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Abstract

The amount of bias in news stories covering the preliminary hearings of the O.J. Simpson trial is measured by analyzing articles printed in the New York Times and the Independent Record and applying the Hayakawa-Lowry system of content categories for determining bias. The results indicate that the New York Times is slightly more likely to be perceived as fair in their coverage of the Simpson event than the Independent Record. The results also point towards a greater chance of perceived bias when Associated Press articles are compared with NYT originals.
Preface

This honors thesis is the culmination of two and one-half years of research and writing. I originally brought the idea for this honors thesis to the late William Huber, in the waning weeks of my Junior year at Carroll College. Those early discussions helped narrow the focus for this research in the direction of critiquing media coverage of news and expanding the parameters of mass media research. Mr. Huber and I had no premonition that a spectacle on as grand a scale as the O.J. Simpson trial would fall into my lap just a few weeks later. At last, I had my topic area decided.

Perhaps the most discouraging and challenging difficulty I faced in completing this project was the untimely and deeply saddening passing of my original thesis director, Mr. William Huber in the fall of my Senior year at Carroll College. Fortunately, Dr. Charlotte Jones, at that time as new to Carroll as I was, agreed to oversee my thesis research. Together, Dr. Jones and I struggled through many an afternoon hammering out my findings into the current form. In the process, I have seen my ideas take shape and have been forced to question many of the notions I had about the impact of the media in our lives. I feel that this research has helped me utilize many of the raw skills I have honed at Carroll College in the field of Communication and is truly an accumulation and demonstration of the skills I will need to pursue my chosen career.
News on the wire: Exploring and evaluating the content of newspaper coverage of the O.J. Simpson case.

In the early morning hours of June 14, 1994 the Los Angeles Police Department discovered Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman dead outside Nicole Simpson's suburban home. In the next 24 hours, the event initially received scant attention from print media, mentioned briefly in news reports perhaps solely due to the fact that Nicole Brown Simpson was the ex-wife of football hall-of-famer turned movie actor O.J. Simpson. This cursory attention would explode three days later on the afternoon of June 17, 1994 as audiences sat transfixed in front of their televisions as O.J. Simpson took what one television commentator labeled a "historic ride" down L.A.'s freeways, fleeing the police as the primary murder suspect in a brutal killing. The media spectacle surrounding the O.J. Simpson case had begun and would continue on a daily basis - in almost every conceivable media venue - until the verdict of the trial was announced over 16 months later.

This study will critique and analyze the role that one form of mass media played in the Simpson case, at both a national and local level. Specifically, two newspapers - one local, one national - will be examined in order to determine if the media coverage presented within the two newspapers was objective or biased. Realizing that many local newspapers reprint articles from wire services and large circulation newspapers, this study will seek to compare coverage found in these two publications to discover possible discrepancies in regards to the amount of objective or biased reporting that occurred in each. Comparing these two levels will help to reveal differences that occur in the telling and retelling of the news stories (Roeh, 1989). To examine and compare these two levels of newspaper coverage, we will utilize the Hayakawa-Lowry (1985) method of determining bias (explained further below).
We will begin first by describing the nature of mass media messages in terms of their narrative qualities. Narrative qualities include the concept of newsworthiness which will be explored to display the underlying dynamics in the relationship between journalist and reader. Second, the concept of newsworthiness will be applied to the O.J. Simpson case in order to fully illustrate the narrative qualities of this particular case. Third, definitions of terms such as bias, objectivity, fairness and balance are offered. Fourth, previous research findings that have sought to critique mass media messages in a similar fashion to this study will be reviewed. Fifth, the methods utilized in this research will be presented. Sixth, the results of the analyses are explained. Finally, the conclusions of this project are discussed in terms the level of bias that occurred in news reports about the O.J. Simpson event.

Literature Review

Stories as Narratives. Theorists point out that the narrative format of communication helps to explain the entirety of human communication (Fisher, 1984). According to Fisher (1984):

The narrative paradigm insists that human communication should be viewed as historical as well as situational, as stories competing with other stories constituted by good reasons, as being rational when they satisfy the demands of narrative probability and narrative fidelity... The narrative paradigm does not deny reason and rationality; it reconstitutes them, making them amenable to all forms of human communication (p. 2).

Humans naturally use stories and storytelling to express themselves, incorporating context and background into their messages. The process of communication in our daily lives is not isolated to simply moments of interaction that occur and then forgotten. Our lives are a continual process of compounding and adding information and new experience. Mass media messages are no exception (Fisher, 1984). Roeh and Ashley (1986) extended
the narrative perspective into the realm of journalism. They claimed that all news is a form of storytelling:

The wide range of activities in the domain of news media should be viewed as storytelling; and the wide variety of print and electronic journalism output should be viewed as tales or stories. Let us emphasize: It is not any particular journalistic practice nor any specific format of journalism to which we refer. It is journalism as a whole (p.157).

This does not imply however that news stories are not related to social reality (Roeh, 1987; Roeh & Ashley, 1986) and are simply stories that are excusable from standards of objectivity. These standards, fundamental in the field of professional journalism, are also subsumed by the narrative paradigm. As Fisher (1984) stated: "some stories are better than others, more coherent, more 'true' to the way people and the world are - in fact and value" (p. 10).

In agreement with Roeh and Ashley (1986), Smith (1992) claimed that news stories are dialectical narratives, meaning that journalists, or storytellers in this case, are "absolutely prohibited from purposefully fabricating the stories they tell" (p. 340) because they have a responsibility to record accurate narratives of what occurs. Many theorists point out that though it is stated practice by journalists to achieve objectivity in their news reports, the notion of objectivity is in itself an idealistic notion at best (Fisher, 1984; Roeh, 1987; Roeh & Ashley, 1986; Tuchman, 1977). They assert that part of the basic human endeavor is to create meaningfulness, and it always involves some evaluation and interpretation on the part of the person construction the news story (Fisher, 1984; Roeh & Ashley, 1986). This implies that though objectivity remains the primary goal of a journalist when crafting a news story, inferences and judgments will unwittingly crop up. These inferences and judgments should not in themselves relegate the entire story to being a biased account unless pervasive. The dividing line between objectivity and bias lies within our cultural standards of what is objective and what is biased. According to theorists, journalists must
be careful to limit their own assumptions and views in a news story or risk being considered biased by the broader public (Lowry, 1985; Smith, 1992).¹

Journalistic stories follow the narrative pattern that is present in all human communication and become part of the dialogue that occurs in society (Smith, 1992).

In each case the argument is straightforward: news organizations do not offer random accounts of events they report, but stylized interpretations that follow standardized narrative patterns (Smith, 1992, p. 339).

In essence, there is an implied relationship between journalist (sender) and reader (receiver) that is outlined by the narrative paradigm that theorists like Fisher (1984) claimed should become the theoretical basis for examining mass communication. Most importantly this relationship gives insight into how exactly bias is determined by the broader public. The disseminator of information, in this case the print journalist, depends upon social structures and norms to guide what stories will be reported and what information is relevant (Shoemaker, Chang, & Brendlinger, 1987; Smith, 1992).

