

5-2021

## Examining the Demographic and Situational Characteristics that Predict News-Media Coverage of Bias Homicides:

Caitlin Tidwell  
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

---

### Citation

Tidwell, C. (2021). Examining the Demographic and Situational Characteristics that Predict News-Media Coverage of Bias Homicides:. *Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/3958>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact [ccmiddle@uark.edu](mailto:ccmiddle@uark.edu).

Examining the Demographic and Situational Characteristics that Predict News-Media Coverage  
of Bias Homicides:

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Sociology

by

Caitlin Tidwell  
University of Arkansas  
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology & Criminal Justice, 2019

May 2021  
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

---

Casey Harris, Ph.D.  
Thesis Director

---

Jeff Gruenewald, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Kayla Allison, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

## **Abstract**

Recent trends indicate that incidents of hate crime have become increasingly more violent since 2017, resulting in an overall increase in incidents of bias homicide specifically. Knowledge of bias crime among the general public largely derives from news media sources and, unfortunately, research that illustrates how the media covers and/or portrays bias crime incidents remains underdeveloped. Using theories of strategic news making, the current study examines the types of bias homicide incidents that receive media coverage by constructing a unique database of newspaper articles from prominent, national papers for 216 bias homicides that occurred between 2000 and 2019 drawn from the Bias Homicide Database (BHDB). Articles are paired with information on the victims, offenders, and the events themselves. Findings speak to the newsworthiness of certain types of lethal bias crime events versus others, which have important implications for public and political discourse regarding bias crime policy.

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Literature Review .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Victim Characteristics.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Offender Characteristics.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Incident Characteristics .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Bias Homicide Victim, Offender, and Incident Characteristics.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Theoretical Orientations .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>The Rarity Model .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>The Cultural Deviance Model .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>The Current Study .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Data Sources.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Searching for Articles: Constructing Terms.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Dependent Variables .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Independent Variables .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Analytic Strategy .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Results.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Descriptive Statistics .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Predicting Coverage (Bivariate Analysis) .....</b>	<b>24</b>

<b>Regression Analysis .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Discussion &amp; Conclusion.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Theoretical Contributions.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Limitations, Directions for Future Research, &amp; Policy Implications .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>50</b>

## Introduction

Recent trends indicate that incidents of bias crime have become increasingly more violent since 2017, resulting in an overall increase in deadly attacks (Treisman, 2019). While still relatively rare compared to conventional forms of violence, bias crimes, especially those involving lethal violence, are among the most damaging crime given their intent to evoke fear among specific groups (Perry, 2001, p. 1-2). Since the beginning of the Trump administration, bias crimes have increasingly entered the conversation of the general public. Such conversations center upon the egregious nature of bias crime and evoke concern for those individuals possessing the same characteristics as victims of bias crimes (e.g., LGBTQ, racial minorities, religious minorities), who might fear their mere presence may result in violence or death. Recognizing that all homicides can traumatize victim's families and respective communities, research shows that targeting victims based on their personal attributes causes disproportionate psychological harm and feelings of vulnerability (Dunbar, 2006; Garnets, Herek, & Levy, 1990; Herek, Gillis, Cogan, & Glunt, 1997; Iganski, 2008; Rose & Mechanic, 2002). In sum, bias crimes are an important element of the criminal landscape in the United States even if they are infrequent in occurrence and geographically concentrated in some places and not others (Allison & Harris, 2018; Gruenewald & Allison, 2018).

Few individuals have direct experience with crime generally and bias crime more specifically. Instead, the public tends to learn about crime from the news media (Surette, 2014). Yet, past research has found that not all crimes receive equal news coverage (Graber, 1980). In particular, findings reveal that violent crimes like homicide are over-represented in the news (Chermak, 1994a, 1994b; Paulsen, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997), while other types of crimes (e.g., property crime, drug use, public order crime) are dismissed or de-emphasized in

comparison to their actual frequency. This disproportionality has been linked to heightened interest among the general public for more exciting and unusual stories. Hence, the old saying: “if it bleeds it leads” (Pooley, 1989, p. 36-44).

Prior research also indicates that there are certain types of victims and offenders that receive more coverage than others even for the same overall offense (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Chermak, 1994a, 1994b; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Johnstone, Hawkins, & Michener, 1994; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Petersen, 2016; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998). For example, Johnstone, Hawkins, and Michener (1994) compare 212 homicides reported in one or both of Chicago’s two daily newspapers (the *Tribune* and *Sun-times*) against the 684 homicides known to police. Findings reveal that the news media are more likely to report killings of Whites rather than minorities, as well as murders that occur in middle-class rather than poorer areas. Similarly, Gruenewald, Chermak, and Pizarro (2013) examine the newsworthiness of 866 homicide incidents in Newark, NJ between 1997 and 2007 and find that intra-racial homicides are significantly less likely to be covered when involving Black victims.

The idea that the news coverage and presentation of overall crime is driven by certain victim, offender, and incident characteristics has become a well-studied area of criminology (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Dixon & Williams, 2015; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Johnstone, Hawkins, & Michener, 1994; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Petersen, 2016; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Schildkraut & Donley, 2012; Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998). As an example, Schildkraut, Elsass, and Meredith (2018) examine the

disproportionate coverage of violent crimes by the news media, finding that the disproportionate coverage of violent crimes, specifically typical homicides, varies based upon victim, offender, and incident characteristics. Unfortunately, research extending this framework to the study of bias crime has yet to be conducted, leaving open the question of whether news makers treat bias homicide in the same manner as crime more generally.

Consequently, the current study addresses the following question: *What characteristics make bias homicide incidents more or less newsworthy?* In particular, I aim to explore the specific incident, victim, and offender characteristics of bias homicide incidents between 2000 and 2019 and how they are related to the coverage of those incidents in local, regional, and national media outlets. The current study conceptualizes coverage as more than whether a bias homicide receives *any* attention in the news media, but also on the *extent* of that coverage, including its geographic scope, timing, and prominence (i.e., front page) as presented for public consumption.

Answering this specific research question is important for two reasons. First, there remains little to no prior research that evaluates the newsworthiness of bias homicide incidents, including which ones are covered or not and how prominently they are covered. As such, this study provides a foundation for future scholars to evaluate the ways in which the media describe or frame (accurately or in a distorted manner) issues related to bias crimes. Second, this study seeks to aid policymakers by illustrating the ways that bias crime prevalence and perceived risk among the general public can be shaped by media behavior. Though I know of no prior study specifically examining this issue, such findings may be of use to the those who wish to better understand the risks of bias-motivated lethal violence for specific groups in the United States and who seek to create policy for reducing those risks. Over-and under-represented coverage in the



news means that different stakeholders may not grasp the scope and types of crime in need of remedy (i.e., the overall prevalence, the most common victims, typical offenders, etc.).

Moreover, the misrepresentation of crime in the news may also produce bias among the general public in terms of their support for policies intended to reduce victimization among vulnerable groups (Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998).

This project unfolds by, first, briefly describing the news making process with specific attention on the selection of stories (coverage) for crime, including the correlates of coverage broadly. My attention rests in particular with the victim, offender, and incident characteristics observed in prior media-crime research that might extend to coverage of bias homicides. Second, I review two theoretical frameworks that inform the analysis of news coverage of bias homicide incidents. Third, I describe the data, methodology, and results of the current study's analysis. Finally, fourth, I discuss key findings relative to prior research, theorizing, and the implications for future research and policy work.

### **Literature Review**

Journalists and other news makers play a fundamental role in the process of news making by choosing which topics to cover and which to ignore (Petersen, 2016). These stakeholders must appeal to audiences and maximize readership, so the selection of stories that are both interesting and reflective of community interests is paramount (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001). Yet, "newsworthiness" is objectively hard to define because it varies based on the organizational and situational context in which journalists operate (Chermak, 1994b; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Lundman, 2003). As a result, journalists are expected to reflect upon the business interest of the news organizations in which they serve, specifically by treating each

news story as a possible commodity of exchange accentuated today by increased market competition (Mayr & Machin, 2012).

Stories of crime attract a great deal of news media attention because they are inexpensive, easy to cover, and generally interesting for the public (Chermak, 1994b). Not surprisingly, a robust interdisciplinary literature examines how news media outlets, including both newspapers and television sources, determine the newsworthiness of criminal incidents (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Chermak, 1994a; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Petersen, 2016; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998). In general, news outlets do not discuss crime in ways reflective of its actual frequency generally, or in ways that capture the actual prevalence of specific offenders and victims. For example, research shows that newspapers disproportionately cover crimes of violence, particularly homicide and robbery, as compared to crimes against property (Graber, 1980). In turn, many scholars limit their examination of media and crime to only focus on the portrayal of violence, specifically “typical” homicides,<sup>1</sup> because of how frequently the media reports these types of criminal incidents (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Chermak, 1994a; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Petersen, 2016; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998). This disproportionate coverage of violence also varies based upon particular victim, offender, and incident characteristics (Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018), which I review below. Given that my focus is on bias homicides, this review centers on empirical research at the intersection of media behaviors and homicide.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Typical” homicide refers to the deliberate and unlawful killing of a person by another that does not transpire from bias motivations.

## **Victim Characteristics**

Much of prior literature focuses on three key victim characteristics that impact newsworthiness: race, sex, and age. The victim's race has historically been an important characteristic of many criminal studies. Most notably, a growing number of studies examine the portrayal of racial/ethnic minority victims in news-media (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Dixon, 2017; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Petersen, 2016). Results suggest that Black and Hispanic victims are significantly less likely to receive newspaper coverage than White victims (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Paulsen, 2003; Petersen, 2016). In contrast, incidents involving racial/ethnic minority offenders and White victims are more likely to appear in news outlets (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010).

In regard to the victim(s)' sex, much of prior media literature has advanced the notion that female victims receive more news media coverage than their male counterpart (Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004). However, other scholars note that coverage depends on cultural typification (i.e., race and gender stereotypes) entailed in news media's construction of crime stories (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). For instance, Gruenewald and colleagues (2013) find that crime stories involving Black females, despite the rarity of the events, are considered less newsworthy when compared to stories involving more familiar homicides involving Black males (Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013).

In regard to the victim's age, prior literature finds that younger victims receive more prominent news coverage than older victims (Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Sorenson, Manz,

& Berk, 1998). For instance, both Sorenson, Manz, and Berk (1998) and Paulsen (2003) observe that as the victims age decreases, the likelihood of the homicide incident receiving celebrated news coverage increases. However, Gruenewald, Chermak, and Pizarro (2013) find more nuanced results that indicate that older victims increase the likelihood of a Hispanic victim homicide receiving coverage.

### **Offender Characteristics**

Offender characteristics has also been shown to affect the newsworthiness of “typical” homicide incidents, though scholars primarily focus upon the offender’s race and sex (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Dixon & Williams, 2015; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Schildkraut & Donley, 2012). Most notably, a number of studies find an overrepresentation of minority offenders in the news media relative to their actual offending rates (Dixon & Williams, 2015; Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Schildkraut & Donley, 2012). Gruenewald, Pizarro, and Chermak (2009), for example, focus on the news media’s portrayal of ethnic/racial groups in crime news and find that Hispanic offenders are over-represented, whereas Black offenders are under-represented (see also Dixon & Williams, 2015; Schildkraut & Donley, 2012; Lundman, 2003).

In relation to the offender(s)’ sex, several studies illustrate that males are covered significantly more prominently in the news than female offenders (Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). For example, evidence shows that typical homicide incidents involving female suspects receive significantly less news media attention than homicides involving male suspects (Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). Related to this last point, others find the relationship between the offender and victim important in determining

the newsworthiness of homicide incidents (Paulsen 2003). In particular, Paulsen (2003) shows that incidents where the victim and offender possess more distant relationships (i.e., brief/acquaintance, stranger, unknown) are more likely to garner newspaper coverage when compared to the statistically deviant intimate relationship (see for example, Paulsen, 2003).

### **Incident Characteristics**

In addition, prior research shows that incident characteristics – like defense tactic (e.g., weapon), location, motive, and number of victims – are predictive of the newsworthiness of typical homicide incidents (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Gruenewald, Pizarro, Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Petersen, 2016; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998). This research suggests that homicides involving firearms receive more newsprint coverage than homicides carried out with other weapons (i.e., blunt objects or knives) (Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009). In particular, the statistical likelihood of news media coverage increases when firearms are used on both Hispanic and Black victim homicides (Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013).

