IDENTIFYING PATTERNS OF ETHICAL SENSITIVITY IN TV NEWS VIEWERS: AN ASSESSMENT OF SOME CRITICAL VIEWING SKILLS

This study applies a multidimensional assessment of ethical sensitivity to 104 viewers' descriptions and evaluations of a local TV news story about a hit-and-run accident. Ethical sensitivity is measured along four dimensions or abilities: ability to notice relevant story characteristics, ethical issues, consequences, and stakeholders. Cluster analysis reveals eight distinct clusters or patterns of ethical sensitivity abilities, which we label broadly aware, outcome oriented, consequence oriented, stakeholder oriented, issue oriented, fact oriented, outcome oriented, and broadly unaware.

Recently, some media ethics scholars have recommended that more attention be paid to the behaviors and responsibilities of TV audience members in their role as news consumers in a democratic society (Peters & Cmiel, 1991; Voakes, 1997). Most media ethics research to date has focused on message content or journalist/gatekeeper attitudes and decision-making (Christians, Fackler, & Rotzall, 1995; Weaver & Wilhoit, 1991). Aside from general surveys of audience attitudes on TV news, and media credibility studies (Gaziano, 1988), there has been relatively little empirical research on how audience members select, interpret, and sometimes critically evaluate ethically controversial news stories.

Understanding the role of the audience is essential to developing a more balanced view of media ethics, and has gained renewed urgency with increased attention in the 1990s to critical viewing skills education and to media literacy program assessment (Brown, 1991; Christ, 1996). Media literacy programs help viewers interpret the codes and conventions of TV discourse, become more sensitive to problematic messages, and demand more quality and diversity as they begin to use TV --particularly news -- as active, responsible citizens (Christ, 1996). Critical news viewers can comprehend news stories, can evaluate reporting choices, and can infer consequences of stories for themselves and society (Brown, 1991).

This study uses a model of viewer response to ethically controversial news stories (Lind, 1993) to assess one critical viewing skill --ethical sensitivity. Ethical sensitivity (ethsen) is defined as an ability that "involves an awareness that something one might do or is doing can affect the welfare of someone.
else (or may affect others' welfare by violating a general practice or commonly held social standard” (Bebeau, Rest & Yamoor, 1985, p. 226).

This study identifies patterns of ethsen among 104 adults who viewed and evaluated a local TV news story containing several potentially problematic elements: invasion of privacy, graphic content, and sensationalism. The focus is on viewer ability to notice relevant story characteristics, specific ethical issues in story reporting, consequences of those issues, and stakeholders.

The Research Model

This study uses Lind's (1993) research model, which is based on Rest's (1983) Four Component Model of Moral Behavior. Rest lists four processes involved in enacting moral behavior: Interpreting the situation as involving moral issues and being able to see the issues and their consequences (ethical sensitivity); making a moral judgment by determining what course of action would best fulfill a moral ideal; deciding what to do by selecting from among competing moral and nonmoral values; and executing a plan of action.

The present study employs a research model of audience response to ethically controversial TV content (Lind, 1993) which parallels these processes. Prior research on our Component One, in which viewers select and view a news story and may or may not interpret it as having ethical issues in reporting, indicates that viewers differ in their ability to see ethical issues in TV news stories (Lind, 1997; Lind & Rarick, 1995). Component Two assesses viewer judgments of whether a news story should be aired, and research has found that most viewers can provide ethics-based reasons for airing (or not) ethically problematic stories (Lind, 1993; Lind & Rarick, 1992). In Component Three, viewers decide what to do based on their evaluation of a news story; prior work suggests viewers can report what should be done to improve TV news, and can also suggest what they individually could do (Lind, 1992; Lind, 1995). Research on Component Four, has found that viewers differ in their reported behaviors and justifications relating to channel changing, using viewer guides, or filing complaints to try to improve TV news (Lind, 1995; Lind, 1993). The current model is consistent with prior information-processing research on TV news viewing (Bryant & Rockwell, 1991), which has found viewers may selectively attend to and comprehend various aspects of a news story (Gunter, 1991), may use prior knowledge or abilities to understand and evaluate stories (Graber, 1988; Price & Zaller, 1993), and may or may not decide to take action about the news story (Lind, 1995; Montgomery, 1986).