It is important to note that the narrative paradigm implies that the audience carries a responsibility for a perceived breach of objectivity that may occur in a story. It could be said that the journalist is simply providing a "story" that the broader public "wants" to read (Shoemaker et. al., 1987). This demand, actual or perceived by the journalist, creates an interesting paradox. On the one hand there may be an actual demand within a culture for "tabloid news," while on the other, there may be an equal concern for objective and accurate coverage. The journalist must balance between the two cultural desires.²

What Messages Are Sent? Recognizing and Defining Newsworthiness. Once the journalist determines what subjects interest potential readers, she or he will then seek to

¹ The term "broader public" will from here forth be used to describe the general populace or the particular audience that reads the news story or participates (listens and/or responds) in the ensuing dialogue about the news story with one or more persons (Smith, 1992).
² The responsibility for biased reporting may not rest solely on the journalists shoulders. Obviously, standards for what is biased and what is objective fluctuate and deviate within different communities, eras, etc. What is considered biased by one group or individual, may not be suspected as so by another.
involve them in the story by providing as much relevant information (i.e., what the
journalist feels will be of most interest to the reader) as will fit in the designated space that
is to be devoted to the article. For example, journalists seek to answer the "Five W's and
One H" (who, what, where, when, why, and how) when reporting news stories
(MacDougal, 1992). Many articles elaborate on the details that are deemed interesting
enough to draw readers past headlines (MacDougal, 1992). Editors select stories based on
the assumption that readers will find the stories interesting (Shoemaker et al., 1987). The
newspaper organization will also select stories based on the degree to which they are
deemed "newsworthy" by the organization (MacDougal, 1992; Shoemaker et. al., 1987).

The concept of "newsworthiness" is an essential component in the narrative process of
mass communication (Shoemaker et. al. 1987). Understanding what specific factors create
newsworthiness is an important step in examining the narrative aspects of mass
communication. This understanding provides insight into the relationship between the
journalist and the reader and implies a responsibility by both parties in constructing a
specified narrative (Fisher, 1987). The reader of course represents the broader public and
helps to establish the guidelines for what determines a newsworthy story by responding to
particular stories over others. The journalist, on the other hand, must interpret and respond
to what she or he feels the broader public demands (MacDougal, 1992).

To date, Shoemaker et. al. (1987) have provided the most comprehensive compilation
of research that specifically discussed the concept of newsworthiness. They discussed
deviance as an important factor in determining the newsworthiness of a subject. Deviance
applies either to an event or an individual that is aberrant from social norms and normally
involves (a) novelty (i.e., how often a particular type of story or event occurs), (b) conflict
(i.e., competition between groups), (c) sensationalism (i.e., usually referring to violence
and crime) and (d) prominence (i.e., the social status of the actors involved) (Shoemaker et
al., 1987).
Shoemaker et al. (1987) also discovered two more building blocks that determine newsworthiness: social significance and timeliness. Social significance refers to the level of interest that is perceived to exist in the broader public. Timeliness refers to the proximity of an event, that is, whether or not the event occurred at a time when the broader public perceived it as interesting. Each of the above concepts - deviance, social significance and timeliness - can be applied to the Simpson case.

The Simpson Case as a Narrative. The Simpson case meets the criteria for deviance from a journalistic perspective. First, the element of novelty is created due to the "made for TV atmosphere" that surrounds the Simpson case: a high profile celebrity is involved in a double murder and a state-wide manhunt ends up in rush hour traffic on a major interstate. Second, competition is created in the natural drama of the courtroom setting- a setting that pits one group against another, though the two groups in question are certainly well recognized players. In one corner stands a well-known celebrity, in another a police force barely recovered from intense criticism over previous riots due to the Rodney King beatings. Third, sensationalism surrounds these proceedings. This is due to the nature of the crime, a brutal murder, and due to the involvement of a relatively well-known celebrity. Fourth, Simpson's status as a celebrity has helped construct the deviance factor of prominence.

But the Simpson case is a narrative that is far reaching in newsworthiness beyond simply the deviant factors of Simpson's status and perceived popularity by journalist and reader alike. Other factors include social significance. Though undocumented in this research, an interesting aside is the increase in the number of news reports since the Simpson case occurred pertaining to related social issues such as domestic violence and racism. This increase was noted during this research in the two newspapers examined. Many of the articles ran adjacent to stories on the O.J. Simpson preliminary hearings. Most stories on domestic violence approached the subject in broad social terms, while many of the stories related to racial relations mentioned...
as a platform to launch discussion on the social problem of domestic violence and racism. Obviously, some journalists felt that the Simpson case brought to light the problems of domestic violence and racism and the dire consequences that ensue if the problem is not solved.

Though not a vital factor in light of the strong support for the deviance paradigm, timeliness of this narrative is also demonstrated in the social realm. Certainly, the possibility of yet another high-profile celebrity trial in the wake of the Menendez, Kennedy-Smith, and Bobbit trials was appealing to journalists, especially when one considers Simpson's status before the trial even began. It would also be safe to assume that the Simpson case made other events timely. Certainly, the Simpson case has made issues of crime and violence against womyn timely, perhaps explaining the increase in publication of stories that dealt with this issue.

The Simpson case is certainly compatible with the factors of deviance, social significance, and timeliness, conditions set down by Shoemaker et al. (1987) for determining newsworthiness. Thus, it is logical to assume that journalists involved in constructing news articles for this event considered the Simpson case to be newsworthy. Journalists felt that their audiences would be receptive to the information presented.

The next step, after determining that a news story is newsworthy, is to examine how the story was presented. As stated before, the journalist is often compelled to present a story in ways that will be interest readers. The task then is to discover how the Simpson case was handled and ascribe characteristics to the type of reporting that occurred.

Precidence in Determining and Defining Bias and Objectivity. In order to make assumptions on the amount of biased-versus-objective reporting that occurred in stories and

the previous Rodney King incident in which a black motorist was videotaped on an L.A. expressway being beaten by white police officers. This issue may have indeed grown beyond the limits of the proceedings.
newspaper articles surrounding the Simpson case and to adequately provide a definition for bias and objectivity, some standard for evaluating and measuring what is biased and what is objective must be established. Two sub-components of objectivity, balance and fairness, must also be defined. Clarification of the distinctions and dynamics that exist between these four terms must be explained before proceeding with establishing working definitions.

The narrative framework is useful because it establishes a criteria of responsibility for the journalist to create quality reports that reflect the true nature of the event being covered. The narrative framework justifies adherence to the principle of objectivity beyond professional journalistic ethics (Roeh, 1987). Though the narrative paradigm offers no clear-cut distinction between the two terms "bias" and "objectivity," it does uphold that journalists refrain from inserting their own inferences or judgments in news stories (Smith, 1992). Note that in this study the term "bias" will be diametrically opposed to the term "objectivity." Each incident of bias in a news story is in itself to be considered an "un-objective" reference (Fico, Lacy & Simon, 1992; Smith, 1992). This polarized relationship is essential because it is incorporates the recognized perception that exists within the broader public that some news is "biased" and some "objective" (Lowry, 1986).

