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After the police withdrawal in January 2011 from Egypt’s streets, Egyptians tasted another level of fear of crime. Media coverage played a visible role in heightening people’s fear of crime with its intensive and completely uncensored coverage of crime scenes. Nowadays, it has become a common TV News practice to show footage of dead bodies and graphic scenes of violent acts during riots. This study attempted to explore the extent to which scenes of people getting assaulted, kidnapped, tortured, and killed on air cultivates fears inside viewers, specifically youth. The concept resonance occurs when the impact of television amplifies with the real life facts of a specific social group, an example of which is local news broadcasting numerous violent messages related to viewers’ communities which are dissimilar to real crime rates (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). The results of a sample of 154 undergraduate Egyptian students enrolled at the American University in Cairo showed that the Resonance Hypothesis was observed solely in female students who experienced crime in real life in response to TV newscasts only rather than Talk Shows. These females showed a moderate correlation between TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime. The rest of the sample did not show any correlation between TV news credibility and the level of fear of crime.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The Egyptian anchorman appeared on the screen with a gloomy face, addressing viewers with the following words: “Please protect yourself and your properties! There are no police left on the streets! Police officers have abandoned their locations and armed gangs are attacking civilians…”

Egyptians will never forget those stirring moments when their youth formed citizen groups in many Egyptian neighborhoods, taking to the streets to provide protection against such thugs, ready to defend their families and properties. “Fear soared among Egyptians who were concerned about protecting their families, properties, and the future of the nation”, (El-Bendary, 2013). This was the first seed of fear of crime cultivated by television in Egyptian viewers’ minds in January 2011 when the Mubarak regime tried to control protesters with the fear factor after the Interior Ministry’s failed attempts to quell them. The question here is: For how long can Egypt be controlled by fear?

The Egyptian people’s first taste of fear of crime occurred at the moment that terrorists assassinated President Saddat in 1981. Viewers were horrified by the assassination scene, which was on air during the 6th of October victory celebration. As waves of terrorism broke out all over the country, Egyptians became more exposed to fear and media coverage of those crimes.

The first few years of Hosni Mubarak’s (Saddat’s successor) three-decade rule witnessed popular support of his war against terrorism; later on, however, Mubarak seems to have governed Egypt through fear, especially during the last ten years of his term. This might be due to the excellent camouflage provided by
fear in hiding the fatal shortcomings of Mubarak’s regime. Massive media coverage was devoted to stoking and magnifying this fear. Depending on one of the largest state security forces in the world, Mubarak ruthlessly cracked down on all his opponents. The inhuman State Security activities operated outside the law and included physical and verbal abuse, torture, and even killing – all of which have been documented by means of undercover cameras and mobile phone cameras and gone unpunished, (Elshahed, 2011).

Mubarak resigned, but the violent acts did not come to an end: in the village of Sol in Atfeeh, south of Cairo, a Coptic church was set on fire in March 2011, followed by violent clashes that claimed the lives of thirteen people and left a hundred and forty injured. Another horrific incident was the Port Said football stadium tragedy of February 1, 2012, where 74 youth were killed in cold blood, leaving Egyptians without any answer as to the identity of the actual perpetrator, (El-Bendary, 2013). Egyptians claimed that violence in the country was deliberately stirred in order to scare people into accepting a Mubarak-like government led by the likes of former prime minister Ahmed Shafiq in the presidential elections, in what has been referred to as a counter revolution, (El-Bendary, 2013), emphasizing that voters who fear crime are looking for a tough and disciplined candidate, (Schneider, 1993), such as Shafiq.

As it turned out, Egyptians found themselves with a new president but without gaining any change in the system. The MB used the same tools and mechanisms as the NDP in creating another bogeyman to horrify Egyptians. They started to cultivate a fear of liberal ideas and politicians, depicting them as a bunch of degenerates. Political polarization started in the media climate; non-state outlets
were inclined to praise the secular and liberal position while Islamist channels staunchly supported President Morsi, (BBC, 2013). Each camp sought to demonize the other: in the race to magnify mistakes committed by each side, professional ethics were completely cast aside. The most salient example of such unethical media coverage is the case of Hamada Saber, the naked man who was beaten by policemen in front of the Itihadiya presidential palace. All liberal media channels rebroadcast the scene in which Hamada was completely stripped with no attempt to cover the sensitive parts of his body. On their part, the Islamist channels also broadcast the same scene, aggravating matters by claiming that Saber was a thug, while others accused him of being a member of the ‘black block’, adding that the police did the right thing by beating and dragging him, (Youm7, 2013). What policemen did to this man was unquestionably a crime, but broadcasting the scene and repeating it over a hundred times per day represents yet another crime against this man as well as viewers of these channels. Although lawlessness is a huge problem, unethical media coverage and usage of crime as a tool of fear to sway people politically is a greater threat than the crime itself.

Another question arises here: what is the impact of using fear on Egyptian youth? According to many researchers, there are two types of victims. First, there are victims of crime in the conventional sense, specifically, those who have personally experienced crime; second, there are people who are indirectly victimized by the fear of crime irrespective of their actual crime experiences, (Williams, Paul, Dickinson, & Julie, 1993).

A number of researchers have applied elements of the Cultivation Theory, primarily to research fear of crime. The common perception in criminology is that
the media not only misrepresents perceptions of crime, but also creates unrealistic fears and misgivings (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). Advocates of public health claim that news coverage in media imparts to its readers and viewers the idea that violence is haphazard and unpredictable; on the other hand, the Cultivation Theory proposes that violence in the media depicts a meaner world than reality and leads heavy viewers to be suspicious of people in general, (Reber & Chang, 2000). Paul Kilte, Robert Bardwell and Jason Salzman found that 33 percent of news is devoted to crime stories, (Paul, Robert, & Jason, 1997). This, in turn, may lead to what Lianos and Douglas (2000) call dangerization, which refers to the process whereby people tend to view the world in which they live as excessively dangerous, leading to extreme fear and anxiety. Journalists and media people should be sensitive while covering a story to those affected by tragedy or grief in order to minimize harm on their society, (Day, 2006).

To explore children's fright reactions to media coverage, Cantor, Mares, & Oliver (1993) conducted a survey to determine the prevalence of emotional disturbances produced by televised coverage of the war in the Persian Gulf. From a random sample of parents of children in public schools, a sizable number of parents reported that their children had been upset by the televised war coverage. Approximately one fourth mentioned the coverage spontaneously when asked to name something on television that had disturbed their children recently, and when asked directly about war coverage, 45 percent said that their children had been upset, (as cited in MacBeth, 1996).
This study aims to investigate and understand the level of fear cultivated by media in Egyptian youth and explore the extent to which scenes of people being assaulted, kidnapped, tortured, and killed on air cultivate fears inside viewers.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Cultivation Theory:

This study applies the *Cultivation Theory* which examines the impact of television on viewers’ perceptions, attitudes, and values, (Severin, & Tankard, 1979). The Cultivation Theory shifted the focus of researchers from studying audience behavioral change to exploring the change in beliefs and conception of the world. In fact, fear of crime has always been the main focus of this theory (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). According to Gerbner, television impact clearly appears with heavy viewers on the grounds that “the more people watch, the less selective they can be” (Gerbner, 1998, p. 178). This implies that specific lifestyles of viewers enable them to watch TV at certain times of the day, week, or season. Similarly, the actual amount of viewing depends on the viewer’s lifestyle. Those heavy viewers who have extra time to spend watching TV have less choices than those with less available viewing time. One might find a particular viewer watching a seemingly boring program; when asked why he or she are watching this program, a typical reply would be that there is nothing better on TV.

Signorielli, (1990) wrote “If the Cultivation Theory is correct, then television could be having significant but unnoticeable effects on society. For instance, the Cultivation Theory suggests that heavy television watching makes people feel that the world is an unsafe place. Fearful people might welcome repression if it helps to reduce their anxieties”, (as cited in Warner J. Severin, & James W. Tankard, 2001, p. 268).
Gerbner’s team supported the Cultivation Theory by conducting several surveys based on comparisons between heavy and light television viewers. Following is one of the questions which were given in surveys: “During any given week, what are your chances of being involved in some type of violence?” The correct real-world answer is 1 percent or less. The answer presented by heavy television viewers is about 10 percent. Heavy television viewers are more likely than light television viewers to give a higher percentage. Another question was: “Can people be trusted?” Heavy television viewers were found to have a heightened sense of threat and anxiety from television. Television may be leading heavy viewers to think about the real world as a “mean world syndrome”. The Gerbner team proposes that this may be one of the main and commonly shared cultivation impacts because of television,” (as cited in Warner J. Severin, & James W. Tankard, 2001). Gerbner (1998) noted that when he uses the term cultivation, it is not a synonym for effect; rather, it means that there is a continuous, active, ongoing process of interaction between television and viewers. Cultivation researchers are exploring to what extent television dominates viewers’ sources of information.

2.2 Mainstreaming and Resonance:

Paul Hirsch (1980) criticized the findings of Gerbner’s team because they did not control other variables which exaggerated television impact. Therefore, Gerbner revised the theory and added mainstreaming and resonance. The newly added concepts indicated that heavy viewers of television from different social groups have different outcomes (as cited in Warner J. Severin, & James W. Tankard, 2001). After the following two modifications, Gerbner conceded that television
does not have that much of a strong impact on all heavy viewers, (as cited in Warner J. Severin, & James W. Tankard, 2001).

The first concept is *mainstreaming*, which means that heavy viewing overrides variances in cultural, social, and political perspectives of different social groups. That is, they obtain the same point of view regardless of their social groups (Gerbner, 1998).

The second concept is *resonance* which occurs when the impact of television resonates with the real life facts of a specific social group. One example is local news broadcasting quantities of violent messages related to viewers' communities which are actually dissimilar to real crime rates (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). This research will apply the second concept, *resonance*, because it is more compatible with the current situation in Egypt, especially among youth.

Gerbner provided evidence for 'resonance' as a 'double dose' effect which may increase cultivation. This occurs when the viewer’s everyday life experiences are in harmony with those represented in the world of television. Since women are most likely to be victims of crime, for example, female heavy viewers are led to feel especially fearful for themselves as women. The cultivation effect is also arguably higher when the viewer's community is similar to that depicted in TV news. Crime on television mainly takes place in urban areas; thus, urban heavy viewers are subjected to a double dose. This is why cultivation theorists assumed that violent content 'resonates' more for this particular group (Chandler, 1995).

In Egypt, young people can easily witness criminal acts and rioting presented on TV from their own balcony in addition to hearing about their colleagues getting
robbed, tortured, or killed. All of this exposure resonates with TV crime news and higher cultivation impact and thereby magnifying their fears. The horrific ‘girl in a blue bra’ incident is the best example of assault and sexual harassment as it shows “a veiled young woman … dragged and beaten by the Egyptian military during a protest in Cairo’s Tahrir Square. (While) her face is covered, her torso is bare, except for her bright-blue bra; she's a millisecond away from being kicked by a soldier” (Amaria, 2011).

Hirsch argued that the relationship between exposure to violence on television and fear of crime can be explained by the neighborhood viewers live in. Those who live in high-crime areas have a preference to stay at home and watch television since they are convinced there is a higher risk of being attacked than those living in low-crime areas. Cultivation theoreticians have a tendency to underestimate the fact that heavy and light viewers vary in ways other than their TV viewing habits such as in age, sex, and education, (Livingstone, 1990).

