AD-A263 587

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

STUDY PROJECT

ETHICAL REASONING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL MARVIN L. NICKELS
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 06 1993
S E D

USAWC CLASS OF 1993

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

93-09860

93 5 05 153

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013-5050	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. / PROJECT NO. / TASK NO. / WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)
Ethical Reasoning: A Comparative Study

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
LTC Marvin L. Nickels

13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)	15. PAGE COUNT
Final MSP	FROM _____ TO _____	93/02/26	78

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

The unwritten code of ethics by which American military officers serve demands strict adherence to the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and decency. While most officers live up to these lofty standards, a few do not. Most studies of leadership focus only on leaders who have succeeded but there is also much to learn from those who have failed - those who have "derailed" ethically. This paper is a report of the results of a study conducted to compare levels of ethical reasoning displayed by a group of officer inmates at the United States Disciplinary Barracks and a similar-sized group of CAS student officers. Ethical reasoning was measured using the Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI), an instrument developed by Roger Page and James Bode, Ohio State University, based on the theories of Dr. Lawrence Kohlberg, Harvard University. The study also examined the two groups in terms of family, religious, and educational backgrounds. The results of the study showed no significant differences between moral reasoning levels of the two groups, nor could ERI scores be explained by the limited information collected on family religious, and educational background
(see reverse side)

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS	Unclassified

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL
CH (COL) Thomas H. Norton, Project Adviser	(717) 245-3479	AWCAA

Continued from Item 19. Abstract

The members of both groups felt family upbringing had the greatest influence in their ethical decisionmaking. Both groups reported receiving minimal ethical education or training in the military and assessed its influence on ethical decisionmaking as minimal. Ethical education and training for military officers should be examined in detail both for quantity and quality.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 5

Accesion For
NTIS CRA&I
DTIC TAB
Unannounced
Justification
By
Distribution/
Availability Codes
Dist | Avail and/or Special
A-1

ETHICAL REASONING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Lieutenant Colonel Marvin L. Nickels
United States Army

Chaplain (Colonel) Thomas H. Norton
Project Adviser

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Marvin L. Nickels, LTC, USA

TITLE: Ethical Reasoning: A Comparative Study

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 26 Feb 1993 PAGES: 78 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The unwritten code of ethics by which American military officers serve demands strict adherence to the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and decency. While most officers live up to these lofty standards, a few do not. Most studies of leadership focus only on leaders who have succeeded but there is also much to learn from those who have failed - those who have "derailed" ethically.

This paper is a report of the results of a study conducted to compare levels of ethical reasoning displayed by a group of officer inmates at the United States Disciplinary Barracks and a similar-sized group of CAS^3 student officers. Ethical reasoning was measured using the Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI), an instrument developed by Roger Page and James Bode, Ohio State University, based on the theories of Dr. Lawrence Kohlberg, Harvard University. The study also examined the two groups in terms of family, religious, and educational backgrounds.

The results of the study showed no significant differences between moral reasoning levels of the two groups, nor could ERI scores be explained by the limited information collected on family, religious, and educational background. The members of both groups felt family upbringing had the greatest influence in their ethical decision-making.

Both groups reported receiving minimal ethical education or training in the military and assessed its influence on ethical decision-making as minimal. Ethical education and training for military officers should be examined in detail both for quantity and quality.

INTRODUCTION

The profession of arms is a noble calling and appeals to men and women of honor. The unwritten code of ethics by which American military officers serve demands strict adherence to the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and decency. As a rule, incompetence is more tolerable to the "system" than is immoral or unethical behavior. From their first days of precommissioning training in the service academies, officer candidate schools, and Reserve Officer Training Corps programs, officer candidates and cadets are taught to "follow the rules" and not to lie, cheat, steal or to tolerate such misconduct by others. They are taught the importance of following rules, even if those rules may appear inconsequential. From their first Officer Evaluation Reports, officers are rated in the areas of integrity, moral courage, and moral standards. In fact, ratings in these areas carry so much weight that there is an unwritten understanding that weaknesses noted in one or more of these areas generally spells career "death."

Most officers live up to the lofty ethical standards expected of them, or if not, at least their failures are considered insignificant. There are several factors which make this observation more remarkable than it might first appear. First, the ethical code by which officers are expected to live is generally unwritten. It is often assumed that "right" has the same meaning for everyone and that integrity is a simple matter of choice.

Second, officers come to the military services from a wide variety of backgrounds and range of ethical training. Some have

received extensive ethical training in the home and others have not. Some have strong religious beliefs while others have none. Officers bring with them education obtained from military academies, private colleges and state colleges and universities. Military ethical training at the precommissioning level ranges from four years of the academies' honor codes to no training at all for those officers who receive direct commissions.

While the vast majority of military officers are exceptionally honest and trustworthy, there are a few who fail to live up to expected ethical standards. The repercussions of officer ethical failures vary widely. At the lower end of the spectrum, failure may be annotated in Part IV of the Officer Evaluation Report by a rating of "2" or "3" in "integrity" or "moral standards" instead of the normal and essential "1." More serious ethical problems may result in administrative elimination under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-100 and Title 10, United States Code, Section 681. For example, of the 209 officer elimination actions initiated in the US Army during Calendar Year 1990, at least 119 (57 percent) involved what be defined as ethical problems on the part of the affected officers. Of those actions, 4 were for homosexuality, 25 for sexual misconduct, 32 for drug or alcohol problems, 4 for larceny, 10 for false statements, 2 for absent without leave and 42 for other categories of misconduct.[1] At the highest end of the spectrum are those officers whose ethical failures are serious enough to warrant judicial action under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. At any given time, a total of 30

to 50 officers from all services are confined at the United States Disciplinary Barracks (USDB), Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, for offenses ranging from crimes against property to murder.

Studies of ethical aspects of military leadership tend to focus only on successful leaders, and while this may be entirely fitting, there is also much to learn from studying those who have failed - those who have "derailed" ethically. One could logically assume differences in moral development and ethical reasoning between the most serious officer ethical failures and successful officers. Presumably, levels of moral development and ethical reasoning of those who fail should be lower than those of officers who do not.

This paper includes a report of the results of a study conducted to test the thesis that officers who fail ethically are measurably less developed morally and reason ethically at levels lower than their successful counterparts. It compares moral development levels of a group of officer inmates confined at the USDB and a group of student officers at the Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS^3), U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Additionally, it addresses the results of an attempt to explain levels of ethical reasoning in terms of family, religious, and educational backgrounds. Finally, it examines how members of the CAS^3 and inmate groups view peers, supervisors, and how they assess the ethical climates of their current or most recent units of assignment.

While this paper is primarily a report of the results of the comparative study, to place the study in the proper perspective it first addresses ethics and moral y in a broader sense. It briefly outlines the historical traditions of morality, addresses morality and ethics as they relate to the military officer, and presents a more detailed discussion of some moral development theories. The discussion of moral development is more lengthy since it lays the foundation for the discussion of the results of the comparative study of moral judgment and ethical reasoning.

Following a discussion of the study results, the paper offers some conclusions concerning officer ethical training, to include strengths and weaknesses of the present system. Finally, some possible improvements to officer ethical training are offered.

MORALITY AND ETHICS

While this paper is not intended to be a history of moral philosophy, some discussion is necessary if for no reason other than to define terms and assist the reader in interpreting the study results presented in a later section of the paper. Because of different family and religious background and education, terms such as "morality" and "ethics" connote different meanings to different people.

By definition, moral behavior is "right" behavior, and among the definitions of morality are "a doctrine or system of morals" and "moral conduct."[2] Ethics is "the discipline dealing with what

is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation, a set of moral principles or values, or a theory or system of moral values."[3] Members of the military profession may automatically associate the term "ethic" with its further use as a set of values associated with a profession. For example, all soldiers should be familiar with the elements of the Army Ethic: loyalty to the Nation, the Army, and the unit; duty; selfless service; and integrity.[4]

For the ancient Greeks, ethics was a question of "how to live one's life." Aristotle's writings attempted to answer the question in terms of the virtues by which an individual should live in order to be happy. Aristotle, like other ancient Greek philosophers, addressed the issue of ethics in terms of what was best for the individual.[5] For Aristotle, each person's aim or goal in life is personal happiness and well-being. If an individual can successfully live by a set of virtues, such as justice, courage, and temperence, he should be happy.[6] Although society would surely benefit from individuals living by such virtues, the focus was on the individual.

Modern moral philosophers, however, have dealt with issues of morality and ethics somewhat differently. While their individual theories of why people act the way they do vary greatly, Immanuel Kant, Thomas Hobbes, David Hume, Joseph Butler, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and most other moral philosophers since the 17th Century have addressed morality not in terms of what is best for each individual but rather how individuals should conduct themselves in their relations with other people.[7] In these more

modern terms, one's moral reasoning and conduct is not based solely on self-interest but considers other members of society as well.[8] It is in light of the modern treatment of morality that we now turn to a discussion of morality and the military officer.

