

March 1, 2010

**Choice or Chance?
Gender, Victimization, and Responsibility in *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation***

Katherine Foss, Middle Tennessee State University

In nine seasons of the television program *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*, five out of the six original Crime Scene Investigators become crime victims themselves. Nick Stokes is kidnapped and buried alive. Catherine Willows is drugged, abducted, and left naked in a motel. A street gang assaults Greg Sanders after he interrupts their beating up a tourist. The “miniature killer” abducts Sara Sidle and pins her under a car in the desert. And finally, CSI Warrick Brown is murdered in a dark alley by a corrupt police officer.

When CSIs become victims, the Las Vegas police force focuses all of its efforts on solving the crime, except in the abduction of Catherine, which goes unreported. In season eight, Catherine accepts a drink from an unknown patron at a local bar. A few scenes later, she wakes up naked and alone in a discount motel. Instead of calling the police, Catherine processes her body for physical evidence and calls Sara Sidle for assistance. Sara asks Catherine why she contaminated the evidence, making it “inadmissible” in court. Catherine replies, “I didn’t want an official investigation. I just want to know what happened.” By knowingly covering up her crime, Catherine’s actions suggest that she feels embarrassed and ashamed. The connection between Catherine’s initial actions (accepting a drink from a stranger) to her desire to cover up the crime, particularly when the other CSIs themselves had reported their victimizations in other situations, suggests that she believes she should have protected herself from becoming victimized.

At a young age, women are taught never to accept drinks from strangers, along with a host of other crime-prevention “rules,” including being aware of one’s surroundings, dressing

March 1, 2010

appropriately, avoiding certain neighborhoods and carrying pepper spray and other protection (Gordon & Riger, 1989). With these instructions, a woman is socialized to believe that it is her responsibility to amend her behavior for her own protection (Gordon & Riger, 1989). While some crime prevention for both men and women is necessary, this construction of a woman as a potential victim is problematic. It creates a false sense of control and belief that with proper crime prevention, a woman should be able to avoid becoming a victim. Under this misguided belief, it can be assumed that those who are victimized must have ignored proper precautions and are therefore somewhat responsible for the crime (Karmen, 1990; Weedon, 1997). In the fictional case of Catherine Willows, then, her violation of basic safety rules suggests that she could have prevented her victimization and, therefore, she is at least somewhat responsible for the attack.

The notion that victims contribute to their victimization, deemed shared responsibility, dates back to the 1940s when Hans Von Hentig (1948) asserted that certain types of people are naturally more vulnerable to victimization, such as children, senior citizens, women, the mentally ill, immigrants, and the “heartbroken” (p. 348). Since then, scholars have shifted their focus from inherent traits to lifestyles and behaviors that make certain types of victims more responsible than others for becoming victims (Hindelang, Gottfredson & Garofalo, 1978). Building on this idea, Andrew Karmen (1990) created four classifications of victim responsibility: repeated victims, victim facilitation, victim precipitation, and the innocent victim. Repeated victims routinely place themselves in risky situations. With victim facilitation, people are partially responsible for their attacks because they “unknowingly, carelessly, negligently, foolishly, and unwillingly make it easier for the criminal to commit the crime” (Karmen, 1990, p.110). Thirdly, with victim precipitation, the victim incites the action leading to the crime

March 1, 2010

(Karmen, 1990). Finally, the fourth type of responsibility is the completely innocent victim, referring to “crime-conscious people who tried not to be victimized” (Karmen, 1990, p.115).