At the same time, the location of the incident influences the newsworthiness of typical homicide incidents, as well (Paulsen, 2003; Petersen, 2016; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998). For example, using data on the actual prevalence of homicide in Houston, Texas relative to the social construction of homicide as reflected in news coverage, Paulsen (2003) finds that homicide incidents that occur in wealthier neighborhoods in the city are more likely to receive celebrated newspaper coverage than incidents that occur in disadvantaged areas. Likewise, Petersen (2016) shows that victims killed in or near economically disadvantaged Latino and Black communities are significantly less likely to receive any coverage.

Other studies illustrate that the motive surrounding typical homicide incidents determines the amount of news media coverage the criminal incident receives (Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). For example, homicides committed during other criminal acts are more likely to generate news coverage (Paulsen, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997), while those involving rare circumstances (e.g., sexually motivated homicides) or circumstances deemed “culturally deviant” (e.g., murder of a child) receive disproportionately more coverage than homicide incidents involving more conventional circumstance (Peelo et al., 2004). In much the same way, incidents that involve more victims tend to see greater media coverage (Gruenewald, Pizarro, Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018). For example, Schildkraut, Elsass, and Meredith (2018) show that, even when there is not a high fatality count, mass shooting incidents are more newsworthy than other smaller, independent events over greater periods of time.

In summary, news media coverage of crime varies depending on characteristics of victims, offenders, and the incident itself. Focusing mostly on overall violence or homicide specifically, crimes involving minorities, younger victims and offenders, incidents in more affluent communities, or those involving firearms receive greater news media attention. However, this same body of literature has yet to address whether these same characteristics apply to crime motivated by specific biases, particularly bias-motivated homicides. In supplement of such limited research, the following paragraphs describe prior bias homicide literature, focusing on the specific difference between the event characteristics that surround bias homicide and those of more typical homicide.

## **Bias Homicide Victim, Offender, and Incident Characteristics**

Before discussing the prior bias homicide literature, it is essential to note the event characteristics that surround crimes motivated by bias in a general context (Messner, McHugh, & Felson, 2004; Stacey, 2011; Strom, 2001). Strom (2001), for example, illustrates that a majority of bias crime incidents are non-violent, though the level of violence seems to depend upon the motivation of the offense. In particular, findings suggest that bias crimes motivated by race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability typically result in more violent offenses than those that are motivated by religion. Additionally, not all bias crimes involve the same combination of victims and offenders. For instance, Stacey (2011) shows that crimes motivated by sexual orientation bias are more likely to have a White victim than a victim of another race, when compared to racial bias crimes. Similarly, Messner, McHugh, and Felson (2004) highlight the differences between the motivations of bias assault offenders and conventional assault offenders, finding that assault offenders motivated by bias are more likely to be versatile offenders (i.e., using illegal drugs and alcohol during the commission of their crime), rather than specialists, when compared to conventional assault offenders.

However, other research explicitly examines how such event and victim/offender characteristics for bias homicides deviate from typical American homicide incidents (Gruenewald, 2012; Gruenewald, 2013; Klein & Allison, 2018). For example, Gruenewald (2012) finds that anti-LBGT homicides are significantly more likely involve the stabbing of their victims (i.e., rather than use a firearm), involve a greater number of offenders and victims, target unknown victims, and be carried out in public places that foster symbolic meaning (i.e., gay bars and gay cruising sites) than non-bias homicides. Similarly, Klein and Allison (2018) demonstrate that the victim(s)' and offender(s)' race are an important predictor of homicide type because anti-

race/ethnicity victim(s)' are significantly more likely to involve Black, Asian, and other race victims, and offenders are significantly more likely to be White when compared to typical homicide incidents. Gruenewald (2013) also find that anti-homeless homicides typically occur in parks, involve the use of blunt objects, are committed by groups of young males against older male victims, and involve no known relationship between the victim and offender. Overall, these findings suggest that bias motivated homicides are significantly more likely to involve younger, White and male offenders, who target unknown victims of minority statuses that are carried out in public places when compared to non-bias homicides.

Recent studies have attempted to advance bias homicide research by focusing on how the event characteristics surrounding bias homicides vary across victim groups (Allison & Harris, 2018; Gruenewald & Allison 2018). For instance, Gruenewald and Allison (2018) empirically compare the situated nature of homicide targets (e.g., racial and ethnic, homeless, and sexual orientation and gender identity groups), showing that there are significant differences across bias victim groups. In particular, their findings show that anti-race/ethnicity homicides are significantly more likely to be committed using firearms in public places by older far-rightists, who are also more likely to be intoxicated during their attack, as compared to anti-LGBT homicide. In turn, Allison and Harris (2018) stress the differences in community-level factors that shape violent and non-violent bias crimes across victim groups (i.e., LGBT, racial/ethnic, and homeless). While there is only a small likelihood of a county experiencing any bias homicide, the likelihood of any specific type of bias homicide occurring differs according to the levels of diversity, disadvantage, and urban population.

Taken as a whole, this body of literature stresses that bias homicides generally, and by specific types of victim, differ from more typical homicides in terms of incident, victim,



offender, and geographic characteristics. When combined with insights from the media-crime literature more broadly, this suggests that the way media covers and describes crime may be distorted to a greater degree than it is for homicide broadly. Yet, this remains empirically unsettled. Nevertheless, I turn now to a review of theoretical orientations that will guide the current study and that provide expectations for why some bias homicide incidents may receive more coverage than others.

### **Theoretical Orientations**

That some bias homicides might be more newsworthy than others overlaps with two theoretical frameworks: the rarity and cultural deviance models. The following paragraphs offer an in-depth explanation of each framework and their key premises. In addition, and because both the rarity model and cultural deviance model borrow themes from other theoretical traditions, I draw parallels with other, closely related theories where applicable for the current study.

#### **The Rarity Model**

Within the broader media-crime literature, a prominent perspective asserts that rare or unusual elements of crime are more likely to be presented by the news media than more “typical” homicide incidents. Across a variety of studies, the infrequency of the type of homicide not only influences whether the incident is covered by the news at all, but also determines the amount of coverage that the incident receives (Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004). This theme has coalesced as the *rarity model*. As summarized by Keir, McCombs, & Shaw (1991, p. 3): “When a dog bites a man, that is not news; but when a man bites a dog, that is news.”

Importantly, the rarity model proposition that more unusual events – including rare bias homicides – might receive more news coverage draws from both the market model and the normal crime model of media behavior. On the one hand, the market model suggests that the

media determines the newsworthiness of a homicide incident based on the novelty of the event and, in turn, whether a story “sells.” Most commonly used to represent this model is the figurative phrase: “if it bleeds it leads,” which suggests that journalists convey crime stories that they feel will entice the audience and promote their organization in order to obtain higher ratings and monetary return. The theoretical underpinnings of this model have been supported by media scholars focusing on newsroom decision-making (Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004).

On the other hand, the normal crimes model argues that certain aspects of crime make incidents more or less newsworthy depending on whether they are unusual, regardless of whether they will sell (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010). For example, Sudnow (1965) set forth a normal crime perspective with the intent to highlight how normal crimes (even if attractive as stories on the whole) involving common victim and offender characteristics are often written off by the media, while incidents involving statistically deviant offender and victim characteristics receive prominent news media coverage, even if such stories do not propel sales. In short, it is the crimes with more “unusual” offender and victim characteristics that matter, regardless of whether the story generates ads, ratings, or other economic success in the traditional sense (Sudnow, 1965). Instead, it is the mundane nature of “normal crime” that drives coverage toward anything that is unusual.

For the current study, the rarity model captures these assumptions to argue that bias homicide incidents containing rare or unusual incident characteristics will receive more prominent news coverage than more normal or common bias homicide incidents. Because of the heightened public attention (versus “normal crime”) that these incidents receive, they attract readers in ways that make such stories sell (per the “market model”). For example, anti-sexual orientation types of bias homicide might receive less attention in the news media than anti-

religion incidents because the former are more common and unlikely to garner as much public consumption (Allison & Harris, 2018). Broadly, however, prior research that shows that violent crimes tend to be covered more in the news (Paulsen, 2003) and I might expect bias homicides to be covered frequently by news media.

### **The Cultural Deviance Model**

The second theme found in prior literature asserts that some crime incidents receive more news media coverage because they ensure that common scripts of crime are upheld by emphasizing crime as culturally deviant. This theme emerges among scholars who focus on the homicide participants' characteristics as they overlap with broader social expectations and norms (Gruenewald, Pizarro, Chermak, 2009; Lundman, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). Victim and offender attributes, including race, gender, age and other ascribed statuses, determine the newsworthiness of crime incidents because they get selected out by news workers.

Overlapping with hypotheses drawn from four perspectives: power structure (Poindexter, Smith, & Heider, 2003), racial threat (Blalock, 1967), racial privilege (McIntosh, 1988), and cultural typification theories (Lundman, 2003), the cultural deviance model predicts that crime stories involving minority offenders and majority White victims, male offenders and female victims, and those of the lower class versus upper class to be more likely to be covered in the news. Such stories reflect the power held by media organizations that affect their story selection (Poindexter, Smith, & Heider, 2003), reinforce the threat of racial/ethnic minorities (Blalock, 1967), reinforce the privileges of Whites, males, and the upper class (McIntosh, 1988), and fit cultural stereotypes held by the broader public (Lundman, 2003).

Overall, the two frameworks discussed in the paragraphs above present different perspectives held among scholars when explaining why and how the media selects specific

criminal (especially homicide) incidents and not others. That is, the newsworthiness of certain lethal events varies by incident, victim, or offender characteristics because of decisions made in the newsroom or because of broader social processes of power and privilege that underlie news making decisions. Instead of treating these two theoretical models as competing, the current study seeks to utilize them as sensitizing frameworks for answering the question: *What characteristics make bias homicide incidents more or less newsworthy?* The paragraphs below describe the data and methodology used in the current study to answer this question.

## **The Current Study**

### **Data Sources**

The current study seeks to answer the proposed research question using a unique database that incorporates information from two primary sources: The Bias Homicide Database (BHDB) and Nexus Uni/ProQuest Central archive of newspapers. The BHDB provides information on bias homicide incidents for the current study as an open-source database recording bias-motivated lethal violence in the United States. All recorded bias crime incidents involve victims who are discriminately targeted based on perceived attributes/status, including race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, homelessness, gender identity, and nationality/immigrant status. The BHDB has in the past served as an established, reliable record of bias homicide (Allison & Harris, 2018; Gruenewald & Allison, 2018; Kelley & Gruenewald, 2015; Klein & Allison, 2018).

For the purpose of the current study, the BHDB defines bias homicide incidents as fatal attacks against persons due in entirely or partly because of their real or perceived status as listed above. Individual statuses and motivation for lethal violence are obtained from publicly accessible sources, including official criminal justice sources, watch group reports, and scholarly

reports and chronologies (Allison & Harris, 2018; Gruenewald & Allison, 2018; Gruenewald, 2013; Kelley & Gruenewald, 2015; Klein & Allison, 2018). The BHDB was specifically chosen for the current study as a way to avoid several limitations identified in prior research. In particular, bias-motivated crime data measured by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program or National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) have been critiqued for their reliability given the inconsistency in reporting procedures across policy agency jurisdictions (Boyd, Berk, & Hamner, 1996; Haider-Markel, 2002; McDevitt et al., 2000; Nolan & Akiyama, 1999). In contrast, the BHDB data has proven to be a reliable source for studying bias homicides (Gruenewald, 2012, 2013; Gruenewald & Allison, 2018; Kelley & Gruenewald, 2015) because it uses an open-source, event-level database tracking the violent crimes committed by domestic extremists without requiring an official determination of bias motivation across each jurisdiction (Freilich, Chermak, Belli, Gruenewald, & Parkin, 2014). The current study restricts the bias-motivated homicide incidents to the 216 unique events occurring between the years of 2000-2019.

The second source of data for the current study is Nexis Uni/ProQuest Central, which provides information on the news media coverage of bias-homicide incidents. Nexis Uni (and its close counterpart ProQuest Central) provides researchers access to more than 1,100 major United States regional, national, and local newspapers in a time-bounded, searchable archive. Each archive gives access to different papers at different levels (local, regional, and national), allowing for an assessment of the coverage of bias homicide incidents across a larger number of unique sources and geographies than would be possible by searching in a single archive. As described in more detail below, Nexis Uni and ProQuest Central capture other critical information pertaining

to both the paper and article, including the word count, date of publication, the section of the newspaper, and date.