MORALITY, ETHICS, AND THE MILITARY OFFICER

Much attention has been devoted to ethics within the profession of arms. Scores of books have been written on ethics in military leadership, ethical practices within the military services, war and morality, military education and training, and the role of the soldier in a democracy. Military officers regularly talk and write about ethics and morality with superiors, peers, and subordinates. Ethics is discussed in classrooms, in organizations, and is addressed in policy statements from company to Army levels. In fact, issues of ethics and morality probably receive more attention by military professionals than by any group other than the clergy.

Why do the services pay so much attention to the subject? In 1987, the President of the National Defense University, Air Force Lieutenant General Bradley C. Hosmer answered that question well in a foreword to the book, Military Ethics. He wrote, "All of us respond in varying ways to the beliefs and values of our families, our communities, and our nation. Members of the military services, however, must do more than respond to our commonly held beliefs - they must be ready to risk their lives defending them.

As a consequence, military men and women are never far removed from the central issues of ethics and morality."[9]

General Hosmer's conclusion is a valid one - members of the military profession are inextricably bound to the values of the Nation, even to the point of risking their lives to defend them. Although the military profession reflects the values of the larger society, as a profession it has a unique set of additional precepts under which it also operates. As Dr. Richard Gabriel explains, "The individual acquires a sense of what he ought to do, namely, a sense of ethics, when he gains membership and participates in the profession."[10] By virtue of membership in a profession, one becomes "obligated" to act in a certain manner and to comply with the ethic of that profession.[11]

The core values embraced by the professional ethic of the U.S. Military are generally no different from the core values of American society, but often include extensions or amplifications of them. Because of the unique nature and purpose of military service, some values of the larger society take on special importance in the military ethic. As discussed in the previous section, modern moral philosophy has approached the study of morality in terms of the individual's dealings with other members of society. This approach is especially appropriate in addressing ethics and the military profession. In The Soldier and the State, Samuel P. Huntington wrote, "Both because it is his duty to serve society as a whole and because of the nature of the means which he employs to carry out this duty, the military man emphasizes the

subordination of the will of the individual to the will of the group. Tradition, esprit, unity, community-these rate high in the military value system. The officer submerges his personal interests and desires to what is necessary for the good of the service."[12] It is, perhaps, this concept which influences most the expectation that military officers strictly adhere to military and civil laws.

Another example of amplification of a value can be found in examination of the special importance placed on integrity in the military services. The military officer serves in a profession where life and death decisions, even decisions involving the very survival of the Nation, are made based on the trust placed in written and spoken words. In a 1972 policy letter, the then Air Force Chief of Staff wrote, "Integrity-which includes full and accurate disclosure-is the keystone of military service. Integrity in reporting, for example, is the link that connects each flight crew, each specialist and each administrator to the commander in chief. In any crisis, decisions and risks taken by the highest national authorities depend, in large part, on reported military capabilities and achievements."[13]

The importance of integrity, however, goes well beyond the practical need for accuracy and truthfulness in reporting. Malham M. Wakin suggested that Alfred T. Mahan should be corrected in that it is integrity, rather than obedience as Mahan thought, which is "that one among the military virtues upon which all of the others depend."[14] He further theorized that integrity is one of the

"critical moral qualities which makes loyalty and obedience possible."[15] FM 100-1, The Army, places integrity at the heart of leadership when it says, "Leadership is built on trust, and trust is built on integrity."[16] For this reason, integrity is so valued in the military, especially among the officer corps, that an officer who compromises his or her integrity in any significant way is often "ousted" from the profession for failing to live up to an "obligation" of membership.

Why do the American people expect so much from members of their military services, especially the officers who lead them? Basically, this expectation arises from the great and special trust of the defense of the Nation and its values which society places in the hands of its military. Society's expectations of the officer corps are even greater since the officer corps not only leads the defense effort but is entrusted with the lives of America's youth. The American people have a proper right to demand not only competence from the leaders of its military, but also honesty, integrity, and the highest moral standards.

As leaders, officers serve as role models for subordinates. Consequently, the services as a whole will never be more honorable than the officers who lead them. Military service places great demands on young Americans, expecting them to adhere to standards of personal integrity and morality which were foreign to many prior to their military service. These soldiers look to their officer leaders as role models and emulate their conduct. This conduct is not viewed by soldiers as merely an acceptable standard, but rather

is generally considered to be the ideal. For this reason, the personal conduct of officers, on and off-duty, is the key factor in the ethical climate of any unit.

While FMs 100-1, The Army, and 22-100, Military Leadership, define the core values of the "Army Ethic", the total encompassing ethic is otherwise unwritten.[17] [18] Although unwritten, there is surely a professional ethic for all soldiers and, quite properly, officers are to conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the values of that ethic.

Before turning from the subject of ethics and the military officer, a brief discussion of the tie between morals, character, and ethics is warranted. Some moral philosophers go to great lengths in attempts to separate them, especially when "ethic" is used in the context of the professional ethic. As a practical matter, they are deeply intertwined in the Army ethic, and intentionally so. Under the precepts of the Army ethic, its members are expected to be "moral." In fact, FM 100-1 states clearly, "Leadership in war must be framed by the values of the profession - tenets such as Duty, Honor, Country - that are consistent with the larger moral, spiritual, and social values upon which our nation was founded."[19] In discussing the Army Ethic as the "informal bond of trust between the nation and its soldiers," the manual goes on to say it "sets the moral context for the Army in its service to the nation," "guides the way we must live our professional and private lives," and "sets standards by which we and those we serve will judge our character and our performance."[20]

Soldiers, especially officers, are expected to be men and women of character with high moral standards and who strictly obey the law. The standard to which the military holds its officers in this regard is probably higher than any other profession. It is clear the Army views moral conduct as part of the Army ethic, as evidenced by the fact that officers are evaluated on "moral standards" in the professional ethics section of the Officer Evaluation Report.

Attempts to separate the professional from the personal are not only impossible but undesirable. Max Lerner describes the importance of a sense of "wholeness" for a professional, and opines that, the "worst thing that has happened to professionals has been the divorce between their professional and business life and their personal life."[21] To do so inevitably leads to a confused sense of moral direction.[22]

It is because of this link between morals, character, and ethics that officer inmates are characterized as "ethical failures" in this paper. While it is possible that unethical conduct (in the sense of the values of the professional ethic) may not be illegal or immoral, no instances come to mind where the reverse could be true.

MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Much of the study of moral development and ethical reasoning conducted during the past fifty years has been based on the theory

of cognitive moral development proposed by Jean Piaget. Piaget theorized that children develop two separate and sequential moralities which can be distinguished in adults and are the basis for adult morality. However, according to Piaget, the two stages are not distinct and there is an intermediate phase between them. The first stage consists of the "moral constraint of the adult which leads to heteronomy and moral realism." During the intermediate phase, rules are "interiorized and generalized," and the third phase consists of "cooperation which leads to autonomy."[23]

In Piaget's first stage of morality, the child acts from a sense of duty to obey the orders of its parents. At this level, the child's morality is a "morality of right" rather that a "morality of good." For the child at this level, "right" conduct is obeying the orders of the parent. In the intermediate phase, children begin to "obey the rule," not only the order or command of their parents. A pertinent illustration cited by Piaget has to do with lying. At the intermediate stage, the child begins to reason that lying is bad and that one "ought" not lie even if he will not be caught and punished. In Piaget's final stage of morality, the child accepts an ideal and acts because of his internal acceptance of the ideal rather than because of external pressure.[24]

Influenced by Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg developed his own cognitive-developmental theory of moralization. As a cognitive-developmental theory, it purports that individuals make moral choices based on thinking processes and that these processes

change as children develop through adolescence into adulthood. Further, moral development is linked to development of logical thinking and social perspective.[26] In other words, a child first attains a certain stage or level of individual logical thought, then a parallel stage of his perception of society and his or her place in it, and finally, a corresponding stage of moral reasoning.[26]

Kohlberg theorized that individuals progress to some point through one or more of six moral stages, grouped into three major levels.[27] Kohlberg's theory is examined in detail in successive paragraphs since it provides the theoretical foundation for the comparative study of ethical reasoning of officer inmates and CAS[3] officers, the results of which are presented later in this paper.

