.  He turned my son into a rapist.  He's ruined Danny's life.*
*Stabler:  Why did you do this?*
*Carolyn:  I had to.  Couldn't let him ruin another family.*

For males, this technique of neutralization was almost exclusively used for revenge for themselves.  They had been wronged in some way and had to retaliate.  Two offenders exemplify this pattern.  In '100,' an episode of Criminal Minds, a serial killer comes after the family of Agent Hotchner.  This particular plot is one that is shown throughout several episodes of the show, two of which were in the original data sample. Hotchner discovers the identity of 'The Reaper' and has several close encounters with him but is unable to capture him.  In this particular episode, the Reaper, George Foyet, asks Hotchner to make a deal with him, stop pursuing him and he will not go after Hotchner's family.  As this deal is not made, Foyet fulfills his threat.  Foyet is angered that Hotchner will not leave him alone and enacts revenge on the family.

*Foyet:  Did you even tell her what this is about?  About the deal?*

110

*Hotchner: He's just trying to make you angry.*
*Foyet: Well she should be. She's gonna d-i-e because of your inflated ego.*
*Hotchner: Ignore him Haley.*
*Foyet: I'm sure you don't want to know this part either. You know, all he had to do was stop looking for me and you wouldn't be in this mess.*

A final example of revenge for themselves can be seen in an episode of CSI, '4X4'. A side plot of this episode shows a body builder, Charles, who murders Tiffany, a woman he was sleeping with. He is on a high dose of steroids and this has rendered him impotent. After the woman makes fun of him for this fact, he shoots and kills her.

*(Charles and Tiffany are in Bed)*
*Tiffany: Oh baby, looks like you have one muscle that isn't hard. (she laughs)*
*(Chalres reaches for gun.)*
*Charles: You think that's funny bitch!? (shoots her)*

In sum, while both men and women had revenge cited as a reason to excuse their offenses, the reasons why varied. For women revenge for the family was just as common as revenge for themselves. Men had revenge for themselves used almost exclusively. This man stem from the fact that men must protect their personal image as masculine more so than women must defend their image of femininity. Sad another way, when it comes to people denigrating you, women can walk away whereas men must defend their honor.

**Victim as a Bad Person**

Another common way this technique was used was to convey the victim as a bad person. There was a nuance here that is worth mentioning. For female offenders, the victims were described *holistically* as bad people. This can be seen in an episode of CSI, 'Lover's Lane'. While not the main story line of the episode, the new agent on the staff is looking into a case from a while back that has evidence that did not add up to him.

111

Upon reopening the case, and recreating ballistics of the incident, the agent discovers that a man who was ruled murdered by his wife was actually murdered by the wife's sister, Hannah. He brings her in for questioning and confronts her.

> *Hannah: Would it make any difference if you knew that James York was a piece of garbage? I wouldn't have touched him with a ten foot pole. You know he had three other children with other women. Sweet little kids he'd already managed to screw up. I loved my sister, but she never was very bright. And she was an idiot to stay with a man like that. Their daughter, my daughter… is two years old now. And I tell her that I love her every day. And she knows I really mean it. Whoever killed James York did her a favor that should make a difference.*

Another example comes from a Special Victims Unit episode 'Signature,' which describes a female offender, FBI agent Cooper, who was pursuing a serial rapist and murderer for years. Detective Benson discovers that Cooper has taken the law into her own hands and killed the man before he could be arrested and brought to justice. Detective Benson confronts her.

> *Benson: I would have been proud to help you collar the bastard who murdered 24 women. That would have satisfied me.*
> *Cooper: That wasn't good enough.*
> *Benson: Why not?*
> *Cooper: You know why. How many dead babies have you stood over? How many rape victims? You can't tell me you never wanted to put your gun under the bastard's chin who raped a two year old.*

That offender was also defended by another character on the show as well.

> *Ms. Tillman: Every victim he killed took a little bit more out of Carl. It crushed him. He never would have let that vicious killer sit in a cushy cell for the rest of his life. I guess Lauren felt the same way.*

While there were male offenders who used this 'bad people' trope in a similar way, it was rare. The majority of male offenders who put their victims in a deserving place of their crime did so by attacking a *singular trait*. Examples of these traits are referring to the victims as weenies, whores, and losers. One example can be found in an

112

episode of Criminal Minds, 'Plain Sight.' Here, a serial killer is seeking out wealthy

people. These people disgust him in their excessive lifestyles. He is profiled by

detectives Hotchner and Gideon.

> *Hotchner: You are not going to catch him accidently, he destroys symbols of*
> *wealth in the victim's homes.*
> *Gideon: He harbors envy of and hatred of people of a higher social class. He*
> *feels invisible around them.*

Another example comes from a Special Victim's Unit episode, 'Trials.' In this episode,

the main offender, Noah, is a man who has been serially raping women. Throughout the

show the detectives discover that there is a common thread among all the women he has

chosen as victims.

> *Noah: First you accuse me of child abuse, now rape? Where does this end?*
> *Benson: With justice. For Natalie, Emily, Annabelle and Caitlyn. All single*
> *moms working outside the home.*
> *Stabler: You got a problem with that don't you?*
> *Noah: No.*
> *Benson: Come on, Noah. You forced your wife to quit her job when you adopted*
> *Christopher.*
> *Benson: He told them they were bad mothers, just like he did to Caitlyn.*

Potentially, it is easier for men to denigrate a person based on a singular negative trait

than for women. They reduced the worth of their victims to that one trait.

The technique of <u>*condemnation of condemners*</u> did not yield any differences

across gender groups mainly because no women utilized this technique at all. Half of the

males who used this technique, did so for religious reasons. An example comes from

Criminal Minds episode 'Lessons Learned.' Here the detectives are trying to get

information out of a Muslim terrorist leader, Jind Allah, held at Guantanamo Bay. When

Gideon pleads with Jind to give him information that could stop an upcoming attack, and

save hundreds of innocent people, Jind discusses his beliefs.

113

*Gideon: Tonight all those innocent people.*
*Jind: There is no such thing Gideon, they were infidels and they were engaged in activities that spread American policies all over the entire world. Your incessant need to own things. Material things, your capitalism rests on the back of third world countries. No one's hands are clean, no one is innocent.*

The last technique, <u>appeal to higher loyalties</u>, offered a greater chance for variations. While the other techniques have pretty ridged scripts of usage, this one allows for more customizing depending on who or what the 'higher loyalties' used by the offender are. In general, the higher loyalties came heavily from the following: family, friends, greater causes (not tangible), self, money, and love. There are patterns in how the sex groups similarly and differently utilize this technique.

**Similarities: Protection of family**

For both male and female offenders, family and greater causes were the most utilized. When it came to family, both sexes displayed heavy reliance on protection. One example comes from 'Prodigy,' an episode of Without a Trace, Alexander, the estranged father of a world class violinist, who is only a child, seeks her out and kidnaps her. After following her career for some time, he is convinced that she is not happy in the spotlight and wants to help her get away from the fame.

*Alexander: Natasha, I am your father.*
*Natasha: You were supposed to be dead. Now that I am rich and famous you show up? That's great.*
*Alexander: I spent ten years looking for you. I always loved you, Natasha, from the moment you were born. I just want to be with you. I don't care if you never play the violin again.*
*Natasha: Just stop please!*
*Alexander: This is no life for you like this. You should be in school with friends and...*
*Natasha: Get out! Get out before I scream.*
*Alexander: Natasha.*
*Natasha: I mean it. I don't want to see you again. [starts to have an anxiety attack]*

114

*Alexander: [grabs Natasha from behind and covers her mouth] This is for your own good Natasha.*
*Alexander: That was no life for her, like that. I was only trying to save her.*

Another male offender, also accused of kidnapping, comes from 'Scheherazade,' an episode of Special Victims Unit. Judson Tierney is a retired bank robber who we discover killed his partner and kidnapped his daughter to raise as his own decades ago. When the agents discover this they ask Tierney about the circumstances surrounding the incident.

*Tierney: He starts splashing the stuff all around. I says Jack, what about the baby? He says to hell with her let her burn. He makes a move towards the crib with the gas can in his hand. And I shot him right through the pump.*
*Benson: So you took the baby. What did you tell your wife?*
*Tierney: I told her the truth. About Jack, Suzanne the bank jobs, the whole thing. She cried for about an hour. Then she made me swear that part of my life was over. I locked up jack and the money in the bomb shelter. I never looked back.*
*Benson: Why didn't you ever tell Sheila that she was adopted?*
*Tierney: What was I gonna tell her? That her mother was a black mailing tramp her father was a murderous thief. And me? I killed him!*
*Benson: You didn't want her to hate herself.*
*Tierney: Everything I did, I did for Sheila, and I'd do it again. There are too many secrets, too many lies. Look I killed a man and stole his kid. Now I gotta answer for that at least. So arrest me. Please. Come on. Did you leave your handcuffs at home?*

The element of protection of the family is present among female offenders as well. In 'Birthright,' an episode of Criminal Minds a serial rapist is kidnapping and murdering women. As this is something that happened in the same town years ago, and mysteriously stopped, the agents are called in to see if the original suspect has returned. They find out that the present killer is the son of the previous offender. After trying to unearth what happened to the first offender, they discover that he was murdered by his wife, who discovered what he had done.

*Mary: I killed him.*

115

*Karen:  What?*
*Mary:  Before Charlie was born.  I came home, and I saw this place, and I knew what he had done.  And I couldn't let my innocent baby be brought into this.*

Another example can be found in the CSI episode 'Secrets and Flies.' Here, a woman and husband who were unable to naturally have children attempt to undergo Invitro-fertilization.  After the husband's untimely death, the woman decides to donate her unused embryos to other women.  Upon learning that one of her embryos was successfully used, the woman's mother, Sandra, seeks out the baby.  Sandra knows that all her daughter has ever wanted is to be a mother and wants to ensure that it happens for her so she kills the mother of the child so that her daughter can gain custody.

*Sandra:  Then it was all worth it.  My baby has her baby. That's all that really matters.*
*Catherine:  Did you ever consider that Christina Adalian is somebody's baby?*
*Sandra:  We each protect our own.  That's how it's done.*

**Differences: Financial gain and Love**

One noticeable difference when it comes to using appeal to higher loyalties for the family is that for male offenders there was a theme of money that was noticeably absent for female offenders.  Males cited committing offenses for monetary gain that would aid their family's situation.  An example comes from the CSI episode 'Meet Market,' where a Ross Neddy, a male offender is struggling to make ends meet.  He cannot provide for his family with the job selections available to him after being released from prison.  In order to make ends meet, Ross gets involved in illegally removing bodies from morgues and giving them to a company that harvest organs for other people's use.

*Ross Neddy:  I've been out two months and the best job I can get is five bucks an hour welding engine parts together.  They won't even let me flip burgers.  Heidi just had the baby…*

116

Another example comes from 'Trip Box', an episode of Without a Trace. In this episode, three firemen agree to commit arson of a building owned by a mutual friend. They agree to do so in order to gain a share of the insurance money. Two of the men agree to the arson to help their friend, Gus, who is in dire straits with his family. Due to monetary issues, Gus' wife kicks him out, and then they lose the house.

> *Gus: I do this one thing, I get out of my hole. I have enough extra to get my house back.*
> *Scott: This goes against everything we believe in. All that we stand for. You want to do this?*
> *Billy: If he needs it.*
> *Gus: I have to get back on my feet. I have a little extra in my pocket. I get back with Lisa, my family. You don't have to deal with me on your couch anymore.*

There was one reason that was cited by female offenders that was not cited by male offenders; love. In 'Conned', an episode of Special Victim's Unit, Dr. Fran Stanton is on trial for having sex with a minor in her care, Andrew. She also misdiagnoses Andrew and medicates him to keep him complacent and in her care. Dr. Stanton legitimately believes that she is doing the best thing for Andrew as his home life is difficult. In court, after pleading guilty she is asked to give an allocution of her crime.

> *Stanton: I never meant to hurt you Andrew. Everything that I did, I did out of love. When I first met you, you were a scared little boy. And I wanted to protect you and I wanted to protect you and heal you but… I fell in love with you.. and um, I tried to deny my feelings but they were too strong. And I know you felt it too. The first time that we were together was the happiest moment of my life. I know that I am guilty of things that many people can't understand. But I want you to know that I am sorry if I ever hurt you and I hope that you can forgive me.*

Another example of love as a higher loyalty is seen from Jill Rosenthall, a character from an episode of Crime Scene Investigators, 'Young Man With a Horn.' Jill was the wife of Jules, a prominent business man in Vegas in the 1960s and 1970s. Jules owned a Jazz

117

club and Jill had a romantic relationship with Harry, one of the musicians.  When her

husband caught the two and threatened her lover, she killed him.