As Karmen’s classifications suggest, the extent to which victims are considered responsible for their attacks has varied historically, based on the type of crime and behavior of the victim. In particular, rape victims have been tragically considered more likely to have contributed to their crimes than victims of other crimes. In *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape* (1975), Susan Brownmiller argued that the perpetuation of rape myths, such as ‘she was asking for it,’ have been used to condition women to adopt a “victim mentality” (p. 311). Although feminist scholars and criminologists have theoretically agreed that attributing responsibility to a victim of sexual assault is faulty, rape myths continue to be perpetuated in real-life victimizations. For example, in a 1989 rape case, a Florida jury found the defendant “not guilty” because, the jurors argued, the victim had “asked for it” as indicated by her provocative clothing (Baer, 1991). Since these myths primarily affect female victims harmed by male perpetrators, the perpetuation of these myths in public discourse exemplifies and reinforces a patriarchal system, implicating the female victim in the crime itself (Baron & Strauss, 1989). In other words, the implications of a crime (or representation of crime) extend beyond a crime’s effect on an individual victim, reflecting and socially constructing notions about victimization and gender. As demonstrated by the Florida rape case, the extent to which a victim is believed to have shared responsibility in his or her victimization has significant ramifications—often affecting the initial police arrest, a trial (if there is one) and its outcome, as well as financial restitution and emotional support for the victim (Karmen, 1990).

Media representations significantly influence the extent to which individual victims are believed to be responsible for their attacks, in addition to the types of victims perceived to have

March 1, 2010

contributed to their victimizations. For example, research on news media and victimization has shown that news framing can impact the degree to which victimization is viewed as an injustice (Ettema & Glasser, 1988). With visual media, aesthetics such as camera angles can encourage or detract sympathy for the victim (Cavender & Bond-Maupin, 1993). As first noted by Gerbner and colleagues (1976), cultivation theory suggests that media representations can have significant effects on the viewing audience. Building on Gerbner's research, Nabi and Sullivan (2001) identified a correlation between television viewing and viewers' intentions to protect themselves against crime.

The extent to which victims are framed or depicted as responsible for their crimes in media can have a critical impact on the public's perception of the crime. In cases of sexual assault, news framing can impact the extent to which people believe that a crime has occurred. For example, Franiuk and colleagues (2008) found that people who read news stories about the Kobe Bryant case, which perpetuated rape myths, were less likely to believe that his actions were criminal. Because media often perpetuate rape myths, a cultivation effect has been noted between heavy viewership and beliefs that rape is not a crime. Kahlor and Morrison (2007) found that college women who were heavy television viewers were more likely to believe that many rape accusations were false.

Research on representations of crime highlights the importance of media in framing victimizations. For example, James Ettema and Theodore Glasser (1988) found that news frames can impact the degree to which victimization is viewed as an injustice. Likewise, Gray Cavender and Lisa Bond-Maupin (1993) concluded that visual aesthetics in television programs are used to encourage sympathy for a victim. While it is evident that media constructions of victimization are significant, few studies have explored fictional representations of victimization

March 1, 2010

on television, especially in regard to gender and shared responsibility. Considering the popularity of crime dramas, which center on victimization, this is a needed area of study.

The current research examines constructions of victimization in the crime drama *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*. Specifically, this study explores how men and women are constructed as victims and the implications of these constructions. It is assumed that representations of victimization in *CSI* help to shape and influence social perceptions of victimization and, therefore, can reinforce or challenge rape myths and other faulty beliefs about victim responsibility.

Method

This research explored the extent to which “shared responsibility” is constructed in crime drama, examining whether a gender disparity exists. The following questions guided the research:

1. Which types of shared responsibility are perpetuated in the fictional victimizations in *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*?
2. Is a gender disparity apparent between notions of shared responsibility for male and for female victims? If so, what are the differences? How are these differences connected to patriarchal views of gender, power, and victim-blame?

To answer these questions, this study examined seasons one through eight of the crime drama, *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation (CSI)*. This television program was selected because it continually offers depictions of victimization, has been immensely popular, and has had tremendous social impact. For example, lawyers have noted the “CSI effect”—the connection between *CSI*'s popularity and juries' increased demand for forensic evidence (Makin, 2004). The popularity of *CSI* has also led to additional funding for crime laboratories. After *CSI*'s Gil

March 1, 2010

Grissom testified in support of crime scene investigation, the Senate passed the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act, providing \$482 million of federal funding for crime laboratories (McMurray, 2001; Orndorff, 2001).