Recent theories place more emphasis on the active viewer while toning down the power of television to influence viewers, which is the main assumption of the Cultivation Theory. Viewers do not passively receive as 'real' what they watch on television since television programs are open to many interpretations. Moreover, the motivation to watch varies to a great extent. Dominick said that people who watch television to pass time or because it has become a habit seem to be more affected than people with higher motivation and awareness of their viewing schedule (Dominick, 1990). There is some evidence that lower socio-economic groups tend to watch television as a source of information more than other groups; however, the viewer's framing of television 'reality' also needs to be considered
It is often argued that cultivation may be enhanced when the viewer interprets the content of programs as realistic while skeptical viewers are less likely to be affected (Chandler, 1995). This perception prompted researchers to correlate TV news credibility and level of fear of crime instead of using the amount of exposure.

Researchers did not apply resonance studies without considering other elements that influence their level of fear of crime. To build their own perception of risk, people use information from a variety of sources, such as personal experience (direct experience) as well as from communication channels such as word-of-mouth and the mass media (indirect experience) (Shrum, 2001). Direct experience of crime resonates with indirect experience and formulates the ‘mean world’ syndrome.

2.3 First-order Beliefs and Second-order Beliefs:

First-order beliefs refer to opinions about several real world facts, such as the estimated number of victims of violent crime in a given year. Second-order beliefs refer to extrapolation from these facts to general anticipations; for example, the belief that we live in a safe or a dangerous world (Warner J. Severin, & James W. Tankard, 2001).

Some researchers argued that the first-order beliefs might influence the second-order beliefs and that they are strongly correlated; however, Hawkins and Pingree (1990) said that the two kinds of beliefs are not always correlated (as cited in Severin, & Tankard, 1979).
2.4 Extended Cultivation Hypothesis:

Researchers criticized the Cultivation Theory because Gerbner and his colleagues did not differentiate between types of programs, preferring instead to lump all of these broadcasted messages via television (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). Potter (1993) proposed that the Cultivation Theory might hold up for some television programming types but not for all the content broadcasted on television (as cited in Severin, & Tankard, 1979). Morgan & Shanahan (2010) stated that the latest cultivation research tends to study the effect of exposure to specific program types. They called this type of research *Genre-Specific Cultivation*, mentioning talk shows as one of the program types that received the attention of researchers. However, they argue that the total watching experience must be considered while studying the impact of one type of program, especially with heavy viewers who commonly watch more than one genre.

2.5 The News Refraction Hypothesis:

A study conducted by McLeod and associates (1995) tested media impact on crime perceptions. Results indicated that respondents think that crime rates are increasing while statistics of crime showed that those rates are actually decreasing. In order to understand the causes of dissimilar perceptions of crime, they proposed the News Refraction Hypothesis which presumes that local news content changes viewers’ perceptions of certain issues such as crime. Reality and vicinity to home exaggerates the impact of this content (as cited in Severin, & Tankard, 1979).
2.6 The Culture-institutional Model of the Cultivation Theory:

The original Cultivation Hypothesis assumed that television programming is uniform. Gerbner’s team refined this assumption by presuming that some television content is uniform due to centralized production and financial drives to increase viewership rates (as cited in Severin, & Tankard, 1979).

To clarify the role that commercial necessity plays in uniform television content, Gerbner described the American broadcasting climate as the most focused, standardized and globalized medium. Sixty six percent of all TV networks are funded by the top 100 U.S. advertisers. Four networks control production and form the national mainstream allied to big multinational firms, resembling what can be described as a ‘private Ministry of Culture’. The probability of any challenge to the community mainstream (such as religious or educational minority views) loses ground. This is because “formula-driven, assembly-line-produced programs increasingly dominate the airwaves. The formulas themselves reflect the structure of power that produces them and function to preserve and enhance that structure of power,” (Gerbner, 1998, p. 176).
Chapter 3: Literature Review

3.1. Real-life Violence and the Role of Television:

Violence frequently erupts in our world, and the main role of television is to show viewers a glimpse of this violent world. Surveys results showed that viewers rely on television to receive full and unbiased news about global affairs, including wars and conflicts. Furthermore, journalists believe that if they presented the painful reality of conflicts and wars, people would promote peaceful causes through their political structures, (Gunter, B., & Wober, J. M., 1988). Grabe and Drew (2007) tested the impact of viewing several types of crime programs such as news and fictionalized stories. The findings showed more evidence of cultivation influence with footage containing violence as in the news, and less evidence with televised crime drama. Romer, James, and Aday (2003) also found that local news viewership is correlated to fear of crime and is dissimilar to local crime rates.

In contrast, Gros and Aday (2003) did not find a relationship between local news and fear of crime; however, they determined that those who heavily view local news are more likely to mention crime as a significant problem in their communities (as cited in Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). This is consistent with the Cultivation Theory assumption that television heavy viewers feel that the world is an unsafe place where fearful people welcome repression as long as it helps to reduce their anxieties (Signorielli, 1990).
Gallup Organization Survey:

Face-to-face interviews were conducted in Egypt by the *Gallup Organization* with nearly one thousand adults aged from 15 years and older. The results of surveys made during 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and from March 25 to April 25, 2011 revealed that Egyptians feel their streets are less secure after the January 25 Revolution. In fact, 39 percent of respondents do not feel secure walking alone in their neighborhood as compared to 17 percent in 2010. The results of real-life crime incidents involving respondents showed that crime rates are declining while fear rates are on the increase. The research team assumed that the reason behind lower crime rates is a higher level of social engagement while reportedly higher fears can be attributed to media stress on violence and crime during 2011, (Gallup, 2011).

**Figure 1: Fear VS Reported Crime (Gallup 2011)**
In July 2011 the fear rates reached 51 percent of respondents, decreasing to 38 percent in August 2011. Surveys conducted in March and April indicated a relationship between respondents’ fears and the media sources used to gain information on the protests. Respondents who watched Egyptian television news coverage felt safer (62 percent), than those receiving protests news from Al-Jazeera (58 percent), and those who used social media (51 percent), (Gallup, 2011).

*Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live?*

*Asked of Egyptian adults*

---

**Figure 2: walking alone at night (Gallup 2011)**

Surveys also showed differing percentages for respondent viewership of protest news; 8 percent: social media via twitter or Facebook, 63 percent: Al-Jazeera, and 81 percent: Egyptian Television, (Gallup, 2011).
3.2. Fear of crime

Neil (2001) indicated that people have six basic emotions that help them to survive, fear being one of them (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012). In Dictionary of Youth Justice “Fear of crime is a sense of worry, dread or anxiety occasioned by the subjective assessment, whether rational or otherwise, of one’s risk of, and vulnerability to, criminal victimization”, (Willan, Cullompton, 2008).

Fear of crime started to draw researchers’ attention in the mid-1960s. In the United States, several surveys were conducted by the President’s Commission to investigate this phenomenon in 1966. The results of two studies in two high-crime neighborhoods were included in a volume named “The Challenge of Crime in a Free society” and revealed that fear of crime has a serious impact on the American quality of life. Forty three percent of the respondents indicated that they do not walk in the streets at night, 35 percent rarely speak to neighbors, 21 percent do not use taxi services at night, and 20 percent wished to move due to fear of crime. In addition, one-third protected themselves against criminals by owning firearms or watchdogs. Surveys also indicated that there are several elements that affect levels of fear of crime such as race, gender, income level, and
experience of violence. The report advised that people’s fears should be acknowledged and respected because fear, especially fear of strangers, lessens levels of sociability and mutual trust, (Doran, Burgess, 2012).

Researchers identified two types of fear of crime: forms of victimization as discussed by Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) who distinguished between fear of personal victimization and fear of property being attacked, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012). Warr (2000) cited the second type of fear as the subject of victimization, which divided one’s fears into personal fear and altruistic fear concerning household members, family and friends, or even the public (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012). Graph 1 illustrates these types of fear of crime.

3.2.1. Fear of crime measurements:

According to Doran, Burgess (2012), in his book ‘Putting Fear of Crime on the Map’, there are three methods to measure fear of crime: the cognitive, affective, and behavioral approaches.

Cognitive approaches:

Cognitive approach features global and concern-based measurements.

Global measures are the most widely used measurements. They depend on respondents’ perceptions of risk. The common question in these surveys is ‘How safe do you feel in your neighborhood?’ Respondents choose an answer from a list ranging from ‘I feel very safe’ to ‘somewhat safe’ (Doran, Burgess, 2012). Pantazis (2000) called these types of questions global measures because they do not specify a specific type of crime. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987, 1988, and 2000)
criticized global measures because the word ‘crime’ is not mentioned in the questions; this may mix the fear of crime with other types of fears and phobias. Also, when a question does not mention the type of crime the respondent is afraid of, the respondent is given space to choose his own conceptual references, rendering the results incomparable with other respondents’ answers. Furthermore, the researchers found global measures questions to be cognitive in nature since they elicit respondents’ thoughts or their perceptions of risk, which is totally different from their feelings or their fear of victimization. This problem also appears with the geographic references; the word ‘neighborhood’ can be defined differently from one person to another, and the geographic boundaries of this word may differ from one person to another. Also, since respondents may live in different neighborhoods, their fears may be shaped by the degree of risk attached to their specific areas, leading them to give answers based on their assessment of this risk. In addition, global measures questions do not specify if the respondents’ are fearful in certain spots in their neighborhood or in the whole neighborhood, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).

**Value- or Concern-Based Measures** were evaluated by many researchers who found that these measures usually replace the word ‘fear’ with words like ‘concern’ or ‘worry’ to evaluate peoples’ opinions about crimes in their neighborhood. Furstenberg (1971) assigned the question ‘Choose the single most serious domestic problem (from a list of 10) that you would like to see government do something about’ as an example of value or concern-based measures. Other researchers used the example of asking respondents to rate their concern about being a victim of a crime without specifying this crime type, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).
Affective approaches:

Researchers used the term emotion-based measures to describe these approaches. Affective approaches target respondents’ emotional reactions towards a specific fear of a particular crime. The question ‘How afraid are you of becoming a victim of ……?’ makes the respondent visualize himself as a victim of the mentioned crime. Personal fears are controlled by two factors: first, the respondent’s social climate and, second, the respondent’s sensitivity towards the crime cited in the question. When respondents think about a specific crime, they subconsciously evaluate these two factors which affect their level of fear response and show the actual significance of this particular crime. As a result, these measures avoid the many weaknesses of global measurement questions, eliciting highly subjective answers, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012). This study will use this approach because it is the best way to measure young people’s fear of crime.

Behavioral Approaches:

According to Skogan (1999), when individuals start to demonstrate behavioral responses to their fears, these responses validate their fears. He also indicated that behavioral approaches help researchers to reduce the amount of subjectivity arising from cognitive and affective questions as well as make the answers of those questions comparable. Warr (2000) assumed that behavior is the most accurate indicator of fear. Many other researchers, such as Gabriel and Greve (2003); Samuels and Judd (2002); Smith and Tortensson (1997); Tulloch (1998, 2000), indicated that behavioral measurements examine the protective activities and avoidance tactics used by people to cope with their daily life fears, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).
Many researchers indicated that people use self-protection when they are afraid of crime. They also stated a list of protective actions that give them a sense of security, reduce the likelihood of victimization, and lessen their fear. Protective actions are divided into coping strategies and collective actions. Following is a list of strategies people adopt to avoid property crimes:

- Target hardening efforts (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981)
- Installing extra security locks, bars, and systems (Carvalho and Lewis, 2003)
- Keeping trained watch dogs (Williams et al., 1994)
- Installing car and home alarms (Reid et al., 1998)
- Leaving lights or timed appliances such as radios and television sets on at home when they are out (Krahn and Kennedy, 1985; Warr and Ellison, 2000)
- Purchasing theft and vandalism insurance (Williams et al., 1994)
- Using police property identification systems (Toseland, 1982), (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012)

People also use coping strategies to protect themselves against personal crime such as:

- Carrying a weapon to use in self-defense against an attacker (DeFronzo, 1979; Kenney, 1987; Reid et al., 1998)
- Carrying whistles to drive away attackers (Reid et al., 1998)
- Choosing to drive a car or using other ‘safe’ methods of travel through feared areas rather than going on foot (Warr and Ellison, 2000)
- Refuse to open the door to a stranger (Warr, 1985)
Collective actions go beyond the limits separating personal and property crime. A common collective action is when walking in unsafe areas people gather and walk in couples or groups, (Carvalho and Lewis, 2003; Nasar et al., 1993). Another common action is organizing ‘neighborhood watches’ (Reid et al., 1998), a tactic which has recently become known here in Egypt after the security lapse during the January 25 Revolution.