### **Searching for Articles: Constructing Terms**

In order to identify news articles that contain the coverage information necessary to answer my research question, I draw from the BHDB to construct incident-specific terms for systematic searching. Specifically, I retrieved articles from each archive (Nexis Uni and ProQuest Central) using the date of each incident, the name of the offender(s), and the location (city) where the bias homicide incident occurred. A preliminary search indicates that the combination of these pieces of information uniquely identify incidents and articles in both Nexis Uni and ProQuest Central.

For the current study, only newspaper articles are included, rather than web-based materials, in the overall analysis. This may underrepresent coverage of BHDB incidents because additional web-based materials may be dismissed from the overall analysis if they do not achieve traditional print circulation coverage. Critically, there has been a decline in newspaper readership in favor of online news sources (Pew Research Center, 2019b), the sample of news articles collected here does still capture both traditional print circulation and online formats since many newspapers create their own websites to host articles (Greer & Yan, 2011; Harris, Gruenewald, & Tuttle, 2020). I return to this issue in the conclusion.

Similarly, each of these search engines/archives includes only those articles for which they have purchased access. As such, I acknowledge that there is likely missing news coverage of homicide incidents that are not part of the purchased and archived papers in my sample. However, since each of the search engines/archives hold copyrights to different newspapers, the current study leverages the most widely available unique sources available.

## Dependent Variables

The current study uses multiple markers of coverage as the dependent variables. The first measure addresses *overall coverage*, that is whether or not a bias homicide incident received any news media recognition in the archives within which searches were conducted (dummy coded as 1 = any coverage). Relatedly, I measure the geographic level of coverage as whether a bias homicide incident received any *local, regional, or national coverage*. Each bias homicide incident was dummy coded at each geographic level.

Second, I include several measures of coverage that are not as well-established in prior literature, including the amount of coverage represented by the *total number of articles* overall and for each geographic level, as well as the *duration of overall coverage* and the *duration of time before coverage* across each geographic level (i.e., amount of time between incident date and first news article). Finally, I capture the amount of space devoted to each incident using the *logged number of words* devoted to each incident (overall and at each geographic level), and whether an article had any *prominent coverage* (i.e., front page) overall and for each geographic level.

Given the focus on coverage at local, regional, and national levels, I define national publication as any one of the top six national newspaper: *USA Today; The Wall Street Journal; The New York Times; New York Post; Los Angeles Times; or The Washington Post*. In turn, I define local and regional coverage based upon the daily circulations total of the newspaper that the bias homicide article is published in. News articles published in a newspaper where the daily circulation is below 50,000 are coded as receiving local coverage, while all other articles that are published in newspapers that exceed 49,999 (and which do not appear in national papers) are coded as receiving regional news coverage. Examples of regional papers include the *San Diego*

*Union Tribune* (121,321 circulation), *Pittsburg Post-Gazette* (173,160 circulation), *Daily News* (New York, 200,000 circulation), and *Houston Chronical* (169,000).<sup>2</sup>

It is important to note that the sample size changes depending upon the measure and level of coverage under review. For instance, measures that asses overall coverage are available for the full sample size of 216 (e.g., any coverage, local coverage, regional etc.). However, the remaining coverage measures limit their analysis to only incidents that received any coverage overall or at each specific geographic level. For example, I examine the total number of articles only for those incidents that received some coverage rather than for all incidents including those that did not have a single article written about them. This reduces the sample size as noted in the tables below but ensures that I am examining the detailed measures of coverage in a meaningful way.

### **Independent Variables**

To predict the likelihood of a bias homicide incident receiving news media coverage, the current study evaluates a variety of demographic and situational and incident characteristics drawn from the BHDB database. First, I include a series of dummy variables for the type of bias crime, including those that are anti-homeless, race, religion, sexual orientation, and other (which serves as the reference category in multivariate analyses). This latter category includes homicides that are anti-nationality/immigrant status and anti-gender identity.

Second, I measure other situational characteristics, including whether the victim and offender are *known* to each other (e.g., family, friends, acquaintances) versus unknown/strangers,

---

<sup>2</sup> The circulation totals reflect their most current circulation totals, though not necessarily for the same year. For example, the *San Diego Union Tribune* (May 23, 2015); *Pittsburg Post-Gazette* (November 2, 2018); *Daily News-New York* (October 8, 2016); *Houston Chronicle* (September 1, 2015) reflect relatively recent circulation estimates, but not necessarily from the same month or year.



as well as whether a *firearm* was used in the homicide event (versus other weapons, including knife/shank/cutting object, blunt object, bodily weapons, etc.). Third, I code whether the bias homicide occurred in the *Northeast*, *Midwest*, or *West* region with South region serving as the reference. Fourth, the location of bias homicide measures whether the incident took place in a *private* (residence/motel) or public (e.g., road/highway/in a car, parking lot, outside of business/abandoned lot/alley, subway/bus stop/train/sidewalk, park, remote/secluded area, stores/restaurants/theatre, bar/club, hospital/clinic, school property, religious facility, office/commercial, jail/prison/detention center, government building, or other) setting.

Finally, fifth, I include some basic demographic characteristics of victims and offenders not captured by the variables above. These include both the victim(s)' and offender(s)' race, coded as *Non-White* (i.e., Black, Hispanic, Asian, Multi-race, Other, and Multiple races) as compared to *White*, which serves as the reference category. Likewise, both the victim(s)' and offender(s)' gender is captured using a *male* dummy variable.

### **Analytic Strategy**

The analysis unfolds across three stages. First, I provide descriptive statistics regarding the overall levels of coverage of my bias homicide incidents, as well as describe the sample of homicides themselves. This includes describing different types of coverage at the national, regional, and local levels, as well as space/word count and front-page coverage prominence. Second, I employed a series of bivariate statistical tests (Chi-square, ANOVA) to assess whether there are differences in news media coverage across specific offender, victim, and situational characteristics of bias-motivated homicides. The emphasis here centers on whether or not certain bias homicide factors produce greater/lesser coverage (at specific geographic levels or in terms of prominence, word count, etc.) when considered one at a time. Third, and central to the

research question, I employed multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) and logistic regression techniques to model the relationship between offender, victim, and situational characteristics with bias homicide news coverage outcomes. All continuous dependent variables (e.g., logged word count, number of articles, duration of coverage) are examined using ordinary least squares regression models, while dichotomous/binary outcomes (e.g., any coverage at each geographic level, front page coverage) are explored using logistic regression models. More broadly, multivariate statistical tools allow for the simultaneous examination of multiple relationships that might explain differences in news coverage across the current study's sample of bias homicide incidents rather than conceptualizing those relationships as independent of each other (Messner, McHugh, & Felson, 2004).

## **Results**

### **Descriptive Statistics**

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics (i.e., means, standard deviations, percentages, and sample sizes) for both the coverage outcome and characteristics of the bias homicide incidents themselves. Recall, my overall sample includes 216 bias homicide incidents between the years of 2000 and 2019 but is reduced for some dependent variables as I restrict my analysis to only those incidents receiving at least some coverage (see note above). I draw the following conclusions. First, the likelihood of a bias homicide incident receiving any news coverage is high: out of the 216 bias homicide incidents, 165 (about 76 percent) have at least one article written about them. However, second, coverage varies across geographic level. Specifically, bias homicide incidents are more likely to receive regional coverage (62 percent of incidents) than local (44 percent) or national (36 percent) coverage. Many incidents are covered at several geographic levels.

<b>Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Sample of Bias Homicide Incidents</b>				
	% (n)	Mean	Std. Dev.	Total n
<b>Dependent Variables (Coverage):</b>				
Any Coverage (dummy)	76.39 (n =165)	-	-	216
Local Coverage (dummy)	43.98 (n = 95)	-	-	216
Regional Coverage(dummy)	62.04 (n = 134)	-	-	216
National Coverage (dummy)	35.65 (n = 77)	-	-	216
<i>Note: dependent variables below require coverage at their respective geographic levels, resulting in reduced sample sizes at each level.</i>				
Total Articles	-	50.01	268.24	165
Local Articles	-	25.53	113.23	95
Regional Articles	-	29.01	131.61	134
National Articles	-	25.17	96.32	77
Total Days of Coverage	-	1041.29	1465.67	165
Local: Time to 1st Article	-	441.09	1122.49	95
Regional: Time to 1st Article	-	321.88	742.93	134
National: Time to 1st Article	-	327.39	885.99	77
Any Front Page (dummy)	36.97 (n = 61)	-	-	165
Local Front Page (dummy)	36.84 (n = 35)	-	-	95
Regional Front Page (dummy)	28.36 (n = 38)	-	-	134
National Front Page (dummy)	24.68 (n = 19)	-	-	77
Total Word Count	-	8.31	1.84	165
Local Word Count	-	7.72	1.63	95
Regional Word Count	-	8.04	1.70	134
National Word Count	-	7.79	1.65	77

<b>Table 1. (Continued)</b>				
	% (n)	Mean	Std. Dev.	Total n
<b>Independent Variables (BHDB Incident Characteristics):</b>				
<b>Bias Type:</b>				
Homeless	12.50 (n = 27)	-	-	216
Race	26.39 (n = 57)	-	-	216
Religion	6.48 (n = 14)	-	-	216
Sexual Orientation	34.26 (n = 74)	-	-	216
Other	20.37 (n = 44)	-	-	216
<b>Victim-Offender Relationship:</b>				
Known (family, etc.)	47.69 (n = 103)	-	-	216
Unknown (stranger, etc.)	52.31 (n = 113)	-	-	216
<b>Weapon Type:</b>				
Firearm	42.13 (n = 91)	-	-	216
Non-Firearm	57.87 (n = 125)	-	-	216
<b>Region of Bias Homicide</b>				
Northeast	19.91 (n = 43)	-	-	216
Midwest	17.59 (n = 38)	-	-	216
South	35.65 (n = 77)	-	-	216
West	26.85 (n = 58)	-	-	216
<b>Location of Bias Homicide</b>				
Private	31.48 (n = 68)	-	-	216
Public	68.52 (n = 148)	-	-	216
<b>Offender Race</b>				
Non-White	46.30 (n = 100)	-	-	216
White	53.70 (n = 116)	-	-	216
<b>Offender Gender</b>				
Male	93.98 (n = 203)	-	-	216
Non-Male	6.02 (n = 13)	-	-	216
<b>Victim Race</b>				
Non-White	77.78 (n = 168)	-	-	216
White	22.22 (n = 48)	-	-	216
<b>Victim Gender</b>				
Male	86.11 (n = 186)	-	-	216
Non-Male	13.89 (n = 30)	-	-	216

Third, looking at other coverage measures, I find other important differences by geographic level. For example, more articles are written, on average, at the regional (about 29 articles) than local or national levels (about 25 articles) and take fewer days until the first article appears (322 days, on average) than either local (441 days, on average) or national papers (327

days, on average). On average, my bias homicide incidents receive over one-thousand days of coverage. Regional papers also devote more space to these incidents (about 8 logged words or 3100 words) than local and national papers. In contrast, bias homicide incidents are slightly more likely to appear on the front page of local papers (about 37 percent) than in regional (28 percent) and national papers (25 percent).

Fourth, there are notable patterns among victim, offender, and incident characteristics as presented in Table 1. In regard to the incident characteristics, this sample is largely composed of bias homicide incidents that were motivated by anti-sexual orientation (34 percent) and race (26 percent). In the majority of incidents, the relationship between the victim and offender was unknown (52 percent), did not involve the use of a firearm (58 percent), and occurred in the South (36 percent) or West regions (27 percent). Likewise, the vast majority occurred in public places (69 percent) and involved White (54 percent) and male (94 percent) offenders and non-white (78 percent) and male (86 percent) victims.

### **Predicting Coverage (Bivariate Analysis)**

I now examine whether there are disparities in new media coverage across the key incident and victim/offender characteristics described in Table 1. To that end, Tables 2 and 3 display the results of chi-square statistics examining each of the categorical independent variables and my categorical dependent variables (*any coverage* and *front page*, respectively), while Tables 4-6 use analysis of variance tests (ANOVA) for those same independent variables and my continuous coverage outcomes (*number of articles*, *time of coverage*, and *word count*, respectively). I find the following.