The first of Kohlberg's levels is the "Preconventional Level."[28] According to his theory, most children under the age of nine, some adolescents, and many criminal offenders operate at this level. He labeled this level "preconventional", since those who function at this level tend to view the rules and expectations of society as something external to themselves. The first two of Kohlberg's six stages fall within Level 1. Stage 1 is "Heteronomous Morality," wherein people avoid breaking rules in order to avoid punishment and because of outside authority. People who function at Stage 1 on the moral development scale tend to be egocentric and to care little about the interests of others. Stage 2 is "Individualism, Instrumental Purpose, and Exchange." At this stage, like Stage 1, people tend to follow rules if it is in their

own interest to do so. Socially, they tend to have an "individualistic perspective," believing that everyone pursues his or her own interests.[29]

Kohlberg believes most adults in any society function at the second level of moral development, the "Conventional Level."[30] This level is so labeled because people who have developed morally to this level tend to obey the rules and "conventions" of society, basically because they are the rules and conventions of society. The lowest stage at this level, Stage 3, is called the level of "Mutual Interpersonal Expectations, Relationships, and Interpersonal Conformity," because people at this stage tend to adhere to the Golden Rule and treat other people in the manner in which they would want to be treated. They tend not to be as self-centered as those at the preconventional level and can put the interests of others ahead of their own. Stage 4 of level two is the stage of "Social System and Conscience." People at this level recognize the "system" as the definer of rules. For these people, the rules of society are to be upheld except in extreme situations where they conflict with other duties prescribed by society.[31]

Few people, mostly adults, reach Kohlberg's third level, the "Postconventional Level."[32] These people accept the rules and conventions of their society but not simply because they are the rules and conventions. They accept them based on acceptance of the principles which underly those rules and conventions. Those who function at Stage 5, the "Social Contract or Utility and Individual Rights" stage, generally believe the rules of society should be

followed, but that the rules should be based on "rational calculation of overall utility." According to Kohlberg, less than 20 percent of American adults reach Stage 5.[33] Stage 6, which rarely occurs, is the stage of "Universal Ethical Principles." At this stage, people follow their own ethical principles even when they conflict with the law. They tend to believe in moral principles which they think are universal.[34]

A complete description of Kohlberg's three levels and six stages of moral development is provided in Appendix A. It includes definitions of what is considered "right" by people functioning at each level, the reasons for which they adhere to that view, and the social perspective of each stage.

Not all scholars agree with Piagetian theory or Kohlberg's expanded cognitive-developmental model. The works of Piaget, Kohlberg, and other "cognitive-developmentalists" are at odds with social-learning theories of moral development.[35] Part of the basis for the disagreement stems from the tendency of cognitive-developmental theories to be based on "stage concepts" of moral development.[36] Social-learning theories question "whether any significant amount of moral decision-making enters into the internalized control of conduct for most human beings (despite the fact that various states of moral knowledge may be available to them)," and question the link between knowledge and conduct.[37] That question of linkage is addressed in greater detail in a later section of this paper. Basic assumptions of both general theories (cognitive-developmental and social-learning) are included as Appendix B.

ETHICAL REASONING - A COMPARATIVE STUDY

This study was conducted to compare levels of moral reasoning of officer inmates and successful Army officers. Additionally, its purpose was to compare family, religious and civilian educational background and military ethical training between the two groups and, to a more limited extent, assess their affect on levels of moral reasoning. Further, it was conducted to examine ethical reasoning in terms of length of military service; branch of service; Army branch, if applicable; rank; sex; age; state from which the subject entered military service; and source of officer commission. Finally, it was designed to assess differences between how officer inmates and successful officers view peer honesty, their units' treatment of individuals who try to do the right thing versus those who do not, and the honesty of their commander or officer supervisor.

The study was conducted under the assumption that, overall, officer inmates would reason ethically at levels lower than their successful counterparts. It was also assumed that those who assessed family, religious, and educational background as more important in their ethical decision-making would reason at a higher ethical level than those who assessed those areas as less important. It was assumed that those more senior in rank would reason at a higher level and that military education would also positively affect ethical reasoning. It was assumed that if so analyzed, study results would support previous research findings

concerning the relationships of gender, age, and level of education to ethical reasoning. No specific assumptions were made as to the possible relationships between branch of service, Army branch, source of commission, state from which the subject entered military service or other factors.

Subjects

The study compared two groups. The first group was comprised of 29 officers assigned as students at CAS^3, US Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. CAS^3 is a ten week course attended by all active duty Army captains, normally at about the eighth year of service. In the Army's officer education system, CAS^3 falls between the branch officer advanced course and the Command and General Staff Officer Course. The course is designed to teach staff skills necessary for staff officer duty at battalion and brigade levels.

Student officers who participated in the study consisted of volunteers from 29 separate small groups. Twenty-six of the officers were male and 3 were female. Since there were no females in the officer inmate group, the data collected from the female officers, including ERI scores, were not considered in the study. One cannot assume away male-female differences and some data indicate there may be differences. Additionally, there was a disproportionate number of chaplains in the CAS^3 group, probably due to the manner in which the CAS^3 staff identified volunteers for

the study. Apparently, those who expressed a particular interest in the subject were allowed to participate. Data collected from the six Army Chaplains were also omitted from the study. Due to their extensive ethical training, the chaplains are not comparable to the inmates and not necessarily representative of the entire Army officer population. Of the remaining 20 officers, the average age was 31.85 with a range of 27 to 47 years. The officers had an average of 7.53 years of active federal service, with a range of 4 to 10 years.

The second group consisted of 30 officer inmates confined at the USDB, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The USDB is the only maximum security prison within the Department of Defense. Officer inmates from all military services serve their sentences at the USDB, regardless of sentence length. Their are normally 30 to 50 officer inmates confined at the USDB, serving sentences from a few months to life for crimes ranging from relatively minor crimes against property to murder.

Thirty officer inmates, all males, voluntarily participated in this study. Their average age was 35.8, with a range of 21 to 47 years. They had an average of 11.03 years of active federal service prior to confinement, with a range of less than 1 year to a maximum of 23 years.

With few exceptions, inmates who participated in the study began confinement in January 1991 or later. It was hoped that this restriction would exclude any inmates who might have become "institutionalized." The following tables provide additional

demographic information on both study groups. The term "missing cases" in the tables refers to questions not answered by the subjects of the study.

Table 1
Branch of Service

	CAS³		Inmates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Army	20	100	15	50
Navy	0	0	6	20
Marine Corps	0	0	1	3
Air Force	0	0	8	27
	20	100	30	100

After chaplains were excluded from the CAS³ group, Army branches in both groups were fairly representative of the Army overall. Additionally, both groups were comprised of roughly the same percentages of the three branch groupings (combat, combat support, and combat service support).

Table 2
Army Branch

	CAS³		Inmates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Combat	10	50.0	7	46.7
CS	5	25.0	3	20.0
CSS	5	25.0	4	26.7
(Missing cases)	0	0	1	6.7
	20	100	15	100.1*

* Rounding error

The modal rank for both groups was clearly captain. All 20 members of the CAS³ group were captains. There were 9 former field grade officers in the inmate group.

Table 3
Rank

	CAS³		Inmates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
LTC	0	0	2	6.7
MAJ	0	0	7	23.3
CPT	20	100.0	11	36.7
1LT	0	0	3	10.0
CW4	0	0	1	3.3
CW3	0	0	1	3.3
CW2	0	0	1	3.3
WO1	0	0	1	3.3
Cadet	0	0	2	6.7
(Missing cases)	0	0	1	3.3
	20	100.0	30	99.9*

* Rounding error

The inmate group had a higher percentage of former officers commissioned through one of the military academies or OCS. The two inmates described as "not commissioned" were academy cadets sentenced to confinement prior to graduation and commissioning.

Nearly all the subjects of both groups had at least a bachelors degree (95 percent of the CAS³ group and 77 percent of the inmates). Two of the 4 inmates at the high school or GED level were the cadets who were in an academy prior to confinement.

Table 4
Source of Commission

	CAS[3]		Inmates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Academy	2	10.0	5	16.7
OCS	2	10.0	6	20.0
ROTC	14	70.0	11	36.7
Direct	2	10.0	5	16.7
Not commissioned	0	0	2	6.7
(Missing cases)	0	0	1	3.3
	20	100	30	100.1*

* Rounding error

Table 5
Civilian Education

	CAS[3]		Inmates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Professional	1	5.0	0	0
Masters	4	20.0	7	23.3
Bachelors	14	70.0	16	53.3
Associates	1	5.0	3	10.0
High School/GED	0	0	4	13.3
	20	100	14	100.1*

* Rounding error

Nearly 37 percent of the officer inmates had attended a command and general staff officers course prior to confinement. The high number of missing cases in the inmate group in Table 6 is attributable to the difficulty experienced by former Navy and Air Force officers in converting their service schools to the equivalent Army school.