Purpose And Research Questions

This study builds on prior work on Component One by identifying different patterns or profiles of viewer sensitivity to ethical issues in how a TV crime victim news story is reported. Previous research has identified several abilities underlying TV news viewers' ethsen: (1) ability to notice/comprehend relevant special characteristics of the story; (2) ability to see the possible ethical issues in how the story was reported (including the ability to differentiate between the ethics of the news professionals and those of the topic of or people involved in the news story); (3) ability to see possible consequences of the choices made by the journalists; (4) ability to identify stakeholders who would be affected by those consequences; and (5) ability to see how these factors interact to comprise a reasoned overall pattern of understanding (Lind, 1997; Lind & Rarick, 1995; 1998). The present study focuses on the first four of these abilities.

After showing 111 viewers a local TV news story and interviewing them about the story, interview transcripts were content analyzed using cognitive mapping techniques. The map data were profile analyzed via cluster analysis to reveal patterns of ethsen. The research questions were:
RQ₁: How ethically sensitive are TV news viewers in terms of four variable abilities of comprehension, awareness of ethical issues in reporting, awareness of consequences, and awareness of stakeholders?

RQ₂: What patterns of ethical sensitivity, based on differential abilities on the four ethical sensitivity variables, can be identified in TV news viewers?

This study is limited to one TV news story and its associated ethical issues, and uses a restricted sample of viewers so results cannot be generalized. However, coupled with prior studies of other TV news stories (Lind, 1997; Lind & Rarick, 1998) it provides added evidence of the usefulness of Component One of the research model, may assist in developing more effective media literacy assessment programs, and may help news gatekeepers become more aware of the range of critical abilities of their audiences.

**General Ethical Sensitivity Research**

Research on Component 1 of the Rest (1983) model began with Bebeau, Rest, and Yamoor's (1985) development of the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (DEST), which measures the degree to which dental students see ethical issues or problems in three dramatized dental office scenarios. Students' role-played responses to the scenarios are scored by expert judges according to awareness of special situational characteristics, operative ethical issues, and actions that would serve the welfare of others in the situation. Ethsen is reflected in students' ability to comprehend and select relevant information, and apply prior knowledge structures about ethical theories and professional norms.

Researchers in professional ethics have developed a variety of measures of ethsen, including rating the ethicality of certain practices in sales (Dabholkar & Kellaris, 1992); identifying ethical issues in medical or business settings (Hebert et al., 1990; Karcher, 1996); and role playing situations in counseling (Volker, 1983).

The present study was informed by the Bebeau et al. (1985) DEST research, but instead of using role playing and scoring by expert judges, this research developed an objective method of content analysis of peoples' responses in a structured interview given after exposure to the news story. This content analysis is rooted in a cognitive mapping procedure (Axelrod, 1976) that creates visual representations of key concepts (relevant story characteristics, ethical issues in reporting, consequences, and stakeholders) mentioned by the respondent. The concepts are mapped, with arrows depicting respondents' linkages among the concepts.

Thus, rough chains of reasoning used by viewers can be charted (Lind, Rarick, & Swenson-Lepper, 1997). Cognitive maps have previously been used in this program of research to assess viewer sensitivity to ethical issues in a hidden camera story and a political sex-scandal story (Lind, 1997; Lind, Rarick, & Swenson-Lepper, 1997). The present study extends these works by identifying patterns of viewer ethsen based on differential abilities on four ethsen indicators described below.

**Method**

**Interviewees and the News Story**

A quota sample of 111 Afro- and Euro-Americans was recruited from the Chicago area. The sample was well distributed by race, gender, and political orientation, but skewed to younger, better educated professionals. Participants viewed a two-minute local TV news story about a hit-and-run accident, which led a Chicago evening newscast. The victim was 12-year-old Megan Diaz, critically injured by a driver who was still at large. The story shows the girl being put in an ambulance, with an obvious pool of her blood in the foreground, an interview with her father who pleads for witnesses to come forward, and an interview with a "Good Samaritan" who provided assistance to Diaz and called 911. Use of an accident...
victim story is appropriate, since this type of story is quite common in TV news (Fang, 1985), and victim stories have been criticized on ethical grounds for being unimportant, sensational, exploitive, and overly violent (Haskins, 1981; Ryu, 1982; Wilkinson & Fletcher, 1995).

After viewing the story, participants took part in a structured open-ended interview presented as "your opinions about TV news." Respondents were first asked to describe the story and what aspects of the story stood out to them; then whether the story should have been aired and why; then what were the positive and negative aspects of the story; and finally overt questions as to whether the reporting raised any ethical issues and what they were. Of the 111 interviews taped and transcribed, only 104 were usable; these were content analyzed by two trained coders according to a codebook created to develop cognitive maps for each interview (Axelrod, 1976).