**Table 2. Chi-Square Tests and Category Percentages Summarizing Relationships Between Each BHDB Incident Characteristic and Coverage (Cov.) by Geographic Level**

	<i>Any Cov.</i>	<i>National Cov.</i>	<i>Regional Cov.</i>	<i>Local Cov.</i>
Bias Type:	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.65	X <sup>2</sup> = 15.58**	X <sup>2</sup> = 2.13	X <sup>2</sup> = 5.06
Homeless	62.96	11.11	55.56	37.04
Race	77.19	36.84	61.40	42.11
Sexual Orientation	77.03	33.78	62.16	41.89
Religion	85.71	71.43	78.57	71.43
Other	79.55	40.91	61.36	45.45
Victim-Offender Rel.:	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.18	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.24	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.10	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.01
Known	77.67	33.98	63.11	43.69
Unknown	75.22	37.17	61.06	44.25
Weapon Type:	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.28	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.56	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.01	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.91
Firearm	80.22	42.86	65.93	49.45
Non-Firearm	73.60	30.40	59.20	40.00
Region:	X <sup>2</sup> = 5.44	X <sup>2</sup> = 21.37***	X <sup>2</sup> = 5.85	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.40
Northeast	86.05	62.79	76.74	44.19
Midwest	65.79	15.79	55.26	39.47
South	79.22	35.06	62.34	45.45
West	72.41	29.31	55.17	44.83
Location:	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.03	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.64	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.44	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.33
Private	72.06	26.47	58.82	38.24
Public	78.38	39.86	63.51	46.62
Offender Race:	X <sup>2</sup> = 4.21*	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.45	X <sup>2</sup> = 2.88	X <sup>2</sup> = 9.11**
Non-White	70.00	38.00	56.00	33.00
White	81.90	33.62	67.24	53.45
Offender Gender:	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.39	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.05	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.00	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.55
Male	76.85	35.47	62.07	43.35
Non-Male	69.23	38.46	61.54	53.85
Victim Race:	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.65	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.13	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.18	X <sup>2</sup> = 2.60
Non-White	74.40	37.50	60.12	41.07
White	83.33	29.17	68.75	54.17
Victim Gender:	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.93	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.84	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.89	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.10
Male	75.27	33.87	60.22	43.55
Non-Male	83.33	46.67	73.33	46.67
N	216	216	216	216

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

**Table 3. Chi-Square Tests and Category Percentages Summarizing Relationships Between Each BHDB Incident Characteristic and Front Page (FP) Coverage by Geographic Level**

	<i>Any FP</i>	<i>National FP</i>	<i>Regional FP</i>	<i>Local FP</i>
Bias Type:	X <sup>2</sup> = 10.60*	X <sup>2</sup> = 2.19	X <sup>2</sup> = 6.22	X <sup>2</sup> = 9.39
Homeless	35.29	33.33	26.67	40.00
Race	43.18	33.33	40.00	33.33
Sexual Orientation	28.07	16.00	21.74	29.03
Religion	75.00	30.00	45.45	80.00
Other	31.43	22.22	18.52	30.00
Victim-Offender Rel.:	X <sup>2</sup> = 5.98*	X <sup>2</sup> = 8.95**	X <sup>2</sup> = 4.34	X <sup>2</sup> = 2.32
Known	27.50	8.57	20.00	28.89
Unknown	45.88	38.10	36.23	44.00
Weapon Type:	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.81	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.58	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.32	X <sup>2</sup> = 7.48**
Firearm	45.21	30.77	33.33	51.11
Non-Firearm	30.43	18.42	24.32	24.00
Region:	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.41	X <sup>2</sup> = 7.23	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.07	X <sup>2</sup> = 6.96
Northeast	32.43	14.81	24.24	31.58
Midwest	36.00	50.00	23.81	40.00
South	42.62	37.04	29.17	51.43
West	33.33	11.76	34.38	19.23
Location:	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.26	X <sup>2</sup> = 7.70**	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.96	X <sup>2</sup> = 2.92
Private	26.53	0.00	22.50	23.08
Public	41.38	32.20	30.85	42.03
Offender Race:	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.68	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.58	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.25	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.93
Non-White	28.57	18.42	23.21	30.30
White	43.58	30.77	32.05	40.32
Offender Gender:	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.05	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.06	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.05	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.22
Male	37.18	25.00	29.37	37.50
Non-Male	33.33	20.00	12.50	28.57
Victim Race:	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.21	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.14	X <sup>2</sup> = 0.08	X <sup>2</sup> = 1.34
Non-White	36.00	23.81	27.72	33.33
White	40.00	28.57	30.30	33.33
Victim Gender:	X <sup>2</sup> = 4.58*	X <sup>2</sup> = 5.90*	X <sup>2</sup> = 3.78	X <sup>2</sup> = 5.31*
Male	33.57	19.05	25.00	32.10
Non-Male	56.00	50.00	45.45	64.29
N	165	77	134	95

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

<b>Table 4. ANOVA Tests Summarizing Relationships Between Each BHDB Incident Characteristic and Total Number of Articles by Geographic Level</b>				
	<i>Total # Articles</i>	<i>Total # National Articles</i>	<i>Total # Regional Articles</i>	<i>Total # Local Articles</i>
Bias Type:	F= 0.34, p>.05	F= 0.26, p>.05	F= 0.42, p>.05	F= 0.38, p>.05
Victim-Offender Relationship:	F= 2.52, p>.05	F= 2.47, p>.05	F= 2.07, p>.05	F= 2.65, p>.05
Weapon Type:	F= 3.52, p>.05	F= 2.19, p>.05	F= 4.38, p<.05*	F= 2.02, p>.05
Region:	F= 1.07, p>.05	F= 1.09, p>.05	F= 1.15, p>.05	F= 1.07, p>.05
Location:	F= 1.12, p>.05	F= 1.13, p>.05	F= 0.77, p>.05	F= 1.05, p>.05
Offender Race:	F= 0.00, p>.05	F= 0.10, p>.05	F= 0.02, p>.05	F= 0.00, p>.05
Offender Gender:	F= 0.17, p>.05	F= 0.22, p>.05	F= 0.26, p>.05	F= 0.18, p>.05
Victim Race:	F= 0.40, p>.05	F= 0.45, p>.05	F= 0.20, p>.05	F= 0.65, p>.05
Victim Gender:	F= 12.18, p<.001***	F= 8.94, p<.01**	F= 11.50, p<.001***	F= 12.46, p<.001***
N	165	77	134	95
* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001				

<b>Table 5. ANOVA Tests Summarizing Relationships Between Each BHDB Incident Characteristic and Time of Coverage by Geographic Level</b>				
	<i>Total Days Covered</i>	<i>Days to 1<sup>st</sup> National</i>	<i>Days to 1<sup>st</sup> Regional</i>	<i>Days to 1<sup>st</sup> Local</i>
Bias Type:	F= 3.61, p<.01**	F= 1.74, p>.05	F= 0.96, p>.05	F= 0.54, p>.05
Victim-Offender Relationship:	F= 0.56, p>.05	F= 0.17, p>.05	F= 0.81, p>.05	F= 0.00, p>.05
Weapon Type:	F= 6.32, p<.05*	F= 2.50, p>.05	F= 2.46, p>.05	F= 2.50, p>.05
Region:	F = 0.46, p>.05	F = 1.43, p>.05	F = 1.44, p>.05	F = 1.22, p>.05
Location:	F= 1.31, p>.05	F= 0.29, p>.05	F= 1.08, p>.05	F= 0.40, p>.05
Offender Race:	F= 1.25, p>.05	F= 1.70, p>.05	F= 0.00, p>.05	F= 0.22, p>.05
Offender Gender:	F= 0.03, p>.05	F= 0.51, p>.05	F= 0.08, p>.05	F= 0.92, p>.05
Victim Race:	F= 0.32, p>.05	F= 0.75, p>.05	F= 0.11, p>.05	F= 1.54, p>.05
Victim Gender:	F= 0.41, p>.05	F= 0.32, p>.05	F= 0.83, p>.05	F=1.64, p>.05
N	165	77	134	95
* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001				



<b>Table 6. ANOVA Tests Summarizing Relationships Between Each BHDB Incident Characteristic and Word Count by Geographic Level</b>				
	<i>Total Word Count</i>	<i>National Word Count</i>	<i>Regional Word Count</i>	<i>Local Word Count</i>
Bias Type:	F= 3.19, p<.05*	F= 0.94, p>.05	F= 2.51, p<.05*	F= 0.78, p>.05
Victim-Offender Relationship:	F= 3.51, p>.05	F= 1.34, p>.05	F= 4.72, p<.05*	F= 7.30, p<.01**
Weapon Type:	F= 3.22, p>.05	F= 2.51, p>.05	F= 3.98, p<.05*	F= 3.23, p>.05
Region:	F= 0.94, p>.05	F= 0.68, p>.05	F= 0.28, p>.05	F= 0.28, p>.05
Location:	F= 1.98, p>.05	F= 3.79, p>.05	F= 1.81, p>.05	F= 3.67, p>.05
Offender Race:	F= 10.22, p>.01	F= 2.42, p>.05	F= 7.13, p<.01**	F= 1.27, p>.05
Offender Gender:	F= 0.02, p>.05	F= 1.59, p>.05	F= 1.19, p>.05	F= 0.00, p>.05
Victim Race:	F= 0.47, p>.05	F= 0.39, p>.05	F= 0.58, p>.05	F= 0.16, p>.05
Victim Gender:	F= 6.05, p<.05*	F= 0.86, p>.05	F= 2.86, p>.05	F= 11.34, p<.01**
N	165	77	134	95
* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001				

First, Table 2 reveals that overall coverage differs across offender race groups with incidents involving White offenders more likely to receive coverage than those with non-White offenders ( $X^2 = 4.21, p<.05$ ). At other geographic levels, the likelihood of receiving national coverage is more likely for anti-religion bias homicides than other bias types ( $X^2 = 15.58, p<.01$ ), as are incidents that occur in the Northeast region ( $X^2 = 21.37, p<.001$ ). There are no statistically significant differences at the regional level, though I find that incidents involving White offenders are also more likely to receive local coverage than those with non-White offenders ( $X^2 = 9.11, p<.01$ ).

Second, regarding front page coverage, incidents involving anti-religion motivation ( $X^2 = 10.60, p<.05$ ), where victims and offenders don't know each other ( $X^2 = 5.98, p<.05$ ), and that involve non-male victims ( $X^2 = 4.58, p<.05$ ) are more likely to have at least one article appear on the front page. Similarly, at the national level, I find that incidents where the victim and

offenders do not know each other ( $X^2 = 8.95, p < .01$ ), and that involve non-male victims ( $X^2 = 5.90, p < .05$ ) are more likely to achieve front page coverage. At this same geographic level, I also find the location of the incident to be a significant predictor, whereas incidents that occur in public places ( $X^2 = 7.70, p < .01$ ) are more likely to receive front page coverage than those that occur in private. There are no statistically significant differences at the regional level, though, at the local level, I find that incidents are increasingly more likely to receive front page coverage when they involve the use of a firearm weapon ( $X^2 = 7.48, p < .01$ ), and contain non-male victims ( $X^2 = 5.31, p < .05$ ).

Third, Table 4 shows that the number of articles written about each incident differs by victim gender. Specifically, I find that bias homicide incidents involving non-male victims receive a greater number of articles when compared to male victims when measuring both the overall total number of articles ( $F = 12.18, p < .001$ ), and the total number of articles across each geographic level: national ( $F = 8.94, p < .01$ ), regional ( $F = 11.50, p < .001$ ), and local ( $F = 12.46, p < .001$ ). Fourth, regarding time of coverage, statistical differences appear across the total number of days covered between both bias type ( $F = 3.61, p < .01$ ) and weapon type ( $F = 6.32, p < .05$ ). Specifically, I find that bias incidents motivated by religion receive increasingly more total days covered when compared to anti-homeless, anti-sexual orientation, and other bias types. I also find that incidents involving the use of non-firearm weapons receive less total number of days covered when compared to incidents involving firearm weapons. In relation to time of coverage across geographic levels, I find no statistical differences.