Reid et al., (1998) criticized the lack of collected information about people’s protective responses towards fear of crime; similarly, avoidance actions feature the same defects and lack of information, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).
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**Figure 4:** Approaches to measure fear of crime (Doran, Burgess, 2012).

### 3.2.2. Fear of crime and perception of risk:

Ferraro (1995) and Warr (2000), said that most of the confusion around the concept of fear of crime stems from the inability to distinguish between emotion, or what we feel, and cognition, or what we think, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).
Many researchers were concerned about the level of fear of crime and its relation to actual crime rates in society. They indicated that fear of crime as a concept is a positive feeling that motivates people to protect themselves from victimization. Fear of crime, however, becomes an irrational feeling when it exceeds real-life risks, (Doran, Burgess, 2012).

Researchers clarified that perceptions and emotional states are dissimilar psychological entities (Zillmann and Wakshlag, 1985). Garofalo and Laub, (1982) indicated that fear of crime and assessment of risk are not necessarily linked, (as cited in Gunter, 1987). “Television news viewing in general is related to heightened perceptions of crime risk on both personal and societal level”, (Romer, 2003, P.99). When beliefs about crime overly exaggerate real-life facts, this can be construed as media influence playing a significant role, (Gunter, 1987).

The National Risk Survey (NRS) was a nationwide survey conducted in 1997 to study the correlation between exposure to news and assessment of various risks covered by media. A total of 1,204 respondents were asked to assess and rate 13 risks to their families and themselves. Respondents reported that street drugs are the greatest serious risk, with violent crime mentioned as the third. The analysis showed that respondents’ concerns about street drugs arose from drug-related violence rather than drug hazards them self. Results also showed that concerns over crime risk were related to respondents themselves and their families in addition to the general public. 70 percent of the sample used local television news as a focal source of news, (Romer, Jamieson, and Aday, 2003).
3.2.3. Experience of crime versus crime on media:

According to Daragahi (2013), the number of crime rates following the January 25 Egyptian revolution is alarmingly high: kidnapping quadrupled from 107 cases to 412; house breakages from 7,368 to 11,699; incidents of armed robbery from 233 to 2807 cases; finally, car theft from 4,973 to 21,166. As a result, high crime rates lead to high crime reports and stories on media.

![Figure 5: Kidnapping, armed robberies rate 2010-2012 Egypt (FT, 2013)](chart)
Many researchers proposed that the Victimization Hypothesis, which correlates direct experience of crime with fear of crime, appears because victimization heightens the victim’s sensitivity to risk. The Indirect Victimization Hypothesis also found that non-victims may also experience fear of crime when they are directly exposed to victims’ stories. Some researchers even suggest that fear of crime disorder may be at the same level with direct and indirect victims (Doran, Burgess, 2012). Roundtree and Land (1996) investigated how people obtain information about crimes, finding that media and interpersonal communication are the most popular channels, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012). Later studies dating from 2000 pointed towards media as a main producer of fear of crime. In contrast, Lane and Meeker, (2003) and Romer et al., (2003) discredited the relation between fear of crime and media exposure. Other researchers supported media impact on fear of crime when crime rates are high in the community, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).
According to Gunter (1988), we should determine the extent to which people experience crime first-hand and have anxieties about it before studying the impact of media content on their perceptions and fear of crime. Gerbner (1998) stated that fear of crime is stronger among those who live in high crime urban areas and correlated with the media credibility and the amount of television viewing. He called this concept *resonance* to describe the real-life facts about duplicating the dose of messages delivered by television and amplifies cultivation.

### 3.2.4. Fear of crime impact:

Clemente (1977), Brown and Polk (1996), Oc and Tiesdell (1997) believe that fear of crime is more problematic than crime itself. They assume that fear of crime is more pervasive than actual crime and features unrestricted distribution by the availability of a criminal and a victim at the same time and in the same location. Fear of crime needs only a single victim to occur. Therefore, a crime has one direct victim and several indirect victims when they hear of this crime, (as cited in Doran, Burgess, 2012).

“Scared people stay home and watch more television”, (Morgan and Shanahan, 2010, p. 343). Nabi and Sullivan (2001) cited that heavy viewership of all television genres “(1) cultivated exaggerated perceptions of the prevalence of violence, which in turn (2) heightened *Mean World* perception, leading to (3) intentions to take protective measures against crime, and (4) actually taking such measures”, (as cited in Morgan & Shanahan, 2010, p. 342).
In a similar study sponsored by the US Dept. of Justice, “reactive responses hypothesized as stemming from fear of crime are:

(1) Avoidance (limiting mobility according to perceptions of victimization risks)

(2) Targeting hardening (adding locks on doors, burglar alarms, etc.)

(3) Purchasing of weapons

(4) Purchasing of theft insurance

(5) Organizing collective response (participation in organized crime prevention programs)

(6) Changing residence in response to perceived crime threat

(7) Voicing complaints against public officials believed responsible for not countering crime”, (Maxfield, 1977, p.9)

An example which illustrates this point is the following joke shared by youth on Facebook: “Believe it or not! Only in Egypt does a thug share his photo while committing a crime and police click ‘Like’.”
Egyptian citizens’ responses are noticeably linked in most cases with Point 2, 3, and 7. Holbert et al (2004) also found that overestimation of crime rates prompts handgun ownership, (as cited in Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). The researchers assume that this is the main problem in Egypt: weapons in the hands of those who have not yet reached emotional maturity, namely, youth from 18 to 21 years old.

The impact of crime media coverage in this age group is not always direct; it may be transmitted through parents who are heavy viewers of this coverage. Busselle (2003) indicated that there are direct and indirect impacts of fear of crime cultivation. His study found that parents who watch more crime programs that heighten their fears are more likely to transmit their fears about crime to their children which, in turn, heightens their own crime estimates. This process usually occurs with high school children and is called the indirect cultivation process, (as cited in Morgan & Shanahan, 2010).

3.3. Television News:

Despite the shift of TV audiences towards the Internet all over the world, TV has maintained its status in the Arab World. An analysis of the habits of TV viewing in 2009 and 2012 showed that the average amount of time spent watching TV in Egypt and Saudi Arabia increased slightly from 3.10 hours per day in 2009 to 3.11 hours per day in 2012, (Dubai Press Club, 2011).

The following figure number (8) gives a brief about some of those channels, some of whom have obvious liberal tendencies while others are fundamental Islamic.

Figure 8: new channels after Jan, 25 (Dubai Press Club, 2011)

Top genres:

News shows achieved number one ranking in 2012 after occupying third place in 2009. This peak in ranking was caused by greater public awareness of and interest in political developments post January 25 Revolution, (Dubai Press Club, 2011).

Credibility:

Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2000) defined credibility as “the extent to which the source is perceived as possessing expertise relevant to the communication topic and can be trusted to give an objective opinion on the subject”, (as cited in Mertel, 2012, p.5).

While people tend to watch credible sources of news more than those they perceive as non-credible, Garrett (2009) found that people are somewhat less likely to examine news items that include opinion-challenging information.
However, they sometimes select this source to avoid mental isolation and to stimulate critical thinking about this source and evaluate its news. In a Chinese study data were collected from an online survey of a non-probability sample of more than 600 college students in China. Results showed that news exposure is not significantly correlated with credibility ratings for different news sources. The reason behind this might be attributed to young audiences’ tendency to use media sources they do not find credible simply out of habit, (Shan, 2013).

3.4. TV Newscast Credibility:

Although Fogg et al. (2001) argued that online users have doubts about online information; many researchers indicated that the web is more credible than traditional media (Johnson and Kaye, 1998). To examine this hypothesis, Mehrabi, (2009) distributed a survey to identify the factors influencing the opinions of 270 non-academic professional staff about mass media credibility. The results showed a positive amount of television viewership and supposed credibility. Results also showed that the more time audiences gave to the medium, the more credible it became to them. Respondents rated the Internet as less credible than television in delivering news. Figure number (10) illustration was also supported by Gunter (1987). Gunter discussed the kind of relationship between television viewership and audience fears. He stated that there is a correlation because researchers could not establish causality or cause and effect relationship. Though we can reverse the hypothesis and say that the high level of fear of crime can lead to similarly high viewership rates and vice versa.
Elgammal (2011) conducted a study to examine Egyptian youth dependence on traditional and new media as a source of cultural knowledge. She distributed a survey to 400 respondents, 33 percent of whom were college students aged from 18 to 23. Results showed that the Internet is the most preferred medium to gain cultural knowledge, followed by television with a small difference, then newspapers, while the radio was ranked the last. When there is an important cultural event, young people rearrange their priorities and depend on television public space channels rather than cultural websites on the Internet.

When she asked young people about the reasons that motivate them to depend on certain media to gain cultural knowledge, 45 percent mentioned it provided full knowledge about subjects of interest, 43 percent said it was easily accessible, 37 percent mentioned credibility, 37 percent stated they were accustomed using it, and 35 percent mentioned immediate coverage of cultural events. Study results also showed that television talk shows constituted the preferred program format for respondents.
Another Egyptian researcher examined the correlation between television and newspaper coverage of crises and the collective sense of danger. Abd Elfattah (2011) studied a stratified random sample of 420 Egyptian respondents from Cairo and Giza governorates with different economic levels; Heliopolis and Mohandeseen districts represented the high economic level, Haram and Hadayek Elkobbah districts represented the middle economic level and Shoubra and Emmbaba districts represented the low economic level. A survey was distributed in February 2009.

- Results showed that the most important medium respondents receive crises news from is Egyptian TV (34 percent), while Arabic space channels make up 26 percent.
- The most credible medium is Arabic space channels (38 percent) as compared to Egyptian TV at 26 percent.
- When respondents were asked to rank the most important issues they considered dangerous, 34 percent cited crime rates and insecurity as the fifth most dangerous issue.
- Regarding perceptions of respondents to crises and availability of information about them as well as efforts to tackle them, 69 percent of the respondents indicated that they have accurate information, 24 percent mentioned inaccurate information, and 12.6 percent rarely received information, while 4 percent did not have information at all.
- When asked if they were sure that the issue really was a crisis, 59.3 percent were sure that crime constituted a true crisis, 25.5 percent were sure it was a crisis but could not rate its seriousness, 8.6 percent were not sure it was a crisis, and 6.2 percent did not consider it a crisis.
• 68 percent of the respondents believed that the crime crisis would continue, 26 percent indicated that they believed it would continue and 5.7 percent said that they believed it would never continue in Egypt.