The program *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation* was also selected for its unique visual and narrative style. Contrary to the linear story of a typical crime drama, *CSI* episodes include flashbacks,¹ shots from the point of view of inanimate objects, called “CSI shots,”² and other tools to construct the victimization. In most episodes of *CSI*, the victim dies before the opening credits. For the remainder of the episode, the Crime Scene Investigators (CSIs) try to decipher how the victim died—illustrated through flashbacks (or speculation by the CSIs) of the victim’s life and the victimization, supported by forensic evidence. This unique style enables the audience to view the victim prior to the victimization, providing a glimpse into the victim’s lifestyle. By linking a victim’s lifestyle with his/her victimization, this program implies that certain lifestyles or behaviors may put a person more at risk for victimization. The “CSI flashbacks” reinforce an implication of responsibility, since they are usually from the point of view of the program’s authority figures, the CSIs.

This research examined only “anonymous” victims of violent crime, in which the victim had no prior relationship with his/her criminal. Victims of suicide, accidental death, disease, and cases of homicide in which the victims had prior relationships with their assailants were not considered. Crimes with mass anonymous victims, in which many people die, were excluded.

To explore how male and female victims were depicted in *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*, a textual analysis was conducted on all episodes of seasons one through eight of this program, focusing on verbal and visual cues that conveyed information about victimization. For this form of textual analysis, meanings of the text are not considered to be fixed or inherent

March 1, 2010

but are influenced by prominent societal ideas and values (Larsen, 1991). In other words, the representations of victimizations in *CSI* reflect, reinforce, and perpetuate perceptions about victimization discourse in American society. According to Larsen, (1991) then, familiarity with the cultural context should minimize subjective misinterpretations.

To conduct the study, all episodes of *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation* were initially examined. For each episode, the sex and “reason” given for the victimization were noted. From this pool, all episodes that included one or more “anonymous” victims (victims who had no prior relationship with their assailants) were further analyzed. This analysis focused on first identifying information about the victim, the assailant, and the victimization. Using verbal and visual cues in the text, the following questions guided this detailed analysis: What characteristics were given about the victim? Was the victim male or female? Did the victim live alone or with roommates? What was the victim’s occupation? What other information is provided about the victim? What does the program convey about the assailant (i.e., sex, race, lifestyle)? Where did the victimization occur (i.e., in a parking lot, in the victim’s bedroom, etc.)? What was the cause of death, according to the CSIs or coroner? Was the victim sexually assaulted, according to the CSIs or coroner? Why did the victimization take place, according to the assailant and/or the CSIs’ speculation? What other information is conveyed about the victimization?

For example, the episode “The Strip Strangler” begins with a woman sitting up in bed. The shot cuts to a dark figure at the end of the bed holding a power cord. As the CSIs investigate her murder, their dialogue provides information about the victim: she lived alone and the killer entered through her unlocked window. The coroner tells the CSIs that the woman had been sexually assaulted and tortured in other ways prior to her death from strangulation. When CSI

March 1, 2010

Gil Grissom confronts the suspected assailant at the end of the episode, the killer explains that his victims were “asking for it” by being sexually provocative, stating that women “work out because they want us to look at them and then they parade around and you just want to say, ‘Hello.’” He goes on to describe how they ignore his advances so he has to punish them. This episode conveys information about the victim (a woman in her 30s who lives alone) and her lack of safety awareness (she left her windows unlocked) and suggests that the assailant attacked her because of her behavior (appearing sexually attractive in public but ignoring him).

After all of the relevant episodes were analyzed for the above questions, the findings were then examined, using existing research on rape myths to guide the discussion. For example, “The Strip Strangler” concluded that the woman became a victim because of her interaction with the killer at the gym and her failure to lock her windows. Based on Karmen’s classifications of victimization (1990) and identified myths about victim responsibility and rape, such as victims might “ask for it” by dressing provocatively, analysis of “The Strip Strangler” suggested that this episode conveys the message that the female victim somewhat facilitated her attack by failing to lock her windows and behaving a certain way in public. And, because of these steps, she becomes a victim and is not only killed but punished prior to her death. Overall, this finding may be problematic in that it reinforces rape myths and, when compared with the analysis of male victimizations, indicates a disparity based on the victim’s sex.