Balance and fairness are characteristics of objective reporting. It is possible to determine to what extent objectivity occurs in a news story by measuring the balance and fairness of the news story (Fico et. al., 1992). Each term will be used operationally to indicate, for example, the amount of reporting devoted to both sides of controversy or other distinctions that may appear in the news story. These two terms will serve only as descriptors in determining objectivity. They will not be considered separate concepts, but rather, building blocks upon which evaluation of objective or biased news reporting may be determined.

But why should journalists be fair and balanced in their presentation of news stories? In a news story that is unbalanced towards one side of a controversy, for example, the risk for
the writers opinions bleeding through increases (Fico, Lacy, & Simon, 1991; Hayakawa, 1979; Sopher, 1986). If a journalist were to deviate too far from objective reporting (i.e., the upholding of fairness and balance) as a guiding standard in crafting the news story by inserting her or his own judgments, then this would generally be considered a biased or "slanted" account (Hayakawa, 1979; Smith, 1992). With this criteria established in relation to the broader public's perception of the ideal standard of news reporting, it is now possible to define (a) bias and (b) objectivity in order to further understanding of how they will be applied in this research.

Few studies have attempted to describe the nature of biased reporting by comparing two newspapers. Sopher's (1986) study that outlined four characteristics of bias in two newspapers in London is an exception. Sopher divided his analyses into four categories. The first, information-content was divided into two sub-categories called overt comment and covert comment. Overt comments were described as objective statements, while covert comments (judgments or evaluative statements) were based upon a consistent policy of selection. Sopher critiqued the organization of information-content in both newspapers, and claimed that the order in which the information or quotations from sources appeared could be a subtle form of bias. Next, Sopher examined the lexis-- the author's own created material. He focused on the use of thematic words, metaphor, and the titles that appeared above the news stories. He then claimed that the use of metaphor indicated bias and color in journalism and criticized one of the newspapers in his study for creating what he called trite headlines. The final category utilized in Sopher's study was graphology- or spatial arrangement. The assumption here is that bias could be represented symbolically by the amount of space devoted to a particular viewpoint. The study indicated that bias can occur on many levels and coincides with the narrative paradigm's adherence to the notion that
authors of news stories must strive to limit their own inferences and judgments or risk being considered unobjective.5

These conceptualizations of bias and objectivity demonstrate the importance of balance and fairness. It is apparent now, that by definition, objectivity is established if journalists are perceived as balanced and fair in their reports. Bias, on the other hand, is established by the perception that there is an absence of balance and fairness.

But very little research has focused solely on balance and fairness and the role each plays specifically in constructing objectivity. In the most prominent and comprehensive study, Fico, Lacy, and Simon (1991) attempted to measure balance and fairness in the prestige press (i.e., The New York Times, Wall Street Journal, etc.). They defined fairness as both sides of a controversy successfully contacted in a news story or an explicit statement that one side could not be contacted. A breach of fairness would be only one side of the controversy presented with no explanation as to why (Fico et al., 1991). For example, if a news story presents a defendant criticizing police action and then provides no counter-criticism or explanation as to why the other side is not being represented in the news story then the story would be considered unfair.

Fico et al. (1991) then defined balance as the number of words presented in the story for both sides.

Balance was determined by comparing the number of words given the two sides of a controversy. A words per-inch formula that accounted for variations in type size, type density and column widths was developed to assure consistent and accurate measurement of story lengths. The most

5 It should be noted that the concept of objectivity has undergone some changes since its original application to journalistic ethics in the 1920s (Streckfuss, 1990). Richard Streckfuss (1990) provides a comprehensive historical evaluation of the term that traces its inception and development since the 1920's. Streckfuss (1990) explained that the term objectivity was originally used to describe a "methodology needed to preserve democracy" (p. 974). In the early part of this century many newspapers were affiliated with political parties. It was imperative, for example, for a paper to present their political view, because balance would be achieved by the "slanted" reports of their competitors. However, with the merging of newspapers in many cities "editors had to find a substitute for the partisan approach to journalism. The objective approach provided such and alternative" (p. 975). Objectivity, then, has taken on a new face in modern times. Today it is a "practical posture of day-to-day production" that implies that journalists strive to avoid bias by presenting both sides of a news story, while keeping "themselves and their opinions out of their stories." (Streckfuss, 1990, p.983).
prominent entities on each side and any identified supporting sources in each story were identified. The number of word from those entities quoted, paraphrased or cited from documents were counted (p. 429).

The researchers worked from the assumption that in order to achieve balance and fairness equal "time," or in this case, space, should be devoted to each side of a controversy. The reader must have available both perspectives in a controversial issue, or explanations that one side refused to defend, explain, or respond to the situation being discussed. The authors concluded that "defamation is most likely to appear when the story is measurably imbalanced or unfair" (1991, p.434). They pointed out that stories that do uphold fairness and balance are "written in ways that reduce risk while providing more information" (p. 434). This supports the notion that journalists should provide accurate accounts and should they fair to do so the perception that the news story is "slanted" or biased is more likely (Lowry, 1986).

Providing an "unbiased" account is a potentially difficult task when one considers that each member of the broader public has a different conception of what bias is. Hayakawa (1949) stated: "By the process of selection and abstraction imposed on us by our own interests and background, experience comes to all of us (including newspaper editors) already 'slanted'" (p.50). This statement implies that bias, by definition, is a relative concept. It is still possible, however, to measure with validity the likelihood that bias will be perceived by the broader public for a particular story (Hayakawa, 1949; Lowry, 1985; 1986; 1987).

But how have the distinctions between bias and objectivity been utilized in previous research? Many studies have examined these concepts and sought to employ a variety of methods for critiquing and analyzing information content. We will now examine the findings of previous research that has explored the concepts of bias and objectivity.

**Previous Studies.** Many studies have demonstrated that mass media messages significantly effect the broader public's perceptions and often help to craft the narratives
society discusses (Roeh, 1987; Roeh & Ashley, 1986). Knowing that mass media messages have an important impact on society, theorists have attempted to measure these impacts using several different methods (i.e., semiotics, media performance assessment, content analyses, etc.). Additionally, previous studies have used various techniques to analyze mass media messages that surround "spectacular" events. In recent studies the focus has been on messages generated during elections in the United States (Bennett, 1992; Gurevitch & Kavoori, 1992; King & Petress, 1990; Lowry, 1985; 1987; Seigelman, 1992; Swanson, 1992; Zarefsky, 1992). However, many other "spectacular" events are reported in the media beyond the political realm. One such event that has received attention is the O.J. Simpson murder trial. In light of the enormous amount of research that has been devoted to evaluating the news media it is surprising that there is very little research that has sought to critique the performance of media reporting of non-political events such as the O.J. Simpson murder trial.