> *HARRY: Baby, you sure we are safe.*
> *JILL: Everybody has gone home.*
> *(replay of Harry) We were making sweet music. Sweet music. He was jealous.*
> *JULES: You son of a bitch.*
> *HARRY: He came at me.*
> *JULES: This is how you replay me.*
> *JILL: No! No! (Jill shoots her husband)*
>
> *JILL: Harry wanted to say that he did it and I couldn't let that happen. I took the cash out of Jules wallet and gave it to him. I told him to run and never come back.*
> *GRISSOM: Then you and Sheriff Montgomery framed Melchior Wilson.*
> *JILL: No. I confessed. The town was very different then. And the man who ran the town, Sheriff included, arrested Melchior. You see, a white woman could get away with murder, but she couldn't love a black man.*

Other than within the context of family, no male offenders justify an offense for a

romantic relationship.

In sum, there are three themes found concerning the techniques of neutralization.

In the first, *speaker of the technique*, I found several patterns.  First, while both male and

female offenders did tend to give the techniques themselves, females were also more

likely to have other characters on the show offer them on their behalf.  Second, female

offenders had a method of delivering techniques that was unique to them, I called it 'self

through others'.  With these two patterns it is seen that male offenders were allowed to

use their own voices to construct their techniques and that female voices were not given

equal screen time as males.  In the second theme, *multiple techniques*, two patterns

emerged.  First, female offenders were more likely to use more than one technique when

they used them at all, this was not the case for males, who more often than not, only used

one technique per offense.  Second, when males did use more than one offense, it was

118

only two whereas female offenders could use three or more.  This theme calls attention to the fact that we do not see women as offenders as readily as we do men. When women are depicted as offenders on screen, we as viewers need help to process this.  One way the shows offer that is to present several defenses for their actions.  This allows us to understand the specific circumstances of the offenders and feel acceptance of their illegal actions.

For the third and final theme, *gendered portrayals*, there patterns identified with four of the five techniques.  For denial of responsibility, I found that males do not use mental capacity like females do however, they do use addiction whereas females do not.  Males tend to use a fit of rage to deny responsibility and we do not see this from females.  For denial of injury, I found that males mostly use this technique for sexual assault offenses.  Denial of the victim showed two main patterns.  While both groups of offenders tend to use revenge as a jumping of point, females cite revenge for families and men cite revenge for themselves more commonly.  Also, while both use the pattern of framing the victims as 'bad people', females do so holistically while males single out specific traits.  Lastly, appeal to higher loyalties found that while both tend to use families and their protection, males reference money whereas women do not.  Potentially, this coincides with women being depicted as nurturing and men needing to be providers.  Also, female offenders used romantic love as a higher loyalties and males did not.

### Doing Gender

Unique to the qualitative section of my dissertation is the discussion of doing gender.  Until now, offenders in this section are discussed only in terms of the sex they were shown to be (male/female).  Here, the offenders are discussed in terms of the gender

www.manaraa.com

they are meant to display.  The last research question asks how elements of 'doing gender' (i.e., gendered behavior, gendered action, gendered accountability) play a role in the gendered nature of male and female offenders' techniques of neutralization.  I analyzed gendered behavior, actions and accountability for themes.  For gendered behavior and action, behaviors of characters were recorded and ways in which the characters acted to achieve their gender were identified.  This analysis yielded two main patterns (1) how characters behaved appropriately for their gender and (2) frequencies of behavior.  Within the first pattern three main themes emerged for men as appropriate behaviors:  (1) violence/rage, (2) virility, and (3) job success/provider status.  For women, there were three themes of appropriate behavior: (1) violence, (2) physical appearance and (3) parental merit.  Within the second pattern, frequency of behavior, two themes emerged, (1) women's duality and (2) men as exclusively appropriate.   For gendered accountability, whether or not the offenders were verbally held accountable for their gendered actions by other characters was recorded as well as which behavior (appropriate or inappropriate) they were held accountable for engaging in.  This was then analyzed for themes.  The main accountability theme which emerged was accountability for inappropriate behaviors.  All themes and patterns are discussed below.

**Appropriate Behaviors**

*Men*

Male offenders' behaviors and manners of dress were watched through a gendered lens in order to identify how their gender was conveyed and were recorded in the codebook.  Every time a trait was recorded, a quote supporting it was provided.

120

These quotes were analyzed until three themes emerged. The first theme found was that of *violence or rage*. In this way, masculinity was achieved through showing a violent act or even showing excessive anger or rage. This was present for most men even if the offense itself was not a violent offense. Men who were physically aggressive, argumentative, or consistently angry were almost always called out as such by other characters on the show. These negative attributes were used to reinforce a typically masculine trait. In the Criminal Minds episode 'Birthright,' such traits were discussed about Charlie. Charlie, a serial killer abducted women and while they were captive, he sexually assaulted them until ready to move on to the next victim, when he killed the women. Detective Rossi discusses Charlie with his mother, Mary.

> *Rossi: We're looking for Charlie. Don't you want to know why? You knew Charlie was an angry kid, made excuses when he killed the neighbor's cat. You saw the path he was going down. It's why you moved away from this place. You knew what happened here.*
> *Mary: That's not true.*
> *Rossi: You were afraid of the stock he came from. You thought if you just took him away from his father's home, you kept it all a secret, then everything would be ok.*
> *Mary I protected him.*
> *Rossi: Problem is, boy like Charlie, with so much anger, so many questions, needs to know where he came from. He wouldn't quit until he knew. And then one day, he figured it out.*
> *Mary: It was over, John. You didn't have to worry about any other girls getting hurt. And I did not want my son to have the legacy that his father was a murderer.*

Additionally, in the Without a Trace episode, 'Risen,' Dr. Polk's rage and violent actions were discussed.

> *Vivian: Oh, but it is your problem, Dr. Polk. You raped and beat Trista Bowden and you murdered Jessica Raab. You are going away for a very long time.*
> *Dr. Polk: Okay, look, I admit to what happened to Trista. But I don't know anything about Jessica, okay? I- we only messed around once.*

121

In this episode, Dr. Polk was dating Jessica's mother and sexually assaulted Jessica when she was younger. He maintains that the encounter was consensual but he also has had inappropriate relations with another young girl who threatens to tell authorities so he murders her.

Finally, in the Special Victims Unit, episode 'Signature,' Helen Moore is confronted by detective Benson about her nephew, Larry Moore. Larry is a serial rapist and killer who has abducted 24 women across state lines. His profile is read on the show and after he kidnaps women he also mutilates and tortures them prior to killing them.

> *Benson: Ms. Moore, your nephew has been torturing and murdering women.*
> *Helen: (starts to cry) How many?*
> *Benson: Over 20.*
> *Cooper: You don't seem surprised.*
> *Helen: I've known for a long time what he's capable of.*
> *Benson: Have you had any contact with him?*
> *Helen: No. Not since he got out of jail.*
> *Benson: he doesn't have a record.*
> *Helen: He was a juvenile. It was sealed and expunged. He was visiting me for the summer. He volunteered to clean up central park. Some of the girls he worked with said he touched them.*

The second theme is that of *virility*. This theme is not the same as saying that men are simply shown as heterosexual. It specifically refers to instances where men are shown to be 'ladies men,' or their actual ability to engage in sex is referenced. This theme was not only common, but there were several patterns within it. When men's virility was in question, they were held accountable for this and their masculinity was challenged. On the other side, many offenders either bragged about their status with women or were shown to be involved with multiple women, even if it had nothing to do with the offense. Their ability to engage in sex served to help show them as masculine. In the Criminal Minds episode, 'Zoe's Reprise,' the agents discover that a serial killer

they were looking for was revisiting his crime scenes with his girlfriend in order to have sex. The male agents discuss how he was unable to be sexually aroused without the aid of his crime scenes.

> *Hotchner: That's where the jogger was killed. He can only have sex with Linda when he's revisiting his crimes.*
> *Hotchner: I need you to write down for me all the places he took you to have sex.*
> *Rossi: You needed to revisit the crime scenes because it was the only way for you to get a gratifying sexual release. But revisiting the scenes wasn't enough. You had to capture it on film, put it on your computer, display it on your wall, so you could look at it every day.*

Another example comes from Special Victims Unit, episode 'Closet.' In this episode, Gary, a successful football agent, describes what it is like going out with his client. In the selected quote he is expressing his shock that the football play is gay because he is so successful with women.

> *Gary: I can't believe it. That guy's a chick magnet. We go out together, it's guaranteed I get laid!*

We see in Special Victims Unit, episode 'Quickie,' a character named Peter Butler also exemplifies this theme. Peter spends the majority of the episode discussing his sexual conquests with great pride. He brags about how many women he has been intimate with and lauds himself on their satisfaction.

> *Peter: Rape? No. I've slept with thousands of women and every one of them says, yes please.*
> *Benson: Ha*
> *Stabler: Thousands? You've been a busy boy. AQ's only been up for, 6 months?*
> *Peter: I'm talking lifetime RBI. Only tapped about 100 on AQ.*
> *Benson: Only? So you're a sex addict?*
> *Peter: I'm a red-blooded guy living the American dream.*

The last theme for men is that of *job success*. This theme was unique to men. The occupational status of women is rarely one that is commented on by other characters

123

on the show aside from simply being shown.  In fact, only one woman who was an offender and was in a successful position at her job, had that point referenced by other characters.  When a male offender is in a position of power in employment, is good at his job, or is known to be a good financial provider, all are frequently mentioned by other characters.  In this way, occupation and job success serve to help men accomplish masculinity but they do not help women accomplish femininity.  An example comes from the CSI episode 'Suckers.'  Ty Caulfield is the owner of one of the most popular casinos in Vegas.  He is constantly shown in fancy suits and is followed by his security detail. He claims that someone has stolen 10 million dollars from his casino vault and is having the agents investigate it.

> Ty Caulfield: Oh, my god. The cash-- it's gone. (He turns to look at his HEAD OF SECURITY.) How the hell did they get in here?
> (GRISSOM picks up one of the $10,000 money bands on the vault counter and looks
> at it.)
> Grissom: How much cash did you have in here?
> Ty Caulfield: Ninety percent of the casino's cash is in the basement vault. I only keep an emergency reserve here.
> (GRISSOM looks away for a moment, nodding.)
> Ty Caulfield: Ten million ... at all times.
>
> Ty Caulfield: Son of a bitch! He made a fool out of me.
> Grissom: Well, we have that in common.
> Ty Caulfield: Find out when he checked out.
> Head of Security: I'm on it.
> Ty Caulfield: And Vanessa Green. Where did she go?
> (The HEAD OF SECURITY picks up the phone.)
> Grissom: Brandon Miller, Nathan Pollard, Vanessa Green, and Yuri Yamamoto. Three of your employees and one whale ... all evidently disappear.
> Ty Caulfield: Along with my $10 million.

In the Without a Trace, episode 'Upstairs, Downstairs' we see Lawrence, a wealthy business man who claims that his daughter has been kidnapped.  In actuality, he paid

124

their nanny $40,000 cash to run away so that he could frame her. The episode shows him hosting a fancy dinner party at his mansion. His money is also discussed as his wife, Terri, recounts a fling she had with Anthony, their gardener, when she was younger. Terri's father threatened to cut her off if she did not stop seeing Anthony. She obliges and Lawrence is described as a better match for her.

> *Malone: I don't know. But I do know that she had $40,000 in cash in her possession.*
>
> *Anthony: She was beautiful…and happy. Not like now.*
> *June: I feel sorry for her. I don't think she really loves Lawrence.*
> *Anthony: Lawrence was the right choice. She's paying for it now.*
>
> *Terri: I understand why he feels the way he does, but she—she went after him to get at me. Because it was the one thing that she could have that I couldn't.*
> *Malone: But you had him at one time.*
> *Terri: We've been in love since we were 15. It's been the only time of my life that I've ever been happy.*
> *Malone: Let me guess, your father put a stop to it.*
> *Terri: Oh, he said that he would stop paying for school, he was gonna take away from trust fund, disown me.*

Another example comes from Special Victims Unit, episode 'Confidential'. Richard Morgan is the main offender in the show and owns several business buildings in New York. He is shown in fancy suits, having discussions about yachts, and in the constant surveillance of his lawyer. His power in terms of money is discussed by ex-employees and his wealth is mentioned as an SVU agent talks about decades before he was affected by the stock market crash.

> *Hopkins: Richard Morgan, owns the building. Police incident, sir. There may be a crime victim missing on the premises.*
>
> *Matt: Morgan was a master of the universe. I was a slave, a nobody. I still am.*

www.manaraa.com

*Matt: No, the opposite.  She was.. She was excited.  She, she, she says she's going to pay for me to go to college, she was going to buy an apartment, she was gonna be rich.*
*Stabler: How rich?*
*Matt: Half a million bucks from Morgan.  He was gonna buy out her firm.  Nancy was gonna take her piece of the action and quit.  He flipped out.  Decided she had to stay on to get the money.  The next day she goes back to the office to get her stuff.  And then Sunday... they find her dead.*
*Stabler: Nancy was murdered Friday October 23, 1987.  That was four days after the stock market crashed on Black Monday.*
*Tutuola: Now the market tanks again.  Any cat with Morgan's kind of scratch must have taken a bath.*

In sum, when examining men's behaviors, it was found that the traditional masculine behaviors of violence, virility, and job success were utilized the most.  All three work to affirm masculinity in the offenders.  When these are absent from men, they are held accountable for such deficiencies.

