

International Digital Organization for Scientific Research

IDOSRJCE93.4044.202400

IDOSR JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION AND ENGLISH 9(3):40-44, 2024.

<https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSR/JCE/93.4044.202400>

How Reality TV Portrays the Legal System: An Analysis

Nyiramukama Diana Kashaka

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how reality television portrays the legal system, focusing on the balance between legal realism and entertainment value. Reality TV courtroom dramas have become popular cultural artifacts, influencing public perceptions of legal institutions. By analyzing their content, evolution, and ethical implications, the study explores how such programs shape narratives around justice, fairness, and legal professionalism. It highlights the dual role of these shows as both education and entertainment while emphasizing their potential impact on societal attitudes toward the law. Ultimately, the paper argues that these portrayals, often exaggerated for dramatic effect, provide a distorted but culturally significant reflection of the legal system.

Keywords: Reality television, legal system, courtroom dramas, media influence, legal realism, public perception.

INTRODUCTION

As more and more people watch television, the reality TV phenomenon is playing an increasingly important role in our society. Turning the television on, you have the freedom to tune into some of the most dramatic real cases in which people are involved. Courtrooms are settings that are becoming intriguing arenas of human activity and are producing a plethora of television content. Moreover, these reality shows give viewers an approximation of what the actual legal process is like. These scripted television dramas present a legal understanding of the world. A legal drama creates a narrative about who does wrong, who suffers because of it, how the truth is discovered, and how the wrongdoers are punished. In these narratives—both criminal shows about victims of corporate fraud and civil actions for damages—the person who appeals to the law for justice generally gets it. For viewers of these shows, the law can be depended upon [1, 2]. There has been a lot of

social and cultural research on television, exploring how media images can affect our shared social reality. Can we take the drama on television seriously as an education in our legal institutions, or should we see it just as entertainment? In other words, how do the dramatizations of legal life we see on television compare to the realities of everyday life in the legal system? Each of the "reality" shows examined here becomes a microcosm of the often-competing elements of our current postmodern legal system. They also present competing images and meanings of justice and jurisprudence and offer lessons about how media and legal culture jostle and meld with each other in the quest for relevance and entertainment. The public's response to the genre of reality TV is mixed. Some may see it as harmless escapist entertainment, but much of America is not laughing at it, but rather with the shows [3,4].

The Evolution of Reality TV and Its Influence on Society

The hyperbolic reality TV has used serves as a sort of funhouse mirror on society: it imitates us, expands our vision, deepens our disaffection, gives us full-blown permission to regard

ourselves as heroes and to despise ourselves as losers, and has come to comprehend what else we might want to watch. If we look at the history of reality television over the years, from

the onset as a group of ordinary people navigating their daily lives in segments proceeding on social media, to a world of dating and talent shows across the big hot TVs of decades, we get to face. We indeed wonder what has transformed. From the representation of current social media actions at its first digital efforts to the narratives of lives, it reflects us in a great way [5, 6]. We live in a time of instant satisfaction. In recent years, we have seen a blurring of speculation and truth, secrecy and espionage, news, and gossip occurring across many structures, from books to podcasts, game shows to novel fiction. Major cultural incidents, including the Capitol riot and the rise of conspiracy theories, can be traced back to earlier reality shows. As reality television programs increasingly span a broad variety of formats and content, the phenomenon is also blurring ethical and rhetorical lines. While there have been breaches of security and staff rights, the structure shows where non-professionalism is the norm, and the violation of privacy rights are

Legal Realism Vs. Entertainment Value: Balancing Act

Reality television can be a double-edged sword for those who are in charge of creating content. Producers are constantly under pressure to create entertainment, regardless of whether the subject they are covering is staged or real. Creating interesting, organic, real content while preserving legal realism is no easy feat. In reality-based programming, a sense of reality may be necessary for authenticity; but entertainment value is key since it will drive the story and capture the audience. When do the demands of legal realism trump entertainment value, and vice versa? Judges have much latitude to guide lawyers in their storytelling and the level of theatricality accepted in their performance; however, the lawyer as entertainer threatens the basic values in the legal profession [9, 10]. Courtroom justice shows can take many forms. They can offer a shadow trial, with certain segments of the courtroom scenes shown. They can be reportorial where the focus is on behind-the-scenes activities between prosecutor, judge, and defense attorney. Dating shows can follow the cases of same-sex couples who are seeking to marry or have their marriage recognized in the states where marriage rights are being contested. Often in presenting sides of these cases, litigants and lawyers have more showmanship than in other formats. By dramatically presenting the views of each side, neutrals and lay audiences can gain an

the fixed standards. Broadcasting “the statements,” investigations, and writings of a recognized convicted “liar,” for instance, is not only a common practice but forms the narrative foundation of the “imposter” series. It can easily be said that a reality TV illustration mirrors that of the legal “uncertain evidence.” Life’s sweet mystery of the “innocent” can be imprisoned. At the same time, when “policy” provides “coverage” in the court of any diversity. While these examples are entertaining, they also raise questions about the genre of reality TV as complete fiction in every sense, or as legitimate public-labeled fiction. In recent years, it was declared that each of its programs was intended for “educator viewing.” Given that most shows are normal centers of “family values,” it is pretty shocking. The wave of unintended types for the sake of public viewing may be the explanation for such classifications. After all, who on mainstream television isn’t “real reality?” [7, 8].