Table 6
Highest Military School Attended

	CAS[3]		Inmates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CGSC	0	0	8	26.7
CAS[3]	20	100	3	10.0
Officer advanced	0	0	5	16.7
Officer basic	0	0	8	26.7
(Missing cases)	0	0	6	20.0
	20	100	30	100.1*

* Rounding error

Materials

Each subject completed 2 instruments. The first instrument administered was the Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI). The ERI is a "paper-and-pencil" instrument which measures Kohlberg's stages of moral development.[38] [39] The ERI includes six of Kohlberg's moral dilemmas. Subjects answered questions about the stories and also selected one best answer from six alternatives. This best answer was the alternative offering the reason which most closely matched theirs in each of the dilemmas. The 26 questions of the questionnaire are branched, i.e., the answer to one question would lead to other questions specific to the previous answer. In this way, one can more fully explore the specific ethical choice an individual makes. Nonsense and complex answers are included among the possible choices to detect "careless/random answering techniques" and "endorsement of complex-

sounding answers." The ERI is scored by computing the mean of the stages (1 through 5) selected. For example, while both 2.25 and 2.50 represent Stage 2, 2.50 represents a higher level of reasoning. Abstract and nonsense answers and unanswered questions are not included in the average.[40]

The authors of the instrument claim internal consistency between dilemmas with Cronbach alphas of .69. The test-retest reliability correlation for 7 days was calculated at .80, and .69 at 10 days.[41] Research conducted for the purpose of comparing the ERI and other measures of moral judgment or reasoning to the instrument used by Kohlberg, the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), showed the ERI to have the highest correlation with the MJI (.54).[42] A later study showed a correlation with the MJI of .56.[43] In comparing studies of moral reasoning, readers are cautioned to remember the relatively weak correlations between the various instruments. Research to determine the instrument's susceptibility to faking determined that subjects were unable to fake scores upwards in the test but could intentionally fake lower scores.[44]

The second instrument was a questionnaire consisting of 25 questions, used to gain information about the subjects. It collected general information such as branch of service, rank, sex and family, religious, educational, and military background. The questionnaire included questions designed to obtain the subject's assessment of the effects of family upbringing, religious participation, and military and civilian education on ethical

decision-making. Subjects were also asked to evaluate the honesty of their peers and commander or officer supervisor and to assess the "fairness" of their military organization in the sense that "right" conduct is rewarded and "wrong" conduct is not. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix D.

Procedures

The study began with the submission of an application for a research project to the Commandant of the USDB, in accordance with the provisions of AR 70-2, Use of Volunteers as Subjects of Research and USDB Regulation 70-25, Research With Human Subjects. A request was also made of the Director, CAS^3 for permission to involve the student officers. The requests were approved by the Commandant, USDB and the Director, CAS^3. A copy of the research proposal is at Appendix E.

Volunteers were solicited from among officer inmates and CAS^3 student officers by the USDB and CAS^3 staffs. The author administered the ERI and the background questionnaire at Fort Leavenworth to the CAS^3 group on 4 December 1992 and to the officer inmates on 5 December 1992. Volunteer subjects were briefed on the study (see Appendix F) and each completed an overprinted DA Form 5303-R, Volunteer Agreement Affadavit (see Appendix G). All subjects were afforded an opportunity to request the results of their ERI. Those who requested results completed a request form (Appendix H) and the results were forwarded to inmates by the USDB

and to CAS³ students by the author by use of a form designed for that purpose (Appendix H). Officer inmates were also afforded the opportunity to request 3 days of special sentence abatement for participating in the study by completing an abatement request form, a sample of which is at Appendix I. Subjects were identified in the study base only by subject number and, except for requested limited exceptions for the purpose of providing results, remained anonymous.

Completed ERIs were scored through a computer program written at the USDB using Ashton Tate dBASE III Plus. Data were analyzed at the US Army War College using the SPSSX-PC package of statistical analysis. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution, chi-square, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) methods.

Results and Discussion

CAS³ Officers and Officer Inmates

The differences in overall ERI scores for the two groups were insignificant. The mean scores were 3.63 for the CAS³ officers and 3.71 for the officer inmates. Additionally, frequency distributions for the two groups were nearly identical. The standard deviation was .2966 for the CAS³ group and .3005 for the officer inmates. ERI means ranged from 2.88 to 4.12 for CAS³ officers and from 2.90 to 4.27 for officer inmates.

These findings contradict several theories of moral reasoning, including Lawrence Kohlberg's. Kohlberg believed there was a difference in ethical reasoning between adult criminal offenders and noncriminals. For example, he found that most children under the age of nine, some adolescents, and many criminal offenders, adolescent and adult, reasoned at the Preconventional (Stages 1 and 2) Level.[45] Hudgins and Prentice also found that delinquent adolescents tended to reason at the preconventional level (Stages 1 and 2) while nondelinquents generally reasoned at a higher level.[46] Arbuthot cited a number of studies which showed that both adolescent and adult offenders reasoned at levels below their noncriminal counterparts.[47] He quoted the author of one of those studies, J. D. Ayers, who concluded, "...adult prisoners simply have deficits in cognitive development and moral/ethical reasoning, that these deficits are a causal factor in decisions to commit criminal acts, and that they are best dealt with through a process of habilitation rather than rehabilitation, that is, development rather than transformation."[48]

The results of the present study do not at all support the studies or theories of those who believe adult offenders are deficient in moral reasoning, at least as measured by Page and Bode using Kohlberg's levels and stages. There were only two Stage 2 scores in the study, one in each study group and both were very nearly Stage 3. The lowest overall score (2.88) was that of a CAS[3] officer and the highest (4.27) was that of an inmate.

How then, does one account for the difference in the findings of the present study and previous ones comparing moral reasoning of offenders and nonoffenders? This study may be the first to successfully control other factors in comparing offender and nonoffender groups. Although not measured directly, there is probably little, if any, difference in the basic cognitive ability of members of the two groups, an important factor in Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental theory of moral development. The members of both groups have generally the same family, religious, educational, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Their civilian educational levels are almost identical and most have participated in at least some ethical training in the military. Most research in the area has focused on adolescents who mature at different rates. Adults may be more similar in comparisons.

The lack of difference between ethical reasoning levels between the two groups may also be partially explained by the relationships, or lack thereof, between ethical reasoning, attitudes, and behavior. This relationship is the topic of the next section of this paper.

Ethical Reasoning, Attitudes, and Behavior

While many theorists have suggested a link between moral reasoning and behavior, it has never been shown to be more than a weak one. After extensively reviewing the literature of the day (1976), Mischel and Mischel concluded that "knowledge of

individuals' moral reasoning would permit one to predict no more than about 10 percent of the variance in their moral behavior."[49] They also point out that this weak relationship would be even weaker if other factors thought to affect moral reasoning and behavior (intelligence, socioeconomic level, and age) were factored out.[50] Interestingly, the present study may have succeeded in factoring out precisely those variables. Again, this may account for the similarities in the ethical reasoning scores of offenders and non-offenders.

More recent studies, primarily with children, have shown significant correlations between moral reasoning and behavior. In a study of school children, Kalliopuska and Mustakallio found a statistically significant but low correlation between moral judgment and behavior at school.[51] The correlation was significant for boys but not girls.[52] They found that children with lower levels of moral judgment were more likely to have behavior problems at school.[53] However, the weakest correlation they found was that between moral judgment and good behavior in that good behavior did not seem to be dependent on high levels of moral judgment.[54]

Rholes and Bailey examined the link between reasoning and behavior somewhat differently. They sought to explain the connection between attitudes and behavior by examining moral judgment as a variable. Based on Kohlberg's idea that social attitudes are based on different reasoning processes depending on the stage of moral judgment[55], they hypothesized that "persons at

higher levels of moral development would show greater consistency between their attitudes and behaviors than persons at lower levels would."[56] They found greater consistency between attitudes and behavior for persons at higher moral judgment levels.[57]

Those at higher moral reasoning levels were more likely to act on strong attitudes and less likely to act on weak attitudes. Those at the lowest level of moral reasoning were just as likely to act on weak attitudes as they were to act on strong ones.[58] As Rholes and Bailey indicate, there have been few studies attempting to apply Kohlberg' theory to social-psychological issues[59], and apparently none attempting to explain criminal behavior. Studies of the link between moral judgment, attitudes, and behavior in an offender population might be meaningful. It is possible that a correlation exists between the type of offense and the level and stage of moral reasoning and the offender. Additionally, one could speculate that offenders who reason at higher moral levels might tend to explain their crimes in terms of "principle over law." The moral reasoning levels of the officer inmate group in this study should be an excellent group on which to base such a study.

Peers, Superiors, and the Organization

The military is an institution built on a foundation of smaller organizations. Its manuals acknowledge that different units have different "command climates" and different group norms. Studies of honesty and dishonesty have shown "group codes" and

norms to be major determinants of honesty and dishonesty.[60] Roger Burton cited studies of classroom cheating which indicated that attitudes about cheating were distinctly different between different course majors, between social groups within schools and colleges, as well as between the schools and colleges themselves.[61] Researchers also found that when studied over time, cheating scores became more homogeneous, a finding which they attributed to the establishment of a "group code."[62] Maitland and Goldman found that moral judgment levels of high school students were affected by peer group interaction.[63]

The questionnaire used in this study asked the subjects to assess peer honesty within their current military organization or for officer inmates, their most recent organization. The results were significantly different for the CAS^3 and officer inmate groups. Subjects were asked whether they strongly agreed, agreed, had no opinion, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statement, "In my current unit (or last unit if no longer in the service), most of my peers are honest and try to do the right thing." Responses were rated on a five-point scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = no opinion (neutral), 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. The overall mean rating for CAS^3 officers was 4.15 and the officer inmate mean was significantly lower at 3.46 ($p < .05$). As shown in Table 7, 90 percent of the CAS^3 officers agreed or strongly agreed that peers in their current or last unit were honest, compared to 63 percent of the inmate group.