### *Women*

In the same way described above, the behaviors of women were analyzed.  There were three themes that emerged as most common among women offenders.  The first was that of *violence*.  While this is also present for men, there is one main difference of note.  Both are held accountable for displays of violence, the distinction comes into play when considering adherence to gender roles.  Violence is used to show men as masculine but to show women *as not feminine*.  Also, while men are generally shown as violent, even outside of the offense, women are generally shown as violent only within the context of the offense, not in their 'normal' characteristics.  Meaning, while most men are shown as violent people, women are shown as engaging in an isolated violent incident.  An example of this comes from the Criminal Minds episode, 'Birthright.'  Here we see Chrissy who discovers that her husband, Charlie, is the person who has been abducting

126

and murdering women. When Chrissy finds this out she confronts Charlie and kills him.

Shortly after she has an exchange with her mother in law, who also killed her husband

who was abducting and murdering women, in order to protect her children. This

maternal protection can be seen as a feminine trait.

> *Chrissy: The F.B.I.'s at the farm. They went into the barn, and they found a lot of blood. The sheriff says you killed those girls who have been missing. They have pictures and book and everything. That's why you'd stay in the barn all night? What did you do to them, Charlie? Did you---did you rape them? We are starting a family!*
> *Charlie: I never wanted that.*
> *Chrissy: You are a liar and a sick son of a bitch, just like your daddy was. (Gunshot)*

In the Without a Trace, episode 'Rage,' we see Claire erupt during a fight with Mitch, a

man at her gym. Mitch is trying to hit on Claire and a friend and after repeatedly turning

him down, Claire becomes violent and assaults him. This is stated repeatedly to be out of

character for Claire who is a school teacher and described as caring and nurturing.

> *Fitzgerald: Like the way she went off on Mitch, did you ever see her do anything like that before?*
> *Friend: No, never. That's what was so completely odd. It was totally unlike her. Claire's usually the cool headed one in the classroom with the kids.*

From the same episode, we see Pamela Seaver. Pamela is a medical doctor and the head

of her department at the hospital in which she works. It comes to light that Pamela is

abusing her son Ray and her husband physically. The stress of her job and her

background with abuse are used to explain her violent outburst.

> *Ray: Because it's not him. It's my mom. She's the one that beats me. She's the one that screams and punches and throws stuff and my dad just takes it.*
> *Claire: Your mother?*
> *Ray: I'm too embarrassed to tell you the truth. Because it's not him, it's her. It's my mom. She's the one that hits me.*

127

The second theme is *physical appearance*.  Most women in the shows who were offenders were shown as overtly feminine in appearance.  They dressed in a feminine nature, wore make up, and their attractiveness was mentioned by other characters on the show.  Perhaps, the need for female offenders to be shown in this way was compensation for the masculine nature of their offending behaviors.  Even men who are shown as 'ladies men' do not have actual quotes about their attractiveness presented in the show.  Another key component of this theme is the fact that women's physical appearance is often also used to help her credibility in the shows.  An example can be seen in the Special Victims Unit, episode 'Intoxicated,' where a girl is accused of killing her mother.  While it does not add to her credibility, her looks are referenced by detective Stabler.

*Stabler:  Look, she'd hot.  I used to be your age, I know what it's like.*

Another Special Victim's Unit episode, 'Conned,' shows Fran Stanton, a doctor who is having a relationship with a minor in her care.  At first, when the affair is suggested, there are doubts among the agents as to the veracity of the claim.  One detective lends credence to it based on Stanton's appearance.

*Tutuola:  Captain, he's a kid plus she's hot, plus she's got him whacked out on drugs.*

There is also an example in the Criminal Minds, episode 'Jones.'  Sarah Danlin is a rare female serial killer who is attacking and killing men in New Orleans.  She was raped there in her college years and has returned to kill as many men as she can.  Since it is rare to see this behavior in a woman, they discuss how Sarah has managed to be so successful specifically in overcoming the physical strength of her victims.  Her attractiveness is credited and discussed.

128

*Morgan:  Prentiss, there's only one thing that's gonna make a straight man leave his friends on guys night out.*
*JJ:  And I'm guessing she'd have to be quite attractive in order to lure them away.*

The third and final theme in women's behavior is that of *parental merit*.  While the parental status of men is occasionally mentioned, it is not nearly as frequent as for women offenders.  Women on the shows are constantly having their parental merit discussed.  An interesting pattern that exists here is that while men are discussed as either a good or bad father (when it is discussed at all), women are almost always described as both at the same time.  This can show itself in a few different ways.  The mother can say that she was acting in defense of her children or in their best interest while others point out that she is acting in ways opposite this or there are other people who offer character witness to how great of a mother the woman is even when it comes to light later on that she acted inconsistent with this image.  Either way, women's role as a mother is integral to her image in these shows, while it at best seems secondary for men.  Even the women who commit violent crimes can be referred to as good mothers.  There is an attitude of the ends justifying the means, when it comes to the family unit which is not present for men.

The following examples illustrate this theme.  In the CSI episode, 'Turn of the Screws' the mother in the episode is Raina Press.  Raina is depicted as both a good and a bad mother.  In the way of being a good mother, she is shown as concerned when her daughter is missing, in fact, she is the one who alerts the police.  She is a single mom who works her schedule out to be able to have the most face time with her daughter.  This is commented on by CSI agents as a good trait.  However, as the episode continues, we

129

find out that Raina actually killed her daughter.  She accuses her of sleeping with her

boyfriend and during a confrontation, accidently kills her.

> *Raina:  Couple nights a week, she'd sleep at her friend Carrie's.  There's just the two of us.  I'm a waitress.  Work nights.  That way I can…make her breakfast and be there when she gets home from school. (Good parent)*
> *Catherine: A single mother, working night.*
> *Warrick:  I'm just saying, she didn't check on her own kid, ya know? (Bad parent)*
> *Catherine:  Ah, you do the best you can.  She is.  (Good parent)*
>
> *Raina:  I bought Tessa a bus pass, and that little slut still gets my guy to pick her up after school. (Bad parent)*

Another good example comes from Special Victims Unit, episode 'Retro.'  The mother

here is Susan Ross.  Susan is described as a caring and loving mother by her eldest son,

doctor, and friends.  All are shocked at the death of Susan's youngest daughter and refuse

to believe that Susan had any hand in it.  However, Susan's ex-boyfriend tells a different

story.  Susan has HIV and as an AIDS denier, does not feel that she needs to take any

medical precautions with her daughter.  This is seen as dangerous and reckless parenting

by the ex as well as the SVU agents.

> *Tommy:  She would never hurt Lisa (daughter).  Why are you doing this to us?(Good parent)*
>
> *Susan:  I did not hurt my baby.  I loved Lisa.  I did not make her sick. (Good parent)*
>
> *Benson:  Why was she fire and not you?*
> *Jack:  Well she thinks HIV is harmless.  What if she cuts herself and one of her students gets exposed?  Hell, she doesn't even take precautions with her own kids.*
> *Benson:  What do you mean?*
> *Jack:  She breast fed Lisa for a year after she was born because Dr. Hutton said it was okay! (Bad parent)*

A final example comes from Crime Scene Investigators, episode 'Still Life.'  Karen calls

the police one day to report that her son is missing.  Her house, where she home schools

130

the boy, is decorated with original artwork and she seems distraught by the disappearance of her child.  We later find out that she is having a psychotic break and actually killed her son years ago after her husband's death.  But even in this action, she is described as doing so for what she felt was in the best interest of the child.

> Karen: I, uh ... I never bring Jesse to the park. But this afternoon, the backyard just couldn't hold him, so we came here and ... uh ... he was on the swings; I couldn't even get him off, and then I look around and he's gone; he's just ...
> BRASS: Mrs. Matthews, there's really nothing more you can do here. Why don't you let us give you a ride home?
> (She turns and looks at Grissom.)
> Karen: I'm not leaving. (She looks at Brass.) Not without Jesse. (Good parent)
>
> Grissom: Euripedes tried to understand it when he wrote Medea. "I will slay my children without delaying long enough to hand them over to some more savage hand."
> Grissom: Medea, like Karen, was a soldier's wife.
> Catherine: His father was a soldier, his grandfather was a soldier, ...
> Catherine: ... Karen did not want that for Jesse. (Good parent/protection)
>
> Catherine: Karen is already mentally fragile when her husband is killed. She gets into a very heated argument with the in-laws at his funeral, goes over the deep end, poisons Jesse and buries him in the backyard near the fence. (Bad parent)

In sum, when examining women's behaviors, it was found that violence, a traditionally masculine trait, physical appearance, and parental merit were used the most.  With respect to violence, it was different than when used for men.  For women it was usually contextual whereas for men it was a characteristic trait.  Parental merit was used in such a way as to show women offenders as simultaneously good and bad mothers.

**Frequency of Behaviors**

### *Women's Duality*

After analyzing *how* men and women are shown as gender appropriate or inappropriate, I turned to looking at the *frequency* with which they were shown as such. One theme that quickly emerged was that women were rarely shown as only one or the other. In fact, less than a third of the women who offend are shown as only having appropriate or inappropriate behaviors for their gender. The majority are shown as simultaneously acting in accordance and against gender norms. This makes sense intuitively when considering the women in the sample are all people who are committing offenses, which is rare for women. However, it is not enough for a woman to simply be an offender to be marked as acting inappropriate, it needs to be commented on by characters on the show. As discussed previously, Pamela Seaver from the Without a Trace, episode 'Rage,' is found to be abusing her husband and son. While she is engaging in a masculine behavior, her husband is consistent in calling her a good woman.

> *Mr. Seaver: It got bad in the last year or so when Pam took over the department. She's a good woman. I mean, the work she does, the lives she saves."* **(Good woman/appropriate)**

> *Fitzgerald: Are you saying that your wife was abused as well?*
> *Mr. Seaver: They all were. And she wasn't the smartest in her family. Uh, it's the only way she knows how to deal with things. And with the stress and pressures at work and my job keeping me out of the house, and Ray… he's a great kid, he's just not that driven.* **(Bad mother/inappropriate)**

Jessica Delay is a character shown in Special Victims Unit, episode 'Fat.' Her physical appearance is described by two different characters on the show and she is shown as overtly feminine. However, she also is being charged with assault. She and her friends assaulted a man so badly, he lost a leg to his wounds.

132

*Jessica: Tommy started it.*
*Stabler: Yeah, but you joined in.*
*Jessica: Yes.  I couldn't stand the sight of him! (violent/inappropriate)*

*Latif:  She comes in here, she says, I want cigarettes.  I say, you're too young.*
*She says, Come on, I won't tell anybody.  And she's really pretty.*
*(Attractive/Appropriate)*

Another episode of Special Victims Unit, 'Poison,' shows Karen, a woman whose

adoptive daughter dies.  She is described constantly as a good mother, a nurturing and

caring woman.  There is one character who challenges this and says that she consistently

mistreats the daughter.

*Karen: Look, you're making a mistake.  I love Alexis.*
*Benson: Not according to your sister-in-law.*
*Karen: Wendy never liked me.  You can't listen to her.*
*Stabler: Can we listen to Katie, Mrs. Campbell?*
*Oliver: Oh, sure, Detectives, because seven-year-olds are so reliable.  Tomorrow*
*she'll tell you that a pony with wings lives in her closet.*
*Stabler:  So Katie made the whole thing up, huh?  Like how you shoved a sponge*
*full of soapy water into Alexis' mouth, repeatedly, while she gagged and cried?*
*Karen:  I don't know where Katie would get that.*
*Stabler: Then you made her stand in a corner, counting, until she collapsed?*
*Oliver: Plenty of children accidentally ingest household poisons.  Sad, but it's a*
*fact of life.  It's not a crime.*
*Benson: So it was an accident?*
*Karen:  I feel terrible that I wasn't paying enough attention.  But I can't possibly*
*be everywhere at once.  I have four children.  I'm a good mother.  I would never*
*hurt Alexis.* ***(Good mother/appropriate)***

*Karen:  I just wanted her to be quiet.*
*Stabler: So you killed her.  You placed a pillow over her face and you killed her,*
*Karen.* ***(Killed her child/inappropriate)***
*Karen:  It wasn't my fault.*

In sum, with respect to women, there was a theme of duality in appropriate

behaviors displayed.  Here, I found that women on the show were more often than not

depicted as acting both appropriate for their gender and inappropriate at the same time.

This theme perhaps plays into the fact that for women to be seen as offenders they need

133

to display some masculine traits as offending itself is seen as a masculine endeavor. At the same time, to counter that masculinity, the feminine parts of their character must also be referenced. The goal is to see them as women who *are also* offenders, not as women offenders.