Recent research has examined bias in news coverage of various types, and has provided precedence towards understanding the levels of bias versus objectivity in mass media. As mentioned earlier, Sopher (1986) critiqued two newspapers in London, the Daily Mail (a British popular press paper) and The Daily Telegraph (a British middle class paper), and examined the differences in the coverage each presented, paying particular attention to the occurrence of bias in each based on the four levels of textual meaning described earlier. Sopher's study is significant in that it is one of the few to look for differences in style and presentation of stories between two competing newspapers- a middle class newspaper and a popular press newspaper. Sopher found that popular press publications are more biased than middle class newspapers. He concluded that the middle class newspaper was "simply informing its readers what took place" (p. 253), while the popular press paper was actually "telling [its readers] what to think" by being a "mixed dish of news and views" (p. 253). Sopher extended his analyses by claiming that the popular press paper was designed to attract one particular group while the middle class paper was designed to attract another,
respectively. He claimed that the popular press newspaper had a higher level of biased content because it was geared towards attracting an audience that would respond positively to this type of reporting. The results of Sopher's study imply that different types of newspapers present different slants on news based on the audience that the particular newspaper is aimed at attracting.

In another study that compared newspapers, Fico, Lacy, and Simon (1991), examined high circulation newspapers and prestige newspapers in the United States, measuring balance and fairness specifically, to determine differences in the levels of objectivity present in both genres. They concluded that prestige newspapers (i.e., The New York Times, Washington Post, etc.) had less instances of bias, on average, than large scale circulation newspapers (i.e., New York Post, Chicago Sun Times, etc.) for a one-week period for all types of stories.

Another study by Fico, Lacy, and Simon (1988) analyzed coverage of controversial events in more than 21 nationally recognized newspapers. Balance and fairness were measured in order to determine a national average for objective journalism surrounding reports of conflict. Of particular value is their finding that almost 47 percent of all law enforcement stories "included unqualified defamation [that] had no contact with one side of the controversy" (p. 434) and provided no explanation as to why. The research also pointed out that "extended study of how crimes are handled by newspapers as they move through the judicial system would help to understand the nature of these findings" (p.434).

This research project attempts to do just this.

One study has examined a case that resembles the O.J. Simpson case. From a feminist perspective, Meyers (1994) analyzed two local newspapers in Atlanta, Georgia and their coverage of a local business person's brutal murder of his wife outside their home and his subsequent suicide. Meyers (1994) sharply criticized the local press for painting the victim of the murder, in this case the wife, as somehow at fault for the actions of her assailant. The assailant on the other hand, criticized Meyers, was portrayed as "out of control" and
“driven” to his crime (p. 54). This type of reporting, contended Meyers, only serves to reinforce those attitudes in society that perpetuate instances like the one described. Meyers (1994) concluded that "the news, by and large, supports the status quo by primarily representing the interests of the ruling elite" (p. 48). Meyers (1994) claimed that coverage of instances like the one in Georgia is often slanted and full of judgment statements (perhaps unwittingly due to ignorance in regards to social inequalities that exist) that uphold destructive notions that paint the victims (womyn, primarily) as somehow primarily at fault. The critique offered by Meyers (1994) is valuable to this particular research in that it calls attention to the fact that a framework of evaluating media content must be comprehensive and valid in any social instance. Careful attention and consideration must be given to statements that may seem objective from one social perception and quite biased from another.

Employing content analyses for the purpose of critiquing long-term narratives presented by media venues, in particular newspaper coverage, is not unprecedented. Dunmire (1992) critiqued the news coverage that surrounded the Gulf War in The New York Times and The Washington Post. The researcher analyzed the content of articles concerning the leader of Iraq’s (Sadaam Hussein) intentions in the Middle East and concluded that the media did not utilize "the power of language to construct events in such a way that they read, not as constructions but rather as [accurate] reflections of the world" (Dunmire, 1992, p.9). Dunmire provided samples of inferential statements that she defined as misleading due to the fact that they consistently alluded to the actions of Iraq as being similar to historic brutalities and aggressions employed by the Nazis in World War II. Dunmire claimed that often the media will cross the threshold of providing accurate reflections of the world through the use of rhetorical devices such as metaphor, and analogies (i.e., inference statements and judgment statements). Like Meyers (1994), Dunmire (1992) called attention to social perceptions that can cloud the standards of objectivity.
These studies clarify how bias and objectivity have been evaluated in news media and how differences may exist between individual newspapers and their levels of objective reporting. Also, the particular type of event that is being reported plays a role in determining what type of reporting is likely to occur. In most cases reporting that is not balanced between presenting two sides of a controversial issue is considered un-objective. The use of metaphor and analogy is also often suspect when critiquing for bias. Finally, the researcher who attempts to critique the level of objectivity in a particular news story must be aware of social structures that lead to judgments that may disguise themselves as statements of fact.

With the above assertions in place it is now possible to employ empirical analysis with the understanding that the results should not only test for bias in the news stories themselves, but also reflect on our cultural standards for what is considered an accurate construction of a news narrative. A method of evaluating content that reflects and upholds our cultural opinions of what is balanced or unbalanced, fair or unfair, objective or biased is needed (Holsti, 1969; Lowry, 1986).

Lowry (1986) promoted the Hayakawa-Lowry content analyses system as having not only good face value but construct validity. The content categories he derived are a "system of content categories that measures bias in a way that agrees with the perceptions of bias of a broader public" (Lowry, 1986, p. 576). Lowry (1986) formulated three major categories of sentence types derived from Hayakawa's (1979) writings: (a) reports, (b) inferences, and (c) judgments. This method of analyzing content will be utilized due to its reported construct validity (elaborated on in the methods section of this research).

In addition, though the above studies provide valuable insight into the nature of coverage that has occurred with other controversial events, none have addressed the Simpson case in particular. Nor have they attempted to measure the levels of bias that may have occurred at both a national and a local level. Research into this particular area of mass communication is limited at best by focusing on either strictly local contexts or nationwide
contexts by dealing solely with the representation of political ideologies in the news. There
has been little research into the small town usage of language and sentence types to
construct descriptions of national events similar to the Simpson case, perhaps due to its
uniqueness. Further there has been little comparison between the type of coverage and
level of bias that may occur within a national report compared to a small-scale local report.
This leads us to the following research question.

Research Question

RQ: Does there exist a significant difference between local and national
newspapers and their levels of objectivity and bias when reporting the same
story?

Is it possible that differences in the level of bias that occurs in a news story will be
apparent when local articles are compared to nationally printed articles? If so, what is the
amount of differentiation that exists between the two types of newspaper publications?

Methods

Scope. In order to evaluate objectivity and bias in newspaper coverage, this study will
examine a related series of reports surrounding the O.J. Simpson case in two newspapers.
More specifically, this study will compare articles that appeared in a prestigious, nationally
circulated newspaper with those appearing in a small, locally circulated newspaper. This
type of comparison will allow a critique of the performance of media at different levels and demonstrate differences that may exist in the type of reporting that occurred surrounding this event.