• The role of the media towards respondents’ feelings of fear and anxiety over the crisis was also examined. 47.6 percent of the respondents said that media satisfied and validated their fear because crisis really is distressful, 29.8 percent reported that media suppressed their fear and reassured them, and 22.6 percent saw that media were neutral towards the worry and fear of crisis, merely conveying the news with no impact on their feelings.

• 76 percent of the respondent also reported that the crime problem in Egypt is complex and requires more attention while 24 percent thought the situation normal and no longer newsworthy.

• The level of attention to media crime coverage was tested and results showed that people pay attention for different reasons: to keep up with current events (37 percent), because this news deeply affected their life (29.5 percent), the likelihood of being affected (28.6 percent). The remaining participants did not pay attention to some extent (2.9 percent), generally did not pay attention (1.7 percent) while 0.2 percent paid no attention at all.

3.5. Talk Show Credibility

Nowadays a plethora of state-run and privately-owned television channels broadcast a bewildering array of talk shows. In fact, the talk show genre has evolved into a cutthroat business where media personalities and high-profile guests discuss, analyze, and offer comments on both national and regional events.
According to Dubai Press Club (2011), Egypt has the third largest advertising market in the Arab Region, 11 percent of the Arab advertising market, approximately US$505 million, expected to reach US$557 million in 2013, and US$596 million. During 2011, 25 percent of the money spent on advertising in Egypt was devoted to television advertising at an approximate cost of US$126.25 million. 40 percent of Egyptians watch television up to 4 hours daily. News surpassed sports as the most interesting top genres in 2012 as compared to third ranking in 2009 - the political shift in Egypt probably being the cause behind this change. Local Egyptian content is preferred by Egyptian television viewers with eight of the top 10 preferred channels. Al Hayat Bouquet is the most watched in Egypt, as in 2009, with 4 of its channels occupying top ranking, while El-Mehwar channel achieved third rank out of the top five. The top most-watched TV programs are El Hayat El Youm and El Ashara Massan talk shows (Dream TV).

**Figure 10:** TV in Egypt market research results (Dubai Press Club, 2011)
All of this money spent on television, news and talk shows nowadays, emphasizes money talk at the expense of media ethics. According to Buvinić and Morrison (2000, p 58) “The phrase ‘If it bleeds, it leads” is a shorthand description of the media's tendency to sensationalize episodes of violence, whether or not they are particularly newsworthy or even characteristic of underlying trends.

Assessing the extent of global violence based on information filtered through the mass media is therefore an inherently risky strategy. They added that violent crime is manifested in young people between 18 and 24 of age. Young people in this age group constitute the highest share of committing crime as well as being victims of these crimes. This phenomenon appears across all countries. “This trend highlights a key feature of aggressive behavior: Once it occurs, it tends to reoccur. Violence begets violence as entire societies learn to solve conflicts by recourse to aggression”, (Buvinić and Morrison, 2000, p 61).

A study of American school students found that continuous watching of violence on television heightens children aggressive behavior, (Buvinić and Morrison, 2000). This study (as well as earlier and subsequent ones) examined violent drama on television, and found that real-life violence covered in local news resonates more with young viewers and increases the impact of these violence scenes. “The subsequent lack of efficient policing has brought higher crime levels, with armed gangs robbing motorists and attacking factories and warehouses”, (Khalaf, Saleh and Allam, 2011, p.4). Every evening viewer sought channels that they found more credible and started to consume more violence on screen. Egyptian channels covering the political conflict in Egypt after the January 25 Revolution included Misr 25, Al Hafez, El Nas, CBC, Al Faraeen and other Egyptian TV channels
acted as mouthpieces for political currents that provided these channels with funding and privileges. Each political current attempted to demonize the other, depicting them as criminals and broadcasting hours of violence that committed by demons in the other political entities. The more violence they broadcast, the more viewership they gained, reinforcing the saying, “If it bleeds, it leads”. Violent scenes are not the only reasons that boosted viewership of each channel, but also because specific channels functioned as a psychological comfort zone to the viewer by assuring him that he is supporting the right side of this political war threatening our country.

Ward listed the criteria of media ethics as follows: “The limits of free speech; accuracy and bias; fairness; respect for privacy; the use of graphic images; avoiding conflicts of interest; the use of anonymous source; and the representation of minorities and other cultures”, (Ward, 2011, p. 68).

**Talk Shows Credibility studies:**

Mertel (2012) conducted a study to investigate the factors that establish a newscaster’s credibility. Consideration was given to political factors, amount of exposure, para-social relationship, and visual credibility. A survey distributed via the Internet received 139 responses. The results indicated a correlation between level of exposure to specific newscasters and level of credibility given to them. Some results, however, showed that respondents may not recognize a newscaster even though they are able to see him as a credible source. The most interesting result is that respondents tend to perceive newscasters with liberal political opinions as more credible than those with traditional points of view.
A study conducted by Khalili (2011), gave a questionnaire to a sample of 356 respondents, 186 of whom were undergraduates (52.2 percent) to examine the agenda-setting impact of Egyptian talk shows. Results found that 80 percent of the sample watch talk shows and 99 percent depend on television talk shows as a source of news of Egyptian affairs, and 84 percent depend on television news. In the same study, the questionnaire included an open-ended question asking the respondents to list the five most important news issues occurring in Egypt; criminal acts were ranked third news by 143 respondents, while media agenda received fourth ranking. Television talk shows were the prime news source in all topics with 54 percent for the criminal topic.

3.6. Ethical Debates:

Delivering news should be governed by ethics’ however; negative media pressure groups are now forming. These groups are overwhelmingly money-oriented, serving their own interests with complete disregard for media social responsibility and the negative impact on the community. What happens when money drives the media is illustrated in Amer’s (2005) study reflecting media circumstances at the present time. He conducted a study on four privately-owned Egyptian newspapers. The study observed the violation of the journalism code of ethics in Alnabaa, Almedan, Alosbua and Sout Alomah newspapers in 5 categories.

1. Lack of accuracy and objectivity:

A journalist’s responsibility is to accommodate his readers’ right to know by providing information that enables them to form an opinion and make a decision about several issues. Moreover, the journalist should provide the full news story
without any missing parts, including background of events and how they evolved. Amer’s study results found that misleading information rates are: 45 percent - Almedan, 44 percent - Alnabaa, 36 percent - Alosbua and 24 percent - Sout Alomah.

Amer also found a biased focus on crimes committed by high-profile businessmen and celebrities, following an approach which seeks to titillate readers in order to maximize distribution rates and profits at the expense of true journalism. Moreover, he detected a tendency to mix between news and opinion; this result in misrepresentation by placing news corrections in mismatching spaces and previously published material. Finally, there is no follow up on crime stories previously covered because ‘old’ crime news does not raise distribution rates.

2. Anonymous crime news stories:

This category reflects the weakness of and the absence of professionalism in favor of a desire to provoke readers’ interests. This happens when the newspaper intentionally omits names of main characters in the news story and puts their initials or first name only, dropping a lot of hints about this character. A survey was distributed among 365 respondents in Midwestern states during November, 1998. The goal of the survey was to elicit respondents’ opinions about crime media coverage. The results revealed that respondents need to know about the nature of typical crimes as well as more about the actual victims. This supports the need to focus on the larger crime picture, particularly when reporting sensational crime stories to fight the idea that violence is random and unreasonable, (Reber & Chang, 2001).
Another method identified by Amer to convey anonymous news is to publish a news piece without putting the writer’s name when writing gossip about celebrities. Amer found that all four newspapers use these strategies in order to attract readers and also to serve businessmen’s interests. The newspapers attracted sponsors by spreading gossip about their competitors. Such complex relationships created a new pressure group that serves its own interests and has a negative impact on the media climate and its social role.

3. Violation of public morals and values:

The above is achieved by overstating crime details, using indecent words and photos, portraying criminals as heroes, and focusing on sexual and perverse crimes. There is also a tendency to promote stories featuring themes of jinn, charlatans, and superstition.

4. Influencing the course of justice and investigation:

This involves judging accused persons before receiving their right to a fair trial, publishing misleading headlines about them, and, finally, using bias against specific groups in society.

5. Invading privacy:

This occurs with the publishing of names and photos of accused people before a court find them guilty, publishing names and photos of victims and relatives, using celebrity names to spark readers’ interest, publishing names and photos of minors less than 18 years old, and violating the sanctity of dead bodies by taking photos and publishing them.
Chapter 4: Methodology

The current study applies the Cultivation Theory, specifically the Resonance Hypothesis using quantitative methods to investigate the correlation between television news credibility and the level of fear of crime among Egyptian undergraduate students at the American University in Cairo aged from 18 to 21 years old. Researcher will correlate TV news credibility and level of fear of crime instead of using the amount of exposure. As previously mentioned in literature review, cultivation impact is affected by three variables; age, gender and previous crime experience. Researcher in the current study controlled age as a variable by selecting a specific age group (18 to 21 years old). The study aims to examine the gender differences and previous crime experience interaction with TV news credibility and either they magnify or reduce the level of fear of crime were examined.

TV News:

TV news is divided into two genres: TV newscast and TV talk shows

The sample is divided into 4 sections:

1. **Students Saying ‘No’**: Students who did not experience crime in real life, answering ‘No’ to both Questions Number 4 and 5.

2. **Students Saying ‘Yes’**: Students who experienced crime in real life, answering ‘Yes’ to either one or both of Questions Number 4 and 5 in the whole sample.

3. **Female Students Saying ‘No’**: Female students who did not experience crime in real life, answering ‘No’ to both Questions Number 4 and 5.

4. **Female Students Saying ‘Yes’**: Female students who experienced crime in real life, answering ‘Yes’ to either one or both of Questions Number 4 and 5.
4.1. Hypotheses:

TV news is divided into two genres: TV newscast and TV talk shows. Accordingly, each hypothesis is divided into two parts; part a, to test TV newscast credibility and part b, to test Talk Shows credibility.

**H.1.a.** There is no correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among students who did not experience crime in real life.

**H.1.b.** There is no correlation between Talk Shows credibility and level of fear of crime among students who did not experience crime in real life.

**H.2.a.** There is a correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among students who experienced crime in real life.

**H.2.b.** There is a correlation between Talk Shows credibility and level of fear of crime among students who experienced crime in real life.

**H.3.a.** There is no correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who did not experience crime in real life.

**H.3.b.** There is no correlation between Talk Shows credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who did not experience crime in real life.

**H.4.a.** There is a correlation between TV news credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who experienced crime in real life.

**H.4.b.** There is a correlation between Talk Shows credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who experienced crime in real life.
4.2. Methodology

4.2.1. Study Variables:

Dependent Variable: *Fear of Crime*

There are various ways to measure fear of crime. Some researchers focused on how people estimate the amount of violence in their communities. Other studies measured personal risk perceptions while some explored the degree of fear of being victimized. None of these methods are related. For example, an individual estimating a high level of violence in society does not necessarily need to be afraid at home if he or she lives in a safe neighborhood, (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). This study will focus on students’ fears of being victimized, or, in other words, their *fear of crime at a subjective level*.

According to the Dictionary of Youth Justice (2008), fear of crime is “a sense of worry, dread, or anxiety occasioned by the subjective assessment, whether rational or otherwise, of one’s risk of, and vulnerability to, criminal victimization” (Willan, Cullompton, 2008).

As identified by J. Jackson (2005), there are five types of crime people are afraid of:

- getting attacked by a stranger in the street
- getting robbed or mugged in the street
- getting harassed, threatened, or verbally abused in the street
- having your home broken into while you are there
• having your home broken into while you are away

The current study added four elements related to commonly occurring incidents involving Egyptian youth, namely: getting killed, getting kidnapped, being tortured, and getting injured during rioting.