### *Men as Exclusively Appropriate*

When looking at patterns for men, I quickly found that while women were shown as both acting feminine and not feminine simultaneously, men were almost exclusively shown as acting only masculine. In fact, there were only ten men who used a technique of neutralization and were shown as acting inappropriately for their gender. Again, this would seem to make sense as men are more likely to be seen as offenders than women. Thus, when looking at a sample of men who are offenders, they would be more likely be depicted as masculine. Even more telling, of the ten offenders who were shown as inappropriate half came from one technique, denial of responsibility. This is salient as I identify this technique as one that would be more utilized by women than men. It requires the user to take on a passive role in the commission of the offense, an action that would be more in tune with feminine traits than masculine one; which seems to be the case here.

A good example of a man who only displays masculine behaviors comes from Special Victims Unit, episode 'Goliath.' This episode shows us a man who is masculine in profession, a cop, and is ex-military. His wife reports him for repeated episodes of abuse.

> *Mrs. Callahan: As usual, he starts hitting me. Then he rips off my clothes, says he's gonna get his gun if I don't do what he says. That part was new. Son of a bitch. I can't believe he'd do this. I can't let it go on. Not with the baby coming. (Speaking about Tommy Callahan: cop, ex-military)*

134

In CSI, episode 'The Panty Sniffer,' Finn is dating a woman who sells her used underwear for extra cash. When Finn discovers this he is shown as angry, jealous, and confrontational. He demands that she stop. When Finn finds out that she does not, he kills her in a fit of rage.

> Finn*: Wait a minute. You're going to choose a bunch of perverts over me?*
> Katsaros: They're not perverts. They're fans; they're my fans. You shouldn't be jealous.
> Finn: Are you kidding me here?
> Katsaros: Look, Finn, if you can't accept my lifestyle, we're over.
> Finn: Wait a minute, wait a minute! What is wrong with you?! [Grabs her, throws her down, kicks her down stairs when she stands up] **(Jealous, violent, confrontational)**

Another example can be seen from the Criminal Minds, episode 'Natural Born Killer.' The agents pursue a serial killer who is particularly violent with his victims. He is described as methodical, in control, and aggressive, all traditionally masculine traits.

> *Elle: Despite all the blood, this crime scene shows method, order, control. I'd say it's pretty organized.*
> *Morgan: Hey Garcia. Look at this. There's no hesitation wounds on the body. One clean cut through flesh and bone.*
> *Garcia: Ok, so what does that tell us?*
> *Morgan: Most people wouldn't imagine doing something like this to another human being but this guy, he doesn't even flinch. He's got no conscience. We've got ourselves a serial killer with the perfect career. Russo has no idea who he's dealing with. I think we can shake him. Keep looking.* **(Controlling, violent, aggressive, dominant)**

Men offenders on these shows are almost exclusively shown as acting appropriate for their gender. This is perhaps due to the fact that the writers, with the ultimate goal of creating "real" characters, do not have anything to counterbalance as they do with women who are offenders. Men are more likely to be offender, so we conflate offending with masculinity.

135

**Accountability for Inappropriate Behaviors**

This theme was found for both men and women. As previously stated, women who offend are almost always shown as acting both masculine and feminine. What is interesting about this pattern is that despite the fact that women are more likely to be shown this way, they are usually *only* held accountable for the former. In other words, women are almost always held accountable for acting in a way that is deemed inappropriate and yet when they are shown as feminine, it is rarely commented on by other characters on the show. One example comes from CSI, episode 'Grissom Versus the Volcano.' Beth Dunbar is held accountable for the fact that her actions killed several people with a bomb. She is also seen with her child but no one ever comments on her status as a mother.

> *Beth: I'd always suspected there was another woman, but never ...*
> *another family. So. Two weeks ago Sunday, I followed him. He, uh, dropped off*
> *his rental car and walked to some apartment building. Then he changed his*
> *clothes, and got into a nicer car, and drove out to Henderson.*
> *Catherine: Why didn't you just leave him? Turn him in?*
> *Beth: He made a fool out of me. A mockery of our life.*
> *Catherine: Mrs. Dunbar, you killed three innocent people.*
> *Beth: (shakes) That was never my intention. That bomb was supposed to*
> *go off at 8:30 on his way to the airport.*

Another example is found in CSI, episode 'XX'. Juanita is a woman in prison who is accused of killing another inmate. It is discovered that the inmate was her lover and this lesbian relationship is commented on by agents on the show.

> *Catherine: (sighs) Gets lonely in prison, doesn't it? Was it the first time*
> *you had a relationship with a woman?*
> *Catherine: Tattoo. Baby Girl had the other half.*
> *Juanita: I'm not ... like that.*
> *Catherine: It wouldn't be the first time to cross gender lines in search of*
> *some ... affection.*
> *Juanita: It was the first time I felt that way about anyone.*

136

*Juanita: And then, later that night, she said she was sorry, and we made
up. The next day, she got the Warden to transfer her ... out of our cell. She
wasn't playing Doug. She was playing me.*
*Catherine: So you killed her?*
*Juanita: She promised to end it with Doug.*
*(Quick flashback to: [THE BUS] JUANITA goes to the bus to clean it and finds
BABY GIRL and Bus Driver inside. She turns and runs out of the bus.)*
*(Cut to: [THE CELL] JUANITA takes the pad lock off the locker and slips it
into a sock. She angrily hits the bedding.)*

This pattern is echoed among men. In fact, there were only three men who were shown

as acting inappropriate that were not held accountable for that in the data set. A character

from Special Victims Unit, episode ' Low Down,' is Andy Abbott. Andy is living a

double life and routinely meets up with a group of other men who sleep with each other.

This is commented and discussed by several people on the show.

*Mrs. Abbott: One day you picked up a little paint brush, and you painted a
watercolor Christmas card for me. Big trees in Central Park, the buildings behind
them. I remember it like yesterday. I fell in love with you then, and I love you now,
and I will love you till the day I die. And by the grace of God, I will live long
enough to see our girls grow up and find their way home. I forgive you for what
you did. But I cannot forgive you if you let our children, and your friends, and
their families be destroyed. A trial will drag all of us through the mud. I'm asking
you, Andy, to be a man and admit what you've done.*
*Andy: I'm so sorry. I'm sorry, I didn't tell you the truth about me. I'm sorry for
what I did to you.*
*Mrs. Abbott: I know.*
*Andy: He wanted me to leave my family. But I couldn't. I couldn't admit I'm gay.
And we argued and I…I got angry. I got so angry and I killed him.*

Lastly, in the Special Victims Unit episode, 'Brotherhood' we see that one of the pledges

in a fraternity is held accountable for crying and acting 'wimpy during routine hazing

exercises.

*Benson: (reading) Pledge Kathy was being a weenie tonight, so we showed him
what we do to weenies. He'll crap blood tomorrow, but we'll make a man out of
him.*

137

This theme shows that no matter if the offender is a man or a woman, they must be shown as relatable to the viewers.  When either gender is shown to cross the lines of appropriate gender behavior, it must be commented on.  This can work to socialize us into appropriate roles as men and women.  Society wants us to fit into the prescribed boxes of men and women as this duality makes more sense to us and allows for society to 'run smoothly'.  In sum, both men and women are shown to be held accountable for breaking gender approved behavior more often than not.  This serves to remind the viewers that there are scripts of behaviors for each gender and when we stray from them, we will be reprimanded.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

**Sample and General Use of Techniques**

There are several findings from this dissertation to discuss. Before delving into them, I will discuss the characteristics of my sample and how they compare to real world crime statistics. For the most part, the sample accurately portrayed many trends we see in crime. For example demographically, the sample is mainly white, under thirty years of age, and male. All of these are reflected in the UCR from 2013 which states that almost 70% of offenders were white and about 74% of those arrested were male (Crime in the US 2013). Two big characteristics that were incongruent with statistics are that violent crime was overrepresented in my sample and that most of sample offenders came from the middle class. Violent crime in the sample accounted for over half of total crime. According to the UCR, property crime is much more common than violent crime as the former has a rate of 2,730.7 per 100,000 and the latter, only 367.9 per 100,000 (Crime in the US 2013). These discrepancies are important to mention as they present a skewed view of crime rates in the US. Another characteristic of the sample worth noting is that much like the literature shows, there was a wide breath of crimes depicted in the shows and all were able to be used with a technique of neutralization.

Another important group of findings to discuss are those surrounding the general use of techniques of neutralization in my sample compared to the literature. The majority

139

of literature on techniques of neutralization uses a mixed sample of male and female offenders (LaBeff et al 1990; Hinduja 2007; Ingram and Hinduja 200; Cromwell and Thurman 2003; Eliason and Dodder 1999; Shoenberger, Heckert, and Heckert 2012; Shigihara 2012; Evans and Porche 2005; Gauthier 2001; Piquero, Tibbets, and Blankenship 2004). This body of literature established two main trends, irrespective of gender. The first was that the most widely used technique was denial of responsibility. This finding was not found in my sample as appeal to higher loyalties was the most commonly used technique at 37.1%. In fact, denial of responsibility was the third most common (18.5%), behind denial of the victim (24%). The second main finding was that denial of the victim was the least likely to be used in the literature. Again, this was not echoed in my sample. Denial of the victim was the second most likely to be used by offenders in general, and condemnation of condemners was the least likely at only 1.3%. The broad techniques of neutralization literature also establishes a trend that they can be successfully applied to a wide range of illegal behaviors. This was helpful in my sample as the crime shows depicted the techniques being used on crimes running the gamut in severity from multiple homicides all the way to obstruction of justice and perjury.

A main goal of this dissertation was to discover gender differences in the use of techniques of neutralization, something that had not been elaborated on much in extant literature. There was one study that attempted to explain sex differences in the use of techniques of neutralization and it showed that despite minor mean level differences, the usage of techniques was the same across gender groups (Vieraitis et al. in 2012). This finding was present in my dissertation as well showing that not only do males and females use the techniques in the same order of frequency, but the proportions are similar

as well.  Chi square tests confirmed that there was not enough evidence in my sample to suggest a relationship between sex and use of techniques of neutralization.  In fact, the only difference of note is when a technique is *not* used.  This is much more often the case for men.  This potentially can be explained by the fact that men, who are generally presented as more assertive and confident, feel less of a need to justify their actions to others.  All of these are elements of the 'badass' as described in gender literature of a man who is tough and answers to no one (Katz, 1988).

Since this dissertation used a mixed methods approach there are a breath of findings.  In order to best synthesis all the results, the remainder of this discussion will be organized in two main sections: techniques of neutralization and gender.  Within the former section, quantitative and qualitative results will be discussed together as they are found to compliment or complicate each other.  The discussion points are divided by technique so as to mirror the results chapters.  The latter section will discuss trends found solely in the qualitative section.

### Techniques of Neutralization (Frequency and Portrayal)
#### Denial of Responsibility

My general findings concerning this technique were that it was more likely to be used when the offense occurred in a public place and when the offender had a mental illness.  When I looked qualitatively at the way this technique was used by characters on the shows, the main reasons for both sexes of offenders using denial of responsibility, or having it used on their behalf had to do with denying fault for the offense or labeling the offense an accident.  These two defenses have greater potential for use in a public setting versus a private one.  With respect to mental illness, this finding makes sense.  If the

offender had a diminished mental capacity at the time of the offense, it would likely be referenced as a way to distance themselves from blame. An interesting point here is that qualitatively, female offenders were the only ones who specifically had mental illness used as a means of denying responsibility whereas male offenders had a specifically altered mental state mentioned at the time of the offense (i.e., addiction or being under the use of drugs or alcohol).

Another finding that was interesting was that intimate partner violence was more likely to result in the use of denial of responsibility than homicide was. This was found to be significant in the full sample and the male only sample, but not the female only sample. This likely means that the effect found in the full model is mainly attributable to male offenders. This is further supported by qualitative results which indicate male offenders entered into fits of rage as an excuse to deny responsibility. This is often found within the context of disputes between intimate partners, where offenders may not take responsibility for the victimization of their partner (Lee, Hurst, Zang 2011).

There was also one finding for denial of responsibility that was unique to the female only sample. With respect to age, as females got older, denial of responsibility was less likely to be used. This makes sense as when we age we tend to become more responsible and that would make it less likely for this technique to fit. Interestingly, this finding is telling when looked at against the male only sample as age was *not* found to significantly decrease as males get older. This could be a reference to the women in this sample and their responsibility conferring roles of wife and mother. Women in the sample are more likely to be married (25%/20%) and be parents (42%/33%) than the men. Further, the offending literature states that when girls (terminology used in

142

original) are younger they put more stock in their relationships with peers, making them more susceptible to negative peer influence than boys (Mears et al 1998; Zimmerman and Messener 2010; Daly 1998). This particular relationship could lead to the finding here as females may tend to cite pressure from their peer less often as they grow up. One finding unique to the male only sample was that those who were legally punished were more likely to have denial of responsibility used for their offenses. This would seem to imply that when one take less ownership of one's actions, they are more likely to be punished.