Table 7
Peer Honesty

	Assessment				
	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	No Opinion n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
CAS[3]	0 (0)	1 (5)	1 (5)	12 (60)	6 (30)
Inmate	0 (0)	8 (27)	3 (10)	16 (53)	3 (10)

A second question designed to assess unit climate asked the subjects to indicate agreement or disagreement with the question, "...my immediate commander or officer supervisor is honest and tries to do the right thing." The difference between the scores of the two groups (CAS[3] - 4.25, inmates - 3.10) was also significant ($p < .01$). It is impossible to assess the importance of this difference without some method of determining how much of the negative assessment by the inmates is attributable to resentment over prosecution. Immediate commanders or officer supervisors were undoubtedly responsible for many of the events preceding the judicial action which led to confinement. However, the fact that 50 percent of the inmates agreed that their commanders or officer supervisors were honest and tried to do the right think is interesting. It appears they are able to assess honesty even if they are resentful.

Table 8
Commander or Officer Supervisor Honesty

	Assessment				
	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	No Opinion n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
CAS³	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (10)	11 (55)	7 (35)
Inmate	6 (20)	5 (17)	4 (13)	10 (33)	5 (17)

The final question designed to measure an aspect of command climate asked whether the subject agreed or disagreed with the statement as it pertained to thier current or last unit of assignment, "...those who choose to do the right thing are generally rewarded and those who choose not to do the right thing are not rewarded." Although the responses of the CAS³ group were slightly more positive, the difference between the overall responses of the two groups was not significant. Generally, both groups were positive in their responses, with means scores of 3.55 for the CAS³ group and 3.07 for the officer inmates.

Family, Religious, and Educational Background

In an attempt to assess the effects of family, religious, and educational background, subjects in both groups were asked to assess how they thought their background in these areas helped them resolve ethical dilemmas. No significant differences were observed between the two groups in any of the three areas. Although not statistically significant, inmates considered civilian education more important in helping resolve ethical dilemmas than did their CAS³ counterparts. Responses to the questions concerning family,

religious, and civilian educational backgrounds are shown in Tables 9 through 11.

Table 9
Family Influence

How much would you say your family upbringing has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilemma?

	Not at All n (%)	Somewhat n (%)	Moderately n (%)	Greatly n (%)	Very Greatly n (%)
CAS[a]	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (20)	6 (30)	10 (50)
Inmate	1 (3)	1 (3)	3 (10)	15 (50)	10 (33)
Totals	1 (6)	1 (6)	7 (14)	21 (42)	20 (40)

($p > .36$)

Table 10
Religious Influence

How much would you say your participation in religious activities, either as a child, and adult, or both, has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilemma?

	Not at All n (%)	Somewhat n (%)	Moderately n (%)	Greatly n (%)	Very Greatly n (%)
CAS[a]	1 (5)	2 (10)	6 (30)	8 (40)	3 (15)
Inmate	2 (7)	2 (7)	12 (40)	13 (43)	1 (3)
Totals	3 (6)	4 (8)	18 (36)	21 (42)	4 (8)

($p > .47$)

Table 11
Civilian Education Influence

How much would you say your civilian education has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilemma?

	Not at All n (%)	Somewhat n (%)	Mod-erately n (%)	Greatly n (%)	Very Greatly n (%)
CAS[3]	2 (10)	3 (15)	11 (55)	4 (20)	0 (0)
Inmate	1 (3)	4 (13)	15 (50)	7 (23)	3 (10)
Totals	3 (6)	7 (14)	26 (52)	11 (22)	3 (6)

($p > .15$)

While there were no significant differences between how the CAS[3] and inmate groups viewed the importance of family, religious, and civilian education influences on ethical decision-making, both groups assessed family influence as having much greater influence in choosing to do the "right thing" than either religion or civilian education. Responses to all three questions were weighted on a five-point scale as follows: 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderately, 4 = greatly, and 5 = very greatly.

The relative importance of the three influences, as evaluated by the subjects, is shown in Table 12. Scores are based on the five-point scale described above.

Table 12
Comparison of Influence of Family, Religion, and Civilian Education

	Mean	
	CAS[3]	Inmate
Family	4.30	4.07
Religion	3.50	3.30
Civilian Education	2.85	3.23

Subjects were also asked to indicate whether they had participated in religious activities as children, as adults, both as children and adults, or neither. Again, there were no significant differences between the CAS[3] and inmate groups, although it appears inmates were more likely to participate in religious activities as adults without prior participation. Table 13 shows a breakdown of religious participation.

Table 13
Participation in Religious Activities

	Participation			
	None n (%)	Child n (%)	Both n (%)	Adult n (%)
CAS[3]	1 (5)	11 (55)	8 (40)	0 (0)
Inmates	5 (17)	6 (20)	13 (43)	6 (20)
Totals	6 (12)	17 (34)	21 (42)	6 (12)

Source of Commission

One of the objectives of this study was to examine whether early education and training received by the officer or officer inmate at a military academy, ROTC, or OCS would affect moral

reasoning, and whether those who had no precommissioning training (direct appointments) would differ from those who had. For purposes of this analysis, subjects from both groups were considered together. A breakout of the source of commission for the consolidated group is shown in Table 14.

Table 14
Source of Commission

Source	Number	Percent
Academy	7	14
OCS	8	16
ROTC	25	50
Direct	7	14
Not commissioned	2	4
Missing cases	1	2
Totals	50	100

No two groups had significantly different mean ERI scores ($p > .11$). While the differences between the groups were not statistically significant, they were interesting nevertheless. Officers and former officers who were commissioned through OCS programs or who had received direct commissions scored higher on the ERI than those commissioned through ROTC and the academies. This finding is contrary to the widely-held assumption that academy graduates would reason at a higher level due to the influence of the honor codes and the greater amount of ethical training provided at those institutions. There is a caution against "over-interpreting" the data, however, since the sample size is small and

the majority of the members in all source of commission groups other than ROTC in this study were officer inmates. For example, 7 of the 9 academy graduates in this study were officer inmates.

Table 15
ERI Mean Scores

Source	ERI Mean Score
Academy	3.51
OCS	3.83
ROTC	3.70
Direct	3.79

Branch of Service and Army Branch

No significant differences were observed in overall ERI scores of combat, combat support, or combat service support branches of the Army nor between Army and other-than-Army groups.

Military Ethical Education and Training

One would assume that an institution which places so much importance on ethics would devote a proportionate amount of time to ethical training and education within its officer ranks. This assumption, however, appears to be a false one.

As mentioned in the introduction to this paper, young men and women bring to the academies, ROTC programs, and OCS, a wide spectrum of moral and ethical backgrounds and levels of development. We would assume that those attracted to the life of a military officer would tend to be "more ethical" than the norm, but again, this may be a false assumption. Major Charles W. Hudlin who

at the time of his writing in 1982, was an Associate Professor of Philosophy at the U.S. Air Force Academy, cited an experiment frequently conducted by an academy Honor Representative in teaching fourth classmen about the honor code. The Honor Representative would ask how many of the cadets had cheated in high school and inevitably, 95 percent would raise their hands and the remaining 5 percent would be accused of lying by the other cadets.[64] The point of this illustration is that officer candidates and cadets do not necessarily have a basic ethical foundation and do not necessarily possess the fundamental values of the profession such as honesty and integrity.

Officers receive ethical education and training at three levels: precommissioning, in service schools, and in units. Subjects in this study were asked to estimate the number of hours of ethical education or training they had received at each level and then to assess the effect of this training on ethical decision-making. Again, there were no significant differences between the two groups. Mean responses of both groups fell between the 11-20 and 21-30 hours of training categories.

As might be expected, there were differences between source of commission and hours of ethical education and training at the precommissioning level. Academy graduates reported the most precommissioning education or training, with the mean response of 3.86 (between the 21-30 and 31-40 hours of training categories) and OCS the least, with a mean response of 1.5 (between the 1-10 and 11-20 hour categories) ($p < .05$).

Table 16
Precommissioning Ethical Education and Training

	Total Hours					
	0 n (%)	1-10 n (%)	11-20 n (%)	21-30 n (%)	31-40 n (%)	40+ n (%)
CAS³	0 (0)	4 (21)	8 (42)	2 (11)	0 (0)	5 (26)*
Inmates	3 (10)	7 (23)	6 (20)	6 (20)	2 (7)	6 (20)
Totals	3 (6)	11 (22)	14 (29)	8 (16)	2 (4)	11 (22)

*There was one missing case in the CAS³ group

Although overall differences between the CAS³ and inmate groups in the amount of ethical education and training in service schools were not significant, fully 21 percent of the inmate group reported receiving no ethical education or training at all in any service school. Three of those inmates were Air Force, 2 Navy, and 1 Army. While this is hopefully incorrect, a reasonable assumption would be that the nature of the training was such that it made no impression on the officer who received it. It is not uncommon to hear Army War College students make the same claim during classroom discussions.