**Fear of Crime and Gender:**

Since the rate of sexual assault on women is ten times greater than that against men (Crowell & Burgess, 1996), females are more likely to fear getting raped or sexually assaulted (Ferraro, 1995) which also gives rise to their fear of other type of crimes. Ferraro demonstrated this assumption by arguing that women are more likely to fear getting burglarized while at home alone since the crime may also be accompanied by a sexual attack.

**Fear of Crime and Age**

Similar to women, the elderly appear to be more vulnerable to crimes due to their physical defense limitations. However, Moore and Spherd (2007) asserted that, even if elderly individuals have been found to be the most fearful when compared to other groups, in reality, the opposite is true. Accordingly, Ferraro (1995) found that despite being limited in the ability to defend themselves, the level of fear in the elderly is lower than that among younger groups simply because the elderly reduce the likelihood of their being attacked by going out less (Ferraro, 1995).

Many studies found that gender is more influential than age when measuring fear of crime. During March and April of 1976, a General Social Survey was held across the nation by the University of Chicago’s ORC. Using Probability and
Block Quota Sampling methods, 1,499 interviews were conducted with a cross-section of native English speakers aged 18 and above who were non-inmates of institutions. The data were collected and grouped according to age as follows: (1) youth: 18-29 years of age, (2) middle age: 30-59 years of age, and (3) elderly: 60 years of age or older. Sex was marked as male or female. Roughly one-half of the elderly group in the sample reported fear of crime; they were slightly more likely to experience fear than youth (41%) and the middle-aged (42%) adults. In other words, there was a negligible difference in fear of crime based solely on age. The introduction of sex into the relationship prompted female participants to admit to higher levels of fear than those of males, with a minimal increase in fear by age, (BRAUNGART, BRAUNGART, & HOYER, 1980).

**Independent variables:** *Credibility of Television News (Newscast and Talk Shows)*

Credibility means that the viewer finds that the news clarifies events, delivers information in an objective manner, accurately and honestly tells the whole story, gains the viewer’s trust, delivers the news to viewers as it happens, and in a timely manner (Mehrabi, D. et al., 2009).

To measure TV news credibility, the researcher posed the TV news credibility eight items. Following are definitions for each term (Hellmueller & Trilling, 2012):

**Clarity:** the ability to be easily understood

**Biasness:** opinions are not well-founded

**Telling the whole story:** the essential points are included

**Accuracy:** the information given usually is verifiable and true if examined
Believability: the viewer would most likely believe the story presented

Trustworthy: statements are usually true/correct

Fairness: includes different points of views

Timeliness: delivering news at the most appropriate time

The researcher put the above eight concepts in eight statements which were added to observe respondents’ opinion towards TV News. In addition, the eight statements were repeated in both types of TV news: TV newscasts and Talk Shows. The researcher used a five-point Likert scale ranking from: ‘Strongly Agree’, ‘Agree’, ‘Neutral’, ‘Disagree’ and ‘Strongly Disagree’.

4.2.2. Non-probability Sample

Although correlation studies cannot establish causation, they are extremely helpful in deepening our knowledge about relations among variables as well as generating hypotheses to be tested in future research. Sophisticated statistical analyses can also be done with the information yielded to detect trends that lend support to causal hypotheses.

4.2.3. Type of non-probability Sample:

This non-probability sample is a convenient or available sample representing a collection of readily accessible subjects for study, such as college students. Since this type of sample contains an indeterminate number of errors and does not fully represent the population, it lacks external validity. Those who favor using this type of sample, however, assume that if any given phenomenon, characteristic, or trait actually exists, it must be included in any sample.
In line with work by Wimmer & Dominick (2006), the following four key elements help the researcher to decide whether to use a probability or non-probability:

1. **Purpose of the Study:***

   This study investigates whether there is a correlation between the credibility of TV news and talk shows and the level of fear of crime among young people in the 18 to 21 year old age group. Generally, correlation studies are not designed to generalize the results to the population; rather, they seek to examine the main variables relationship. Thus, a non probability sample is appropriate to this study.

2. **Cost versus Value:***

   The cost of the probability sample is too high in relation to the type and value of information collected and the purpose of the study. The function of the sample is to produce the greatest quality for the least investment. Consequently, a non-probability sample is the best choice for this study.

3. **Time Constraints:***

   Given the time constraints, a non-probability sample meets the needs of this study as a probability sample is usually time-uncontrollable.

4. **Level of Acceptable Error:***

   As this study is a pilot study, error control is not the main concern. Thus, a non-probability sample is suitable.
Sample Size:

The researcher’s initial attempts to obtain the data of the target population being researched were frustrated due to portal policies blocking access to researchers. Therefore, the researcher decided to send the questionnaire to all students (5140 Egyptian undergraduate students aged 18 to 21) under the research criteria and analyze their responses. This sample is considered a convenience sample because the researcher will include only students who answered the questionnaire. In an effort to minimize the disadvantages of a convenience sample, the researcher applied the so-called “Law of Large Numbers”. However, the problem was not solved since the sample, although large in number, does not indicate the right respondents or elements. A large sample can be similarly poor in quality as a small sample. A number of guidelines presented by Camery & Lee, (1992) suggested that sample size for multivariate studies is as follows: 100 = Poor; 200 = fair; 300 = good; 500 = very good; 1,000 = excellent. In the final analysis, cost and time considerations inevitably control the sample size. Accordingly, the sample size will depend on the number of email replies from students.

4.2.4. Sample Conditions:

Age group:

Late adolescents meet the research target age (18-21 years old). According to Kafafi (1997), this stage is a critical period in a human being’s life since individuals at this stage start to build their confidence by shifting their focus away from physical appearance to the role they play in their community. Jeffrey (2002) assessed aggressive behavior and television viewing after studying a sample of
707 individual over a 17 years interval. Results showed that aggressive acts were found at a mean age 16 to 22 years old. It was also indicated that the more time adolescents and young adults spend watching television, the more aggressively they act against others. The independent effects of socio-demographic variables on fear of crime were only found to be important in terms of gender (Erdonmez, 2009). One of the strategies that people apply to avoid crime which they are afraid of is carrying a weapon to use in self-defense against an attacker. Weapon trade in Egypt flourished after the Egyptian revolution. Egyptian Weapon Law prohibits giving weapon license to citizens under 21 years old, (Egyptian Weapons Law No: 394, 1954). Less than 21 years old, young people are immature and cannot control their anger, therefore affording weapon for them may have dire consequences. Fear of crime is the main motivation that pushes young people to weapon possession. Show off or defending manhood may easily lead immature young man with a weapon to commit a crime. The best example for this is the following assassination attempt of previous prime minister.

**Assassination Attempt on previous Prime Minister:**

The recent assassination attempt of former Egyptian Prime Minister Hisham Qandil illustrates the potentially excessive behavior of youth. Alhakeem & Mahdy, (2013) published the names of the accused young men in this attempt (which is unethical as they have not been charged yet). The issue is that three of the five accused young men are below the age of 21, while two of them are 22 and 29 years old respectively. The young men, reportedly from the Faisal district, claimed they were heading towards an armed confrontation in the Manial district and were unaware that the cars blocking their path were part of the prime
minister's convoy. This incident is an indicator of the extent to which the situation in Egypt is serious; these young men apparently know nothing about politics yet they seek to prove their manhood by using force. No one can determine the extent to which young people believe in violence as the best solution to their problems. We can only affirm that it is one of our social responsibilities to make these youth believe more in peaceful solutions; at the very least, we should not promote violent solutions in their minds by supporting instances of people taking justice in their own hands simply because there is no law in this country, or justice is too slow to catch criminals.

**Gender:**

Ideally, almost half of the sample should consist of females with males making up the other half to avoid gender bias in sample selection. However, in the current study the researcher was unable to control participation of the target population by gender. However, there is no way for the researcher to control gender. The analysis will divide the sample according to the gender of respondents in order to examine the Resonance Hypothesis which assumes that, due to gender differences females are more vulnerable to crime. That explains why females found the portrait of high-crime world presented on television more credible than their male counterparts.

**Research Zone:**

Undergraduate enrolled Egyptian students at the American University in Cairo age from 18 to 21 years old form the population from which we will obtain responses. The researcher failed to contact other universities; due to the current unrest and
security lapse on university campuses, the actual research was conducted only in the American University of Cairo.

4.3.5. Research Design:

A questionnaire link will be emailed to 5140 enrolled undergraduate Egyptian students at the American University in Cairo aged from 18 to 21 years old. The email provided students with a description of the aim of the study and asked them to evaluate the overall performance of TV news during the last two years.

The first part of the survey will contain two questions on personal experience. In a Canadian study, Doop and MacDonald (1979) reported that, while heavy television viewers are more expected to indicate fear of their environment, this relationship disappears when the real incidence of crime in the community is taken into account. In order to control real life impact, we will include those two first questions in the survey, (as cited in Gunter,1987). The rest of the questionnaire aims to measure the credibility of television news and the level of fear of crime.

4.3. Pilot Study:

The researcher conducted a pilot study and examined the psychometric characteristics of the tools. The pilot study sample number was 53 students between 18 to 21 years of age; mean (19.68), and standard deviation (.967) years.

Tools:

After studying previous measurements, the researcher used a questionnaire consisting of three tools to measure television newscast credibility, talk show
credibility, and the level of fear of crime. The designed questionnaire was evaluated and approved by two professors:

1. Dr. Sawsan Shalaby, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Educational Studies and Research, Cairo University
2. Dr. Manal El Hamalawy, Lecturer at the Institute of Educational Studies, Cairo University

The first part of the questionnaire focused on measuring newscast credibility (Mehrabi, D. et al., 2009). It consists of eight items (Questions 7 to 14 in the questionnaire).

The second part of the questionnaire sought to measure talk show credibility (Mehrabi, D. et al., 2009). In this tool, the researcher applied the same television newscast credibility questions to examine talk show credibility (Questions 15 to 22 in the questionnaire).

The final section of the questionnaire was devoted to measuring the level of fear of crime (as per Jonathan Jackson’s criteria). The researcher applied the five types of crime which Jackson said that people are afraid of. These five types of crime were detailed in nine questions; in addition, the researcher included four other types of crime related to commonly occurring events involving Egyptian youth, namely; getting killed, getting kidnapped, being tortured, and getting injured during rioting. The thirteen items were included in questions 23 to 35 in the questionnaire.
TV Newscast Credibility Statistics:

A. Reliability:

Use of Cronbach’s Alpha Test showed that the following total results were reliable; Cronbach’s Alpha for the whole test (eight items) was .915, meaning that this result is a credible factor. The average of the reliability results ranged from .893 to .924. Table (1) shows Cronbach’s Alpha Test results for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. TV Newscast is clear</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TV Newscast is biased</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TV Newscast tells the whole story</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TV Newscast is accurate</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TV Newscast is believable</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TV Newscast can be trusted</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TV Newscast is fair</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TV Newscast is well-timed</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Internal Consistency:

Internal consistency was tested by calculating the correlation between different item scores and the total score of the test using the Pearson Correlation Test.
Table 2: T.V. Newscast Credibility Internal Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. TV Newcast is clear</td>
<td>.830**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TV Newcast is biased</td>
<td>.776**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TV Newcast tells the whole story</td>
<td>.822**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TV Newscast is accurate</td>
<td>.844**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TV Newscast is believable</td>
<td>.725**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TV Newscast can be trusted</td>
<td>.890**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TV Newscast is fair</td>
<td>.883**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TV Newscast is well-timed</td>
<td>.558**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table (2) shows that all item scores are correlated with the total score of the TV News Credibility Test at a significant level .01 with strong correlation (> .50), which indicates that all items of the test are consistence with each other.