Creating and Applying the Coding System
Prior theory and research suggests four major content categories would be revealed in the interviews (reflecting four ethsen abilities): Characteristics of the news story/situation, ethical issues in the reporting of the story, consequences of perceived ethical issues, and stakeholders affected by those consequences. For assistance in identifying the ethical issues in this story, in depth interviews with nine media ethics experts from Minneapolis-St. Paul (three ethics scholars, three news council members, and three TV journalists) were conducted. Each expert was shown the story and then asked to discuss all the ethical issues in reporting that could be identified. Every expert found multiple ethical issues in the story.

Following identification of the four major content categories and the expert interviews 27 transcripts were randomly selected from the 104 usable viewer interviews. This subset of 27 transcripts was analyzed to determine whether the content categories revealed by prior research were applicable to the TV news viewing situation, and to determine which specific concepts were contained in each category. Transcripts were consistent with and could be analyzed along the four content categories.

The analysis revealed the pertinent story characteristics (e.g., Girl was injured in hit-and-run accident; Girl is in the hospital in critical condition; TV showed a graphic depicting the accident), ethical issues (e.g., invasion of privacy, newsworthiness, positive function of TV); consequences (e.g., story may affect views of safety, may result in finding the driver, gives father a chance to make his appeal); and stakeholders (e.g., the Diaz family, the driver, witnesses, viewers). The system is descriptive rather than prescriptive; any pertinent indicator of ethical sensitivity was added to the codebook when it appeared. These specific concepts, considered indicators of ethical sensitivity abilities, are coded in the interview transcripts.

The lists of story characteristics, ethical issues, consequences, and stakeholders, along with additional definitions and rules, were placed in a codebook that was applied to the 104 interview transcripts to generate the cognitive maps.

The transcripts were analyzed by two trained coders using a derivative of Axelrod's (1976) cognitive mapping procedure and a map coding procedure adapted from Wrightson (1976). Because the unit of analysis (turn at talk) could contain multiple codes, percent agreement was used to calculate coder reliability scores. Agreement across all story characteristics was 98.2%; for ethical issues, 98.3%; for consequences, 96.8%; and for stakeholders, 98.9%.

Data Analysis Procedures
The answer to research question 1 (ethical sensitivity abilities in the four areas) is based on the number of discrete indicators of ethical sensitivity ability evident in each of the four content domains. Analysis of
the ethsen indicators present in the cognitive maps resulted in four separate scores, each representing one ability. The total number of unique responses in each area was summed to create the score for that ability. Thus, someone mentioning four story characteristics, repeating two of them three times, would be given a score of four -- repeated items are not factored into the score.

Cluster analysis was used to answer research question 2 (patterns of ethsen). The clusters are based on the scores described above, and portray relative strengths and weaknesses in the four abilities. An agglomerative hierarchical cluster analysis was performed, using standardized data (z scores) because of the difference in the number of possible responses in each content domain. To prevent one factor from weighing more heavily because it had a greater number of possible responses. The analysis employed squared Euclidean distance as the measure of similarity, and Ward's Method for forming clusters since it optimizes the minimum variance within clusters (Aldendorfer & Blashfield, 1984). The common heuristics of examining the fusion coefficients and the dendogram were used to determine the number of clusters. When examining the fusion coefficients, analysis centered on a magnitude of difference that would suggest the clusters being combined were dissimilar. This occurred both at the 8 and the 9 cluster solutions; the 8 cluster solution was preferable because the only difference between the two was that in the 9 cluster solution a single case was in a cluster by itself, effectively discarding that case from the results.

Results
Before addressing the specific research questions, a description of the concepts raised by respondents is needed. Analysis of the 104 interviews revealed a total of 10 story characteristics, 11 ethical issues, 11 consequences, and 6 stakeholders. These ethsen indicators are presented in rank order in Table 1. The most commonly-noted story characteristics include the main topic of the story (the accident), the father's plea, the victim's hospitalization, and the "image" of the victim as a good girl, student, obedient, etc. The most commonly-noted ethical issues include the function or role of TV in helping find the driver, locate witnesses, or reinforce the need for caution by both pedestrians and drivers; the relative newsworthiness or importance of this story; and the story's objectivity, fairness, balance, and fullness of coverage. Commonly-mentioned consequences include the possibility of locating the driver or encouraging witnesses to come forward, and making drivers and pedestrians more careful. Commonly-mentioned stakeholders include the general public and the hit-and-run driver.