Fifth, Table 6 includes ANOVA tests summarizing the relationships between incident characteristics and the logged word count for each incident. This table indicates that in regard to the total word count, statistical differences are present between both bias type ( $F = 3.19, p < .05$ )

and the victim's gender ( $F= 6.05, p<.05$ ). Specifically, I find that bias homicide incidents motivated by religion receive more logged words overall when compared to both anti-sexual orientation and anti-other bias types. I also find statistically significantly higher total word counts for incidents involving non-male victims when compared to incidents involving male victims. Although, I find no statistical differences at the national level, statistical differences are present at both the regional and local level. The regional level presents a variety of incident characteristics that contain statistically significant differences, including bias type ( $F= 2.51, p<.05$ ), victim-offender relationship ( $F= 4.72, p<.05$ ), weapon type ( $F= 3.98, p<.05$ ), and the offender's race ( $F= 7.13, p<.01$ ). Particularly, I find that bias homicide incidents motivated by religion receive increasingly more logged words when compared to both anti-sexual orientation and anti-other bias types. I also find that incidents receive a greater number of logged words when they involve white over non-white victims, unknown over known relationships, and firearms over non-firearm weapons. At the local level, I find that both the victim and offender's relationship ( $F= 7.30, p<.01$ ) and the victim's gender ( $F= 11.34, p<.01$ ) are related to word count such that incidents involving unknown relationships and non-male victims receive a greater number of logged words when compared to incidents involving known relationships and male victims.

Relative to the five coverage measures assessed (i.e., overall coverage, front page coverage, number of articles, time of coverage, and logged word count), the bivariate analysis finds three key predictor variables that influence the coverage outcomes of bias homicide incidents overall: bias type, weapon type, and the victim's gender. In regard to bias type, homicide incidents motivated by religion are significantly more likely to receive national coverage, front page coverage at any level, more total days of coverage, and a greater number of

logged words (total, regional) when compared to incidents motivated by sexual orientation and other bias types. Additionally, incidents involving the use of a firearm are more likely to receive local front-page coverage, more total days of coverage, and a greater number of logged words when compared to incidents involving non-firearm weapons. Lastly, non-male victims are significantly more likely to receive front-page coverage (any, national, and local), acquire a greater number of written articles overall and at all geographic levels, and log more written words (total, local) than incidents involving male victims.

### **Regression Analysis**

While instructive, the bivariate analyses do not account for the simultaneous impact of each incident characteristic on coverage. To do so, I turn now to the multivariate regression analysis techniques to examine the impact of incident characteristics as predictors of coverage overall and at each geographic level. For coverage measures that are categorical (i.e., *overall coverage, front-page coverage*), I use logistic regression models to account for the binary nature of the dependent variable. Meanwhile, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression modeling is used to examine predictors of continuous coverage measures (i.e., *number of articles, coverage time, and logged word count*). Because sample sizes are small and to avoid over-controlling the models, I cannot include every single predictor simultaneously. As such, for each coverage measure, four models are estimated. Model 1 includes bias type, which is included in every subsequent model. Model 2 includes bias type and victim-offender relationship and weapon type. Model 3 includes bias type and both region of incident and location. Finally, Model 4 includes bias type and both offenders' and victims' gender and race. In total, 80 models were constructed. Due to the difficulty in displaying all 80 models, the current study instead provides summary tables that highlight significant findings for each type of regression analysis performed as shown

in Table 7 and 8.<sup>3</sup> Table 7 summarizes the results of 32 logistic regression models used to predict both (a) *overall coverage* and (b) *front-page coverage* as a function of BHDB incident characteristics. Table 8 summarizes the results of 48 OLS regression models used to predict (a) *number of articles*, (b) *coverage days/time to first article*, & (c) *logged word count* as a function of BHDB incident characteristics. I find the following.

<b>Table 7. Summary of Logistic Regression Models Predicting (a) Coverage and (b) Front Page as a Function of BHDB Incident Characteristics</b>								
	<i>(a) Coverage</i>				<i>(b) Front Page</i>			
	Any	Nat.	Reg.	Loc.	Any	Nat.	Reg.	Loc.
Bias Type:								
Homeless		* (-)						
Race						* (+)	* (+)	
Religion		* (+)			* (+)			* (+)
Sexual Orientation								
Victim-Offender Rel.:								
Known								
Weapon:								
Firearm								* (+)
Region:								
Northeast		* (+)				* (-)		
Midwest		* (-)						
West						* (-)		* (-)
Location:								
Private								
Victim:								
Male						* (-)		
Non-White								
Offender:								
Male								* (-)
Non-White				* (-)				
N	216	216	216	216	165	77	134	95
Average R <sup>2</sup>	.03	.09	.02	.03	.07	.09	.05	.13
Note: Given small sample sizes and to prevent “over-controlling,” four models are constructed for each outcome (coverage, front page): (a) only bias type; (b) bias type, victim-offender relationship, weapon, and location; (c) bias type, victim, and offender; and (d) bias type and region.								
* Indicates a relationship was statistically significant at p<.05 or less. The sign in parentheses indicates the direction of the relationship. Blank cells indicate a non-significant relationship.								

<sup>3</sup> See appendix section for all regression analysis tables.

**Table 8. Summary of OLS Regression Models Predicting (a) Number of Articles, (b) Coverage Days/Time to First Article, (c) Logged Word Count as a Function of BHDB Incident Characteristics**

	<i>(a) Number of Articles</i>				<i>(b) Coverage Time</i>				<i>(c) Logged Word Count</i>			
	Total	Nat.	Reg.	Loc.	Total Days	Days to 1 <sup>st</sup> Nat.	Days to 1 <sup>st</sup> Reg.	Days to 1 <sup>st</sup> Loc.	Total	Nat.	Reg.	Loc.
Bias Type:												
Homeless												
Race												
Religion					* (+)				* (+)		* (+)	
Sex. Ori.												
Victim-Offender Rel.:												
Known							* (+)					
Weapon:												
Firearm			* (+)									
Region:												
Northeast												
Midwest												
West												
Location:												
Private												
Victim:												
Male	* (-)	* (-)	* (-)	* (-)					* (-)			* (-)
Non-White												
Offender:												
Male												
Non-White									* (-)		* (-)	
N	165	77	134	95	165	77	134	95	165	77	134	95
Average R <sup>2</sup>	.04	.07	.05	.07	.10	.11	.05	.05	.10	.08	.10	.08
<p>Note: Given small sample sizes and to prevent “over-controlling,” four models are constructed for each outcome (coverage, front page): (a) only bias type; (b) bias type, victim-offender relationship, weapon, and location; (c) bias type, victim, and offender; and (d) bias type and region.</p> <p>* Indicates a relationship was statistically significant at p&lt;.05 or less. The sign in parentheses indicates the direction of the relationship. Blank cells indicate a non-significant relationship.</p>												

Table 7 provides that coverage at both the national and local level depends on characteristics of the bias homicide incident. Specifically, I find that bias type and region have a statistically significant relationship with national coverage. In regard to bias type, incidents motivated by anti-homeless sentiment are less likely to be covered at the national level than those motivated by “other” bias types (gender identity nationality/immigrant status). In contrast,

I find a positive, significant relationship ( $p < .05$  or better) between bias homicide incidents motivated by religion. Meanwhile, incidents that occur in the northeast region are more likely to receive any national coverage than those in the South (my reference), while incidents that occur in the Midwest region are less likely to receive national coverage than those in the South ( $p < .05$  or better). Despite finding no statistically significant relationships at the regional level, I do find a negative, significant relationship ( $p < .05$  or better) at the local level between non-white offenders and local coverage: incidents involving non-White offenders are less likely to receive local news coverage.

Second, in regard to *front page coverage*, I find that bias type is statistically significant in predicting the likelihood of an incident receiving front-page coverage across all geographic levels. In particular, I find that incidents motivated by race are more likely to receive national and regional front-page coverage ( $p < .05$  or better) when compared to other bias types (my reference). In addition, I find that incidents motivated by religion are more likely to receive any and local front-page than incidents motivated by other bias types (my reference) ( $p < .05$  or better). I also find that incidents involving the use of a firearm are more likely to receive local front-page coverage than incidents involving non-firearm weapons. At the national level, I find that incidents that occur in the Northeast and West region are less likely to receive national front-page coverage when compared to those that occur in the South ( $p < .05$  or better). At the local level, I find that incidents that occur in the West region are less likely to receive local front-page coverage than those in the South ( $p < .05$  or better). In regard to victim characteristics, I note that incidents involving male victims are less likely to receive national front-page coverage ( $p < .05$  or better). Finally, incidents involving male offenders are less likely to receive front page coverage than incidents involving non-male offenders ( $p < .05$  or better).

Third, in reference to Table 8, I find that weapon type and the victim's gender are statistically related to the *number of articles* across various levels of coverage. Incidents involving the use of a firearm weapon have greater number of regional articles ( $p < .05$  or better), than those involving non-firearm weapons. Across all levels of coverage (any, national, regional, local), incidents involving male victims receive a fewer number of articles than those involving non-male victims ( $p < .05$  or better).

Fourth, both bias type and the victim/offender relationship have a significant statistical relationship with *coverage time*. In regard to bias type, I find that incidents motivated by religion are more likely to receive a greater total number of days covered than incidents motivated by other bias types ( $p < .05$  or better). I also find that the victim and offender's relationship is related to coverage time at the regional level ( $p < .05$  or better): known relationships have a more time (days) between the incident date and the date of the first regional article recognition.

Fifth, in regard to logged word count, I find a variety of significant relationships in general (total), as well as across specific geographic levels (regional and local). For instance, bias type is found to be significantly related to the logged word count an incident receives. Whereas incidents motivated by religion were more likely to receive a greater number of logged words ( $p < .05$  or better), both overall and at the regional level, when compared to incidents motivated by other bias types (my reference). In addition, I find that incidents involving male victims statistically receive fewer total and local logged words ( $p < .05$  or better). Lastly, the analysis indicates that there is a negative, significant relationship between the offender's gender and the logged word count: incidents involving non-white offenders receive fewer total and regional logged words when compared to incidents involving white offenders ( $p < .05$  or better).



Overall, the regression models show that bias type victim's gender have the most significant statistical relationships with the coverage outcomes of bias homicide incidents. Taking into consideration all other characteristics, incidents involving anti-religion motivations are statistically more likely to receive national coverage, front page coverage (any, local), more total days of coverage, and a greater number of logged words (total, regional) when compared to incident motivated by other bias types (my reference). Additionally, when compared to my reference category (i.e., other bias type), I find that incidents motivated by anti-homeless bias are statistically less likely to be covered at the national level, and that anti-race motivated incidents are statistically more likely to receive national and regional front-page coverage. In regard to the victim's gender, male victims are statistically less likely to receive national front-page coverage, acquire a fewer number of written articles (total, national, regional, local), and have fewer written words (total, local) devoted to them than incidents involving non-male victims.

### **Discussion & Conclusion**

While still relatively rare compared to conventional forms of violence, bias crimes generally and bias homicides specifically are important – albeit uncommon – pieces of the criminal landscape in the United States. Yet, bias crimes have become increasingly more violent since 2017 (Treisman, 2019). Given their intent to evoke fear among specific groups, bias crimes are particularly damaging for individuals from targeted groups, including the LGBTQ community, racial minorities, and religious minorities (Perry, 2001, p. 1-2).

Nevertheless, few individuals have direct experience with bias crime and the public tends to learn about crime from the news media (Surette, 2014). But not all crimes receive equal news coverage (Graber, 1980): violent crimes like homicide are over-represented in the news media (Chermak, 1994a, 1994b; Paulsen, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997), while property crime, drug

use, and public order crimes are dismissed or de-emphasized in comparison to their actual frequency. In turn, research finds that the news coverage and presentation of overall crime varies by victim, offender, and incident characteristics (Bjornstrom, Kaufman, Peterson, & Slater, 2010; Dixon & Williams, 2015; Gruenewald, Pizarro, Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Johnstone, Hawkins, & Michener, 1994; Lundman, 2003; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004; Petersen, 2016; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Schildkraut & Donley, 2012; Schildkraut, Elsass, & Meredith, 2018; Sorenson, Manz, & Berk, 1998).