**Denial of Injury**

In general, for denial of injury I found that three main variables had consistent effects on usage. I found that sexual and general assault were both more likely to result in using denial of injury than homicides. This is an intuitive finding as the taking of a life may be viewed as less amenable to this technique as these two crimes, regardless of the sex of the offender. Looking at this further, these offense related effects were not present in the female only sample but were in the male only sample indicating the male offenders were responsible for this particular finding. This was corroborated in the qualitative findings. While both sexes generally articulated this technique in the same manner, I found that men disproportionately had this technique used to defend sexual assault.

The other two variables with significant results were legal punishment and personality type. When an offender was legally punished denial of injury was less likely to be used for the offense; this effect is particularly for male offenders. This could relate to the fact that if they deny the caused any harm they are less likely to receive any legal leniency as opposed to accepting their actions. As for personality type, unlikeable

offenders were more likely to have this technique used for their offense. Perhaps the nature of this technique, which is to deny that one caused harm, is found to make offenders less likeable. There was one finding unique to the female only sample which is that as female offenders aged, they were more likely to have this technique used. Again, this could be related to the fact that as women age, they find themselves (or shows want to present them) in more nurturing roles (e.g. mother, wife) and these roles dictate not causing harm. The high presence of females with both these statuses in the data set would suggest that female offenders need to be distanced from the ability to cause harm.

**Denial of the Victim**

There were several variables that influenced the use of denial of the victim. An important note about this technique is that all of the significant findings from the full sample model were also found in the male only sample but not in the female only sample. This indicates that these findings are mainly attributable to offenses committed by male offenders. The only finding of note from the female only sample was that when an offense happened in a public place, females were more likely to have denial of the victim used for their offenses. This is an interesting finding which most likely calls attention to victim blame. In other words, victims in a private location are maybe more likely to be seen as unlikely or unworthy victims. In terms of offenses and relationship with the offender, denial of the victim points to a relationship with previous literature on victim blame as well (Lauritsen and Heimer 2008). In other words, kidnapping and offenses marked as 'other' were both less likely to result in denial of the victim as was also the case when the offender was a stranger. This may indicate that victims who are in categories of "known" relationships with the offender are more likely to be blamed for

144

their victimization (Rader & Rhineberger-Dunn 2010). This is supported in information gleaned from the qualitative results. Both genders use this technique in two main ways, to describe the offender as a bad person or to enact revenge on someone (they had it coming). Both of these are more suited for use when there is an established relationship between offender and victim.

Legal punishment also increased the chances of this technique being used which makes sense in the fact that this deflects responsibility and lack of ownership of ones actions is not a positive attribute that would likely result in legal leniency. The last two findings that need some exploration but have little by way of previous literature is that age had an effect on this dependent variable as did the idea that manipulative offenders were less likely to have this technique used for their offenses. This seems a little counter intuitive as we might expect that manipulative and older offenders might be more likely to deny the victim.

**Condemnation of Condemners**

This technique was only used by males in my sample so all findings from the full sample are the same for the male only sample and attributable to them. The biggest effect was found in the way of drug offenses. They were more likely to result in the use of this technique but it is worth noting that the large effect was due to the low sample size. Offenses labeled as 'other' were also more likely to result in this technique. The qualitative results indicated that these were offenses like running a porn site and terrorist plots. The fact that no females in my sample had this technique used for their offenses is a glaring finding. This is especially interesting considering that this technique was found to be the most related to women's decision to engage in corporate crime (Vieraitis et al.

in 2012) and the second most frequent technique used by women in the female only literature (Heltsley and Calhoun 2003; Copelton 2007; Thompson, Harred, and Burks 2003).

**Appeal to Higher Loyalties**

In this last technique, there were four main discussion points. The first has to do with age. The older one gets the more likely they were to have this technique used and this was found for males and females in their own models as well. This is supported by the qualitative finding that the main reason cited by both gender groups for this technique is the family. Previous research indicates that as we get older, we encounter more 'turning points' and have more stakes in conformity and families are more common, which may explain the finding here (Sampson and Laub 1993). With respect to offense type, kidnapping was more likely to use this technique. Again, this is something I would expect to see as there were several instances of parents kidnapping their children in an effort to protect them of remove them from a situation they found harmful. Sexual assault was less likely to use this technique. This makes sense in two ways. One, it is harder to verbalize why sexually assaulting someone was for a greater good and two, sexual assault was found to be used more with denial of injury (for male offenders).

There are two findings here unique to each sex group. For females, an offense occurring in a public place was less likely to result in the use of this technique. This may be because fictional crime dramas tie female offending to the private sphere rather than the public sphere. For males, financial stability affected the use of this technique. To explain this effect, the qualitative results indicate that while men and women both use family as their higher loyalty, the reasons behind them are different. There is a strong

146

element of protection present from both groups but for men exclusively, is the issue of money.  They are the only ones who justify committing a crime for financial gain that is specifically for their family's benefit.  In both instances of women and men's offending, it seems that traditional gender norms (associating men as bread winners and women as family focused) are a part of appeal to higher loyalties.

### Gendered Findings Concerning Techniques of Neutralization

While the previous section makes sense of how each technique was used by each sex group in my sample, this section discusses two patterns that were found in the qualitative section pertaining to techniques.  Female offenders in the show were more likely to have techniques offered on their behalf than males.  They were also almost exclusively privy to the delivery method of techniques I call 'self through others.'  Both of these findings lead to the reality that females are not given as much screen time as males.  Male characters are allowed to assign their own meaning to their justifications. This plays on the stereotypes that women are passive and men are active and also ties into previous literature that argues that women are less featured through the media than men and when they are, they are presented in stereotypical ways; which in turn effects our conceptualizations of masculinity and femininity (Bandura 1986; Blumer and Hauser 1933; Gerbner 1970).  Secondly, when the 'self through others' method is used it is often for violent offenses.  This is a salient finding when you consider that creating a relatable feminine character is desirable and associating them with the ability to commit violence will detract from that.  This method is also seen juxtaposed with overtly feminine characters.  Meaning, they are shown as attractive, good mothers, etc.  Clearly, the way in which female characters 'do gender' relates to how the techniques are offered.

147

Another important finding is that female offenders are shown as having more than one technique of neutralization used for their offenses substantially more often than males. The salience of this is in the gendered nature of the characters. It may be the case that since society does not normally view women as criminals or offenders, especially when occupying roles of wife and mother, fictional crime dramas need to provide multiple reasons for women's offenses. In order to help the viewers make sense of women committing crimes, we need as many reasons as possible. Knowing the circumstances allows us to sympathize with them. When a man commits a crime we do not need this level of justification for why; it is as simple as saying 'boys will be boys'. Their offenses make sense to us as we see masculinity and violence as synonymous (Messerschmidt 1993). With women we reduce their actions to her specifically, instead of lumping them into the larger gender group. We need to know why she specifically entered into crime commission since it is assumed to not be the path normally taken.

**Gendered Portrayals of Women and Men Offenders**

The first main theme for men was that of violence. For men, masculinity was *achieved* through things such as anger, dominance, and confrontation. Interestingly, these traits did not have to be presented within the context of the offenses. The violence was not a by-product of the isolated offense but rather, a permanent trait of the character himself. A second theme for men was virility. Again, a key distinction here is that this was presented as a characteristic of the man, even if it had nothing to do with the offense. There were several instances of men being discussed as 'ladies men' who slept around. These worked to affirm their masculinity. There were also characters whose virility was called into question. When this was the case, the character's masculinity was questioned

148

by other people on the show.  Often they were reprimanded or chided.  This is supported in the gender literature as men's fear of ridicule often causes them to lash out so as not to be associated with the anti-masculine behavior (Kimmel, 2009).  The last main theme in men's portrayals involved job success.  This was key as the provider status of men is integral to their masculinity.  This is a finding that is echoed in the quantitative results as the only models which showed significance for financial status of the offender come from the male only sample.  Also, when a man is shown to be unable to provide for his family, he is held accountable for it.  This shortcoming is used by men to justify their crime commission.  Men's success helps them accomplish masculinity but the same is not true for women.  Women's jobs are not often discussed or commented on as the ability for them to financially provide is not as heavily tied to their femininity.

When taken together, the behaviors of violence, virility, and job success all represent traditionally masculine traits.  It follows the literature that violence and virility would be present as there is a pervading belief in biological essentialism when it comes to gender (Bem 1993).  American culture weighs heavily the relation between biology and gender.  When that is coupled with testosterone and its association with those traits, we can see how these are attributed to masculinity.  Gender literature also points out that young boys learn to be men from watching their fathers.  Since their fathers are more likely to work outside of the home, they develop an association with job dedication as the path to manhood (Lynn 1969).

The first main theme for women was also violence.  While this is also shown for men, it is differently applied to women.  It was usually contextually tied to the offense itself, not attributed to her 'normal' characteristics.  For women, violence was used to

*deny* femininity. They were consistently held accountable for this behavior whereas men were not. The second theme is physical appearance. Women on the shows were depicted as very feminine in appearance. They dressed femininely, they wore make up, and their attractiveness was referenced by other characters on the show. Men had a theme of virility, but this was more tied to their actual sexuality. Their physical appearance was rarely mentioned by other characters on the show. This was not the case for women. If they were thought of as pretty or hot, it was mentioned. Perhaps this plays on the fact that there is more pressure on women to be attractive to the opposite sex than the other way around. It could also be tapping into the fact that what makes women attractive is mainly their physical appearance whereas men can be deemed attractive by non-aesthetic things like kindness and financial stability. Another reason it could be important to show women this way is to offer a counterbalance to the masculine nature of their offending behavior (Collins 2011; Miller and Sumners 2007).

The last theme for women was that of parental merit. This is far more common for women than men on the show. When men's parental merit is referenced they are either being discussed as a good or a bad father, rarely both. For women, they are more than likely discussed at the same time. Women's role as mother is so integrally linked to her femininity that it can even be used as a justification for her crimes. For example, many women engaged in violent acts, some affecting their children, and yet if they did so in the interest of the child, they were shown in a positive light when it came to parental status.

These behaviors are also supported in the gender literature. Traditional roles of femininity such as attractiveness and motherhood (nurturing, caring, protective, etc) are

all attributable to females, biologically. We use a gender schema when making sense of our roles in society and girls socialized to be kind and nurturing early on (Bem 1993). This would account for the heavy reliance of those behaviors on the shows. Also, this would explain the saturation of depictions of women in a parental role. We identify and model our gender after our same sex parent and in American culture the woman is more likely to raise the children.

There are two other findings to discuss in the gendered portrayals. The first is that women on the shows were more likely to be shown as acting simultaneously appropriate and inappropriate for their gender. This makes sense on the surface as offending behavior is typically seen as masculine. In this sample all the women are offenders so it would follow that they would be marked as acting inappropriate for their gender. Potentially, the heavy reliance on the two themes previously mentioned for women of physical appearance and parental status are due to the fact that the shows want the women to still come off as feminine to viewers. They need to have these aspects of their femininity played up in order to counter the masculinity incurred from their offending behavior.

The second finding is that while women are shown as both masculine and feminine, men are exclusively shown as masculine. Again, this makes sense as the sample consists of offenders and offending behavior stereotypically seen as masculine. It is important to mention here that these are crime shows. The event that drives the story is the criminal offense. If you want the characters on the show to be shown in stereotypical ways, you still have to start from the offenses. Meaning, if the offense was committed by a woman, she is starting with a trait of masculinity so it becomes necessary then to

151

counter and show her in feminine ways as well. This is not the case for men. They are often shown as masculine *through* their offending not *in spite of* it. This is perhaps why we see a lack of men being shown as inappropriate; it is not necessary to cement their status as men. There were only ten men in the sample who were shown with inappropriate behaviors. Half of these also had denial of responsibility used for their offenses. This technique of neutralization is one that requires the user to display passivity and is more in line with feminine traits than masculine ones.

When looking at accountability for gendered actions I found that both men and women were consistently held accountable for behaviors that run counter to prescribed gender roles. Even though women were more likely to be shown as acting appropriate and inappropriate for their gender simultaneously, they were usually only held accountable for the latter. This could be related to the fact that television is a major source of socialization and it serves to show us appropriate roles as men and women (Blumer and Hauser 1933; Gerbner 1970). When the acceptable boundaries of gendered behaviors are transgressed, the characters on the show are reprimanded so as to reinforce stereotypes of how men and women should act (Lavigne 2009:384).

## Limitations and Future Directions

### Limitations

The most salient limitation from this dissertation is that the sample is fictional crime drama episodes. In Sykes and Matza's original piece, they counter the existing subculture of deviance idea by stating that if the subculture did in fact exist, " we could reasonably suppose that he would exhibit no feelings of guilt or shame at detection or confinement" (Sykes & Matza 1957). They find, however, that many juveniles do in fact

152

experience shame and guilt and in an attempt to assuage these feelings, employ techniques of neutralization. The crux of their argument is that the expression of these feelings of guilt via the usage of techniques of neutralization comes from the juveniles *themselves*. When using fictional crime dramas, it is essential to note that the utilization of the techniques of neutralization do not come from the "offenders" themselves. Rather, their usage is indicative of the writers of the respective shows. Although a strict adherence to the original theory would require actual offenders giving their own justifications, this data set offers an interesting perspective on the theory. While the techniques offered in this data set are reflections of the writers of the show and not *actual* offenders, this does not necessarily detract from the validity of the information. In fact, it provides information about what the public "sees" regarding offender excuses and justification which may lead the general public to particular perceptions about offenders.