Talk Show Credibility Statistics:

A. Reliability:

Use of Cronbach’s Alpha Test showed that the following total results were reliable; Cronbach’s Alpha for the whole test (eight items) was .739; this result means it is a credible factor. The average of the reliability results ranged from .803 to .677.
Table 3: Talk Show Credibility Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Talk Shows are clear</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Talk Shows are biased</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Talk Shows tell the whole story</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talk Shows are accurate</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Talk Shows are believable</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Talk Shows can be trusted</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Talk Shows are fair</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Talk Shows are well-timed</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3) shows that item number 22 reliability results is higher than Cronbach’s Alpha for the whole test; therefore, the researcher decided to omit this item. Consequently, the final tool now consists of 7 items. Cronbach’s Alpha for the whole test after omitting this item was .803 which is reliable and credible. Reliability results of the seven items ranged from .812 to .750. Table (4) shows Cronbach’s Alpha Test results for each item after omitting number 22.
Table 4: Revised Talk Show Reliability Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Talk Shows are clear</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Talk Shows are biased</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Talk Shows tell the whole story</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talk Shows are accurate</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Talk Shows are believable</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Talk Shows can be trusted</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Talk Shows are fair</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Internal Consistency:

Internal consistency was tested by calculating the correlation between different item scores and the whole score of the test using the Pearson Correlation Test.

Table 5: Talk Show Credibility Internal Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Talk Shows are clear</td>
<td>.607**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Talk Shows are biased</td>
<td>.540**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Talk Shows tell the whole story</td>
<td>.759**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talk Shows are accurate</td>
<td>.789**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Talk Shows are believable</td>
<td>.642**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Talk Shows can be trusted</td>
<td>.725**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Talk Shows are fair</td>
<td>.744**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table (5) shows that all items scores are correlated with the total score of Talk Show Credibility test at a significant level .01 with a strong correlation (> .50), which indicates that all items of the test are consistence with each other.

**Level of Fear of Crime Statistics:**

**A. Reliability:**

Using Cronbach’s Alpha test showed that the following total results were reliable; Cronbach’s Alpha for the whole test (thirteen items) was .918; this result means it is a credible factor. The average of the reliability results ranged from .923 to .907. Table (6) shows Cronbach’s Alpha Test results for each item.

*Table 6: Level of Fear of Crime Reliability Item-Total Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your level of concern about…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. getting murdered</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. getting raped/sexually assaulted</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. getting attacked by someone using a weapon</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. getting robbed or mugged on the street</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. being approached by beggar or panhandler on the street</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. getting beaten up or physically assaulted by strangers</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. about someone breaking into your home</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. having your vehicle stolen</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. having your property vandalized/ damaged</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. getting cheated, conned, or swindled out of money</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. about getting kidnapped</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. being tortured</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. getting injured during rioting</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Internal Consistency:

Internal consistency was tested by calculating the correlation between different item scores and the whole score of the test using the Pearson Correlation Test.

*Table 7: Level of Fear of Crime Credibility Internal Consistency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Getting murdered</td>
<td>.780**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Getting raped/sexually assaulted</td>
<td>.573**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Getting attacked by someone using a weapon</td>
<td>.826**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Getting robbed or mugged on the street</td>
<td>.776**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Being approached by beggar or panhandler on the street</td>
<td>.489**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Getting beaten up or physically assaulted by strangers</td>
<td>.741**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Someone breaking into your home</td>
<td>.780**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Having your vehicle stolen</td>
<td>.787**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Having your property vandalized/damaged</td>
<td>.765**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Getting cheated, conned, or swindled out of money</td>
<td>.618**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. About getting kidnapped</td>
<td>.805**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being tortured</td>
<td>.752**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Getting injured during rioting</td>
<td>.635**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table (7) shows that all item scores are correlated with the total score of the level of fear of crime test at a significant level .01 with a strong correlation (> .50), which indicates that all items of the test are consistence with each other.
Chapter 5: Results

The questionnaire was accessible from March through October 2013. The data was collected via Google Drive, saved as an Excel sheet, and transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Google Drive URL:

https://docs.google.com/a/aucegypt.edu/forms/d/1wIGG2LoJBoSWIlda7Yf9vVknKq0YC8nL2WpynnxxEr8/viewform

5.1. Response Rate:

The questionnaire URL at Google drive was sent via email to a total of 5140 Egyptian undergraduate students enrolled at the American University in Cairo. During the availability period of the questionnaire as mentioned above, three reminders were sent from the Student Portal to the targeted sample. Out of the 5140 students, only 154 sent back their responses, all of which were valid. The resulting response rate of 3 percent matched the expectations for an email questionnaire, yielding a sufficiently varied sample for analysis. Consequently, the data analysis and the results were obtained based on the 154 completed questionnaire responses.

5.2. Age:

According to sample conditions, emails were sent to students aged from 18 to 21 years old. As shown in Table (8), the age group from 19 to 21 was almost equally represented (27 percent to 30 percent). In contrast, the 18-year age group was less represented in the sample (16 percent). Usually, 18-year-old students are freshmen who lack familiarity with the AUC system and have not yet been
immersed in the research process; thus, this group are not fully aware of the importance of responding to questionnaires.

Table 8: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Age

5.3. Gender:

Female responses were higher than those of males, accounting for more than double the total responses. This might be an indicator that the subject of the study
is in the field of interest of female students. Table (9) shows gender frequency and percentage.

Table 9: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Gender

5.4. Crime Experience:

5.4. a. Personal Crime Experience:

About 10 percent of the sample reported having been a victim of a violent crime while the remaining 90 percent have no first-hand experience with violent crime.
Table (10) shows frequency and percentage of students who answered ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ to Question Number 3: “Have you ever been a victim of a violent crime?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13: Personal Crime Experience**

5.4. b. Crime Experience Climate:

In contrast with personal crime experience, more than 70 percent of respondents know someone that has been a victim of a crime while roughly 29 percent do not. Table (11) shows frequency and percentage of students who know someone who has been a victim of a violent crime.
Table 11: Do You Know Anyone Who Has Been a Victim of a Violent Crime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Crime Experience Climate

5.4. c. Overall Crime Experience:

Approximately 71 percent of the sample have been a victim of a violent crime or know someone who was a victim of a violent crime while the remaining 29 percent have neither first nor second hand experience of violent crime. Table (12) shows frequency and percentage of students who responded ‘Yes’ to both questions and those who replied in the negative to both. Figure (15) illustrates those numbers while Figure (16) compares male and female responses.
Table 12: Students Who Experienced Crime (Yes) or (No)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Overall Crime Experience
5.5. Source of News among Students:

The Internet was the most frequently used source of news among the sample (38.9 percent), followed by television (34 percent). 16 percent of the sample receives news from friends and families, a source which ranks third. Newspapers come in at fourth rank (7 percent). Only one student reported using SMS as a source of news. Table (13) shows the source of news mentioned by students in this open-ended question. Figure (17) illustrates those answers.
Table 13: Frequency of News Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of news</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspapers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Family</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped watching news</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Frequency of News Source

5.6. TV Newscast Credibility Results:

As shown in Table (14), TV newscast credibility was very low. Average calculations revealed that 3 percent ‘Strongly Agree’ that it is credible, 14 percent ‘Agree’, 27 percent ‘Neutral’, 36 percent ‘Disagree” while 20 percent ‘Strongly Disagree’. Figure (18) illustrates those results.
Table 14: TV Newscast Credibility Frequency (%) of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. TV newscast is clear</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>40 (26.0%)</td>
<td>54 (35.1%)</td>
<td>33 (21.4%)</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TV newscast is biased (reversed)</td>
<td>65 (42.2%)</td>
<td>68 (44.2%)</td>
<td>16 (10.4%)</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TV newscast tells the whole story</td>
<td>50 (32.5%)</td>
<td>77 (50.0%)</td>
<td>22 (14.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TV newscast is accurate</td>
<td>31 (20.1%)</td>
<td>60 (39.0%)</td>
<td>48 (31.2%)</td>
<td>13 (8.4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TV newscast is believable</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
<td>35 (22.7%)</td>
<td>61 (39.6%)</td>
<td>39 (25.3%)</td>
<td>7 (4.5%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TV newscast can be trusted</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>64 (41.6%)</td>
<td>49 (31.8%)</td>
<td>16 (10.4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TV newscast is fair</td>
<td>33 (21.4%)</td>
<td>78 (50.6%)</td>
<td>33 (21.4%)</td>
<td>7 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TV newscast is well-timed</td>
<td>7 (4.5%)</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>50 (32.5%)</td>
<td>59 (38.3%)</td>
<td>15 (9.7%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Average</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6. a. Gender Differences in TV Newscast Credibility:

Figure 18: TV Newscast Credibility

Table 15: Means and Standard Deviations of TV Newscast Credibility (M/F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V Newscast Credibility</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The results in Table (15) reveal that there is no significant difference in TV Newscast Credibility test scores between females (M=19.69, SD=5.17) and males (M= 19.22, SD=5.06); t (152) = 529, P= (.598).
5.6. b. TV Newscast Credibility between Students who Experienced Crime and Those Who Did Not:

*Table 16: Means and Standard Deviations of TV Newscast credibility (Yes/No)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV News Credibility</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The results in Table (16) show that there is no significant difference in TV News credibility test scores between *Yes* (M=19.60, SD=5.29) and *No* (M= 19.40, SD=4.75); t (152) = .208, P= .836.

5.6. c. TV Newscast Credibility between Females who Experienced Crime and Those Who Did Not:

*Table 17: Means and Standard Deviations of TV Newscast Credibility Females (Yes/No)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV News Credibility</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The results in Table (17) reveal that there is no significant difference in TV Newscast Credibility test scores between females who experienced crime in real life (*Yes*) (M=19.88, SD=5.29) and females who did not (*No*) (M= 19.3, SD=5.00); t (103) = .525, P= .607.
5.7. Talk Shows Credibility Results:

As shown in Table (18), Talk Show credibility was very low. Average calculations revealed that 3 percent ‘Strongly Agree’ that it is credible, 4 percent ‘Agree’, 28 percent were ‘Neutral’, 36 percent ‘Disagreed’, and 29 percent ‘Strongly Disagree’. Figure (20) illustrates those results.

Table 18: Talk Show Credibility Frequency (%) of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Talk shows are clear</td>
<td>21 (13.6%)</td>
<td>44 (28.6%)</td>
<td>47 (30.5%)</td>
<td>37 (24%)</td>
<td>5 (3.2%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Talk shows are biased (reversed)</td>
<td>60 (39%)</td>
<td>61 (39.6%)</td>
<td>21 (13.6%)</td>
<td>6 (3.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.9%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Talk shows tell the whole story</td>
<td>53 (34.4%)</td>
<td>68 (44.2%)</td>
<td>31 (20.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talk shows are accurate</td>
<td>42 (27.3%)</td>
<td>61 (39.6%)</td>
<td>50 (32.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Talk shows are believable</td>
<td>51 (33.1%)</td>
<td>44 (28.6%)</td>
<td>53 (34.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (3.9%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Talk shows can be trusted</td>
<td>43 (27.9%)</td>
<td>46 (29.9%)</td>
<td>62 (40.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Talk shows are fair</td>
<td>43 (27.9%)</td>
<td>67 (43.5%)</td>
<td>41 (26.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Average</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7. a. Gender Differences in Talk Show Credibility:

*Table 19: Means and Standard Deviations of Talk Show Credibility (M/F)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Show Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The results in Table (19) reveal that there is no significant difference in Talk Show Credibility test scores between females (M=15.19, SD=3.81) and males (M= 14.63, SD=4.16); t (152) = .820, P= .413.
5.7. b. Talk Shows Credibility between Students who Experienced Crime and those who did not:

Table 20: Means and Standard Deviations of Talk Show Credibility (Yes/No)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Show Credibility</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The results in Table (20) reveal that there is no significant difference in Talk Show Credibility test scores between students who reported (Yes) to experiencing crime (M=15.03, SD=3.76) and those who responded (No) (M= 14.95, SD= 4.35); t (152) = .109, P= .907.