The goal of the current study has been to extend this line of inquiry to the study of bias-motivated homicides by asking: *what characteristics make bias homicide incidents more or less newsworthy?* To answer this question, data were drawn from a quantitative analysis of 216 bias homicide incidents recorded by the Bias Homicide Database (BHDB) between 2000 and 2019 with indicators of news coverage drawn from two newspaper archives searches. I found, *first*, most bias homicide incidents were motivated by anti-sexual orientation (34 percent) or anti-race (26 percent) sentiment. In the majority of incidents, the relationship between the victim and offender was unknown, did not involve the use of a firearm, and occurred in the South region or West regions of the United States. Likewise, the majority occurred in public places, involved White and male offenders, and targeted and non-white and male victims.

*Second*, the likelihood of a bias homicide incident receiving any news coverage was high but differed across geographic levels. Over three-quarters of incidents have at least one article written about them but were more likely to have regional coverage (62 percent of incidents) than local (44 percent) or national (36 percent) coverage. Relatedly, *third*, coverage differed across geographic levels at more granular levels, as well. For example, more articles were written, on average, at the regional than local or national levels (about 25 articles) and took fewer days until

the first article appears (322 days, on average) than either local (441 days, on average) or national papers (327 days, on average). Similarly, regional papers devoted more space to each incident, on average, than local and national papers. In contrast, I found that bias homicide incidents were slightly more likely to appear on the front page of local papers (about 37 percent) than in regional (28 percent) and national papers (25 percent).

*Fourth*, bivariate analyses revealed some characteristics of incidents increase coverage. For example, incidents motivated by religion increased coverage (any national coverage, front page at all levels, more total days, and more words) when compared to incident motivated by sexual orientation and other bias types. Likewise, incidents involving the use of a firearm received more coverage (local front-page, more total days of coverage, and more words), as did incidents involving female victims (front-page coverage, total number of articles, and words).

Finally, *fifth*, multi-variable regression models confirmed many of these bivariate associations. For instance, even when other characteristics were held constant, I found that incidents motivated by religion – and, to a lesser extent, race – were more likely to receive news media attention (e.g., national coverage, front page coverage, more total days of coverage, and a greater number of logged words) when compared to incident motivated by other bias types. In contrast, anti-homeless incidents were less likely to receive some types of news media attention (e.g., national coverage). In much the same manner as bias type, incidents involving male victims were statistically less likely to receive attention (e.g., national front-page coverage, fewer articles, fewer words) than incidents involving female victims.

### **Theoretical Contributions**

Largely, these findings provide support for the theoretical propositions set forth by the rarity model. Drawing from both the market model and normal crime model of media behavior,

the rarity model functions under the proposition that more unusual events (e.g., violent crimes) receive more news coverage because they entice the audience and promote their organization in order to obtain higher ratings and monetary return (Paulsen, 2003). When applied to bias homicide incidents more specifically, the rarity model argues that those containing rare or unusual characteristics (e.g., anti-religion motivations, female victims) will receive more prominent news coverage than more “normal” or usual traits because they will attract readers in ways that make such stories sell.

Broadly, the current study hypothesized that bias homicide incidents would be covered more generally by news media because of the rarity and heightened nature of violence surrounding such lethal criminal incidents. In support, I found that the likelihood of a bias homicide incident receiving any news coverage was high. However, when conceptualized by specific bias motivation, I found support for my hypothesis that more common bias motivations would garner less news media coverage when compared to incidents involving uncommon motivations (Allison & Harris, 2018). Findings revealed that despite anti-religion incidents occupying the lowest frequency in my sample (14 out of 216, or 6.48 percent of incidents), these bias homicide incidents were more likely to receive news media coverage when compared to bias types that occurred more frequently. In contrast, anti-homeless bias homicide incidents (27 percent of incidents) were significantly less likely to receive some types of news coverage, controlling for other incident characteristics.

At least in the context of the United States, anti-religion bias homicides might receive more coverage because they are a more marketable bias motivation for news media outlets. Such stories might attract a more diverse population of consumers than other bias types (e.g., anti-homeless) because the United States population is still overwhelmingly religious (Pew Research

Center, 2019a) and, in turn, anti-religious sentiment resonates for many potential readers. For comparison, reduced coverage for anti-homeless bias homicides may reflect the negative social value that society places on the homeless population and because of the general “invisibility” of the homeless population (Huey, 2012). Indeed, the homeless community is often viewed as a throwaway community where criminal victimization might be viewed by news organizations as being less likely to garner public consumption and profitability.

In addition, the current study observed that, despite incidents involving the use of a firearm being less common than incidents involving the use of non-firearm weapons (42.13 percent vs. 57.87 percent), such incidents received more local front-page coverage, more total days of coverage, and a greater number of logged words. In the same manner, the majority of victims were male (86.11 percent), but incidents involving male victims were less likely to receive front-page coverage, have fewer articles written at all geographic levels, and fewer logged words overall and at the local level. Like bias type, this lends support to the rarity model in which more unusual circumstances (e.g., use of firearms, female victims) predict greater news media attention and coverage. In regard to weapon type, incidents involving a firearm perhaps evoke more fear to viewers because they are simultaneously part of our culture but rarely witnessed in use as individuals. In regard to victim’s gender, general social beliefs about the fragility of women and their value as caregivers, as well as their comparably low levels of involvement in most types of crime (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996), means that incidents involving females evoke strong emotional responses, increase overall readership, and generate more revenue.

While I note support for some aspects of the rarity model, many of these same findings also dovetail with the cultural deviance model. Broadly, the cultural deviance model suggests

that some crime incidents receive more news media coverage because they ensure that the common scripts of crime (i.e., who is an offender, who is a victim, how crime occurs) are upheld. The current study hypothesized that crime stories involving minority offenders and majority White victims, as well as involve male offenders and female victims, would receive greater coverage. Such stories reflect the power held by media organizations that affect their story selection (Poindexter, Smith, Heider, 2003), reinforce the threat of racial/ethnic minorities (Blalock, 1967), reinforce the privileges of Whites, males, and the upper class (McIntosh, 1988), and fit cultural stereotypes held by the broader public (Lundman, 2003). In particular, my findings reveal incidents involving male victims receive comparably less coverage than those with female victims. I also believe that cultural deviance may play a role in the treatment of anti-religion bias homicides: because media owners might select incidents to entrench their own power structure, anti-religion incidents might be featured because they are bias crimes that do discuss the vulnerability of minority groups (i.e., racial and ethnic, homeless, and LGBTQ incidents) in ways that would highlight the need for broader social change to protect them. Instead, because of the ubiquity of religion in dominant racial and social class hierarchies, anti-religion homicides are more palatable to news makers.

Overall, findings from the current study contribute to media and crime literature by broadly reaffirming prior findings that violent criminal incidents receive disproportionate news coverage (Chermak, 1994a, 1994b; Paulsen, 2003; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). Indeed, my own analysis shows that the majority of bias homicides make their way into the news at some point. More novel, however, is my focus on expanding the conceptualization of “coverage” to include both geography (overall, national, regional, local) and time (days of coverage, time to first article at each level). In doing so, I found that some bias homicide incidents are more likely to receive

coverage than others, in many ways paralleling the findings from studies of more generalized news coverage. For example, incidents involving firearm weapons over non-firearm weapons and non-male victims were more likely to receive news coverage than male victims, confirming at least some prior studies (Gruenewald, Pizarro, & Chermak, 2009; Gruenewald, Chermak, & Pizarro, 2013; Paulsen, 2003; Peelo et al., 2004). Broadly, the findings revealed here reaffirm a common theme from prior media-crime research: the news does not treat all types of crime in the same way, often obscuring the true empirical distribution.

### **Limitations, Directions for Future Research, & Policy Implications**

It is important to acknowledge that the current study suffers several few limitations that also point to areas for future research. First, I recognize that my analysis may be limited by my relatively small sample size of only bias homicide incidents that occurred between 2000 and 2019. Performing newspaper archival searches and coding takes time and care. As such, my multivariable analyses have somewhat reduced statistical power to detect relationships and, relatedly, cannot include all covariates at once. Nevertheless, I feel that I was able to adequately capture coverage trends due to changes in bias crime policy during this time (e.g., the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crime Prevention Act of 2009) and reveal important differences in coverage. Future research would do well to expand my analysis to include BHDB incidents over the full period from 1990 to the present.

Second, the current study includes only newspaper articles rather than web-based materials, television coverage, or other news media products (e.g., social media). This certainly results in an under-representation of BHDB incident coverage, though I know of no research that indicates it does so systematically for some types of incidents as compared to others. Certainly, my sample of incidents captures some news that appears in both traditional print circulation and

online formats simultaneously since many newspapers create their own websites to host articles (Greer and Yan, 2011; Harris, Gruenewald & Tuttle, 2020). Yet, the analysis presented here marks only the tip of a much larger iceberg in terms of the news coverage that might appear for each incident and I cannot definitively rule out that my results would differ with the inclusion of television, social media, and other sources.

Third, in regard to my independent variable characteristics, my study was limited to accounting only for a handful of incident characteristics. I made careful choices about which offender, victim, and circumstantial factors to model given my smaller sample size. For example, I was unable to include covariates for age, social class, or the more granular details for incident locations and relationships. Such variation may be instrumental in understanding why some incidents receive media attention while others do not. While the current study marks an important advance, I was unable to leverage the full value of the BHDB incident characteristics.

In order to better understand variations in bias homicide news coverage, I also argue that future research should utilize a “focusing events” and subsequent “policy windows” theoretical approach. Broadly, because not all criminal incidents receive news coverage (or the same degree of coverage), incidents compete for attention from lawmakers, moral entrepreneurs, and other “claim makers” (Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; Loseke, 2011). In effect, news media sporadically acknowledge social issues – like bias homicide – as being an immediate concern by disseminating specific sensationalized stories that serve as “focusing events” (Birkland, 1998) to open up “policy windows” (Kingdon, 2003). As such, certain criminal incidents are more likely to receive notable news coverage when they encompass characteristics (incident, victim, offender) that support the particular political agenda being advanced at that time. Based upon my findings here, there is good reason to suspect that variation in coverage may be the result of



conscientious choices made to advance bias crime policy. Thus, future research examining the policy stream, of which the news media remains a part, would make an important contribution to understanding bias crime coverage.

Bias crimes engender strong emotional responses among the general public, none more so than when an incident ends in death. In turn, public sentiment surrounding bias homicides can play an important role in both advocating for vulnerable groups and creating effective policy to protect them. The news media helps shape that public sentiment and I hope that the current study marks an important step in untangling how news media decide which events – and, by default, which groups – feature in public rhetoric about bias crime.