understanding of social values at variance in a lawsuit. These shows also demystify for many the work of lawyers. In these formats, courtroom scenes starkly contrast with the ways lawyers and hearings are characterized in other formats. Indeed, the portrayal may seem capricious when series appear to swing from serious courtroom justice shows to sensational expose programs focused on courtroom personnel corruption of some sort [11, 12]. Television shows often offer a tension between educational content and entertainment value. Often, both suggest a separate appeal to reality. This is complicated by the fact that shows are often sold as what happened. Supporters of the reality television genre often suggest that even though the scenes are edited, they are pieced together to show something that happened. In this way, reality television claims an educational value about the human condition. However, such defense may become a liability when the camera presents the private activities of professional actors, that is the viewing of backstage activity by a public audience. In the instance of courtroom-inspired television, the masks of due process and the human drama are set aside for us all to see. Marketing the patterns of appeal and factual claims for each genre all cohere to a reality for the audience. Thus, the informative value of television is also

compromised by an inconsistent portrayal of

legal subjects [13, 14].

Ethical Considerations in Depicting Legal Proceedings on TV

Attorneys are often told to remember that, for many of their clients, legal proceedings are unknown territory; they only "know" the legal system from TV shows. Much of the world's legal landscape is becoming more and more accessible to the general public, not by access to the courts or legal representation, but because reality television shows purport to show those systems in action. The ability of such programs, and others like them, to shape discourse about variants of the criminal and civil justice system makes it urgent to consider the kind of responsibility the makers of these programs have. What does it mean to produce an entertainment broadcast about real courts, and what sort of obligation do producers and networks have to show proceedings in a fair and accurate light? This paper's analysis of law-focused reality TV shows is part of a broader project that seeks to make sense of when and

why the public tunes into networks that make criminal punishment a subject of entertainment [15, 16]. Millions of people watch reality television shows focused on the law and the courts. Those shows often depict events that impact more than just the participants. Even if a program does not have an obvious impact on bargaining, a defendant's willingness to take a plea or legal culture, real people's lives are brushed by such shows. Our commercial media ecosystems are designed to elicit public interest, responses, ratings, emotions, and, ideally, advertising revenue. Media professionals argue that viewers have a responsibility to decide what to believe and that not every program can or should try to mimic a university seminar room. They argue that there is an obligation on viewers to separate entertainment from truth [17, 18].

Impact of Reality TV on Public Perception of the Legal System

In a bulletin, it is explained that "the continued popularity of reality legal programming could perpetuate perceptions – both positive and negative – about the legal system, including whether courtrooms may be used as venues to address disputes." A study conducted in 2004 set out to determine "whether and to what extent crime-related television shows influence viewers' beliefs regarding the court system's ability to provide justice." In two separate surveys, both before and after the airing of a reality law show, members of a section of "Introductory Corrections" were asked to respond to several scenarios regarding the criminal justice system [19, 20]. In a paper titled "Reality TV and Punishment," it is argued that the "desensitized social environment that allows for the desirability of modern punishment" is in part due to punishment as

entertainment as seen on reality crime shows. Additionally, there is evidence that reality TV programs may hurt those we are relying on to settle disputes. An article titled "Due Process Lite: Cautionary Notes on 'Court TV,' Fine Art of Tele dissemination of Legal Information, and the Legal Profession's Ban on Cameras in the Courtroom" questioned the extensive coverage of famous criminal trials. Whether reality shows tell the truth or manipulate facts, for viewers of such programs, the shows present a pervasive impression of what lawyers and judges do and who they are. Unfortunately, these false perceptions are easily reinforced in today's world of multimedia, 24/7 news cycles, and the very popular social media outlets that broadcast and amplify immediate and collective opinions that are often false [21, 22].

CONCLUSION

Reality television's portrayal of the legal system occupies a unique cultural space, blending elements of truth and fiction to engage audiences. These programs often simplify complex legal processes and dramatize courtroom interactions to enhance entertainment value, which can lead to misconceptions about the judicial system's operations. While they provide a platform for public engagement with legal issues, they also

risk trivializing critical legal principles and processes. As these shows continue to shape public perceptions, it is crucial to balance their entertainment goals with a responsibility to portray the legal system accurately and ethically. Addressing this tension can ensure that these portrayals inform rather than mislead, fostering a more nuanced understanding of the law and its role in society.