5.7. c. Talk Show Credibility between Females who Experienced Crime and Those Who Did Not:

Table 21: Means and Standard Deviations of TV Talk Show Credibility Females (Yes/No)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Show Credibility</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The results in Table (21) revealed that there is no significant difference in Talk Show Credibility test scores between females who experienced crime in real life (Yes) (M=15.33, SD=3.75) and those who did not (No) (M= 14.91, SD=3.98); t (103) = .519, P= .598.
5.8. Level of Fear of Crime Results:

As shown in Table (22), the level of fear of crime was moderate. Average calculations revealed that 18 percent were ‘Very Worried’ of listed crime, 20 percent were ‘Worried’, 24 percent ‘Neutral’, 21 percent ‘Not Worried’, and 17 percent ‘Not Worried’ at all. Figure (21) illustrates those results.
Table 22: Fear of Crime Frequency (%) of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate your level of concern about...</th>
<th>Not worried at all</th>
<th>Not worried</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Worried</th>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Getting murdered</td>
<td>34 (22.1%)</td>
<td>61 (39.6%)</td>
<td>38 (24.7%)</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.8%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Getting raped/sexually assaulted</td>
<td>43 (27.9%)</td>
<td>17 (11%)</td>
<td>19 (12.3%)</td>
<td>37 (24%)</td>
<td>38 (24.7%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Getting attacked</td>
<td>14 (9.1%)</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>49 (31.8%)</td>
<td>42 (27.3%)</td>
<td>26 (16.9%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Getting robbed or mugged</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
<td>14 (9.1%)</td>
<td>32 (20.8%)</td>
<td>48 (31.2%)</td>
<td>48 (31.2%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. being approached by a vagrant</td>
<td>31 (20.1%)</td>
<td>24 (15.6%)</td>
<td>33 (21.4%)</td>
<td>34 (22.1%)</td>
<td>32 (20.8%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Getting beaten up</td>
<td>30 (19.5%)</td>
<td>38 (24.7%)</td>
<td>44 (28.6%)</td>
<td>26 (16.9%)</td>
<td>16 (10.4%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Someone breaking into your home</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>40 (26%)</td>
<td>39 (25.3%)</td>
<td>31 (20.1%)</td>
<td>21 (13.6%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Having your vehicle stolen</td>
<td>22 (14.3%)</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>36 (23.4%)</td>
<td>37 (24%)</td>
<td>36 (23.4%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Having your property vandalized</td>
<td>21 (13.6%)</td>
<td>40 (26%)</td>
<td>38 (24.7%)</td>
<td>25 (16.2%)</td>
<td>30 (19.5%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Getting cheated, conned, or swindled out of money</td>
<td>8 (5.2%)</td>
<td>26 (16.9%)</td>
<td>46 (29.9%)</td>
<td>38 (24.7%)</td>
<td>36 (23.4%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Getting kidnapped</td>
<td>36 (23.4%)</td>
<td>35 (22.7%)</td>
<td>45 (29.2%)</td>
<td>22 (14.3%)</td>
<td>16 (10.4%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Being tortured</td>
<td>45 (29.2%)</td>
<td>47 (30.5%)</td>
<td>37 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (8.4%)</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Getting injured during rioting</td>
<td>17 (11%)</td>
<td>25 (16.2%)</td>
<td>35 (22.9%)</td>
<td>39 (25.3%)</td>
<td>38 (24.7%)</td>
<td>154 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses Test:

**H.1.a. There is no correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among students who did not experience crime in real life.**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak negative non-significant correlation between TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 44) students who did not experience crime in real life ($r = -.012, p = .941$). These results show that Hypothesis 1 is supported by TV newscast.

**H.1. b. There is no correlation between talk show credibility and level of fear of crime among students who did not experience crime in real life.**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 44) students who did not experience crime in real life ($r =$
.075, p = .630). These results show that Hypothesis 1 is supported by talk shows.

**H.2.a. There is a correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among students who experienced crime in real life:**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 110) students who experienced crime in real life (r = .157, p = .102). These results show that Hypothesis 2 is not supported by TV newscast.

**H.2. b. There is a correlation between talk show credibility and level of fear of crime among students who experienced crime in real life:**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 110) students who experienced crime in real life (r = .167, p = .081). These results show that Hypothesis 2 is not supported by talk shows.

**H.3.a. There is no correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who did not experience crime in real life:**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between TV Newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 36) females who did not experience crime in real life (r = .012, p = .945). These results show that Hypothesis 3 is supported by TV newscast.
H.3. b. There is no correlation between talk show credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who did not experience crime in real life:

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 36) females who did not experience crime in real life (r = .254, p = .135). These results show that Hypothesis 3 is supported by talk shows.

H.4.a. There is a correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who experienced crime in real life:

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a moderate positive significant correlation between TV news credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 69) females who experienced crime in real life (r = .366**, p = .002).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

These results show that Hypothesis 4 is supported by TV newscast.

H.4. b. There is a correlation between Talk Show credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who experienced crime in real life:

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for (n= 69) students who experienced crime in real life (r = .237, p = .050). These results show that Hypothesis 4 is not supported by talk shows.
Chapter 6: Discussion

Since the January 25 Egyptian Revolution and the ensuing withdrawal of police from the streets, violent crime broke out a mere three days later. Since then, Egypt has witnessed thousands of crimes, some of which were broadcasted on air during intensive media coverage. Riots escalated, during which a majority of youth fell victim to physical abuse, torture, and even being killed. The Cultivation Theory indicated that “resonance occurs when the cultivation effect is boosted for a certain group of the population”. (Severin & Tankard, 2001). This study seeks to examine resonance of recently occurring violent scenes among undergraduate students at the American University in Cairo by measuring the credibility of television news and determining whether there is a correlation between TV news credibility and the level of fear of crime among youth.

Crime Experience:

Cultivation is not a uni-directional flow of influence from television to audience; rather, it is part of a continual, dynamic, ongoing process of interaction between messages and contexts in which direct experience plays a role. The relationship between the amount of viewing and fear of crime is strongest among those who live in high-crime urban areas. This is a phenomenon described by Gerbner as “resonance”, in which everyday reality and television provide a “double dose” of messages that resonate and amplify cultivation (Gerbner, 1998). Results of this study showed high rates of crime experience among respondents. 71 percent of the sample either have been a victim or know someone who was a victim of a violent crime while 29 percent have not. When we compare these results with those of Abd El Fattah (2011), 38 percent of respondents (420 Respondents) reported that
they or someone they know had been a victim of a violent crime and 61.9 percent said that neither them nor anyone they know have ever been a victim of a violent crime. These figures show that crime experience has almost doubled over the last two years.

**Most Frequent Source of News:**

When respondents answered the question about their most frequent source of news, the Internet was reported to be the most frequent source (38.9 percent), followed by television (34 percent). 16 percent of the sample stated that they get news from their friends and families, a source ranking in third place. Newspapers received fourth place with at a percentage of 7 percent. Only one student mentioned that he uses SMS as a source of news. This result matches with the 7 Ipsos, Deloitte analysis, as cited in Dubai Press Club (2011) regarding the Arab region. In answers to the question, “Which media activity would you miss the most?” 43 percent of young people aged from 15 to 34 years old mentioned the Internet while 20 percent mentioned TV.

Morgan (2010) argued that even new technologies such as DVRs and websites are more convenient for us to watch what we want, when we want, and where we want; however, Bohn & Short (2009) indicated that television still dominates what we watch even on the Internet, (as cited in Morgan, 2010). The best example that clarifies this online TV stream preference is the Bassem Youssef talk show “Al Bernameg”. It was noticed that most of the Egyptian youth used to prefer not watching this program on TV in favor of waiting until it is uploaded online to avoid advertising. These young people frequently mention that they enjoy the program more without the distraction of commercial breaks. It is worth
mentioning that 1,264,295 viewers watched the last episode of Bassem Youssef’s show on YouTube within the first two weeks of its upload online.

**TV News Credibility:**

TV newscast and talk shows, the two genres of TV news, have showed a very low credibility level. TV newscast credibility average calculations revealed that 3 percent strongly agree that it is credible, 14 percent agree, 27 percent were neutral, 36 percent disagreed, and 20 percent strongly disagree. Talk Show credibility average calculations also showed that 3 percent strongly agree that it is credible, 4 percent agree, 28 percent neutral, 36 percent disagreed, and 29 percent strongly disagree. Most of the students strongly disagree that TV news is biased and fails to tell the whole story. These results are consistent with those found by Al-Ahram Centre for Strategic Studies. The Centre surveyed 1,000 viewers to measure the effects of talk shows after the January 25 Revolution. The results of the study were published in August 2012, revealing that 41 percent of viewers stopped watching the shows altogether, 22 percent of viewers reportedly experienced depression and frustration watching the shows, and 20% suffered from anxiety, while only 12% stated that they feel hopeful about the future after watching the shows. It is clear that TV news is losing its audience by attempting to play an increasingly visible role in the political situation in Egypt, (Abu al-Khair, 2012).

**Differences in TV News Credibility:**

Differences between males and females in TV news credibility were tested. Although many studies showed that females tend to find TV news more credible than males, the results of this study showed no significant differences in
credibility in both genres (TV newscast and Talk Shows) between the males and females making up the sample. This result might be due to an educational level that heightens awareness and critical thinking among students, thereby decreasing the gender differences.

In addition, there was a non-significant difference between students who examined crime in real life and credibility of TV news. Also, TV news credibility among females who experienced crime in real life showed no significant differences than in those who did not. However, all credibility rates were very low among all sample categories with no difference appearing because of gender or previous crime experience.

**Level of Fear of Crime:**

Rising crime rates and personal safety on the streets have become major concerns in the Egyptian society nowadays. These concerns have led to intensive media coverage of crime. The assumption of the Cultivation Theory is that concentrated messages relating to crime cultivate more fear of crime within the audience, especially when those messages resonate with high crime rates in areas where the audience live. Although crime experience is at a high rate (71 percent examined crime in real life) in the current study, the actual level of fear of crime was comparatively moderate.

Average calculations showed that 18 percent were very worried about the listed violent crimes, 20 percent were worried, 24 percent were neutral, 21 percent were not worried, and 17 percent were not worried at all. The best way to evaluate fear before and after 2011 is to refer to the Abd El Fattah (2011) study results.
percent of respondents had expectations that they would be a victim of a crime in the future while 43.8 percent did not.