Findings

One hundred and eighty-two episodes were examined for representations of anonymous victims. Findings indicate that women are victimized more frequently than men. Only one man is victimized per episode while an episode often contains multiple women who become victims. Women are also more likely to be murdered by a serial killer. In the eight seasons studied, only

March 1, 2010

one serial killer kills men—a storyline that was stretched over three episodes.³ At least seven serial killers murder women. In addition to the quantity of female victims, only women are sexually assaulted, which occurs in nearly all of the female victimizations, often with multiple victims for each case.

Overall, this research determined that *CSI* constructs anonymous men as “completely innocent” of their victimization. On the contrary, women often played a role in their attacks by making themselves vulnerable and susceptible to victimization.

Male victimization: a random crime

Discourse about the murder of anonymous men suggests that male victims are not responsible for their attacks. This program repeatedly suggested that men became victims of random crimes and, therefore, could not have prevented their attacks. Often a man appeared in a public space where, by chance, a murderer selected him for victimization. For example, in the episode “Justice is served,” a giant dog mauls and kills a male jogger. After the man dies, a woman removes his organs and eats them. The storyline in this episode implies that the man’s actions did not make him susceptible to victimization even though he was jogging alone at night. The absence of a *CSI* flashback demonstrates that the circumstances surrounding the man’s death were irrelevant to the crime. This episode does not focus on the victimization but on the abnormal behavior of the murderer. Throughout this show, the *CSIs* ponder what the killer did with the organs she harvested from the jogger. She eventually explains that she eats them to protect herself from a degenerative condition. A *CSI* flashback illustrates the progression of her disorder without treatment, showing the woman’s skin peel off her face. This emphasis on the killer, not the victim, implies that his death was in some ways an accident and, therefore, he cannot be held responsible for jogging alone in the park at night.

March 1, 2010

The episode “Grissom Versus the Volcano” also paints a man’s murder as merely coincidental with his actions. Shortly after a man rents a car it explodes, killing him instantly. The CSIs determine that the car bomb was intended for the previous car renter. Because the bomb maker miscalculated the timing of the rental, the bomb went off later than expected, killing the wrong man. Since this episode offers no justification for the victim’s death relating to the victim, it implies that this man died because he was in the wrong place at the wrong time.

In the episode “Toe Tags,” a marine is murdered in front of his family at a gas station in broad daylight. As the CSIs review the gas station surveillance tape, they comment on the how illogical the crime appears. Video specialist Archie says, “Why did he stab him? It’s not like he put up a fight.” CSI Nick Stokes replies, “And why does he pick the biggest guy at the station?” Archie agrees, stating, “You’d think that guy in the back would be an easier target.” The belief that this victim could not have predicted his attack is later confirmed when Nick informs the marine’s widow that the crime was random and, therefore, it could not have been prevented.

Men also become victims for other reasons beyond their control. Over three episodes - “The Pilot,” “Anonymous,” and “Identity Crisis” - a serial killer selects male victims by their birthdays and murders them as catharsis for his troubled youth. Throughout the course of their investigation, the CSIs determine that serial killer Paul Millander kills men and then stages their suicides in order to reflect his father’s death. Other than the role they play in Millander’s presentation, the victims themselves are not conveyed as important. In the three episodes with this serial killer, the CSIs never question whether the victim contributed to his own death. Even in “Identity Crisis,” in which a man picks up a hitchhiker (the killer) on a dark deserted road, neither the police nor the CSIs discuss the danger of this practice or that this action led to the man’s death (although clearly it did). Instead, this storyline unravels Millander’s motive for

March 1, 2010

murder (he is an intersexed judge who witnessed his father's murder). The storyline's focus on the serial killer, combined with the assailant's victim-selection process, implies that the men are not responsible for becoming victims, even when they put themselves in danger.