## References

- Allison, K., & Harris, C. (2018). Predicting Bias Homicide Across Victim Groups: A County-level Analysis. *Social Science Research, 74*, 108-119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2018.05.003>
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Birkland, T. A. (1998). Focusing events, mobilization, and agenda setting. *Journal of public policy, 53-74*.
- Bjornstrom, E. E. S., Kaufman, R. L., Peterson, R. D., & Slater, M. D. (2010). Race and ethnic representations of lawbreakers and victims in crime news: A national study of television coverage. *Social problems, 57(2)*, 269-293.
- Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Boyd, E. A., Berk, R. A., & Hamner, K. M. (1996). "Motivated by Hatred or Prejudice": Categorization of Hate-motivated Crimes in Two Police Divisions. *Law & Society Review, 30(4)*, 819-850. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3054119>
- Chermak, S. (1994a). Body count news: How crime is presented in the news media. *Justice Quarterly, 11(4)*, 561-582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829400092431>
- Chermak, S. (1994b). Understanding of How Crimes Become. *Media, process, and the social construction of crime: Studies in newsmaking criminology, 10*, 95.
- Croteau, D., & Hoynes, W. (2001). *The business of media: corporate media and the public interest*. Pine Forge Press.
- Dixon, T. L. (2017). Good guys are still always in white? Positive change and continued misrepresentation of race and crime on local television news. *Communication Research, 44(6)*, 775-792.
- Dixon, T. L., & Williams, C. L. (2015). The changing misrepresentation of race and crime on network and cable news. *Journal of Communication, 65(1)*, 24-39.
- Dunbar, E. (2006). Race, gender, and sexual orientation in hate crime victimization: Identity politics or identity risk? *Violence and Victims, 21(3)*, 323-337.
- Freilich, J. D., Chermak, S. M., Belli, R., Gruenewald, J., & Parkin, W. S. (2014). Introducing the United States Extremis Crime Database (ECDB). *Terrorism and Political Violence, 26(2)*, 372-384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2012.713229>

- Garnets, L., Herek, G. M., & Levy, B. (1990). Violence and victimization of lesbians and gay men: Mental health consequences. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 5(3), 366-383.
- Graber, D. A. (1980). *Crime news and the public*. Praeger New York.
- Greer, J. D., & Yan, Y. (2011). Newspapers connect with readers through multiple digital tools. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 32(4), 83-97.
- Gruenewald, J. (2012). Are anti-LGBT homicides in the United States unique? *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 27(18), 3601-3623.
- Gruenewald, J. (2013). Using Open-Source Data to Study Bias Homicide Against Homeless Persons. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2013.02.48>
- Gruenewald, J., & Allison, K. (2018). Examining Differences in Bias Homicide Across Victim Groups. *Crime & Delinquency*, 64, 316-341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128717715735>
- Gruenewald, J., Chermak, S. M., & Pizarro, J. M. (2013). Covering victims in the news: What makes minority homicides newsworthy? *Justice Quarterly*, 30(5), 755-783.
- Gruenewald, J., Pizarro, J., & Chermak, S. (2009). Race, gender, and the newsworthiness of homicide incidents. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 262-272. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 262-272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.04.006>
- Haider-Markel, D. P. (2002). Regulating Hate: State and Local Influences on Hate Crime Law Enforcement. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 2(2), 126-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/153244000200200202>
- Harris, C. T., Gruenewald, J., & Tuttle, C. R. (2020). Immigration and Crime in the Local News: Exploring the Macrolevel Covariates of Coverage and Framing. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 1-25.
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., Cogan, J. C., & Glunt, E. K. (1997). Hate crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults: Prevalence, psychological correlates, and methodological issues. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 12(2), 195-215.
- Huey, L. (2012). *Invisible victims: Homelessness and the growing security gap*. University of Toronto Press.
- Iganski, P. (2008). *'Hate crime' and the city*. Policy Press.
- Johnstone, J. W. C., Hawkins, D. F., & Michener, A. (1994). Homicide Reporting in Chicago Dailies. *Journalism Quarterly*, 71(4), 860-872. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909407100410>

- Keir, G., McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1991). *Advanced Reporting: Beyond News Events*. Waveland Press.
- Kelley, K., & Gruenewald, J. (2015). Accomplishing masculinity through anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender homicide: A comparative case study approach. *Men and Masculinities, 18*(1), 3-29.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies* (New York, NY, & London, Longman).
- Klein, B., & Allison, K. (2018). Accomplishing Difference: How Do Anti-race/Ethnicity Bias Homicides Compare to Average Homicides in the United States? *Justice Quarterly, 35*, 977-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1351576>
- Loseke, D. R. (2011). *Thinking about social problems: An introduction to constructionist perspectives*. Transaction Publishers.
- Lundman, R. (2003). The Newsworthiness and Selection Bias in News About Murder: Comparative and Relative Effects of Novelty and Race and Gender Typifications on Newspaper Coverage of Homicide. *Sociological Forum, 18*, 357-386. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025713518156>
- Mayr, A., & Machin, D. (2012). *The Language of Crime and Deviance: An Introduction to Critical Linguistic Analysis in Media and Popular Culture*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- McDevitt, J., Balboni, J. M., Bennett, S., Weiss, J., Orchowsky, S., & Walbolt, L. (2000). Improving the quality and accuracy of bias crime statistics nationally: an assessment of the first ten years of bias crime data collection (executive summary and final report).
- McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In: ERIC.
- Messner, S. F., McHugh, S., & Felson, R. B. (2004). Distinctive characteristics of assaults motivated by bias. *Criminology, 42*(3), 585-618.
- Nolan, J. J., & Akiyama, Y. (1999). An Analysis of Factors that Affect Law Enforcement Participation in Hate Crime Reporting. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 15*(1), 111-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986299015001008>
- Paulsen, D. (2003). Murder in Black and White The Newspaper Coverage of Homicide in Houston. *Homicide Studies, 7*, 289-317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767903253707>
- Peelo, M., Francis, B., Soothill, K., Pearson, J., & Ackerley, E. (2004). Newspaper Reporting and the Public Construction of Homicide. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*, 256-274. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/44.2.256>

- Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes*. Psychology Press.
- Petersen, N. (2016). Neighborhood context and media constructions of murder: A multilevel analysis of homicide newspaper coverage in Los Angeles County. *Homicide studies, 20*(1), 25-52.
- Pew Research Center. 2019a. "In U.S., Decline of Christianity Continues at Rapid Pace: An update on America's changing religious landscape." *Religion & Public Life*. Retrieved March 10, 2021. <https://www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/>
- Pew Research Center. 2019b. "Newspapers Fact Sheet." *Journalism & Media*. Retrieved March 10, 2021. <https://www.journalism.org/fact-sheet/newspapers/>
- Poindexter, P. M., Smith, L., & Heider, D. (2003). Race and ethnicity in local television news: Framing, story assignments, and source selections. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 47*(4), 524-536.
- Pooley, E. (1989). Grins, gore, and videotape: The trouble with local TV news. *New York Magazine, 22*(40), 36-44.
- Pritchard, D., & Hughes, K. D. (1997). Patterns of deviance in crime news. *Journal of communication, 47*(3), 49-67.
- Rose, S. M., & Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Psychological distress, crime features, and help-seeking behaviors related to homophobic bias incidents. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(1), 14-26.
- Schildkraut, J., & Donley, A. (2012). Murder in Black: A Media Distortion Analysis of Homicides in Baltimore in 2010. *Homicide Studies - HOMICIDE STUD, 16*, 175-196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767912438712>
- Schildkraut, J., Elsass, H. J., & Meredith, K. (2018). Mass shootings and the media: Why all events are not created equal. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 41*(3), 223-243.
- Sorenson, S., Manz, J. G., & Berk, R. (1998). News media coverage and the epidemiology of homicide. *American journal of public health, 88*, 1510-1514. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.88.10.1510>
- Stacey, M. (2011). Distinctive characteristics of sexual orientation bias crimes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(15), 3013-3032.
- Steffensmeier, D., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual review of sociology, 22*(1), 459-487.

Strom, K. (2001). *Hate crimes reported in NIBRS, 1997-99*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice ....

Sudnow, D. (1965). Normal crimes: Sociological features of the penal code in a public defender office. *Social problems*, 12(3), 255-276.

Surette, R. (2014). *Media, crime, and criminal justice*. Nelson Education.

Treisman, R. (Writer). (2019, November 12). *FBI Reports Dip In Hate Crimes, But Rise In Violence* [Radio broadcast]. NPR. Retrieved March 30, 2020, from <https://www.npr.org/2019/11/12/778542614/fbi-reports-dip-in-hate-crimes-but-rise-in-violence>

## Appendix

	Any Coverage				
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-0.81	-1.07	-0.87	-0.94
		(0.54)	(0.56)	(0.61)	(0.56)
	Race	-0.10	-0.45	-0.20	-0.19
		(0.48)	(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.50)
	Religion	0.46	0.20	0.24	0.44
		(0.84)	(0.87)	(0.86)	(0.86)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.13	-0.37	-0.14	-0.23
		(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.47)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		0.56		
			(0.65)		
	Non-White		-0.64		
			(0.36)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.46		
			(0.54)		
	Non-White		-0.46		
			(0.46)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.24	
				(0.35)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.61	
				(0.42)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			0.27	
				(0.45)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				0.36
					(0.53)
	Midwest				-0.85
					(0.46)
	West				-0.43
					(0.42)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.01	0.04	0.03	0.04

	Local Coverage				
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-0.32	-0.55	-0.33	-0.39
		(0.50)	(0.52)	(0.55)	(0.51)
	Race	-0.09	-0.48	-0.15	-0.13
		(0.40)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.41)
	Religion	1.13	0.77	0.99	1.19
		(0.65)	(0.68)	(0.67)	(0.66)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.12	-0.38	-0.09	-0.14
		(0.38)	(0.41)	(0.40)	(0.39)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-0.23		
			(0.60)		
	Non-White		-0.84**		
			(0.32)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.07		
			(0.42)		
	Non-White		-0.30		
			(0.37)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.26	
				(0.30)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.39	
				(0.36)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			0.16	
				(0.37)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-0.19
					(0.40)
	Midwest				-0.40
					(0.42)
	West				-0.06
					(0.36)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.02	0.05	0.02	0.02



		<b>Regional Coverage</b>			
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-0.22	-0.37	-0.14	-0.24
		(0.49)	(0.51)	(0.55)	(0.50)
	Race	0.04	-0.21	0.05	0.01
		(0.41)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.42)
	Religion	0.85	0.62	0.78	0.78
		(0.71)	(0.73)	(0.73)	(0.73)
	Sexual Orientation	0.05	-0.11	0.07	-0.01
		(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.41)	(0.40)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		0.10		
			(0.60)		
	Non-White		-0.42		
			(0.31)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.57		
			(0.45)		
	Non-White		-0.26		
			(0.38)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.23	
				(0.30)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.28	
				(0.36)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			0.23	
				(0.38)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				0.61
					(0.44)
	Midwest				-0.38
					(0.41)
	West				-0.33
					(0.36)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03

	<b>National Coverage</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-1.68*	-1.61*	-1.97**	-1.93**
		(0.68)	(0.69)	(0.73)	(0.71)
	Race	-0.12	-0.03	-0.40	-0.33
		(0.40)	(0.43)	(0.44)	(0.44)
	Religion	1.32*	1.44*	0.98	1.41
		(0.66)	(0.68)	(0.68)	(0.73)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.28	-0.17	-0.24	-0.53
		(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.42)	(0.42)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-0.03		
			(0.63)		
	Non-White		0.28		
			(0.33)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.51		
			(0.42)		
	Non-White		0.26		
			(0.40)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.27	
				(0.32)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.73	
				(0.38)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.08	
				(0.39)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				0.99*
					(0.42)
	Midwest				-1.49**
					(0.55)
	West				-0.38
					(0.39)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.06	0.07	0.08	0.14

	<b>Total Front Page</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	0.20	0.09	0.01	0.21
		(0.62)	(0.65)	(0.67)	(0.64)
	Race	0.54	0.23	0.33	0.62
		(0.47)	(0.51)	(0.49)	(0.48)
	Religion	1.86*	1.76*	1.63*	2.04**
		(0.75)	(0.77)	(0.76)	(0.76)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.14	-0.29	0.09	-0.12
		(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.51)	(0.48)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		0.19		
			(0.76)		
	Non-White		-0.50		
			(0.38)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.89		
			(0.47)		
	Non-White		-0.19		
			(0.43)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.45	
				(0.36)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.19	
				(0.45)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.53	
				(0.44)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-0.65
					(0.46)
	Midwest				-0.55
					(0.53)
	West				-0.56
					(0.44)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.05	0.08	0.07	0.06

	Local Front Page				
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	0.48	0.47	0.59	0.94
		(0.81)	(0.86)	(0.91)	(0.89)
	Race	0.23	0.12	0.00	0.43
		(0.64)	(0.70)	(0.70)	(0.69)
	Religion	2.25*	2.46*	2.04*	2.70**
		(0.91)	(0.98)	(0.96)	(0.96)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.01	-0.25	0.25	0.10
		(0.63)	(0.72)	(0.71)	(0.67)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		0.57		
			(0.97)		
	Non-White		-0.18		
			(0.52)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-1.53*		
			(0.68)		
	Non-White		-1.07		
			(0.58)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			1.16*	
				(0.50)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.55	
				(0.65)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.11	
				(0.58)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-1.22
					(0.67)
	Midwest				-0.80
					(0.71)
	West				-1.82**
					(0.66)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.07	0.15	0.13	0.15