Over the course of 16 months, the tale of Simpson was told and retold, the trial examined and re-examined by all forms of mass media, as the broader public speculated on the unfolding events and questioned the guilt or innocence of an American sports hero. This study will not attempt to cover the entire 16 plus months of O.J. Simpson's legal defense. Rather, it will focus on the period between the time the murder of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman was announced to the end of the preliminary hearings; a time when the American mass media was more than willing to replace daytime programming with what "the public needs, and wants to know about" (CNN). This study examines 71 articles found in all editions, including Sunday, of the Independent Record (32 articles), a daily newspaper available primarily in Helena, Montana and The New York Times (39 articles), a prestigious, nationally circulated, daily newspaper. The period for the articles ranged from June 14, 1994 through July 10, 1994, the first day after the preliminary hearings.

The time frame is limited in order to provide greater control of variables that occur within this continuing narrative. By examining the events from the time of the murder of to the end of the preliminary hearings in which it was decided that O.J. Simpson would stand trial this research can focus on a more limited set of details.6

None of the articles found in the Independent Record about the events were written by the staff of the Independent Record but were selected, reprinted, and edited with permission from the Associated Press wire service or with permission from a nationally

---

6 However, this should not imply that this study could not be applied to a larger time frame or utilized on the macro-level of mass media. The research conducted in this study could help construct a framework for similar studies on a much larger scale. Forming a comprehensive national critique on this subject is possible, but many more variables would need to be considered. This research is intended to be the first cog in a much larger body of research.
circulated newspaper like The New York Times. The New York Times had a mixture of articles, many with staff and/or correspondents reporting (see Appendix D and E).

**Hayakawa-Lowry System of Content Categories.** As mentioned previously, this study uses the Hayakawa-Lowry (1985, 1986, 1987) system of content categories to analyze objectivity and bias. This system evaluates objectivity and bias by dividing sentences into three basic types. According to Hayakawa (1979) there are three basic sentence types that can be used for communication: (a) report sentences, (b) inference sentences, and (c) judgment sentences. Reports are considered the most characteristic of objective reporting, while inferences are deemed less so because they often include assumptions by the journalist. Judgments, when not balanced in a report or made solely by the journalist are often considered by the broader public to be biased statements (Lowry, 1986).

Report sentences are defined by Hayakawa (1979) as being capable of verification and free of inference or judgment. Lowry (1987) clarified this definition further:

> Report sentences are those which state verifiable information—information that is out in the open and observable in some manner, not things that are matters of personal opinion or inside somebody's head (p. 12).

An inference is a statement about the unknown made on the basis of the known (Hayakawa, 1979). An inference has the characteristics of a sentence that relies on personal or subjective opinions, conclusions, beliefs and feelings (Lowry, 1987). Inference sentences imply, interpret, generalize, and evaluate as well as attempt to describe what people think or feel; they attempt to uncover motive (Lowry, 1987).  

---

7 For example, the statement, "Jack cried because Jill left him stranded," is considered an inference because all we know for sure is that Jack cried. We are making an assumption that Jack is crying over Jill.
Judgments are defined as statements of approval or disapproval of events, people or objects described by the statement, usually containing some distinction between good/bad and like/dislike (Lowry, 1987).8

Lowry (1985) expanded these three major categories into a nine segment system of content analyses.9 The content categories are as follows:

1. Report sentence/attributed
2. Report sentence/unattributed
3. Inference sentence/labeled
4. Inference sentence/unlabeled
5. Judgment sentence/attributed/favorable
6. Judgment sentence/attributed/unfavorable
7. Judgment sentence/unattributed/favorable
8. Judgment sentence/unattributed/unfavorable
9. All other sentences

A report sentence/attributed is indicative of where the journalist obtained the information. The attributed/unattributed distinction draws a line between sentences that state information based on the reporters own authority (unattributed) and sentences that clearly indicate whether or not the information was obtained from someone else (attributed).

Inference sentences/labeled and inference sentences/unlabeled refer to sentences in which the journalist is not stating a verifiable fact. Labeled inferences are considered by

---

8 For example, the statement, "Jack is a perpetually sad and miserable person," is considered a judgment because we are assigning a value to Jack's actions. Jack may cry constantly and never smile, but we can not know for sure that he is sad and miserable.

9 Lowry's categories assign a value to sentence types indicating which are most likely to be perceived as objective and which are least likely. Report sentence/attributed is the first category because it is considered most objective. Judgment sentence/unattributed/unfavorable is listed in the eighth spot since it is most likely to be perceived as biased. The exception is category nine, which seems to be a dumping ground for miscellaneous sentences that can not be placed in a particular category.
Lowry (1985, 1986, 1987) to contain tip-off statements such as "It appears to me" or "apparently," "seemingly," "sounds," "looks," etc. Journalists will use these tip-off words to alert the reader that what is being stated is inferential, and it is assumed that labeled inferences that contain these tip-off words will be perceived as less biased than unlabeled inferences that do not (Lowry, 1985, 1987).

The four categories of judgment sentences follow much the same pattern of definition, however a few key distinctions are notable. The terms favorable and unfavorable apply to the direction in which the judgments are made. An important distinction between judgment/attributed and judgment/unattributed sentences must be made for the purpose of coding. If a statement is made by the journalist that meets the criteria for a judgment sentence then it must be considered editorializing. If someone else's judgments are presented, then it is considered part of the "news function" and thus it is to be labeled as an attributed judgment (Lowry, 1985).

In his critique of the 1984 presidential campaign, Lowry subdivided the judgment categories (5 through 8) into further sub-categories that indicated who the judgments were made about (i.e., Reagan, Mondale, Bush or Ferraro). This study will extend the four judgment categories in similar fashion. The three sub-categories that will indicate whom the judgments are made about will be: (a) O.J. Simpson and the Defense Team, (b) L.A.P.D. and members of the Prosecution, and (c) the court system, witnesses and the members of the jury. Thus we will have eighteen categories beyond the original nine (27 in all).

All other sentences, the final category, will be used for those sentences in which the coders cannot accurately describe as fitting any of the above categories, or those sentences that are misprinted or unreadable. However, it should be noted that if a sentence is "mixed" (containing both a report and inferential statement, report and judgment, etc.) it will be coded in the lowest ranked category on the Hayakawa-Lowry scale. Lowry (1985) explained the rule for handling mixed sentences which will be adhered to in this analyses:
(1) If a sentence contains both statements of fact and inference, it will be coded as an inference sentence.
(2) If a sentence contains both statements of facts and judgment, it will be coded as a judgment sentence.
(3) If a sentence contains both an inference and a judgment, or all three, it will be coded as a judgment sentence. (p. 574).