As exemplified by the physically fit Marine, these men were strong, masculine, heterosexual, Caucasian, and young. This limited representation of the "innocent man" suggests that only one demographic can be considered "innocent" of responsibility in victimizations. Depictions of male victims who did not fit this type (i.e., gay men, obese men, men of color) all included a justification for the victimization (i.e., the gay man's ex-lover murdered him), often suggesting that it was these "deviant" or "abnormal" traits that led to the victimization.

The overly masculine male victim and the absence of male sexual-assault representations ignore other types of male victims and crimes against men. This limited depiction could discourage male victims in real life from reporting their attacks or from pressing charges, especially in cases of rape or sexual assault. Research by Sable and colleagues (2006), for example, indicated that shame or embarrassment about the crime, including perceptions that reporting a male sexual assault may make a victim appear "gay," is one of the most significant barriers preventing men from reporting sexual assault. Therefore, the absence of this representation could contribute to the perception that male sexual assault is not a crime or is an emasculating act that should bring shame to the victim.

The vulnerable female victim

CSI: Crime Scene Investigation often portrayed female victims as responsible for their crimes, using justifications that have historically been used to rationalize crimes against women. Women who became victims were alone and often dressed provocatively at the time of the attacks.

March 1, 2010

Storylines repeatedly suggested that women became victims because they violated basic rules of crime prevention by not being aware of their surroundings or acting carelessly about security. For example, the episode “Too Tough to Die” begins with a woman walking alone in a parking ramp at night. As she places her key into the car door, a masked man appears behind her and sticks his gun into her side. In the next scene, the woman is found on the side of a road. A close-up shows her unconscious, lying in the dirt, with her shirt off and her bra exposed. The juxtaposition of these scenes suggests causality between the woman’s actions and her assault, especially since she is unaware of the man until he attacks her. The storyline conveys that she walked alone in the parking lot and was then raped and shot, ultimately suffering irreparable brain damage. Similarly, in “The Execution of Catherine Willows” and “What’s Eating Gilbert Grissom?” serial killers attack female college students who walk alone at night across campus. The CSI flashbacks show the assailants hiding in the shadows, waiting for their female prey to stroll by alone. The lone women are overtaken, sexually assaulted, murdered, and then discarded in trash bags. Similarly, a vulnerable lone woman becomes a victim in the episode “Empty Eyes.” In this episode, a man follows an unsuspecting woman home from a bar and then proceeds to rape and murder her and her roommates. These storylines suggest that had the women followed preventative measures, such as not walking alone at night, they would not have become victims. Therefore, the female victims are suggested to be at least somewhat responsible for the crimes.

Women in *CSI* also become victims because they fail to secure their homes. In the episodes “The Strip Strangler” and “One Hit Wonder,” the CSIs deduce that serial rapists and murders only attacked women who had left their windows unlocked. Other women became victims after they permitted strangers to enter their homes. In “Invisible Evidence,” a woman

March 1, 2010

opens her door to a man upon the promise of a discounted car wash. He then forces his way into her apartment and brutally rapes and murders her. And, in “I Like to Watch,” a man poses as a firefighter who drugs and assaults any woman who opens her door to him.

These repeated depictions of lone women becoming victims reinforce a common crime prevention/rape myth—that women who walk unescorted put themselves at risk. Thus, these portrayals perpetuate the patriarchal notion that women should not enter the public sphere without male accompaniment so as to prevent themselves from becoming victims (Woodhull, 1988). Furthermore, since many of the women are attacked at home, these representations suggest that women may not be capable of protecting themselves in the private sphere as well. The episode “Empty Eyes,” in which a man is able to subdue, sexually assault and murder six women, implies that even with female roommates, a woman cannot consider herself safe.

For many of the female victimizations, the storylines suggested that the women brought the attacks upon themselves by dressing and behaving in such a way that encouraged rape. The assailants themselves often used the victims’ behavior and dress as motive for their crimes.

In “The Strip Strangler,” for example, the serial killer explains how he believes women invite sexual advances made toward them, stating the women “work out because they want us to look at them and then they parade around and you just want to say ‘hello.’” Since he thinks the women “ask” for his affection through their body language, the serial killer becomes enraged when women reject him. As punishment for turning him down, he invades their homes and brutally murders them. The serial killer’s explanation of the actions preceding the murders suggests it is the women who cause their own demise by “asking” for attention and then dismissing affection when it is given.