REFERENCES

1. Singh RK, Prakash R, Lal R. Adoption of CAB model for instrument development of effectiveness of crime-based reality-shows. *Journal of Content Community and Communication*. 2021;14(7):230-9. amity.edu
2. Chen H, Zuo Y, Law R, Zhang M. Improving the tourist's perception of the tourist destinations image: An analysis of Chinese Kung fu film and television. *Sustainability*. 2021 Apr 1;13(7):3875.
3. Senftleben M. The Unproductive "Overconstitutionalization" of EU Copyright and Trademark Law—Fundamental Rights Rhetoric and Reality in CJEU Jurisprudence. *IIC-International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*. 2024 Oct 8:1-44. springer.com
4. Szegda J, Tylec G. The level of legal security of citizen journalists and social media users participating in public debate. Standards developed in the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and the European Court of Justice (ECJ). *Computer Law & Security Review*. 2022 Nov 1;47:105740.
5. Christin A. The ethnographer and the algorithm: beyond the black box. *Theory and Society*. 2020 Oct;49(5):897-918.
6. Harrington CN, Klassen S, Rankin YA. "All that You Touch, You Change": Expanding the Canon of Speculative Design Towards Black Futuring. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 2022 Apr 29 (pp. 1-10). acm.org
7. Caputo V. Anthropology's silent 'others': A consideration of some conceptual and methodological issues for the study of youth and children's cultures. In *Youth cultures* 2022 Nov 30 (pp. 19-42). Routledge.
8. Pedroso JE, Palencia HG. Negotiating practices of female students in a maritime university. *Australian Journal of Maritime & Ocean Affairs*. 2023 Oct 27:1-8.
9. Brooke RB, Law C. *Argent, Alan. Dr William's Trust and Library: A History*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2022.
10. Alao, Abiodun. *Rage and Carnage in the Name of God: Religious Violence in Nigeria*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2022.
11. Barański, Zygmunt G. and Cachey Jr., Theodore J. *Dante's "Other Works": Assessments*. *Church History*. 2022;91:721-5.
12. Hanych M, Smekal H, Benák J. The Influence of Public Opinion and Media on Judicial Decision-Making: Elite Judges' Perceptions and Strategies. *InIJCA 2023 (Vol. 14, p. 1)*.
13. Pavone T, Stiansen Ø. The shadow effect of courts: Judicial review and the politics of preemptive reform. *American Political Science Review*. 2022 Feb;116(1):322-36.
14. D'hondt S. Why being there mattered: Staged transparency at the International Criminal Court. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2021 Oct 1;183:168-78.
15. Apolo Y, Michael K. Beyond a reasonable doubt? Audiovisual evidence, AI manipulation, deepfakes, and the law. *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society*. 2024 Jun;5(2):156-68. [\[HTML\]](#)
16. D'hondt S. Why being there mattered: Staged transparency at the International Criminal Court. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2021 Oct 1;183:168-78.
17. Simmons M, Lee JS. Catfishing: A look into online dating and impersonation. In *Social Computing and Social Media. Design, Ethics, User Behavior, and Social Network Analysis: 12th International Conference, SCSM 2020, Held as Part of the 22nd HCI International Conference, HCII 2020, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 19–24, 2020, Proceedings, Part I* 2020 (pp. 349-358). Springer International Publishing. [\[HTML\]](#)
18. Bandes SA, Feigenson N. Virtual trials: Necessity, invention, and the evolution of the courtroom. *Buff. L. Rev.* 2020;68:1275.
19. Voeltz RA. The British Tribe Next Door (2019): Reality TV in Kaoko, Tourism, and the "Hollywood Himba". *Critical Arts*. 2023 Mar 4;37(2):63-84.

18. Fisher B. "Swipe up?": Reality Stars-Turned-Influencers vs. College Athletes and the Road Ahead with Name, Image, and Likeness. *Miss. Sports L. Rev.* 2021;10:239.
19. Conway DM. Antiracist Lawyering in Practice Begins with the Practice of Teaching and Learning Antiracism in Law School. *Utah L. Rev.* 2022:723.
20. Ressler-Moyer T, Morales PG, Osorno JA. Movement Lawyering During a Crisis: How the Legal System Exploits the Labor of Activists and Undermines Movements. *CUNY L. Rev.* 2021;24:91.
21. Yeo NL, White MP, Alcock I, Garside R, Dean SG, Smalley AJ, Gatersleben B. What is the best way of delivering virtual nature for improving mood? An experimental comparison of high definition TV, 360 video, and computer generated virtual reality. *Journal of environmental psychology.* 2020 Dec 1;72:101500. [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)
22. Smink AR, Van Reijmersdal EA, Van Noort G, Neijens PC. Shopping in augmented reality: The effects of spatial presence, personalization and intrusiveness on app and brand responses. *Journal of Business Research.* 2020 Sep 1;118:474-85. [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

CITE AS: Nyiramukama Diana Kashaka (2024). How Reality TV Portrays the Legal System: An Analysis. IDOSR JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION AND ENGLISH 9(3):40-44. <https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSR/JCE/93.4044.202400>