From a theoretical perspective, this particular data set gives us insight into something uniquely valuable. The writers are responsible for writing characters that are consistent and relatable to viewers in terms of gendered behavior. Part of this consistency lies in their portrayal as someone who the viewers will like, dislike, see as credible, or not. The writer's depiction of characters in the show reflects what society feels is gender appropriate behavior for the characters. Moreover, acceptance of the techniques can be seen among other characters in the show. This data set can allow for investigation of which techniques are met with approval or disapproval from others. If there is a pattern, it can then be analyzed along gender lines to see if certain techniques of neutralization are more accepted when used by either group.

Another limitation of this dissertation is that the coding of the codebooks are researchers' interpretations of offender characteristics (pre-collected data) and my interpretations of why offenders commit crime. This dissertation cannot interpret what individuals think when they see the fictional crime shows, thus, it is in part the subjective interpretation of the episodes by the original researchers and me that guide this dissertation. This is a common problem among media projects that try to get at how issues are portrayed on television but one that is worth noting as a limitation. However helpful this understanding might be to gaining knowledge about topics from viewers' perspectives, it is a limitation.

A final limitation is that this dissertation does not account for all fictional crime dramas it only accounts for the most popular public access fictional crime dramas from 2003-2010. There are a variety of fictional crime dramas on other paid networks and available through Netflix (and through other companies) that provide access to Americans regarding more diverse types of crime shows. This data was collected in a particular time frame, which may also hinder its results. As time has gone one, many more cable series have come out, which may have different foci or explanations for criminal behavior.

**Future Directions**

With respect to future directions, this data discover several unique trends. Since this data were collected, a vast amount of crime shows have entered television. It would be lucrative to utilize those shows in a new way. Specifically, there are new shows that cover ranges of offenses and offenders that were not as heavily covered in this data set. For example, there are entire shows that are about topics such as cybercrime,

154

international crime, white collar crime, and even terrorism. This would allow for a different type of offender to be evaluated.

In addition to expanding the present dissertation to different sets of data, I would also like to look at addressing one of the limitations of this study. Since most of the data is subjected to my interpretations of the shows, replicating the study with the same guidelines but doing so in focus groups could be a way to move away from a singular researcher's perspective and find consistency in which traits displayed make a character come off as masculine of feminine. From this, it would help to create not only what viewers deem as masculine and feminine, but also could tap into our responses to those traits. In the present dissertation I find that if a woman acts violent, that is a masculine trait but to viewers if the violence was committed by a mother acting in defense of a child, they may not see this as masculine at all. Rather, they may say that this strengthens their role as a mother and helps to portray them in a positive light.

Lastly, I would like to expand this research to a multidimensional perspective. The main goal of this dissertation was to see if men and women use techniques differently. However, I am aware that this is complicated by our other statuses as well, namely race and class. Engaging in a more qualitative analysis of how these interact would be a lucrative endeavor. Being able to look at black women versus white women and upper SES men versus lower SES men would allow for the spectrum of masculinities and femininities to be discussed.

This dissertation found that while there are not necessarily quantitative sex differences in the usage of techniques of neutralization, when utilizing the doing gender lens, there are qualitative differences in how each technique is portrayed from each

155

group.  Men and women on the shows were shown in traditionally stereotypical ways and were reprimanded when they stepped away from these tropes.  This has implications for the socialization and gendered action of fictional crime show viewers.  It was illustrated that these men and women were using techniques of neutralization as an extension of their gendered identities on the show.  Hopefully, with these future directions in mind, these findings can be further examined in relation to not only gender, but in relation to other important categories in sociology; such as race and class.

# REFERENCES

Adler, Freda. 1975. Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Akers, Ronald L. and Christine S. Sellers. 2009. Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Agresti, Alan and Barbara Finlay. 2009. Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences. Upper Saddle City, NJ: Pearson.

Alvarez, Alexander. 1997. "Adjusting to Genocide: The Techniques of Neutralization and the Holocaust. Social Science History 21(2): 140-171.

Antonopoulos, Georgios A. and John A. Winterdyk. 2005. "Techniques of Neutralizing the Trafficking of Women". European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice 13(2): 136-147.

Athens, Lonnie H. 1977. "Violent Crime: A Symbolic Interactionist Approach". Symbolic Interaction 1(1): 56-70.

Ball, Richard Allen. 1966. "An Empirical Exploration of Neutralization Theory". Criminology 4(2): 22-32.

Bandura, Albert. 1986. Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Blumer, Herbert and Philip M. Hauser. 1933. Movies, Delinquency, and Crime. New York, NY: MacMillen.

Callanan, Valerie. J. 2012. "Media Consumption, Perceptions of Crime Risk and Fear of Crime: Examining Race/Ethnic Fear Differences". Sociological Perspectives 55(1): 93-115.

Chiricos, Ted, Kathy Padgett, and Marc Gertz. 2000. "Fear, TV News, and the Reality of Crime". Criminology 38(3): 755-781.

Christensen, Tony. 2010. "Presumed Guilty: Constructing Deviance and Deviants Through techniques of Neutralization". Deviant Behavior 31(6):552-577.

157

Cohen, Jeffery W. and Patrick J. Harvey. 2006. "Misconceptions of Gender: Sex, Masculinity, and the Measurement of Crime". The Journal of Men's Studies 14(2): 223-233.

Collins, Rebecca L. 2011. "Content Analysis of Gender Roles in Media: Where are we Now and Where Should We Go?". Sex Roles 64:290-298. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9929-5.

Copelton, Denise A. 2007. "You Are What You Eat: Nutritional Norms, Maternal Deviance, and Neutralization of Women's Prenatal Diets". Deviant Behavior 28(5): 467-494. doi: 10.1080/01639620701252571.

Copes, Heith. 2003. "Societal Attachments, Offending Frequency, and Techniques of Neutralization". Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal 24(2): 101-127.

Corbin, J. and A. Strauss. 2008. Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.

Costello, Barbara J. 2000. "Techniques of Neutralization and Self-Esteem: A Critical Test of Social Control and Neutralization Theory". Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal 21(4): 307-329.

Cromwell, Paul and Quint Thurman. 2003. "The Devil Made me do it: Use of Neutralizations by Shoplifters". Deviant Behavior 24(2): 535-550.

Daly, Kathleen and Meda Chesney-Lind. 1988. "Feminism and Criminology". Justice Quarterly 5(4): 498-527.

Desmarais, Sarah L., Heather L. Price, and J. Don Read. 2008. "Objection Your Honor! Television is Not the Relevant Authority: Crime Drama Portrayals of Eyewitness Issues". Psychology, Crime and Law 14(3): 225-243.

Dowler, Ken, Thomas Fleming, and Stephen L. Muzzatti. 2006. "Constructing Crime: Media, Crime, and Popular Culture". Criminal Justice 48(6): 837-850.

Durkin, Keith F. and Clifton D. Bryant. 1999. "Propagandizing Pederasty: A Thematic Analysis of the online Exculpatory Accounts of Unrepentant Pedophiles". Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal 20(2): 103-127.

Eliason, Stephen L. and Richard Dodder.1999. "Techniques of Neutralization Used by Deer Poachers in the Western United States: A Research Note". Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal 20(3): 233-252.

Eschholz, Sarah, Matthew Mallard, and Stacey Flynn. 2004. "Images of Prime Time Justice: A Content Analysis of 'NYPD Blue' and 'Law and Order'". Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture 10(3): 161-180.

158

Evans, Rhonda D. and Dianne A. Porche. 2005. "The Nature and Frequency of Medicare/Medicaid Fraud and Neutralization Techniques Among Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists". Deviant Behavior 26(3): 253-270.

Forsythe, Craig J. and Rhonda D. Evans. 1998. "Dogmen: The Rationalization of Deviance". Society and Animals 6(3): 203-218. doi:10.1163/156853098X00159.

Gauthier, DeAnn K. 2001. "Professional Lapses: Occupational Deviance and Neutralization Techniques in Veterinary Medical Practice". Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal 22(6): 467-490.

Gilpatric, Katy. 2010. "Violent Female Action Characters in Contemporary American Cinema". Sex Roles 62(11): 734-746. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9757-7.

Green, Gill, Nigel South, and Rose Smith. 2006. " 'They say that you are a Danger but you are not': Representations and Construction of the Moral Self in Narratives of Dangerous Individuals". Deviant Behavior 27(3): 299-328.

Heltsley, Martha and Thomas C. Calhoun. 2003. "The Good Mother: Neutralization Techniques used by Pageant Mothers". Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal 24(2): 81-100. doi: 10.1080/01639620390117202.

Hinduja, Sameer. 2007. "Neutralization Theory and Online Software Piracy: An Empirical Analysis". Ethics and Information Technology 9(3): 187-204.

Hong, Lawrence K. and Robert W. Duff. 1977. "Becoming a Taxi Dancer: The Significance of Neutralization in a Semi-Deviant Occupation". Sociology of Work and Occupations 4(3): 327-342.

Ingram, Jason R. and Sameer Hinduja. 2008. "Neutralizing Music Piracy: An Empirical Examination". Deviant Behavior 29(4): 334-366.

Klenowski, Paul M., Heith Copes, and Christopher Mullins. 2010. "Gender, Identity, and Accounts: How White Collar Offenders Do Gender When Making Sense of Their Crimes". Justice Quarterly 28(1):46-67.

Khoo, Angeline C.E. and Penelope J. Oakes. 2000. "The Variability of the Delinquent Self: Anti-Authority Attitudes and Endorsement of Neutralization techniques among Incarcerated Delinquents in Singapore". Asian Journal of Social Psychology 3(1): 125-132.

Kohm, Steven A., Courtney A Waid-Lindberg, Michael Weinrath, Tara O'Conner Shelley, and Rhonda R. Dobbs. 2012. "The Impact of Media on Fear of Crime among University Students: A Cross National Comparison". Canadian Journal of Crime and Criminal Justice 54(1):67-100.

159

Kort-Butler, Lisa A. and Kelley J. Sittner Hartshorn. 2011. "Watching the Detectives: Crime Programming, Fear of Crime, and Attitudes about the Criminal Justice System". The Sociological Quarterly 52(1): 36-55.

Laub, Sampson. 1993. Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points in Life. Harvard University Press.

LaBeff, Emily E., Robert E. Clark, Valerie J. Haines, and George M. Diekhoff. 1990. "Situational Ethics and College Student Cheating". Sociological Inquiry 60(2): 190-197.

Lauritsen, Janet L. and Karen Heimer. 2008. "The Gender Gap in Violent Victimization, 1973-2004". Journal of Quantitative Criminology 24(2): 125-147.

Lauzen, Martha M. and Douglas M. Deiss Jr. 2009. "Breaking the Fourth Wall and Sex Role Stereotypes: An Examination if the 2006-2007 Prime-Time Season". Sex Roles 60(5):379-386.doi: 10.1007/s11199-0089553-9.

Lavigne, Carlen. 2009. "Death Wore Black Chiffon: Sex and Gender in CSI". Canadian Review of American Studies 39(4): 383-395.

Lee, Moon J., Stacey Hust, and Lingling Zhang. 2011. "Effects of Violence Against Women in Popular Crime Dramas on Viewers' Attitudes Related to Sexual Violence". Mass Communication and Society 14(1): 25-44.

Levi, Ken. 1981. "Becoming a Hitman: Neutralization in a Very Deviant Career". Urban Life 10(1): 47-63.

Li, Jessica C. M. and Joseph Wu. 2012. "Validating an Indigenous Scale Measuring Neutralization Techniques among Chinese Juvenile Thieves". Psychology Reports: Disability and Trauma 111(3): 971-984.

Liddick, Don. 2013. "Techniques of Neutralization and Animal Rights Activists". Deviant Behavior 34(8): 618-634.

Maruna, Shadd and Heith Copes. 2005. "What Have we Learned from Five Decades of Neutralization Research?".Crime and Justice: A Review of Research 32:221-320

Messerschmidt, James. 1993. Masculinities and Crime. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers

McDonald, Daniel G. and Hyeok Kim. 2001. "When I Die, I Feel Small: Electronic Game Characters and the Social Self". Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media 45(2):241-258.

Miller, Jody and Christopher W. Mullins. 2006. "The Status of Feminist Theories in Criminology". Pp. 217-243 in Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory, edited by Francis T. Cullen, John Wright, and Kristie Blevins. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Miller, Monica K. and Alicia Summers. 2007. "Gender Differences in Video Games Characters' Roles, Appearances, and Attire as Portrayed in Video Game Magazines". Sex Roles 57(3): 733-742: doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9307-0.