In establishing the construct validity of this system of content analyses, Lowry worked from three basic assumptions. First, report sentences are assumed to be perceived as less biased than inference sentences. Concurrently, inference sentences are assumed to be less biased than judgment sentences. Additionally, if a statement was attributed it was assumed that a reporter was on "safer" ground and less likely to be perceived as biased than if unattributed; likewise for the labeled/unlabeled distinction (Lowry, 1985, 1986, 1987). Lowry (1985) also recognized that it is impractical to assume that human beings can communicate at length without utilizing inference statements. Inferential statements will occur in news stories and it is assumed that labeled inferences are less biased than unlabeled (Lowry, 1986).

The Hayakawa-Lowry system of categorizing sentences provides a system of content analyses that has been proven to be construct valid (Lowry, 1986). This system derives its construct validity from its apparent adherence and correlation with what trained researchers find to be biased as well as what the broader public perceives as biased (Lowry, 1986).

**Coder Reliability.** Coding was conducted by one main coder (the author) and two undergraduate volunteers selected from a communication research methods seminar. Each coder was briefed on the Hayakawa-Lowry system of content categories and given copies of each article to read and code sentence by sentence. The inter coder reliability was .8312. After all sentences in each article were coded, the results were tallied based on the number of occurrences of each category.
Results

In order to effectively answer the research question it is necessary to first examine three aspects of the reporting that the data reveals. First, the extent to which both newspapers collectively used attributed and unattributed report sentences will be examined and then a comparison will be drawn as to the level of objective, factual information each newspaper respectively sought to present. Second, the extent to which both newspapers collectively used labeled and unlabeled inferences will be compared. Third, the amount of judgments reported both favorably and unfavorably for the three sub-categories will be compared. Judgments will also be considered collectively between the two newspapers. The amount of judgments that are attributed versus unattributed will also be examined. Finally, the results will be summarized to compare how each newspaper performed in presenting an objective unbiased account in relation to each other.


The findings presented in Appendix A indicates the percentage of each instance that a sentence occurred in a particular category. Appendix B gives the total number of instances that occurred for each content category. Appendix C is a record of sentences that were not included in the sum total because they were judgment sentences that did not fit any of the three sub-categories earlier described.

These findings can be used to answer the three major components of the research question. The first component asked to what extent each newspaper presented factual information that could be verified (i.e., report sentences) both attributed and unattributed. Appendix A indicates that report sentences, both attributed and unattributed, account for over half of the coverage presented in both newspapers combined implying that the
newspapers devoted most of their sentences to relaying verifiable information. A slightly higher percentage of unattributed sentences occurred overall versus attributed sentences, however, indicating that report sentences were often not assigned to a source, but stated by the journalist. Overall, more unattributed reports were recorded than attributed.

When the two newspapers are compared it becomes clear that the New York Times presented a higher total percentage (about 8% more) of attributed factual statements than the Independent Record. The Independent Record also provided significantly less attributed reports (about 7% less) than unattributed reports than did the New York Times which had an almost even split between the two types of sentences. These results indicate that in reporting this event the New York Times relied on attributed reports more often than the Independent Record.

Collectively, labeled inferences presented in the stories also outnumbered unlabeled inferences, suggesting that the writers tended to shy away from their own inferential bias, choosing instead to attribute the inference made to an actor in the story. It should be noted that many of the instances of unlabeled inferences occurred collectively in particular stories. An example is a story that ran concurrently in both newspapers with only minor editing apparent in the version that appeared in the Independent Record. The story described O.J. Simpson's relationship with Al Cowlings since childhood and made several unlabeled inferences and assumptions about their relationship.10

Separately, the Independent Record presented a slightly higher percentage of inferences than did the New York Times. Labeled inferences occurred 22.41% of the time in the Independent Record and only 17.38% of the time in the New York Times. Unlabeled inferences occurred 18.45% of the time in the Independent Record and only 15.36% of the time in the New York Times. The fact that the Independent Record utilized inference

10 This particular story was largely favorable in tone towards Simpson and Cowlings but made repeated reference to the intense loyalty that was inferred to exist between the two since they had been together since childhood.
statements more often increases the likelihood that it was perceived as biased by the broader public (Lowry, 1986).

Both newspapers combined for a total of 11.23% of total judgments in all three subcategories, both favorable or unfavorable and attributed or unattributed. This suggests that the majority of reporting focused on factual and inferential aspects of the O.J. event during the time period specified. The absence of an overwhelming percentage of judgment statements and the large percentage of reports and inferences presented suggests that the reporting was likely to be perceived as objective by the broader public.

However, when the results are compared between favorable and unfavorable judgments respectively for each newspaper, it is noted that 13.78% of all coverage devoted to judgment statements pertaining to the three subcategories occurred in the Independent Record. In The New York Times only 10.29% of all coverage was devoted to reporting judgments in all three sub-categories. This data suggests that slightly more coverage of this event was devoted to judgments in the local paper.

Further examination also reveals that attributed judgment statements that were favorable towards O.J. Simpson outnumbered all other judgments collectively and in each respective newspaper. Of important note is the high number of unattributed, favorable judgments that appeared in the Independent Record versus the New York Times. The fact that the Independent Record contained more favorable judgments towards Simpson that were unattributed (almost 3 per cent more) indicates that the Independent Record had a lower rate of objectivity in this instance than did the New York Times.

To further examine the performance of both newspapers the constructs of objectivity, balance and fairness must be examined. These concepts can be visualized when the perspective subcategories that fall under the judgment statements (categories 5-8) are analyzed collectively in both newspapers. Overall, the total number of favorable judgments either attributed or unattributed aimed towards Simpson and the defense team totaled 186.32 indicating that 6.67% of the total coverage in both the A.P. and NYT stories was
devoted to favorable judgments of Simpson and his "defense dream team." In contrast, total criticisms of either Simpson or members of his defense team totaled only 67.99 instances (2.43%). The amount of favorable judgments aimed at the L.A.P.D. and the prosecution (34.66 total instances for 1.24% of coverage) totaled less than the favorable judgments aimed at Simpson and the defense team. The fact that favorable judgments, either attributed or unattributed, occurred more often for Simpson and the defense team versus the L.A.P.D. and the prosecution indicates the focus of the reporting, at least in the early stages of the Simpson case, was aimed at evaluating Simpson and the defense team. Additionally, the fact that more favorable judgments were made versus unfavorable judgments in both newspapers implies an imbalance in reporting. The arrest of O.J. Simpson and the preliminary hearings posited two sides against one another. In this instance one side is receiving significantly more "good press" than the other.\textsuperscript{11} The data also indicates an inclination by both newspapers to present favorable judgments about any subject over unfavorable judgments.

When the two newspapers are contrasted, it is evident that the percentage of occurrence for both favorable and unfavorable judgments aimed towards the L.A.P.D. and the prosecution are consistent and nearly equivalent in both. However, a disparity emerges when examining the judgment statements made in reference to Simpson and his defense team. The \textit{Independent Record} had a higher number of unattributed judgments in the stories presented than did \textit{The New York Times} (44.32 instances versus 20.66 instances) and a higher percentage (5.44\% versus 1.04\%) suggesting that overall \textit{The New York Times} presented a more balanced report of the event.