Table 17
Ethical Education and Training in Service Schools

	Total Hours					
	0 n (%)	1-10 n (%)	11-20 n (%)	21-30 n (%)	31-40 n (%)	40+ n (%)
CAS³	0 (0)	8 (40)	4 (20)	5 (25)	0 (0)	3 (15)
Inmates	6 (21)	8 (28)	8 (28)	3 (10)	2 (7)	2 (7)*
Totals	6 (12)	16 (33)	12 (24)	8 (16)	2 (4)	5 (10)**

*There was one missing case in the inmate group and a rounding error accounts for the percentage total of 101%
**Rounding error

Subjects were asked to assess the overall influence of ethical education and training received in schools, both before and after commissioning, on their ethical decision-making. Both groups assessed its influence nearly the same. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderately, 4 = greatly, and 5 = very greatly), the CAS^3 group rated the influence of education and training received in schools at 2.70 and the inmate group rated it at 2.83.

Most commanders would probably agree than military schools only lay the foundation of knowledge in any subject area. It is at the unit level that this broad knowledge base is focused and the most important skills are honed and applied. They would also probably agree that ethics is one of the most important subject areas, at least for the officer corps.

Does it then follow that units devote considerable time to ethical training and were the experiences in that regard different for officer inmates and CAS^3 officers? The data in Table 19 would indicate that units do not devote much time to ethical training. The data were collected in response to the question, "About how many hours of unit ethical education or training per year have you received while assigned in units?"

While statistically the two groups do not differ overall, some interesting observations are obvious. Twenty percent of the CAS^3 officers and 38 percent of the officer inmates reported receiving no ethical training in their units. Granted, the subjects may have differed in interpretation of what constitutes

"ethical education and training." For example, did they consider mandatory annual standards of conduct training required by AR 600-50 to be ethical training? In any event, there is probably little ethical training conducted in most units and if there is, it has such little impact that the officer can't remember it. Major Hudlin made an interesting observation in this regard, writing, "Currently, there is no ongoing ethics education program in the Air Force as there is for human relations, drugs, and alcohol abuse."[65] In a recent class at the Army War College, a chaplain student mentioned the requirement of Chapter 5, AR 165-1 for a Moral Leadership Training Plan. It was obvious from the reaction of other students (including the author) that they were unaware of the requirement.

Table 18
Ethical Education and Training in Units

	Total Hours					
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	40+
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
CAS³	4 (20)	14 (70)	1 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (5)
Inmates	11 (38)	15 (52)	3 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)*
Totals	15 (31)	29 (59)	4 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)

*There was one missing case in the inmate group

Neither group assessed the influence of unit ethical training as being very significant. On the same five-point scale described above, CAS³ officers rated its influence as 2.25 and the inmates rated it even lower at 1.89. This is consistent since almost a

third of the total group reported receiving no instruction in their units.

The fact that this study indicates there is no apparent difference in the ethical training of officer inmates and CAS[3] officers does not mean ethical training conducted in the Army is unimportant and does not make a difference. The study group was small and only a small portion of the study dealt with ethical training and education. The results of the study, however, suggest the need for an in-depth study of ethical education and training.

ETHICAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The first step in evaluating the military's ethical education and training program is to attempt to answer the basic question of whether adults continue to develop morally and ethically? Very little work has been done in this area by either psychologists or educators.

Acknowledging that little study had been devoted to this area, Kohlberg believes adults do continue to develop and that education could "stimulate" moral development.[66] He reported that his 20 year longitudinal studies showed moral stage movement by subjects in their thirties.[67]

Interestingly, some of the work done in this area has been with adult offenders, not all successfully. An attempt by Copeland

and Parish to enhance moral judgment of 134 trainees (all of whom had received courts-martial sentences of less than 6 months) at the U.S. Army Retraining Brigade (USARB), Fort Riley, Kansas, failed.[68] They did not, however, attribute this failure to the inability of adults to progress through Kohlberg's moral reasoning stages but rather to the stress and fear of the USARB environment.[69] A similar attempt by Arbuthnot in a civilian correctional facility was more successful and resulted in significant upward changes in moral reasoning stages.[70] He also observed that correctional facilities reward lower-stage reasoning and may inhibit upward moral reasoning stage progression.[71]

Kohlberg's approach toward adolescent moral education is based on a small group approach. Real and hypothetical moral dilemmas are presented to the group for discussion. Individuals are challenged by students who reason at higher levels. For example, students who reason at Stage 2 are challenged by those at Stages 3 and 4, and Stage 3 students are challenged by those at Stage 4.[72] In such a class at Harvard University, Kohlberg reported that approximately one third of the Stage 2 students moved to Stage 3 and about one third of those at Stage 3 moved to Stage 4.[73]

It makes sense that the appropriate time for the military to emphasize ethical education and training for officers is at the precommissioning levels. Shortly after beginning active duty, young officers find themselves in charge of soldiers and quickly

begin to face ethical dilemmas. Their education and training should be designed to prepare them for their new roles.

Under the Army's Military Qualification System (MQS), the framework for officer education and training, cadets and candidates receive 25 hours of leadership training, and of those, 7 hours are devoted to ethics.[74] Learning objectives for that instruction is listed below:

1. Relate military service to a model of a profession.
2. Relate how the Just War Tradition applies to you as a professional soldier and leader.
3. Relate national values, the professional Army ethic, and professional officer obligations to each other and to the implications for your service as an officer.
4. Analyze a situation for ethical consideration.
5. Resolve an ethical dilemma involving a superior.
6. Apply leadership fundamentals to create a climate that fosters ethical behavior.

A lesser amount of ethical training is presented at officer branch schools, designed to reinforce what the officers have already learned and to address dilemmas they are likely to encounter at their present level. A limited amount of time is devoted to ethical education at Command and General Staff College and the Army War College.

The Army has attempted to standardize ethical training through the MQS system. Unfortunately, the Center for Army Leadership can only standardize recommended lesson plans. It cannot ensure that instruction is presented accordingly or even presented at all. There is wide disagreement throughout the Army on how much time should be devoted to leadership training at any level in the officer education system and whether aspects of leadership such as ethics should be taught at all.

Assuming Kohlberg's theory of education is correct, the current instruction is woefully inadequate. We tend to teach officers "about" ethics rather than "how" to resolve ethical dilemmas. Military ethics education and training should be designed so that dilemmas are discussed in the small group environment so that the cadets, candidates, and officers who reason at higher levels can challenge those who reason at lower levels. Most military instruction, at least in the Army, is now presented in the small group environment and lends itself perfectly to Kohlberg's model.

As an institution, the military must dedicate adequate time for ethical education and training for the young officers. It is easier for commanders to control the effects of technical weaknesses in young officers than it is to control the effects of unethical conduct or poor ethical decision-making. One unethical officer can severely damage readiness and morale in any unit.

The reader could conclude from the results of this study that ethical education and training have no effect since there are no

significant differences between ethical reasoning of officer inmates and CAS^3 officers. Unfortunately, that may be the case, but just as likely, it may instead indicate that training is totally inadequate or is simply not conducted. Several questions concerning ethical education and training should be answered. Does the Army devote enough time to ethical training in Army schools, both pre and post-commissioning? Does that training teach officers how to make ethical decisions or does it instead teach "about" ethics? Is there a need for more ethical training in units? How should commanders teach ethics at the unit level?

The answers to these questions are not simple. Only after a thorough examination of the ethical element of the current education program can they be adequately answered.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study showed there were no differences in ethical reasoning levels of officer inmates confined at the USDB and a group of CAS^3 student officers as measured by the Ethical Reasoning Inventory and interpreted by Lawrence Kohlberg' theory. This finding contradicts some earlier studies which claimed criminal offenders were deficient in cognitive and ethical reasoning.

There are some factors which may explain this finding. First, this study may be one of the first to successfully control other factors which affect moral reasoning, including: socioeconomic

class, education, and family, religious, and educational background. Members of the two groups are very similar in those regards. In fact, other than their criminal offenses, virtually no differences between the two groups were observable from the results of this study.

Another factor which may partially explain the lack of difference in the moral reasoning of the two groups is the weak link between moral reasoning and behavior. The officer inmates reasoned at a relatively high level but acted inconsistently.

The CAS^3 group tended to be much more positive in assessing command climate, as measure by the honesty of peers and superiors. This may be partially attributable, however, to feelings of "bitterness" on the part of officer inmates.

There no significant differences between the CAS^3 and inmate groups in religious background and education, and neither of those two categories seemed to affect ethical reasoning. Most members of both groups were well educated and all but a few reported participating in religious activities either as a child, an adult, or both.

Both groups reported receiving minimal amounts of ethical training in their units and assessed its influence as minimal. This finding should be examined as a part of a larger overall look at the entire officer ethical education and training program.