RQ: How ethically sensitive are TV news viewers in terms of the four abilities of comprehension, awareness of ethical issues in reporting, awareness of consequences, and awareness of stakeholders?

Congruent with previous research, a wide range of abilities is evident in the 104 viewers. Table 2 allows many comparisons across all four abilities in terms of means, standard deviations, and number of interviewees falling above and below the mean of each category.

For example, two items insinuated that viewers were relatively skilled at comprehending and understanding the relevant characteristics of the story. First, a relatively large proportion of interviewees (58.7%) placed above the mean based on their score on this ability. Second, and perhaps more important, the mean score in this content domain (4.83) when considered in relation to the highest potential score (10) is much higher than in any other area.

However, interviewees' abilities to recognize ethical issues are clearly lower than their abilities to identify pertinent story characteristics. Though there are more ethical issues than story characteristics, the mean score is lower, and relatively fewer viewers hover above the mean. Further, the range of responses is relatively smaller -- though observed scores in both content domains range from 1-9, the potential range for the ethical issues is greater (0-11) than for story characteristics (0-10).
Respondents seemed least skilled at recognizing consequences and stakeholders. While there were 11 possible consequences, and 6 possible stakeholders, the highest score in either category was 4, and scores of 0 were found in both categories. The means for both of these abilities are quite low.

RQ₂: What patterns of ethical sensitivity, based on differential abilities on the four ethical sensitivity variables, can be identified in TV news viewers?

Cluster analysis revealed eight distinct clusters. Each cluster is defined by the total numbers of story characteristics, ethical issues, consequences, and stakeholders identified by interviewees, and will be described in terms of its relative similarity to the overall means in each category of indicators. The eight clusters will be presented in order of what appears (based on the number of indicators of ability present in each category) to be roughly decreasing overall ethsen. Table 3 presents the means, by cluster, of each category of indicators, as well as the grand mean and standard deviation for the entire sample.

Cluster #1 seems to represent the most ethically sensitive viewers overall. It is above the grand mean on all four categories of abilities. These viewers are above the grand mean by more than a standard deviation in both story characteristics and consequences, and by approximately 2/3 of a standard deviation in ethical issues. These viewers are extremely aware of the relevant issues in all four content domains. They pay a great deal of attention to all pertinent realms; they can be considered broadly-aware.

Cluster #2 seems to represent viewers who are very sensitive across almost all of the pertinent content domains, but show relatively less ability in identifying ethical issues than story characteristics, consequences, or stakeholders. This cluster is just average on attention to ethical issues, but above the mean by about a standard deviation on story characteristics, and by about two standard deviations on consequences and stakeholders. These viewers, while very much aware of the facts of the case, seem to be outcome-oriented. Although they seem quite sensitive on the whole, their abilities are not equally distributed. These viewers focus the bulk of their attention on consequences and stakeholders. In fact, this group has the highest mean of all clusters for both consequences and stakeholders. Since this group was only average on ethical issues, the pattern indicates that these viewers tended to perceive multiple consequences and stakeholders for the ethical issues they did notice.

Cluster #3 seems slightly above average overall. It represents viewers who are about average on both story characteristics and stakeholders, but above the mean by about half a standard deviation on ethical issues, and by about a full standard deviation on consequences. These individuals seem consequence-oriented. They are not as fully aware of "outcomes" as is cluster #2, because these viewers focus on consequences rather than on stakeholders.

Cluster #4 presents a mixture of above- and below-average abilities in the four content domains. This group is relatively unaware of the pertinent story characteristics (about a standard deviation below the mean) and is also below the mean on ethical issues. Its attention to consequences is about average, but this group is nearly a standard deviation above the mean on attention to stakeholders. These viewers seem stakeholder-oriented; they are highly aware of only this one category.

Cluster #5 also presents a mixture of above- and below-average abilities in the various content domains, but in a very different combination than was seen in cluster #4. Cluster #5 seems issue-oriented.

This group is more than a standard deviation above the mean on ethical issues, but lower than the mean on consequences (by about a standard deviation) and stakeholders, and about average on story
characteristics. These viewers appear to have mentioned many ethical issues, but to have done little exploration of the remaining related terrain.

Cluster #6 is below the mean on both ethical issues and consequences, and about average on stakeholders. However, these viewers are above the mean on story characteristics, by about half a standard deviation, and may be considered fact-oriented. They are able to discuss the story details as presented within the news broadcast, but appear to consider neither the ethical dimensions of the story coverage nor its ramifications.