No comparison as to the number of instances of judgment statements either attributed/unattributed or favorable/unfavorable will be made in regards to the third subcategory of judgment statements (the court system and jury members) because the

\textsuperscript{11} It should also be noted that Simpson also received "bad press" as well, but the percentage of occurrence is very small (3.22 per cent compared to 6.33 per cent).
number of occurrences were minimal. The court system was judged favorably a total of three times and only criticized twice.

It should also be noted that 58 judgment sentences were not recorded because they did not fit either of the three subcategories. These sentences were often favorable towards the victims and are reflected in Appendix C. Is should be noted that none of the judgment statements made favorably towards the victims concurrently criticized O.J. Simpson. These sentences came from articles about the victims and their families.

Conclusions

Summary. Due to the relatively small percentage of judgment statements (which are considered to be perceived as less objective than either report or inference statements) each newspaper performed adequately based on the Hayakawa-Lowry system of evaluating content in providing an accurate view of the Simpson case in the time period between June 14, 1994 and July 10, 1994. This is a surprising conclusion in light of the media spectacle that was claimed to surround the proceedings and certain fiascoes that disrupted the proceedings such as the release of the 911 audio tapes from 1989 that effectively killed the grand jury hearing at the beginning of Simpson's legal battle (see Appendix D and E). Regardless of the actions of other media venues, the two newspapers analyzed presented a narrative that, according to the Hayakawa-Lowry principle of construct validity, was likely to be perceived by the broader public as, for the most part, devoid of bias.

In an event such as this some judgments are perhaps unavoidable due to the courtroom setting and the constant public speculation by outsiders as well as those involved in the case. The New York Times, however, proved more careful in its coverage than did the Independent Record, providing more factual information and limiting unattributed judgments to a small percentage of the reporting. Overall, the New York Times presented a
narrative that was less likely to be perceived as biased by the broader public due to the higher percentage of sentences that fit into the first four levels of Hayakawa-Lowry's content analyses system (reports and inferences). However, the Independent Record is dependent upon outside correspondence for its' information. As stated before, all of the stories in the Independent Record were reprinted and edited with permission from large news organizations such as the Associated Press. Perhaps the only fault to find with the Independent Record for containing sentences that are more likely to be perceived as biased than the prestigious, nationally circulated New York Times, is within its selection and editing process when deciding which stories to run from "over the wire."

**Limitations and Extensions.** This research is unique in that it seeks to compare newspaper coverage at two levels: local and national; a comparison that has not been examined in previous mass media studies. Since most all of the articles that appeared in the Independent Record were received from wire services, our critique becomes two-fold. On the one hand we have a comparison between the stories of presented by the New York Times and the stories presented by the Independent Record. But on another level, we also have a comparison between the New York Times and the Associated Press. This second tier of comparison is limited, however, because the full text of the articles were not studied. Only one local newspaper's revisions and edits of wire service stories was examined. The findings in this research project could be applied to a more comprehensive study involving several newspapers from different geographic and demographic locations to better understand the type of coverage that was presented in relation to this specific event. Additionally, other specific events could be examined as well as broader or differing time frames. Further examination in these areas could reveal more about the nature of reporting that not only surrounds this event but others as well.
Implications: Journalist and Reader. Recall that many journalists uphold objectivity as a guiding principle by which to craft news stories. A comparison of the nature presented in this study can help to demonstrate the difficulty in achieving this ideal as well as demonstrate the degree to which journalists achieve objectivity. The findings presented here can help journalists decide what types of sentences (report, inference or judgments are likely to be perceived as objective (or biased) when covering controversial events of this nature.

Journalists must accept that objectivity in its purest form is unachievable; so, too, must readers. Inferences are unavoidable when crafting news stories and appear perhaps more often than we would like to admit. However, as these results show, inferences are a part of the construction of human narratives and do not necessarily indicate that a story has been crafted inaccurately or poorly.

The important implication here, regarding the construction and interpretation of news stories, is the fact that news stories are part of the larger human dialogue that occurs within human society. In order to properly evaluate the quality of the stories presented, an incorporation between fact and value is essential. In other words, a recognition that simply reporting the facts is not sufficient to avoid bias is in order for both journalist and reader. All stories involve interpretation and a retelling of the events that occurred. Thus, we must recognize that "objective" reporting will reflect human truths as well as provide accurate accounts-- in print, on television, and over the wire.
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Appendix A. Comparison of Content Categories  
(Average percentage of occurrence from June 13, 1994 - July 10, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Category</th>
<th>Independent Record</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Report/Attributed</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>26.90%</td>
<td>24.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Report/Unattributed</td>
<td>26.63%</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>26.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inference/Labeled</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
<td>17.38%</td>
<td>18.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inference/Unlabeled</td>
<td>18.45%</td>
<td>15.36%</td>
<td>16.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Judgement/F/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. L.A.P.D. &amp; Prosecution</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Judgement/U/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. L.A.P.D. &amp; Prosecution</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Judgement/F/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. L.A.P.D. &amp; Prosecution</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Judgement/U/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. L.A.P.D. &amp; Prosecution</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All Other Sentences</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The percentage value is so small as to be under 0.10%. Please consult Appendix B for exact # of occurrences.

Note: Amounts do not add up exactly due to normal rounding procedures.
Appendix B. Comparison of Content Categories
(Average Number of occurrence from June 13, 1994 - July 10, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Category</th>
<th>Independent Record</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Report/Attributed</td>
<td>157.67</td>
<td>533.33</td>
<td>691.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Report/Unattributed</td>
<td>217.00</td>
<td>522.00</td>
<td>739.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inference/Labeled</td>
<td>182.67</td>
<td>344.67</td>
<td>527.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inference/Unlabeled</td>
<td>150.33</td>
<td>304.67</td>
<td>455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Judgement/F/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>141.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. L.A.P.D. &amp; Prosecution</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>34.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Judgement/U/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Judgement/F/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Simpson &amp; Defense Team</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>44.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. L.A.P.D. &amp; Prosecution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Judgement/U/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Court System &amp; Juries</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All Other Sentences</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>54.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C. Miscellaneous Judgements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>NYT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed/Favorable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattributed/Favorable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed/Favorable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:


June 14:  • As Police Pursue Clues, O.J. Simpson Seeks Seclusion. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)

June 15:  • Lawyer for O.J. Simpson Quits Case: Ex-Star Has No Connection to Slayings New Advocate Says. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)

June 16:  • Police Move with Care in the Simpson Case. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)

June 18:  • Simpson Charged, Chased and Arrested. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)
  • Cornered at His House After He is Accused of Killing Ex-Wife and Her Friend. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)
  • Disbelieving Crowd Cheers the Juice. (B. Drummond Ayres Jr., Special to The New York Times)
  • Fleeing Poverty, He Ran to Limelight. (Robert Thomas Jr.)
  • A Spectacle Gripping and Bizarre. (Raymond Hernandez)
  • Handling of 1989 Wife-Beating Case was a 'Terrible Joke' Prosecutor Says. (Sara Rimer, Special to The New York Times)
  • A Lifelong Loyalty, True to the End. (Craig Wolff)
  • Case Might Fit Pattern of Abuse, Experts Say. (Tamara Levin)