		<b>Regional Front Page</b>			
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	0.54	0.43	0.46	0.47
		(0.77)	(0.79)	(0.81)	(0.78)
	Race	1.18*	0.97	1.03	1.15
		(0.59)	(0.63)	(0.61)	(0.60)
	Religion	1.27	1.17	1.19	1.35
		(0.77)	(0.80)	(0.78)	(0.77)
	Sexual Orientation	0.27	0.11	0.63	0.26
		(0.61)	(0.63)	(0.67)	(0.62)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		0.94		
			(1.11)		
	Non-White		-0.15		
			(0.44)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.73		
			(0.51)		
	Non-White		-0.31		
			(0.50)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.31	
				(0.42)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			0.20	
				(0.54)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.73	
				(0.55)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-0.40
					(0.54)
	Midwest				-0.31
					(0.63)
	West				0.12
					(0.50)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.04	0.07	0.06	0.05

		<b>National Front Page</b>			
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	0.74	0.74	-0.08	2.67
		(1.35)	(1.43)	(1.42)	(1.58)
	Race	0.85	0.42	0.37	1.94*
		(0.71)	(0.77)	(0.80)	(0.92)
	Religion	0.49	0.27	-0.06	0.91
		(0.86)	(0.91)	(0.94)	(0.97)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.23	-0.37	-0.18	0.41
		(0.79)	(0.82)	(0.94)	(0.95)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-0.08		
			(1.19)		
	Non-White		-0.29		
			(0.62)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-1.35*		
			(0.67)		
	Non-White		-0.11		
			(0.74)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.53	
				(0.61)	
<b>Location</b>	Private				
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-1.17	
				(0.80)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-1.73*
					(0.77)
	Midwest				1.02
					(1.08)
	West				-2.21*
					(1.00)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.04	0.09	0.07	0.17

	Total Number of Articles				
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-6.45	14.96	-20.11	-4.68
		(79.58)	(79.76)	(84.15)	(80.36)
	Race	64.42	46.70	39.12	73.72
		(59.83)	(62.90)	(62.06)	(60.78)
	Religion	30.03	29.67	-0.66	48.83
		(88.41)	(87.68)	(90.02)	(89.24)
	Sexual Orientation	26.71	34.11	63.95	27.03
		(57.59)	(57.99)	(60.91)	(58.04)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-0.40		
			(91.86)		
	Non-White		11.01		
			(46.37)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-		
			190.72**		
			(58.59)		
	Non-White		21.86		
			(52.42)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			77.34	
				(44.51)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-3.60	
				(54.92)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-72.43	
				(54.43)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-68.13
					(56.79)
	Midwest				-87.77
					(65.28)
	West				-91.14
					(54.77)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.01	0.07	0.04	0.03

	<b>Total Number of Local Articles</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-11.45	-0.06	-22.95	-6.04
		(44.15)	(43.01)	(46.78)	(45.34)
	Race	29.53	24.89	19.47	30.89
		(33.40)	(33.35)	(35.00)	(34.49)
	Religion	-9.01	-9.26	-27.11	-0.93
		(42.88)	(41.52)	(44.13)	(43.30)
	Sexual Orientation	4.16	21.07	21.45	3.68
		(32.50)	(32.86)	(34.85)	(33.33)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-4.14		
			(44.04)		
	Non-White		11.26		
			(25.15)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-		
			109.68**		
			(33.03)		
	Non-White		11.42		
			(27.71)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			30.09	
				(24.86)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.35	
				(32.15)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-44.28	
				(29.86)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-38.52
					(33.17)
	Midwest				-42.41
					(36.50)
	West				-44.64
					(30.14)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.02	0.13	0.07	0.05



	<b>Total Number of Regional Articles</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	5.68	10.31	3.89	2.92
		(42.44)	(42.64)	(44.24)	(42.90)
	Race	44.35	31.39	28.43	44.08
		(32.98)	(34.32)	(33.92)	(33.35)
	Religion	24.26	20.20	11.96	30.17
		(46.10)	(45.57)	(46.38)	(46.26)
	Sexual Orientation	23.94	20.64	51.11	19.83
		(31.81)	(31.97)	(33.70)	(32.06)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		3.93		
			(48.18)		
	Non-White		12.80		
			(24.68)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		- 94.87**		
			(31.06)		
	Non-White		1.84		
			(28.70)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			48.58*	
				(24.09)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			4.18	
				(29.34)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-43.76	
				(30.92)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-37.60
					(30.13)
	Midwest				-47.82
					(35.29)
	West				-48.62
					(30.38)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.02	0.09	0.06	0.04

	<b>Total Number of National Articles</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-11.31	6.93	-25.86	10.25
		(61.12)	(62.13)	(62.13)	(63.52)
	Race	25.00	5.50	11.23	31.12
		(30.21)	(31.46)	(30.81)	(32.08)
	Religion	1.19	-5.23	-11.91	9.31
		(37.29)	(36.65)	(37.91)	(37.57)
	Sexual Orientation	12.33	7.44	26.21	13.20
		(29.99)	(29.60)	(32.31)	(31.76)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		2.64		
			(45.10)		
	Non-White		-1.46		
			(23.92)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-80.78**		
			(29.52)		
	Non-White		23.19		
			(29.75)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			34.47	
				(23.33)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			5.33	
				(32.77)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-44.15	
				(29.13)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-42.66
					(27.16)
	Midwest				-30.04
					(47.60)
	West				-46.45
					(31.52)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.01	0.12	0.08	0.06

	<b>Total Days of Coverage</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-195.45	-281.96	-89.76	-287.59
		(416.38)	(430.11)	(443.12)	(422.37)
	Race	438.14	396.52	428.84	365.60
		(313.04)	(339.18)	(326.77)	(319.43)
	Religion	1509.24*	1460.11*	1446.30*	1565.61*
		*	*	*	*
		(462.58)	(472.82)	(474.00)	(469.00)
	Sexual Orientation	-59.57	-133.75	8.79	-95.04
		(301.34)	(312.69)	(320.75)	(305.01)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		180.35		
			(495.36)		
	Non-White		-56.70		
			(250.06)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-78.79		
			(315.94)		
	Non-White		-262.24		
			(282.66)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			410.60	
				(234.36)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-165.82	
				(289.22)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			154.95	
				(286.61)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-78.07
					(298.47)
	Midwest				-340.37
					(343.11)
	West				197.47
					(287.84)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.09	0.10	0.11	0.10

	<b>Time Until First Local Article</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-136.01	-167.36	-79.80	-42.86
		(436.07)	(439.86)	(465.56)	(447.12)
	Race	146.02	76.80	75.63	210.99
		(329.94)	(341.07)	(348.31)	(340.11)
	Religion	-472.81	-482.17	-577.34	-381.46
		(423.52)	(424.67)	(439.13)	(426.98)
	Sexual Orientation	-6.91	11.22	57.94	30.74
		(321.05)	(336.12)	(346.83)	(328.69)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		389.14		
			(450.49)		
	Non-White		-205.32		
			(257.25)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		537.42		
			(337.79)		
	Non-White		386.70		
			(283.44)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			404.07	
				(247.43)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-198.72	
				(319.94)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			61.52	
				(297.14)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-464.67
					(327.11)
	Midwest				-260.80
					(359.87)
	West				-467.99
					(297.19)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.02	0.08	0.06	0.06

	<b>Time Until First Regional Article</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	41.58	46.10	141.16	3.10
		(238.02)	(247.50)	(245.45)	(240.40)
	Race	-123.62	-119.52	-84.21	-140.07
		(184.96)	(199.20)	(188.21)	(186.87)
	Religion	-360.20	-350.85	-385.42	-309.47
		(258.49)	(264.55)	(257.31)	(259.22)
	Sexual Orientation	-243.58	-233.71	-331.69	-255.79
		(178.40)	(185.60)	(186.96)	(179.61)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		86.30		
			(279.66)		
	Non-White		-45.36		
			(143.29)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		143.83		
			(180.31)		
	Non-White		45.22		
			(166.61)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			191.33	
				(133.65)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-303.91	
				(162.80)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			415.01*	
				(171.57)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-293.11
					(168.81)
	Midwest				-224.33
					(197.71)
	West				-42.72
					(170.24)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.03	0.04	0.10	0.06

	<b>Time Until First National Article</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	853.99	721.76	1087.96	784.94
		(541.09)	(577.15)	(550.33)	(562.28)
	Race	367.66	292.79	432.08	411.23
		(267.48)	(292.26)	(272.91)	(284.01)
	Religion	-227.24	-266.87	-211.88	-186.81
		(330.10)	(340.47)	(335.77)	(332.61)
	Sexual Orientation	-74.19	-98.35	-60.07	-3.27
		(265.49)	(275.00)	(286.21)	(281.18)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		206.11		
			(418.95)		
	Non-White		-117.05		
			(222.22)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-64.01		
			(274.27)		
	Non-White		-148.93		
			(276.36)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			348.72	
				(206.62)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			142.93	
				(290.27)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			233.34	
				(258.02)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-235.41
					(240.45)
	Midwest				81.60
					(421.36)
	West				245.30
					(278.99)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.09	0.10	0.15	0.13

		<b>Total Word Count</b>			
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	0.28	0.11	0.24	0.18
		(0.53)	(0.53)	(0.56)	(0.53)
	Race	0.75	0.30	0.65	0.65
		(0.40)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.40)
	Religion	1.85**	1.58**	1.72**	1.82**
		(0.58)	(0.58)	(0.60)	(0.59)
	Sexual Orientation	0.13	-0.05	0.28	0.05
		(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.41)	(0.38)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-0.09		
			(0.61)		
	Non-White		-0.72*		
			(0.31)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.85*		
			(0.39)		
	Non-White		-0.08		
			(0.35)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.35	
				(0.30)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.03	
				(0.37)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.26	
				(0.36)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				0.37
					(0.38)
	Midwest				-0.31
					(0.43)
	West				0.19
					(0.36)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.08	0.14	0.09	0.09

	<b>Total Local Word Count</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-0.03	-0.05	-0.35	-0.17
		(0.63)	(0.62)	(0.66)	(0.65)
	Race	0.31	0.17	0.04	0.21
		(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.50)
	Religion	0.52	0.42	0.14	0.56
		(0.61)	(0.59)	(0.62)	(0.62)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.33	-0.35	-0.14	-0.43
		(0.46)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.48)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		-0.20		
			(0.63)		
	Non-White		-0.18		
			(0.36)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-1.44**		
			(0.47)		
	Non-White		-0.43		
			(0.40)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.40	
				(0.35)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.28	
				(0.45)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.68	
				(0.42)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				-0.20
					(0.48)
	Midwest				-0.52
					(0.53)
	West				0.07
					(0.43)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.03	0.14	0.10	0.05



	Total Regional Word Count				
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	0.42	0.26	0.37	0.35
		(0.53)	(0.54)	(0.56)	(0.54)
	Race	0.61	0.21	0.42	0.56
		(0.41)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.42)
	Religion	1.77**	1.57**	1.63**	1.77**
		(0.58)	(0.57)	(0.58)	(0.59)
	Sexual Orientation	0.22	0.01	0.54	0.17
		(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.42)	(0.41)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		0.70		
			(0.61)		
	Non-White		-0.67*		
			(0.31)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.54		
			(0.39)		
	Non-White		-0.15		
			(0.36)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.50	
				(0.30)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			0.09	
				(0.37)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			-0.58	
				(0.39)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				0.05
					(0.38)
	Midwest				-0.32
					(0.45)
	West				0.05
					(0.39)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.08	0.14	0.11	0.08

	<b>Total National Word Count</b>				
		<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
<b>Bias Type</b>	Homeless	-0.08	-0.44	-0.34	-0.44
		(1.02)	(1.07)	(1.04)	(1.07)
	Race	0.12	-0.17	-0.09	0.01
		(0.51)	(0.54)	(0.52)	(0.54)
	Religion	0.73	0.60	0.41	0.71
		(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.64)	(0.64)
	Sexual Orientation	-0.42	-0.52	-0.64	-0.46
		(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.54)	(0.54)
<b>Offender</b>	Male		1.01		
			(0.78)		
	Non-White		-0.40		
			(0.41)		
<b>Victim</b>	Male		-0.28		
			(0.51)		
	Non-White		-0.29		
			(0.51)		
<b>Weapon</b>	Firearm			0.32	
				(0.39)	
<b>Location</b>	Private			-0.88	
				(0.55)	
<b>Victim/ Offender Relationship</b>	Known			0.15	
				(0.49)	
<b>Region of Homicide</b>	Northeast				0.03
					(0.46)
	Midwest				-0.21
					(0.81)
	West				0.63
					(0.53)
<b>Average R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.05	0.10	0.11	0.08