Cluster #7, like cluster #6, is composed of viewers who attend to the story characteristics more than to any other realm. However, the two clusters differ in that with cluster #7, the category which reflects the highest amount of attention (i.e., story characteristics) is only about average; this group is below the mean on ethical issues by about a half a standard deviation, and about two standard deviations below the mean on both consequences and stakeholders. These viewers paid less attention to outcomes than did any other cluster. Given the overall pattern of abilities in the four content domains, these viewers may be considered outcome-unaware.

Cluster #8 represents those viewers who appear to have the lowest ethsen overall. These viewers were below the mean in all four areas -- by about a standard deviation in three (story characteristics, ethical issues, and stakeholders). This cluster may be considered almost the opposite of cluster #1, as broadly-unaware. Individuals in this cluster paid limited attention even to the most basic domain; they do not appear to have processed the information in the story particularly deeply, and they seem to have unquestioningly accepted the media's performance. This group appears to be naive, passive, and uncritical.

Discussion
This study investigated the first component of the four component research model (Lind, 1993) of viewer interpretation, judgement, decision-making, and perhaps action regarding ethically controversial TV news. It focused on viewer sensitivity to ethical issues in the reporting of a local TV news crime victim story and found different patterns of audience response across four main ethsen abilities. Overall, though respondents on average noted almost half of the relevant story characteristics, they identified few of the operative ethical issues, consequences or stakeholders. This finding is consistent with ethical sensitivity studies in medicine (Hebert et al., 1990) and in counseling (Flower, 1992; Volker, 1983).

Analysis identified eight clusters among viewers in this study, representing different profiles of ethsen abilities, based on the four types of ethsen indicators. By conceptualizing ethsen as a specific subset of critical viewing skills, we present this as an ability that can be learned. The data this type of research generates may be used as a diagnostic tool in critical viewing or media literacy curricula to identify viewers' strengths and weaknesses across the four ability domains and better direct teaching at weak areas. Such data can also be used to assess student progress. For example, research has shown that students increased their levels of ethsen across all four ability domains after taking a college media ethics course (Lind, Rarick, & Ibrahim, 1996). Research in other realms has also found ethsen increases after focused ethics training (Bebeau, 1993).

This research adds to the understanding of how TV viewers differentially interpret local news stories containing ethical problems in reporting. The findings and research model may be of value to broadcasters and journalists by providing more detail about the process and content of audience interpretation and evaluation of news and journalistic performance. According to prior research, many news consumers view issues of ethics and reporting processes differently than do media professionals. For example, Martin, O'Keefe, & Nayman (1972) found little agreement between editors and readers in
perceptions of bias. McNulty (1993) reported different responses to ethical questions by journalists and audiences, and Voakes (1997) found that although journalists and readers agreed on the acceptability of ethically problematic stories, they differed widely in their perceptions of how journalists make their ethics decisions. Future studies might compare journalists’ and various audience segments’ responses to ethically controversial news stories in terms of the concepts in the four component model.

Clearly, journalists do attempt to protect audience members from inaccurate, unethical, and possibly distasteful reporting via editorial processes, codes of ethics, and analyses of viewer feedback. Yet broadcasters may wish to focus to a greater extent on the range of critical abilities of their audiences. The selection and presentation of news must be driven by sound journalistic practices, but such practices themselves may be well informed by learning more about the variety of ethical competencies of media audiences. Particularly in a rapidly changing media environment characterized by the emergence of new communication technologies, media professionals may find themselves targeting their messages to specific, narrowly defined audiences. The present research indicates that different audiences may well have different sensitivities, and media practitioners may wish to take those variations into account. Furthermore, if broadcasters can understand and connect with audience sensibilities, there may be fewer calls for government regulation of media content and potential threats to freedom of speech. We also see broadcasters filling useful roles in educating viewers about journalistic processes and in supporting/participating in research-based media literacy efforts. The present research has shown that, although viewers can be critical consumers, and can understand the competing principles that are the hallmark of much ethically controversial news, in absolute terms ethsen abilities do not seem particularly well-developed.

The present study shows several strengths and weaknesses of the research model. The interview, transcribing, and coding/mapping process is laborious, and a new coding system must be developed for each story. The patterns identified here apply only to one news story, and further research is needed to establish whether similar clusters are identifiable across different respondents and different news stories. Future research must also investigate whether people vary in ethsen across different news stories. Studies in business and medicine suggest ethsen varies with story content and ethical issues involved -- perhaps reflecting the role of prior experience and training (Karcher, 1996; Hebert et al., 1990).