March 1, 2010

The murderer in “Invisible Evidence” also uses the victim’s sexuality as justification for her rape, stating that the victim “answers the door in this sexy, little thing and stuff. Most of the time when a woman answers the door, it’s in sweats. . . This was not like that. I mean, what am I supposed to think?” The killer argues that the victim’s clothing was an indication of her desires to be intimate with him, thus justifying her rape. The CSI flashback stresses the victim’s sexuality. As the victim answers the door, she has long blond hair and is wearing a small lacy dress. She smiles sweetly. It is at this point that he forces the door open and rapes her. The visual imagery of these events suggests that her displayed sexuality “invited” the killer’s advances, resulting in her death. The CSIs clearly do not agree with these justifications. And yet, since the storylines convey that the assailants chose the victims based on their sexual appeal (reinforced by the visual images), these episodes suggest that being sexually provocative may increase a woman’s likelihood of becoming a victim.

By connecting the victims’ dress and behavior to their being “chosen” as victims, these storylines, powerfully reinforced by the visual representations of what the assailants perceived, perpetuate the most commonly used rape myth: that women “ask for it.” As Brownmiller argued, these myths condition women to be victims even prior to a victimization and make crimes against women not appear to be crimes (1976). Furthermore, the suggestion that a woman should watch how she dresses or behaves creates false agency for women, implicates those who become victims, and excuses the behavior of men who “just couldn’t help themselves.”

The brutality of the crimes against women in *CSI* visually emphasizes the consequences of the female victim’s poor choices. For example, in “The Strip Strangler (described briefly in the method section),” the assailant forces his female victims to consume a chemical restraint.

March 1, 2010

Then he beats them and rapes them with a foreign object. Following these events, the killer strangles the women into unconsciousness, revives them, and repeats the process. In “Invisible Evidence,” after her assailant sexually assaults her, the female victim watches as the killer walks towards her with a butcher knife. In “After the Show,” a man forces a woman to pose naked for him, beats her, rapes her with the shaft of his gun, and then suffocates her. The serial killer in “The Execution of Catherine Willows” and “What’s Eating Gilbert Grissom?” binds the victim’s hands and rapes her with a foreign object (e.g., a beer bottle) before strangling the victim and disposing of the body in a trash bag. During the episode “Compulsion,” a female victim is sexually assaulted and stabbed. A CSI flashback shows the victim’s body slashed not once but numerous times all over her naked torso. The brutality of these crimes reinforces the idea that these actions were justified since these women are clearly murdered for a reason other than mere coincidence. Furthermore, by showing parts of the brutal rape and murder occurring, these representations may also desensitize viewers to violent acts against women, promoting the acceptance of rape myths (Kahlor & Morrison, 2007).

Conclusion

Overall, depictions of victimizations in *CSI* are troublesome for both men and women. Most male victims were classified as “completely innocent” whereas female victims were suggested to be “facilitators” in their victimization. The absence of male sexual assault representations may discourage real-life male victims from coming forward. For women, the repeated connection between behavior and victimization suggests that nearly all women are responsible for becoming victims, which becomes especially problematic in that nearly all of the victims are raped. These depictions reinforce a “culture of fear” for women, suggesting that they

March 1, 2010

must modify their behavior to avoid victimization, shifting the focus away from criminal deviance to the victim responsibility (Gordon & Riger, 1989).

No male victims and very few female victims resisted their assailants. For men, the lack of resistance reinforced the randomness of the crime, indicating that they did not have time to prepare themselves for the attack. For the few women who attempted to resist becoming victims, as indicated by abrasions or contusions on the victim's body or the assailant's skin cells under the victim's fingernails, their attempts were futile (since the marks of resistance were noticed by the coroner). In some instances, a victim's resistance even leads to an escalation of the crime itself. In the episode, "Bloodlines," a woman escapes from her rapist by kicking him and fleeing the scene. She reports the crime and the CSI team investigates. In the meantime, the rapist tracks the woman down and murders her, suggesting that not only was her resistance ineffective but also may in fact have incited more violence against her. In the cases in which victim resistance possibly caused the crime to escalate to more brutal violence, these storylines supported myths of victim responsibility due to precipitation, thus discouraging potential victims from fighting back (Mencham, 1967).