Minor, W. William. 1981. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Reconceptualization and Empirical Examination". Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 18(2): 295-318.

Minor, W. William. 1984. "Neutralization as a Hardening Process: Consideration in the Modeling of Change". Social Forces 62(4): 995-1019.

Naffin, Ngaire. 1985. "The Masculinity-Femininity Hypothesis". British Journal of Criminology 25(4): 365-380.

Piacentini, Maria G., Andreas Chatzidakis, and Emma N. Banister. 2012. "Making Sense of Drinking: The Role of Techniques of Neutralization and Counter-Neutralization in Negotiating Alcohol Consumption". Sociology of Health and Illness 34(6): 841-857.

Piquero, Nicole Leeper, Stephen G. Tibbetts, and Michael B. Blankenship. 2005. "Examining the Role of Differential Association and Techniques of Neutralization in Explaining Corporate Crime". Deviant Behavior 26(2):159-188.

Rader, Nicole E. 2008. "Gendered Fear Strategies: Intersections of Doing Gender and Fear Management Strategies in Married and Divorced Women's Lives". Sociological Focus 41(1): 34-52.

Rader, Nicole E. and Jeralynn S. Cossman. 2011. "Gender Differences in US College Students' Fear for Others". Sex Roles 64(7): 568-581.

Rader, Nicole E. and Stacy H. Haynes. 2012. "Avoidance, Protective, and Weapons Behaviors: An Examination of Constrained Behaviors and their Impact on Concerns about Crime". Journal of Crime and Justice 37(2): 1-17.

Reid, Lesley Williams, and Miriam Konrad. 2004. "The Gender Gap in Fear: Assessing the Interactive Effects of Gender and Perceived Risk on Fear of Crime". Sociological Spectrum 24(4): 399-425.

Rhineberger-Dunn, Gayle M. and Nicole E. Rader. 2012. "A Typology of Victim Characterization in Fictional Crime Dramas". Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture. 17(1) 231-263.

161

Rhineberger-Dunn, Gayle M., Nicole E. Rader and Williams. 2008. Constructing Juvenile Delinquency through Crime Drama: An Analysis of Law & Order. Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture 15(1):94-116.

Savage, Joanne. 2008. "The Role of Exposure to Media Violence in the Etiology of Violent Behavior: A Criminologist Weighs in". American Behavioral Scientist 51(8): 1123-1136.

Sefiha, Ophir. 2012. "Bike Racing, Neutralization, and the Social Construction of Performance-Enhancing Drug Use". Contemporary Drug Problems 39(2): 213-245.

Shields, Ian W. and Georga C. Whitehall. 1994. "Neutralization and Delinquency among Teenagers". Criminal Justice and Behavior 21(2): 223-235.

Shigihara, Amanda M. 2013. "It's only stealing a Little a Lot: Techniques of Neutralization for Theft among Restaurant Workers". Deviant Behavior 34(6): 494-512.

Shoeberger, Nicole, Alex Heckert, and Druann Heckert. 2012. "Techniques of Neutralization Theory and Positive Deviance". Deviant Behavior 33(10): 774-791.

Simon, Rita J. 1975. Women and Crime. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.

Smith, Douglas A. and Christy A. Visher. 1980. "Sex and Involvement in Deviance/Crime: A quantitative Review of the Empirical Literature". American Sociological Review 45(4): 691-701.

Smith, Stacy L., Katherine M. Pieper, Amy Granados, and Mare Choueiti. 2010. "Assessing Gender-Related Portrayals in Top Grossing G-Rated Films". Sex Roles 62(11): 774-786.

Stadler, William A. and Michael L. Benson. 2012. "Revisiting the Guilty Mind: The Neutralization of White Collar Crime". Criminal Justice Review 37(4):494-511.

Steffensmeier, Darrell and Emilie Allan. 1996. "Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Female Offending". Annual Review of Sociology 22: 459-487.

Steffensmeier, Darrell, Jennifer Schwartz, Hua Zhong, and Jeff Ackerman. 2005. "An Assessment of Recent Trends in Girl's Violence Using Diverse Longitudinal Sources: Is the Gender Gap Closing?". Criminology 43(2):355-397.

Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza.1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency". American Sociological Review 22: 664-670.

Taylor, Laramie D. and Tiffany Setters. 2011. "Watching Aggressive, Attractive, Female Protagonists Shapes Gender Roles for Women among Male and Female Undergraduate Viewers". Sex Roles 65(1-2): 35-46. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-9960-1.

Topalli, Volkan. 2005. "When Being Good is Bad: An Extension of Neutralization Theory". Criminology 43(3): 797-836.

Thompson, William E., Jack L. Harred, and Barabra E. Burks. 2003. "Managing the Stigma of Topless Dancing: A Decade Later". Deviant Behavior 24(6): 557-570.

Turnbull, Sue. 2010. "Crime as Entertainment: The Case of the TV Crime Drama". Media and Cinema Studies 24(6): 819.827.

Vieratis, Lynne M., Nicole Leeper Piquero, Alex R. Piquero, Stephen G. Tibbetts, and Michael Blankenship. 2012. "Do Women and Men Differ in Their Neutralizations of Corporate Crime?". Criminal Justice Review 37(4): 478-493.

Zimmerman, Gregory M. and Steven F. Messner. 2010. "Neighborhood Context and the Gender Gap in Adolescent Violent Crime". American Sociological Review 75(6): 958-980.

APPENDIX A

FICTIONAL CRIME DRAMA PROJECT

164

## I. SHOW INFORMATION

**A. Show name**    CM    WAT    SVU    CSI

**B. Episode name:** _____

      1. Season #/episode #/year: _____

**C. First Coder:** _____

**E. Fit for Inclusion for R1?**    YES    NO


## II. VICTIM INFORMATION

**A. Name:** _____

**B. Offender(s) name(s):** _____

**C. Offense (check all that apply)**

____drug offense                 ___interpersonal violence

____homicide                    ___sexual assault

____stalking                     ___sexual harassment

____other?


**D. Victim Demographics**

1. Gender- M    F

  a. Is gender used to construct the victim as a good person?    YES    NO
     (e.g., she was a good woman).

  b. Is gender used to construct the victim as a bad person?    YES    NO
     (e.g., she was a woman, what do you expect?)

2. Race-  W    B    A    O determined by:

_____

  a. Is race used to construct the victim as a good person (e.g., someone who didn't deserve to be victimized)?    YES    NO

  B. Is race used to construct the victim as a bad person (e.g., someone who deserved their victimization)    YES    NO

3. Ethnicity – H   NH   U/NK determined by: _____

  a. Is ethnicity used to construct the victim as a good person (e.g., someone who didn't deserve to be victimized)?    YES    NO

165

b. Is national origin used to construct the victim as a good person (e.g., someone who didn't deserve to be victimized?                    YES   NO

4. Age (age or category) determined by:_____

   a. Is age referred to as a reason for why they were victimized?(e.g., vulnerable)

                                                      YES   NO

   b. Is age used to construct the victim as a good person (e.g., as someone who did not deserve to be victimized?)                    YES   NO

5. SES-   L   LM   M   MU   Up   U/NK determined

by:_____

6.  Education: <HS   HS   AA   Trade   BA   Grad/JD/MD   UK   Too Young

7. Employment: UE   PT   FT   UK   determined

by:_____

   a. Is employment type criminal (e.g., prostitution, drug dealing, gambler, mobster)

                                                      YES   NO

   b. Is employment type referred to as a reason for why they were victimized?YES    NO

   c. Is employment type used to construct the victim as a good person?    YES    NO

   d. Is employment type used to construct the victim as a bad person?    YES      NO

8. Marital status: M   D   W   S/NM   UK   Too young   determined

by:_____

   a. Is marital status used to construct the victim as a good person?    YES   NO
      (e.g., She was a loving wife)

   b. Is marital status used to construct the victim as a bad person?    YES   NO
      (e.g., She was not a nice wife.  OR—She was too selfish to be married.

9.  Children-  Y   N   UK   Too young    determined

by:_____

a. Is parental status used to construct victim as a good person?    YES   NO
      (e.g., she was a great mom)
b. Is parental status used to construct the victim as a bad person?    YES   NO

c. Is lack of being a parent (e.g., childless, doesn't want kids) used to construct
the victim as a good person?                    YES   NO

166

d. Is lack of being a parent (e.g., childless, doesn't want kids) used to construct the victim as a bad person? YES NO

10. Injury Status – Dead   Injured   Other     determined by:

_____

11. Location of offense – Private    Public   NK determined

by:_____

12.  Relationship between victim/offender

____strangers                                    ___partner/spouse
____family members                          ___friends
____acquaintance                              ___other?

a. Is relationship to offender used to construct this victim as a good person? YES   NO
   (e.g., She's (the victim) my daughter, I'd never hurt her (says the sexually abusive father)

b. Is relationship to offender used to construct this victim as a bad person   YES   NO
   (e.g, He's (the victim) my son, and yes, he is capable of violence.

11. Religious affiliation ever mentioned?                                              YES  NO
    a.  Is religion used to construct the victim as a good person?            YES  NO
    b.  Is non-religious status (including agnostic or atheist) used to
    construct the victim as  a good person?                                          YES  NO
    c. Is religion used to construct the victim as a bad person?             YES  NO
    d. Is non-religious status used to construct the victim as a bad person? YES  NO

 12. Vices
    a. Victim used drugs or was a past drug user?                             YES   NO
        i. Drugs referred to as reason for victimization                      YES   NO
        ii. Being stoned or high is referred to as a reason for victimization
                                                                             YES   NO
        iii. Drug recovery used to refer to victim as a good person   YES   NO
        iv. Drug recovery used to refer to victim as a bad person     YES   NO

    b. Victim is alcoholic or victim referred to as drinking more alcohol than they should
        i. Alcohol referred to as a reason for victimization              YES   NO
        ii. Alcohol recovery used to refer to victim as a good person. YES  NO

167

iii. Alcohol recovery used to refer to victim as a bad person   YES   NO

c. Victim referred to as sexually promiscuous or having many past/current sex partners

|  | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| i. Referred to as a reason for victimization | YES | NO |
| ii. Used to refer to victim as a good person | YES | NO |
| iii. Used to refer to victim as a bad person | YES | NO |
| iv. Previous consensual sex with the accused | YES | NO |
| v. Previously reported a rape or sexual abuse | YES | NO |
| vi. Previously reported a false rape | YES | NO |

| d. Victim referred to as financially unstable | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| i. Gambles excessively | YES | NO |
| ii. Gambling referred to as reason for victimization | YES | NO |
| iii. Risky financial ventures/activities referred to as a reason for victimization |  |  |
|  | YES | NO |

13. Personality traits used to construct victim as a good, credible person   YES   NO
    e.g., sweet, nice, caring, kind (and many other relative adjectives)

14. Personality traits used to construct victim as a bad, not credible person   YES   NO
    e.g, crazy, stubborn, violent, ruthless, aggressive, mean (and many other related adjectives)

15. Victim is referred to as having a psychiatric disturbance or mental illness?

|  | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| i. Referred to as a reason for victimization | YES | NO |
| ii. Used to refer to victim as a good person | YES | NO |
| iii. Used to refer to victim as a bad person | YES | NO |

16. Victim delayed in reporting the incident   YES   NO

17. Victim concealed characteristics of their personality   YES   NO

18. Victim is intellectually impaired   YES   NO

**E. Victim Blame Typology** (circle the category that BEST fits the victim.  See appendix for details)

168

'innocent'
'innocent with character flaws'
'unlikable but not culpable'
'manipulative'

**F. Rape Myth Acceptance** (For the following indicate if anyone discusses the following seven popularly held rape myths.)  List the name of the person and provide the quote of the person who discusses the rape myth.


### III.   OFFENDER  INFORMATION

*1. Primary Offender*

**A.  Name**: _____
**B. Victim(s) name(s):** _____
**C.  Offense (check all that apply)**

____drug offense                                        ___interpersonal violence
___homicide                                              ___sexual assault
___stalking                                              ___sexual harassment
____other?


**D.  Offender Demographics**


1. Gender- M    F

a. Is gender used to construct the offender as a good person?          YES   NO
     (e.g., She was a good woman).

   b. Is gender used to construct the offender as a bad person?          YES   NO
      (e.g., she was a woman, what do you expect?)