June 19:  • Simpson, Under Suicide Watch, is Jailed on 2 Murder Charges: Former Football Star is Described as Crying and Despondent. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)
  • Prosecutor Sees Simpson Case as a 'Solid One.' (B. Drummond Ayres Jr., Special to The New York Times)
  • Police Buffeted as Tides in Simpson Case Change. (Michael Janofsky)

June 20:  • Building a Case for a Beloved Figure. (David Margolick)
  • T.V. News Displays Air Power in Chase. (Bernard Weinraub)

  • Dueling Magazine Covers: A Police Photo vs. a 'Photo-Illustration.' (James Barron)

June 22:  • Court of Public Opinion is First to Try Simpson: Struggle is for Minds of Potential Jurors. (B. Drummond Ayres Jr., Special to The New York Times)
  • 95 Million Watched the Chase. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 23:  • Nicole Brown Simpson: Slain at the Dawn of a Better Life. (Sara Rimer)

• Good Looks, and Dreams of a Stylish Life. (Ashley Dunn)

June 25: • Echoes of Disbelief in a City Where Simpson was a Hero and a Neighbor. (Craig Wolff)
• Citing News Deluge, Simpson Case Judge Halts Jury's Inquiry. (Seth Mydans, Special to The New York Times)
• The Hearing: What it Means. (AP)
• Time Responds to Criticism Over Simpson Cover. (Deidre Carmody)

June 26: • 'Baddest Cat' or Polished Star? Simpsons Friends Perplexed. (NYT)


June 28: • An Effort to Link Simpson to Hair at Site of Murders: Lawyers Maneuver Over Access to Evidence. (B. Drummond Ayres Jr., Special to The New York Times)

June 29: • Simpson to Give Hair Sample for Prosecution Analysis: But Defense Lawyer Puts Up a Stiff Fight Over the Other Issues. (Michael Janofsky)
• No Reports of Violence By Simpson's First Wife. (Lynda Richardson)

June 30: • Hearing for Simpson is Set Today: Prosecutors to Show the First Evidence. (Michael Janofsky)

July 1: • Simpson Lawyers Seek to Exclude Bloody Evidence Found at Home. (Michael Janofsky)
• Store Clerk Tells Court Simpson Bought 15 inch Knife Weeks Before the Killings. (B. Drummond Ayres Jr., Special to The New York Times)

July 2: • Mysterious Envelope Arrives, But Judge Does Not Open It. (Special to The New York Times)
• Testimony on a Bloody Dog is Attack on Simpson Alibi. (B. Drummond Ayres, Special to the New York Times)

July 3: • A Sightseer at O.J. Simpsons House Says She Found a Knife in the Grass. (Michael Janofsky)

July 4: • Simpson Case Galvanizes U.S. About Domestic Violence: Calls to Hot Lines Rise Significantly. (Jane Gross)

July 5: • Was Evidence Obtained Improperly? Judge to Hear Crucial Arguments Today in Simpson Case. (Michael Janofsky)

July 6: • Prosecutors Use Testimony of 2 Men to Suggest Simpson Had Time to Commit Killings. (Michael Janofsky)
• Where Thoughts of Simpson Linger. (Lynda Richardson)

July 8:  
• A Judge Upholds Evidence Seized at Simpson Home: Entry Without Warrant: Court Says the Circumstances Gave Police Justification to Search the Estate. (Michael Janofsky)  
• The Crowd Consensus: 'Turn the Juice Loose.' (Sara Rimer)  
• Simpson on T.V. in 1 of 4 Homes. (AP)  
• Excerpts from Judges Ruling on Admissibility of Evidence in Simpson Case. (No Byline)
Appendix E:

Simpson Related Stories Appearing in the Independent Record: June 14, 1994 - July 10, 1994
(Includes Headline, Sub-Head and Byline).

June 14:
- Football Greats Ex-Wife Slain. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 15:
- Evidence Linked to Simpson. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 16:
- Lawyer Quits Simpson, O.J.'s Alibi. (Los Angeles, AP)
- Young Beauty Dazzled by Star. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 17:
- Source: Simpson Arrest Due Soon. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 18:
- O.J. Gives Up. Simpson Charged, Chased, Arrested for Two Murders. (Los Angeles, AP)
- Another Black Eye for L.A. Cops. (Los Angeles, AP)
- O.J. 'No Surprise.' Obsessive Abusers Often 'Nice Guys' in Every Other Situation. (AP)
- Stunned Nation Watches Strange Drama Unfold. (Los Angeles Daily News)

June 19:
- Tearful O.J. Apologizes. (AP)

June 20:
- Simpson Might Try Menendez Defense. Admit the Act But Not Responsibility. (AP)
- Kids the Biggest and Smallest Victims. (AP)
- O.J. Popularity Leaves Case in Limbo. (AP)

June 21:
- Simpson Still A Hero. (AP)

June 22:
- Domestic Violence. O.J.'s Case Focuses Attention on Abuse. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 23:
- Simpson Chase Top TV Draw. (Los Angeles, AP)
- Wednesday Simpson Developments Listed. (No Source Listed)
- O.J. 911 Tapes Released. (Los Angeles, AP)
- Run On O.J. Items. Tepid Sellers Now Hottest of Collectibles. (Seattle Post Intelligencer)

June 24:
- Simpson 911 Transcript. (Los Angeles Daily News)

June 25:
- We Knew O.J. on TV But Not Off. (Barry Garron, Commentary, Kansas City Star)

June 27:
- Lawyer: O.J. Won't Plead Insanity. (Los Angeles, AP)
• Stars Spotlight Social, Health Issues. (Boston, AP)
• D.A. Blasts, and Adds To, Media Hype. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 28:
• Checkbook Journalism Hurts Case. Witnesses Tainted by Selling Stories. (Los Angeles, AP)
• O.J.'s Hearing May Be Mini-Trial. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 29:
• Simpson Trial: DNA Tests Key. (Los Angeles, AP)

June 30:
• Simpson. State to Split Hairs. (Los Angeles, AP)
• Preliminary Hearing: How Does It Work? (No Source Listed)
• Simpson Defense: Dream Team or Ego Nightmare? (Los Angeles, AP)
• Prosecution Marshals Cold, Hard Facts. But Will Evidence Against Simpson Convince Independent Minded Judge? (Los Angeles, AP)

July 6:
• O.J. Defense Team Has Hard Work Ahead. (Los Angeles, AP)

July 8:
• If Not O.J., Whodunit? (Los Angeles, AP)

July 9:
• O.J. to Stand Trial. Evidence: Simpson's Blood Type Found at Murder Scene. (Los Angeles, AP)

July 10:
• Prosecutors Paint Picture of Murder. (Los Angeles, AP)