If certain crimes are believed to be justified because the victim did not match the type of the "innocent victim," acted carelessly, dressed provocatively, or resisted the attack, victims of these crimes may receive less or no support from the general public. In some cases, as suggested by CSI Catherine Willow's attack, some victims may not report the crime for fear that others may believe that they "asked for it" and, therefore, no crime has occurred.

This study supports the myth that women are more vulnerable than men, reinforcing patriarchal hegemony. The prevalence of male killers and female victims, and scarcity of female killers and male victims, also supports this unequal power distribution. At the same time, the

March 1, 2010

absence of other types of “innocent” male victims suggests inequality between the “right type of victim” and other groups. Considering the popularity of *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation* and its spin-offs, these representations of victimization are alarming and likely encourage perceptions of shared responsibility between certain types of victims, especially female victims of sexual assault, and their assailants.

References

- Baer, J.A. (1991). *Women in American law: The struggle toward equality from the New Deal to the present*. Holmes & Meier: New York.
- Baron, L. & Straus, M. (1989). *Four theories of rape in American society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Brownmiller, S. (1976). *Against our will: Men, women and rape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bruckheimer, J. (Producer). (2000). *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*. [Television series]. Jerry Bruckheimer Television.
- Cavender, G. & Bond-Maupin, L. (1993). Fear and loathing on reality television: An analysis of *America's Most Wanted* and *Unsolved Mysteries*. *Sociological Inquiry*, 63(3), 20-30.
- Ettema, J. & Glasser, T. (1988). Narrative form and moral force: The realization of innocence and guilt through investigative journalism. *Journal of Communication*, 38 (Summer), 8-26.
- Franiuk, R., Seefeldt, J., Cephress, S. & Vandello, J. (2008). Prevalence and effects of rape myths in print journalism. *Violence Against Women*, 14(3), 287-309.
- Gerbner, G. & Gross L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communications*, 26, 173-99.
- Gordon, M. & Riger, S. (1989). *The female fear*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Karmen, A. (1990). *Crime victims: An introduction to victimology*. (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

March 1, 2010

- Larsen, P. (1991). Textual analysis of fictional media content. *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research*. ed. Jensen, K.B. & Jankowski, N.W. London: Routledge, 121-134.
- Makin, K. (2004). The reliance on science as a cure for injustice. *Globe and Mail Justice Reporter*. Available at: http://www.injusticebusters.com/04/CSI_Effect.shtml [Accessed 2009, January 15].
- McMurray, J. (2001). Lawmakers trying to persuade Bush to renew funding for crime labs. *The Associated Press State & Local Wire*, May 15.
- Nabi, R. & Sullivan, J. (2001). Does television viewing relate to engagement in protective action against crime? A cultivation analysis from a theory of reasoned action perspective. *Communication Research*, 28(6), 802-824.
- Orndorff, M. (2001). Crime lab advocates press for more funds. *Birmingham News*, May 16.
- Sable, M., Danis, F., Mauzy, D., & Gallagher. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(3), pp. 157-162.
- Sumser, J. (1996). *Morality and social order in television crime drama*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Von Hentig, H. (1948). *The criminal and his victim: Studies in the sociobiology of crime*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Weedon, C. (1993). *Feminist practice and Poststructuralist theory*. (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

¹ A CSI flashback is when the killer's confession or a CSI's speculation is depicted through a flashback.

² These unique shots, called CSI shots, allow the viewer to see what the naked eye cannot, such as a bullet tearing through an esophageal wall.

³ One serial killer in the fifth season episode, "What's Eating Gilbert Grissom?" attacks a male teenager because he believed the victim was a woman. The killer emphasizes his error in murdering the male victim stating, "I'm not into boys."