Finally, aside even from the question of education and training, there is a practical side to moral reasoning theory. While psychologists and educators may not be certain as to why

different individuals reason on ethical matters they way they do, they are generally in agreement that the reasoning process is different. Different individuals may choose the same course of action for different reasons. Appealing to an individual on principle w[illegible] his motivation for doing the "right thing" is fear of punishment will gain little. Likewise, to the highly principled individual, rules and conventions have less meaning. Leaders are more effective when they understand these principles.

ENDNOTES

[1]Officer Qualitative Management Program Briefing, U.S. Army Personnel Command presented at the Department of the Army Secretariat for Selection Boards, 19 November 1991.

[2]Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, 1965 ed., s.v. "Moral" and "Morality."

[3]Ibid., s.v. "Ethic."

[4]Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual 100-1 (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, December 1991), 16.

[5]William N. Nelson, Morality: What's In It For Me? (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991), 23.

[6]Ibid., 22-23.

[7]Ibid., 39, 59, 91.

[8]Ibid., 40.

[9]National Defense University, Military Ethics, (Washington: National Defense University Press, 1987), xi.

[10]Richard A. Gabriel, To Serve With Honor: A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982), 25.

[11]Ibid., 30-35.

[12]Samuel P. Huntington, The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 63-64.

[13]John D. Ryan, "Integrity," in War, Morality and the Military Profession, ed. Malham W. Wakin (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 180.

[14]Malham M. Wakin, "The Ethics of Leadership I," in War, Morality and the Military Profession, ed. Malham W. Wakin (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 191.

[15]Ibid.

[16]FM 100-1, 15.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Department of the Army, Military Leadership, Field Manual 22-100 (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, July 1990), 29-30.

[19]FM 100-1.

[20]Ibid., 16.

[21]Max Lerner, "The Shame of the Professions," in War, Morality, and the Military Profession, ed. Malham W. Wakin, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 138.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Jean Piaget, The Moral Judgment of the Child, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960), 193.

[24]Ibid., 193-194.

[25]Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," in Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Lickona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), 32.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," 32.

[28]Ibid., 33.

[29]Ibid., 33-34.

[30]Ibid., 33.

[31]Ibid., 34-35.

[32]Ibid., 33.

[33]Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Implications of Moral Stages for Adult Education," Religious Education, 72 (1977), 191.

[34]Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," 35.

[35]Ibid., 48.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Justin Aronfreed, "Moral Development From the Standpoint of a General Psychological Theory," in Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Licona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), 56.

[38]James R. Bode and Roger A. Page, "The Ethical Reasoning Inventory," in Evaluating Moral Development and Programs With a Value Dimension, eds. M. L. Kuhnocker, M. Menthowski, and V. L. Erickson (Schenectady, New York: Character Research Press, 1980), 139-148. By permission of the authors (Appendix C).

[39]Roger A. Page and James R. Bode, "Inducing Changes in Moral Reasoning," The Journal of Psychology, 112 (1982): 114.

[40]Ibid., 115.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Roger Page and James Bode, "Comparison of Measures of Moral Reasoning and Development of a New Objective Measure," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40 (1979): 325.

[43]James Bode and Roger Page, "Further Validation of the Ethical Reasoning Inventory," Psychological Reports, 45 (1979): 986.

[44]Roger Page and James Bode, "Degree of Susceptibility to Faking of the Ethical Reasoning Inventory," The Journal of Educational Research, 72 (1979): 356.

[45]Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," 33.

[46]William Hudgins and Norman M. Prentice, "Moral Judgment in Delinquent and Nondelinquent Adolescents and Their Mothers," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 82 (1973): 150.

[47]Jack Arbuthnot, "Moral Reasoning Development Programmes in Prison: Cognitive-developmental and Critical Reasoning Approaches," Journal of Moral Education, 13 (1984), 112-113.

[48]Ibid., 113.

[49]Walter Mischel and Harriet N. Mischel, "A Cognitive Social-Learning Approach to Morality and Self-Regulation," in Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Lickona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), 101.

[50]Ibid., 101-102.

[51]Mirja Kalliopuska and Lisa Mustakallio, "Moral Judgment and Behavior at School," Psychological Reports, 59 (1986), 748.

[52]Ibid., 748.

[53]Ibid., 745.

[54]Ibid., 746.

[55]"In very general terms, individuals at the lower two stages of development base their attitudes on reasoning processes that are dominated by a concern with the positive or negative consequences of an action. Persons in the middle two stages base their attitudes largely on the dictates of social and/or legal prescriptions regarding right action, and persons in the highest two stages base their attitudes on self-chosen, general principles regarding human rights and responsibilities."

[56]William S. Rholes and Su Bailey, "The Effects of Level of Moral Reasoning on Consistency Between Moral Attitudes and Related Behaviors," Social Cognition, 2 (1983), 34.

[57]Ibid., 43.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid., 33.

[60]Roger V. Burton, "Honesty and Dishonesty," in Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Lickona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), 182.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Karen A. Maitland and Jacquelin R. Goldman, "Moral Judgment as a Function of Peer Group Interaction," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30 (1974), 699.

[64]Charles W. Hudlin, "Morality and the Military Profession: Problems and Solutions," in Military Ethics, National Defense University (Washington: National Defense University Press, 1987), 95.

[65]Ibid., 92.

[66]Kohlberg, "The Implications of Moral Stages for Adult Education," 199.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Terry F. Copeland and Thomas S. Parrish, "An Attempt to Enhance Moral Judgment of Offenders," Psychological Reports, 45 (1979), 831.

[69]Ibid., 833.

[70]Arbuthnot, 112.

[71]Ibid., 121.

[72]Kohlberg, "The Implications of Moral Stages for Adult Education," 197.

[73]Ibid.

[74]US Army Command and General Staff College, Center for Army Leadership, MQS I Training Support Package, Leadership (Ethics), No. MQS I S1-9001.00-0001 TSP-2 9004, (Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 15 April 1990), vi.

[75]Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," 34-35.

[76]Ibid., 48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arbuthnot, Jack. "Moral Reasoning Development Programmes in Prison: Cognitive-developmental and Critical Reasoning Approaches." Journal of Moral Education 13 (1984): 112-123.

Aronfreed, Justin. "Moral Development From the Standpoint of a General Psychological Theory." In Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Licona, 54-69. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Bode, James, and Roger Page. "Further Evaluation of the Ethical Reasoning Inventory." Psychological Reports 45 (1979): 985-986.

_____. "The Ethical Reasoning Inventory." In Evaluating Moral Development and Programs With a Value Dimension, eds. M. L. Kuhnocker, M. Menthowski, and V. L. Erikson, 139-148. Schenectady: Character Research Press, 1980.

Burton, Roger V. "Honesty and Dishonesty." In Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Licona, 173-197. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Copeland, Terry F. and Thomas S. Parrish. "An Attempt to Enhance Moral Judgment of Offenders." Psychological Reports 45 (1979): 831-834.

Gabriel, Richard A. To Serve With Honor: A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Hudgins, William and Norman M. Prentice. "Moral Judgment in Delinquent and Nondelinquent Adolescents and Their Mothers." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 82 (1973): 145-152.

Hudlin, Charles W. "Morality and the Military Profession: Problems and Solutions." In Military Ethics, National Defense University, 81-97. Washington: National Defense University Press, 1987.

Huntington, Samuel P. The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Kalliopuska, Mirja and Lisa Mustakallio. "Moral Judgment and Behavior at School." Psychological Reports 59 (1986): 743-750.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach." In Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Licona, 31-53. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

_____"The Implications of Moral Stages for Adult Education." Religious Education 72 (1977): 183-201.

Kurtines, W. and E. B. Greif. "The Development of Moral Thought: Review and Evaluation of Kohlberg's Approach." Psychological Bulletin 81 (1984): 453-470.

Lerner, Max. "The Shame of the Professions." In War, Morality, and the Military Profession, ed. Malham M. Wakin, 134-139. Boulder: Westview Press, 1986.

Maitland, Karen A. and Jacquelin R. Goldman. "Moral Judgment as a Function of Peer Group Interaction." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 30 (1974): 699-704.

Mischel, Walter and Harriet N. Mischel. "A Cognitive Social-Learning Approach to Morality and Self-Regulation." In Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues, ed. Thomas Licona, 84-107. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

National Defense University. Military Ethics. Washington: National Defense University Press, 1987.

Nelson, William N. Morality: What's In It For Me? Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.

Page, Roger and James Bode. "Comparison of Measures of Moral Reasoning and Development of a New Objective Measure." Educational and Psychological Measurement 40 (1980): 317-329.

_____. "Degree of Susceptibility to Faking of the Ethical Reasoning Inventory." The Journal of Educational Research 72 (1979): 355-356.