2. Race-  W   B   A   O determined by:_____

  a. Is race used to construct the offender as a good person (e.g., someone who couldn't
   have done it
                                                                          YES   NO
  b. Is race used to construct the offender as a bad person (someone who could
   be criminal                                                           YES   NO

3. Ethnicity – H  HN   UK determined by:_____

a. Is ethnicity used to construct the offender as a good person (e.g., someone who couldn't be criminal)?                                                                                 YES   NO

 b. Is national origin used to construct the offender as a bad person (e.g., someone who
 could be criminal?                                                                                                                 YES   NO

4. Age (age or category): determined

by:_____

   a. Is age referred to as a reason for why they offended?(e.g., vulnerable)  YES   NO

   b. Is age used to construct the offender as a good person (e.g., as someone who
      couldn't' have done it?)                                                                                          YES   NO

5. SES-   L   LM   M   MU   Up   UK  determined

by:_____

6.  Education - HS   HS    AA    Trade   BA   Grad/JD/MD    UK determined

by:_____

7. Employment- UE   PT   FT   UK determined

by:_____

   a. Is employment type criminal (e.g., prostitution, drug dealing, gambler, mobster)

                                                                                                                                 YES   NO

   b. Is employment type referred to as a reason for why they offended?       YES   NO

   c. Is employment type used to construct the offender as a good person?      YES   NO

d.  Is employment type used to construct the offender as a bad person?         YES   NO


 8. Marital status- M   D   W   S/NM   UK  determined

by:_____

   a. Is marital status used to construct the offender as a good person?        YES   NO
       (e.g., She was a loving wife)

   b. Is marital status used to construct the offender as a bad person?         YES   NO
       (e.g., She was not a nice wife.  OR—She was too selfish to be married.

9.  Children-  Y   N   UK determined

by:_____

170

a. Is parental status used to construct the offender as a good person?　　YES　NO
(e.g., she was a great mom)

b. Is parental status used to construct the offender as a bad person?　　YES　NO

c. Is lack of being a parent (e.g., childless, doesn't want kids) used to construct the offender as a good person?　　YES　NO

c. Is lack of being a parent (e.g., childless, doesn't want kids) used to construct the offender as a bad person?　　YES　NO

10. Injury Status – Dead　Injured　Other determined

by:_____

11. Location of offense – Private　Public　UK determined

by:_____

12. Relationship between victim/offender

___ strangers　　　　　　　　　　　___partner/spouse
___family members　　　　　　　　　___friends
____acquaintance　　　　　　　　　 ___other?

a. Is relationship to victim used to construct this offender as a good person? YES　NO
　　(e.g., She's (the victim) my daughter, I'd never hurt her (says the sexually abusive
father)

b. Is relationship to victim used to construct this offender as a bad person　YES　　NO
　　(e.g, He's (the victim) my son, and yes, he is capable of violence.

13. Religious affiliation ever mentioned?　　　　　　　　　　　YES　　NO
　　a.　Is religion used to construct the offender as a good person?　　YES　　NO
　　b.　Is non-religious status (including agnostic or atheist) used to
　　construct the offender as a good person?　　　　　　　　　YES　NO
　　c. Is religion used to construct the offender as a bad person?　　　YES　NO
　　d. Is non-religious status used to construct the offender as a bad person?
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　YES　NO

14. Vices
　　a. Offender used drugs or was a past drug user?　　　　　　　YES　NO
　　　　i. Drugs referred to as reason for offending　　　　　　YES　NO
　　　　ii. Being stoned or high is referred to as a reason for offendingYES NO
　　　　iii. Drug recovery used to refer to offender as a good personYES　NO
　　　　iv. Drug recovery used to refer to offender as a bad person　YES　NO

171

b. Offender alcoholic or referred to as drinking more alcohol than they should

                                                                               YES   NO

      i. Alcohol referred to as a reason for offending/drunk during offense

                                                                                YES   NO

      ii. Alcohol recovery used to refer to the offender as a good person.

                                                                                YES   NO

      iii. Alcohol recovery used to refer to the offender as a bad person

                                                                                YES   NO

c. Offender referred to as sexually promiscuous or having many past/current sex partners

                                                                                YES   NO

| | |
|---|---|
| i. Referred to as a reason for offending | YES  NO |
| ii. Used to refer to offender as a good person | YES  NO |
| iii. Used to refer to offender as a bad person | YES  NO |
| iv. Previous consensual sex with the victim | YES  NO |
| v. Previously reported a rape or sexual abuse | YES  NO |
| vi. Previously reported a false rape | YES  NO |

| | |
|---|---|
| d. Offender referred to as financially unstable | YES  NO |
| i. Gambles excessively | YES  NO |
| ii. Gambling referred to as reason for offending | YES  NO |

      iii. Risky financial ventures/activities referred to as a reason for offending

                                                                                YES   NO

15. Personality traits used to construct offender as a good, credible person YES   NO
     e.g., sweet, nice, caring, kind (and many other relative adjectives)

16. Personality traits used to construct offender as a bad, not credible person
     e.g, crazy, stubborn, violent, ruthless, aggressive, mean(and many other related adjectives)                                YES   NO

17. Offender is referred to as having a psychiatric disturbance or mental illness?

                                                                                YES   NO

| | |
|---|---|
| i. Referred to as a reason for offending | YES  NO |
| ii. Used to refer to offender as a good person | YES  NO |
| iii. Used to refer to offender as a bad person | YES  NO |

| | |
|---|---|
| 18. Offender concealed characteristics of their personality | YES  NO |
| 19. Offender is intellectually impaired | YES  NO |

**E. Offender Typology** (circle the category that BEST fits the offender. See appendix for details)

'sympathetic'

' unlikeable'

'manipulative'

' predators'

**F. Legal**

___Not evident from episode        ___Acquitted

___Community Corrections       ___Probation

___Medical Treatment         ___Prison

___Jail                       ____Other


## IV: CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

1. Name: _____

A. Job title: _____

B. Gender- M     F

C. Race-  W   B   A   O determined by: _____

D. Hispanic? YES NO UK determined by: _____

E. Age (Or category):_____   determined by:_____

F. Any discussion of Romantic partner?                  YES   NO

G. Any discussion of their children?                    YES   NO

H. Any discussion of education level?                  YES   NO

I. Is intellectualism of character discussed? (e.g., does character cite/discuss poetry,

quotes, literary works, academic sources?)         YES   NO

Crime Facts?                                   YES   NO

Social Facts?                                YES   NO

J.Is character praised for work related performance?     YES   NO

    If yes, by whom(check all that apply)

    ___superior                  ___fellow peer professional

    ___community member      ___family member

    ___other?_____

K. Is character criticized/reprimanded for work related performance?   YES   NO

If yes, by whom(check all that apply)

___superior                     ___fellow peer professional

___community member       ___family member

___other?_____

APPENDIX B

DISSERTATION CODEBOOK

175

**Research Questions**

R1: How are techniques of neutralization used to excuse and justify male and female offenders' behaviors in fictional crime dramas?

R2: Does the utilization of each technique differ between male and female offenders?

R3: Does the utilization of each technique differ among male and female offenders?

R4: How do elements of doing gender play a role in the gendered nature of male and female usage of the techniques of neutralization?

## *I. SHOW INFORMATION*

**A. Show name**      CM    WAT    SVU    CSI

**B. Episode name:** _____

      1. Season #/episode #/year: _____

## *II. OFFENDER INFORMATION*

### *1. Primary Offender*

**A. Name**: _____

**B. Victim(s) name(s):** _____

**C. Offense (check all that apply)**

____drug offense                                     ___interpersonal violence

___homicide                                           ___sexual assault

___stalking                                             ___sexual harassment

____other?

**D. Offender Demographics**

1. Gender- M    F

a. Is gender used to construct the offender as a good person?          YES    NO
    (e.g., She was a good woman).

  b. Is gender used to construct the offender as a bad person?          YES    NO
    (e.g., she was a woman, what do you expect?)

2. Race- W   B   A   O determined by:_____

3. Ethnicity – H  HN   UK determined by:_____

4. Age (age or category): determined by:_____

5. SES- L   LM   M   MU   Up   UK determined by:_____

6. Education - HS   HS   AA   Trade   BA   Grad/JD/MD   UK determined by:____

7. Employment- UE   PT   FT   UK determined by:_____

176

8. Marital status- M   D   W   S/NM   UK   determined by:_____

   a. Is marital status used to construct the offender as a good person?   YES   NO
      (e.g., She was a loving wife)
   b. Is marital status used to construct the offender as a bad person?   YES   NO
      (e.g., She was not a nice wife.  OR—She was too selfish to be married.

9.  Children-  Y   N   UK determined by:_____

a. Is parental status used to construct the offender as a good person?   YES   NO
(e.g., she was a great mom)

b. Is parental status used to construct the offender as a bad person?   YES   NO

c. Is lack of being a parent (e.g., childless, doesn't want kids) used to construct the
offender as a good person?   YES   NO

c. Is lack of being a parent (e.g., childless, doesn't want kids) used to construct the
offender as a bad person?

                            YES   NO

10. Injury Status – Dead   Injured   Other determined by:_____

11. Location of offense – Private    Public   UK determined by:_____

12.  Relationship between victim/offender

___ strangers                  ___partner/spouse
___family members        ___friends
____acquaintance        ___other?

a. Is relationship to victim used to construct this offender as a good person?YES   NO
      (e.g., She's (the victim) my daughter, I'd never hurt her (says the sexually abusive
      father)

b. Is relationship to victim used to construct this offender as a bad person   YES NO
      (e.g, He's (the victim) my son, and yes, he is capable of violence).

13. Religious affiliation ever mentioned?                YES   NO

14. Vices
   a. Offender used drugs or was a past drug user?          YES   NO
   b. Offender alcoholic or referred to as drinking more alcohol than they should
                          YES   NO
   c. Offender referred to as sexually promiscuous or having many past/current sex
partners
                          YES   NO
        i. Referred to as a reason for offending      YES   NO
        ii. Used to refer to offender as a good person     YES   NO
        iii. Used to refer to offender as a bad person     YES   NO

|  | iv. Previous consensual sex with the victim | YES | NO |
|  | v. Previously reported a rape or sexual abuse | YES | NO |
|  | vi. Previously reported a false rape | YES | NO |

d. Offender referred to as financially unstable  YES  NO

15. Personality traits used to construct offender as a good, credible person  YES  NO
     e.g., sweet, nice, caring, kind (and many other relative adjectives)

16. Personality traits used to construct offender as a bad, not credible person  YES  NO
     e.g, crazy, stubborn, violent, ruthless, aggressive, mean(and many other related adjectives)

17. Offender is referred to as having a psychiatric disturbance or mental illness?
                                                                     YES  NO

18. Offender concealed characteristics of their personality  YES  NO

19. Offender is intellectually impaired  YES  NO

**E. Offender Typology** (circle the category that BEST fits the offender)
1. sympathetic: Offenders portrayed as relatable or with extenuating circumstances for their crime
2. unlikeable: offenders portrayed as having major personality flaws or other unlikeable characteristics
3. manipulative: offenders portrayed as manipulating their victims or the criminal justice professional in the episode
4. predators: offenders portrayed as committing particularly vicious crimes, often with multiple victims and usually sexual in nature

**F. Legal Consequences**

| | |
|---|---|
| ___Not evident from episode | ___Acquitted |
| ___Community Corrections | ___Probation |
| ___Medical Treatment | ___Prison |
| ___Jail | _____Other |

### III. TECHNIQUES OF NEUTRALIZATION

**If one of the following techniques is utilized to defend or justify the behavior of the offender, indicate which technique is used, by whom, and explain why it is included as well as the relevant quote.**

**Definitions:**

1. Denial of responsibility:  The offender did not have control of the circumstances that pushed them into crime commission (billiard ball effect).

2. Denial of injury:  It is discussed or viewed that no harm was caused by the offenders' action.

3. Denial of the victim:  It is claimed that the person affected by the act deserved what they got or that there was no victim present for the act.

4. Condemnation of condemners:  If it is claimed that it is not fair to pass judgment on the offender because those that judge the act may be guilty of similar actions themselves.

5. Appeal to higher loyalties:  If someone identifies the offender as acting for some greater good or benefitting some group or person they hold in higher importance than the law.


1. Offenders name:_____

2. Offense:_____

2. Technique(s) used:_____

    a. By whom:_____


3. Relevant quote:_____


4. Anything else that is important to discuss concerning the use of Techniques of Neutralization by this offender?


[Repeat for all offenders in episode]


### *IV. DOING GENDER*

1.  Offender's name:_____

2.  Does the offender act in a way that is appropriate for their gender?     YES     NO

      a.  What are the behaviors:_____

      b.  Do other character's comment on these behaviors by the offender?

                                                                                  YES   NO

      c.  Is the offender held accountable *by other* characters for this gendered

      behavior?                                                                   YES   NO

      d.  Does the offender hold themselves accountable for this gendered behavior?

                                                                                  YES   NO

      e.  Are there any situational factors worth mentioning for the way that doing

      gender is accomplished?

      f. Enter relevant quotes:


3.  Does the offender act in a way that would be deemed inappropriate for their gender?

                                                                                  YES   NO

      a.  What are the behaviors:_____

      b.  Do other character's comment on these behaviors by the offender?

                                                                                  YES   NO

      c.  Is the offender held accountable *by other* characters for this gendered

      behavior?                                                                   YES   NO

      d.  Does the offender hold themselves accountable for this gendered behavior?

                                                                                  YES   NO

      e.  Are there any situational factors worth mentioning for the way that doing

      gender is accomplished?

      f.  Enter relevant quotes:

4. Any visual elements about the offender that are worth noting regarding doing gender?

[Repeat for all offenders in the episode]