This shows that fear of crime no longer functions as a tool that can scare people (especially well-educated individuals) in order to coerce them into embracing a certain political tendency. Actually, the Egyptian Revolution, in the words of countless demonstrators and commentators, seems to have reversed the old trend of using fear tactics by making people lose their fear, part of which was “fear of the government forces themselves - police who could arrest, torture, and even murder with relative impunity”, (Bringing Back the Fear in Egypt, 2012).

However, certain types of crime still evoke stable fear levels such as robbery and harassment. When respondents were asked to rate their level of worry about being robbed (or anyone in their family), 38.1 percent were found to be worried to some extent in comparison with 31 percent in this study, 34.5 percent were very worried in comparison with 31 percent in this study, 14.5 percent were not very worried in comparison with 9 percent in this study while 12.9 percent were not worried at all in comparison with 7 percent in this study.

When respondents were asked to rate their level of worry about being a victim of sexual harassment (or anyone in their family), 25.2 percent were worried to some extent in comparison with 24 percent in this study, 28.6 percent were very worried in comparison with 24 percent in this study, 18.8 percent were not very worried in comparison with 11 percent in this study and 27.4 percent were not worried at all in comparison with 27 percent in this study.
Correlation between TV News Credibility and Level of Fear of Crime:

According to Gerbner, resonance occurs when the cultivation impact is heightened for a specific group in the audience (Severin & Tankard, 2001). This study applied the new concept “resonance” to measure the cultivation effect. Crime experience and gender were considered as effective variables that might increase or decrease cultivation.

**H.1.a. There is no correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among students who did not experience crime in real life.**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak negative non-significant correlation between TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime. These results show that Hypothesis 1.a. is supported by TV newscast and that when a low level of credibility is combined with no previous crime experience, the cultivation effect on viewers is reduced, because the resonance perspective states that the media will increase fear when the media content is consistent with experience, (Gerbner, 1998).

**H.1.b. There is no correlation between talk show credibility and level of fear of crime among students who did not experience crime in real life.**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for students who did not experience crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 1.b. is supported by talk shows, and that when a low level of credibility is combined with no previous crime experience, the cultivation effect on viewers is reduced because the
resonance perspective states that the media will increase fear when the media content is consistent with experience, (Gerbner, 1998).

H.2.a. There is a correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among students who experienced crime in real life:

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime for students who experienced crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 2.a. is not supported by TV newscast. These results might be due to low levels of credibility among students.

H.2.b. There is a correlation between talk show credibility and level of fear of crime among students who experienced crime in real life:

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for students who experienced crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 2 is not supported by talk shows. These results might be because of low levels of credibility among students.

Results of hypotheses 2.a and 2.b. are in consistent with Wing’s results which found that family income was a significant predictor of fear of crime. Those reporting higher incomes were more likely to report taking behavioral protections and social responses than those reporting less income, (WING, 2012). It is obvious that AUC students’ level of income is higher than middle income students. Wing also said that it may be the case that individuals with higher incomes are able to afford taking more safety procedures to protect their property family, or self from victimization, (WING, 2012). Additionally, compatible with the Resonance Theory, it may also be the case that since lower income individuals
may also live in higher crime areas, they may be more likely to identify crime as a social problematic and report higher feelings of fear of crime because they are always surrounded by numerous kinds of crime either through the news media or their surroundings, (Dowler, 2003; Weitzer & Kubrin, 2004).

**H.3.a. There is no correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who did not experience crime in real life:**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between TV Newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime for females who did not experience crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 3.a. is supported by TV newscast, and that when low level of credibility is combined with no previous crime experience, the cultivation effect on viewers is reduced.

**H.3.b. There is no correlation between talk show credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who did not experience crime in real life:**

- Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for females who did not experience crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 3.b is supported by talk shows, and that when low level of credibility is combined with no previous crime experience, the cultivation effect on viewers is reduced.
H.4.a. There is a correlation between TV newscast credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who experienced crime in real life:

Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a moderate positive significant correlation between TV news credibility and the level of fear of crime for females who experienced crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 4.a is supported by TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime among females who experienced crime in real life. This result matches the assumptions of Gerbner and his colleagues (1980) that TV newscasts which broadcast crime news induce a “double dose” of the idea of a mean world, especially among people who live in high crime areas (Gunter, 1987). This finding is evidence that TV newscasts resonate among females and magnify their fear of crime, which supports H4 only with female students who previously examined crime in real life. According to Sacco (1995), people tend to contextualize what they have been exposed to in the media according to their personal experience or the experience of others in their social networks. On this basis, they decide the extent to which they should be afraid of crime (As cited in Romer, 2003).

H.4.b. There is a correlation between Talk Show credibility and level of fear of crime among female students who experienced crime in real life:

Use of the Pearson Correlation Test showed that there is a weak non-significant correlation between talk show credibility and the level of fear of crime for students who experienced crime in real life. These results show that Hypothesis 4.b. is not supported by talk shows, and that Talk Shows did not have the same impact on females. This result is in consistence with many researches results such as Erdonmez’s study results which revealed that Individuals getting news from
TV newscast significantly report higher fear of crime scores than those getting news from other sources, (Erdonmez, 2009).

Researchers argued that although both depict real life violence, local news seems to have more resonance with viewers than global news – an observation that supports the Resonance Hypothesis. Actually, the closer the news is to the vicinity of viewers, the more powerful its impact (Severin & Tankard, 2001). This impact is even stronger in cases where viewers experience crime in real life and its impact is magnified with females more than males, (Gunter, 1987).
Chapter 7: Conclusion and Recommendations

7.1. Conclusion:

Fear of crime has always been the focus of cultivation theory research. Researchers first started to study the overall impact of media without concentrating on a specific genre. Later on researchers discovered that real violence in news cultivates fear inside viewers more than violence in drama. They also found that local news resonates more with viewers and magnifies their fears. In this study researcher examined the correlation between TV news coverage after the Egyptian revolution, Jan 25th, and level of fear of crime among the American University of Cairo students aged from 18 to 21 years old. Previous studies showed that resonance occurs when the cultivation effect is boosted for a particular group of population. This study examined cultivation effect on students and female students who experienced crime in real life.

Results showed that there is a high crime experience among respondents, 71 percent. In contrast with expectation of researcher and with previous studies youth showed less TV news credibility and less the level of fear of crime. It seems that at this level of education and critical way of thinking, youth do not tend to believe TV news and relay more on internet as a source of news.

Resonance hypothesis only occurred with female students who experienced crime in life and only with TV newscast and did not occur with Talk Shows. Those females showed a moderate correlation between TV newscast credibility and the level of fear of crime. The rest of the sample did not show any correlation between TV news credibility and the level of fear of crime.
Fear of crime is no more a tool to control youth and direct them towards what politicians want. On the contrary, it seems that the more youth are educated and mind sharpened, the more strategies of fear control do not work with them. Also, the more politicians use this strategy the more it loses its impact on people because they discover the trick and all playing cards are exposed and their TV news agencies are losing their trustworthiness. However, additional research is needed to fully explore differences in the fear–media relationship among different groups of population in Egypt.

7.2. Recommendations for TV Newscasters:

TV news showed a very low credibility level. From this study results researcher came up with the following recommendations:

- Code of ethics should be developed and they should commit to it.
- Avoid biasness.
- Tell the viewers the whole story even it is against your political tendency.
- Try to gain your young viewers credibility again by being objective.
- Even died bodies have rights, you don’t have the right to broadcast their corpses.

7.3. Recommendations for future research:

- The current study applied cultivation theory, to explore the impact of violent scenes among high educated youth to evaluate the resonance effect of those scenes on the level of fear of crime. Different demographics should be studied to understand the impact of violent scenes on them.
- Replication is recommended on children under 18 years old.
• Terms of cultivation change when the medium change, though expected researchers should focus more on the internet; “a world in which everyone is producer, distributor, and consumer of message”, (as cited in Morgan, 2009, p.350), to assess terms of cultivation in this new medium.

7.4. Study Limitations:

• Because of lack of security in Egyptian universities in the last year and due to time constrains, the researcher distributed the questionnaire only among AUC students, further demographics and level of education could give another dimensions to the results.

• The use of non-random sampling technique in the research does not allow the results to be generalized to populations. However, the lack of population information forces the researcher to utilize the non-random techniques. Researcher tried to get the data of research from the target population to select a probability sample, but portal policies at the American University in Cairo do not allow such data. Therefore, researcher decided to send the questionnaire to all students under the research criteria and analyze their answers, therefore this sample is non-random sample because researcher worked only on students who answered the questionnaire.

• Researcher tried to get more data about crime rates and visited the Ministry of Interior Force with a formal letter from the American University in Cairo. The letter was handed to General Alaa Mahmoud, the head of media relationship in the ministry and he promised to provide data within two weeks. Two weeks later the researcher could not contact him.
The ministry was facing hug waves of unrest and they seemed never have time to provide such data in this bad circumstances.
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APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

Documentation of Informed Consent for Participation in Research Study

**Project Title:** *The Correlation between the Credibility of Television News and Talk Shows and The level of fear of crime*

**Principal Investigator:** *Nahla Badr ElDin*

*You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of the research is* [to investigate the correlation between the credibility of Television News and Talk Shows and the level of fear of crime], and the findings may be [both published and presented]. The expected duration of your participation is [10 minutes].

The procedures of the research will be as follows [Questionnaire will be distributed among a sample from AUC students then researcher will analyze the results to find out if there is a correlation between the variables of this study].

*There will not be* certain risks or discomforts associated with this research.

*There will not be* benefits to you from this research.

*The information you provide for purposes of this research [is confidential].

Should you have any questions, please contact:

(PI name: Nahla Badr ElDin)

(Telephone number: 01222547828)

(Email: nbadreldin@aucegypt.edu)

*Participation in this study is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or the loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.*

Signature  

Printed Name  

Date
Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Gender: Male Female

3. Have you ever been a victim of a violent crime?
   Yes No

4. Do you know anyone who has been a victim of a violent crime?
   Yes No

5. I often receive the news from............

6. TV News is clear.
   Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

7. TV News is biased.
   Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

8. TV News tells the whole story.
   Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

11. TV News is accurate.
    Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
9. TV News is *believable*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. TV News *can be trusted*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. TV News is *fair*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. TV News is *well-timed*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Talk Shows are *clear*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Talk Shows are *biased*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Talk Shows *tell the whole story*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Talk Shows are *accurate*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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17. Talk Shows are *believable*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Talk Shows *can be trusted*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. Talk Shows are *fair*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

21. Please rate your level of concern about *getting murdered*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not worried at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. Please rate your level of concern about getting *raped/sexually assaulted*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not worried at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Please rate your level of concern about getting *attacked by someone using a weapon*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not worried at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. Please rate your level of concern about getting *robbed or mugged on the street*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not worried at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. Please rate your level of concern about being *approached by a beggar or panhandler on the street*.
26. Please rate your level of concern about getting *beaten up or physically assaulted by strangers*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all

27. Please rate your level of concern about *someone breaking into your home*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all

28. Please rate your level of concern about *having your vehicle stolen*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all

29. Please rate your level of concern about having your *property vandalized/damaged*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all

30. Please rate your level of concern about getting *cheated, conned, or swindled out of money*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all

31. Please rate your level of concern about getting *kidnapped*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all

32. Please rate your level of concern about *being tortured*.

Very worried 1 2 3 4 5 Not worried at all
33. Please rate your level of concern about getting *injured during rioting.*

| Very worried | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not worried at all |

Google Drive URL:

https://docs.google.com/a/aucegypt.edu/forms/d/1wIGG2LoJBoSWIda7Yf9vVknKq0YC8nL2WpnynxxEr8/viewform
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