The research model (which is grounded in theory and data), and our coding/mapping system (which can be reliably applied by trained coders) may be useful to scholars, teachers, and journalists. The multidimensional approach taken here parallels recent developments in educational assessment which emphasize that cognitive competencies are multifaceted. This is an important step in creating methods and measures to assess ethical sensitivity, to develop more effective viewer education programs, and to stimulate attention to the need for people to be more critical, active, and responsible TV news viewers.

**Table 1 Rank Order of Indicators of Ethical Sensitivity[1]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>STORY CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11 year old Megan Diaz is hit by driver in white car who is still at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>TV interviews father, seems settled, makes plea to public for assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diaz is in Cook County Hospital with brain damage, in critical condition.

Diaz is Latina, described as pretty, good student, obedient, almost home; showed school photo.

"Good Samaritan" (African-American) helped Diaz, is interviewed, describes accident.

TV shows blood on street, stretcher and ambulance, paramedics at work.

Anchor and reporter performance.

TV shows car driving away, implies it's mother looking for her daughter.

TV shows map of area, computer graphic of car going through red light and hitting girl.

Accident happened on Chicago's West Side, on corner of Laramie and Hirsch.

ETHICAL ISSUES

Role/function of TV, help find criminal, locate witnesses, warn of safety issues.

Newsworthiness, good/bad use of air time, length, relevance, importance, focus on crime.

Balance/fairness/objectivity, fullness of coverage, context.

Sensational, dramatization of issue, appeal to emotions.

Invasion of privacy, victim/witness rights, father seemed willing to talk, how tragedy is handled.

Appropriateness of depicting blood, stretcher, victim, good/bad taste.
7  14.4  Use of evidence (map, computer graphic), describing Diaz's condition as "very critical."

8  10.6  How minorities are depicted, Latina victim, African American "Good Samaritan."

9  7.7  Desire for ratings, competition with other stations.

10  4.8  Appropriateness of portraying victim as "pretty, good girl, straight-A student."

11  2.9  First Amendment, right to free speech.

STORY CONSEQUENCES

1  67.3  Results in finding criminal, driver turn in, witnesses come forward.

2  45.2  Affects views of safety, make people aware of danger as pedestrians and as drivers.

3  26.9  Affects the lives/health/emotions of the people directly involved.

4  22.1  Causes emotional reaction in viewers (positive or negative).

5  9.6  Sets good example, works toward community-building, serves community, long-term benefits.

6  6.7  Audience shortchanged, cheated, misled, etc. due to incomplete coverage or covering this story instead of other stories.

7  3.8  Allows father the chance to make an appeal.

7  3.8  Desensitizes viewers, creates an appetite for violence and blood.

9  2.9  Affects views of minorities (positive or negative), perpetuates or helps eliminate
stereotypes.

9  2.9  Affects public view or opinion of the media, or ratings, or earning potential of media.

11 1.9  Sets bad example, leads to "copy-cat" behavior.

STAKEHOLDERS

1  68.3  Viewers, general public, "us."

2  49.0  Hit-and-run driver.

3  30.8  Megan Diaz and her family, friends, and neighbors.

4  22.1  Witnesses and people at the scene.

5  2.9  Minorities.

6  0.9  TV station, reporters, editors, media.

* Rank = Rank order of item, across 104 interviewees; % = Percent of interviewees who mentioned each indicator of ethical sensitivity.

Table 2 Viewers' Ethical Sensitivity Abilities in Four Content Domains
Legend for Chart:

A - Story Chars.
B - Ethical Issues
C - Consequences
D - Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Items in Domain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/High Scores</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean # Concepts</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f(%) Above Mean</td>
<td>46 (58.7%)</td>
<td>53 (51.0%)</td>
<td>67 (64.4%)</td>
<td>43 (41.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f(%) Below Mean</td>
<td>43 (41.3%)</td>
<td>51 (49.0%)</td>
<td>37 (35.6%)</td>
<td>61 (58.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Patterns of Ethical Sensitivity Indicators (Category Means)
Legend for Chart:

A - Cluster (N;%)
B - Story Chars.
C - Ethical Issues
D - Consequences
E - Stakeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13; 12.5)</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4; 3.8)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(23; 22.1)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(19; 18.3)</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(9; 8.7)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(13; 12.5)</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(5; 4.8)</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(18; 17.3)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean | 4.83 | 3.63 | 1.94 | 1.74 |
SD | 1.84 | 1.44 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
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