_____. "Inducing Changes in Moral Reasoning." The Journal of Psychology 112 (1982): 113-119.

Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgment of the Child. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Rholes, William S. and Su Bailey. "The Effects of Level of Moral Reasoning on Consistency Between Moral Attitudes and Related Behaviors." Social Cognition 2 (1983): 32-48.

Ryan, John D. "Integrity." In War, Morality, and the Military Profession, ed. Malham M. Wakin, 180. Boulder: Westview Press, 1986.

Saltzstein, Herbert D., Rhea M. Diamond and Mary Belenky. "Moral Judgment Level and Conformity Behavior." Developmental Psychology 7 (1972): 327-336.

U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Center for Army Leadership. MQS I Training Support Package, Leadership (Ethics),No. MQS I S1-9001.00-0001 TSP-2 9004. Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 15 April 1990.

U.S. Army Personnel Command. Officer Qualitative Management Program briefing presented at the Department of the Army Secretariat for Selection Boards, 19 November 1991.

U.S. Department of the Army. Military Leadership. Field Manual 22-100. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, July 1990.

_____. The Army. Field Manual 100-1. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, December 1991.

_____. Use of Volunteers as Subjects of Research. Army Regulation 70-25. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 25 January 1990.

U.S. Disciplinary Barracks. Research With Human Subjects. United States Disciplinary Barracks Regulation 70-25. Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, undated.

Wakin, Malham M. "The Ethics of Leadership I." In War, Morality, and the Military Profession, ed. Malham M. Wakin, 181-199.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, 1965 ed. S.v. "Ethic."

White, Charles B. "Age, Education, and Sex Effects on Adult Moral Reasoning." International Journal of Aging and Human Development 27 (1988): 271-281.

APPENDIX A[75]
The Six Moral Stages

Content of Stages			
Level and Stage	What is Right	Reasons for Doing Right	Social Perspective of Stage
LEVEL I - PRECONVENT-IONAL Stage 1 - Heteronomous Morality	To avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obed-ience for its own sake, and avoiding physical damage to persons or property.	Avoidance of punishment, and the superior power of authorities.	Egocentric point of view. Doesn't con-sider the interests of others or recognize that they differ from the actor's; doesn't relate two points of view. Actions are considered physically rather than in terms of psy-chological interests of others. Con-fusion of authority's perspective with one's own.
Stage 2 - Instrumental Purpose, and Exchange.	Following rules only when it is to someone's immediate interest; acting to meet one's own interests and needs and letting others do the same. Right is also what's fair, what's an equal exchange, a deal, an agreement.	To serve one's own needs or interests in a world where you have to recognize that other people have their interests, too.	Concrete individualistic perspective. Aware that everybody has his own interest to pursue and these conflict, so that right is relative (in the concrete individualistic sense).

Content of Stages			
Level and Stage	What is Right	Reasons for Doing Right	Social Perspective of Stage
LEVEL II - CONVENTIONAL Stage 3 - Mutual Interpersonal Expectations, Relationships, and Interpersonal Conformity	Living up to what is expected by people close to you or what people generally expect of people in your role as son, brother, friend, etc. "Being good" is important and and means having good motives, showing concern about others. It also means keeping mutual relationships, such as trust, loyalty, respect and gratitude.	The need to be a good person in your own eyes and those of others. Your caring for others. Belief in the Golden Rule. Desire to maintain rules and authority which support stereotypical good behavior.	Perspective of the individual in relationships with other individuals. Aware of shared feelings, agreements, and expectations which take primacy over individual interests. Relates points of view through the concrete Golden Rule, putting yourself in the other guy's shoes. Does not yet consider generalized system perspective.
Stage 4 - Social System and Conscience	Fulfilling the actual duties to to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases where they conflict with other fixed social duties. Right is also contributing to society, the group, or institution.	To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the breakdown in the system "if everyone did it," or the imperative of conscience to meet one's defined obligations (Easily confused with Stage 3 belief in rules and and authority)	Differentiates societal point from interpersonal agreement or motives. Takes the point of view of the system that defines roles and rules. Considers individual relations in terms of place in the system.

Content of Stages			
Level and Stage	What is Right	Reasons for Doing Right	Social Perspective of Stage
LEVEL III - POST CONVENTIONAL, or PRINCIPLED Stage 5 - Social Contract or Utility and Individual Rights	Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, that most values and rules are relative to your group. These relative rules should usually be upheld, however, in the interest of impartiality and because they are the social contract. Some non-relative values and rights like life and liberty, however, must be upheld in any society and regardless of majority opinion.	A sense of obligation to law because of one's social contract to make and abide by laws for the welfare of all and for the protection of all people's rights. A feeling of contractual commitment, freely entered upon, to family, friendship, trust, and work obligations. Concern that laws and duties be based on rational calculation of overall utility, "the greatest good for the greatest number."	Prior-to-society perspective. Perspective of a rational individual aware of values and rights prior to social attachments and contracts. Integrates perspectives by formal mechanisms of agreement, contract, objective impartiality, and due process. Considers moral and legal points of view; recognizes that they sometimes conflict and finds it difficult to integrate them.
Stage 6 - Universal Ethical Principles [Note: Not used in this study since it rarely occurs]	Following self-chosen ethical principles. Particular laws or social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles. When laws violate these principles, one acts in accordance with the principle. Principles are	The belief as a rational person in the validity of universal moral principles, and a sense of personal commitment to them.	Perspective of a moral point of view from which social arrangements derive. Perspective is that of any rational individual recognizing the nature of morality or the fact that persons are

Content of Stages			
Level and Stage	What is Right	Reasons for Doing Right	Social Perspective of Stage
	universal principles of justice: the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.		ends in themselves and must be treated as such.

APPENDIX B[76]

Assumptions of Cognitive-developmental and Social-learning Theories of Morality

Cognitive-developmental	Social-learning
1. Moral development has a basic cognitive-structural or moral judgmental component.	1. Moral development is growth of behavioral and affective conformity to moral rules rather than rather than cognitive-structural change.
2. The basic motivation for morality is a generalized motivation for acceptance, competence, self-esteem, or self-realization, rather than for meeting biological needs and reducing anxiety or fear.	2. The basic motivation for morality at every point of moral development is rooted in biological needs or the pursuit of social reward and avoidance of social punishment.
3. Major aspects of moral develment are culturally universal, because all cultures have common sources of social interaction, role taking, and social conflict, which require moral integration.	3. Moral development or morality is culturally relative.
4. Basic moral norms and principles are structures arising through experiences of social interaction, role taking, and social conflict, which require moral integration.	4. Basic moral norms are the internalization of external cultural rules.
5. Environmental influences in moral development are defined by the general quality and extent of cognitive and social stimulation throughout the child's development, rather than by specific experiences with parents or experiences or discipline, punishment, and reward.	5. Environmental influences on normal development are defined by quantitative variations in strength of reward, punishment, prohibitions and modeling of conforming behavior by parents and other socializing agents.

October 20, 1992

Mr. Roger Page
Ohio State University
4240 Campus Drive
Lima, Ohio 45804

Dear Mr. Page:

As discussed in our telephone conversation of October 20, 1992, I am requesting a copy of your Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI), with instructions for administering and scoring the instrument. I will use the ERI as a part of a student research project at the United States Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA.

In addition to the ERI, please provide written permission for its use in my project.

Thank you very much for allowing me to use the ERI and for providing a copy of the test materials. I will insure you are appropriately acknowledged in the project report. Thanks again!

Most sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Marvin L. Nickels
204 South West St
Carlisle, PA 17013

OSU Communication

Subject Permission to use ERI

Date 10/23/92

From R. Page and J. Bode

To Marion Nichols

You may use the Ethical Reasoning Inventory (enclosed) and may duplicate as many copies as you may need for your research.

Sincerely,

Roger A. Page

P.S. I've enclosed some relevant reprints.

See reverse side for addressing
The Ohio State University

Subject Number _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain information concerning your family, religious, educational and military background. The survey is part of a study on moral development and ethical decision-making being conducted as a student project at the United States Army War College. We would appreciate your assistance in answering the questions below. Please do not write your name on this form in order that the replies remain anonymous.

01. Years of commissioned federal military service _____.

02. Branch of service.

☐ Army ☐ Navy ☐ Marine Corps ☐ Air Force ☐ Coast Guard

03. If Army, list your branch (such as Infantry, Armor, Artillery).

_____.

04. Highest rank held _____.

05. What is your sex? ☐ Male ☐ Female

06. What is your age? _____.

07. From what state did you enter military service?_____.

08. Source of commission.

☐ Service academy ☐ OCS ☐ ROTC ☐ Direct

09. Civilian education (indicate highest level completed).

☐ High school graduate/GED ☐ Associate degree

☐ Bachelors degree ☐ Masters degree ☐ PhD

☐ Professional degree (such as MD, DO, JD)

10. Type of college or university attended.

☐ Service academy ☐ Private college/university

☐ State college/university ☐ Other _____

11. Military schooling (indicate highest level completed).

☐ Officer basic course ☐ Officer advanced course

☐ CAS³ ☐ CGSC (any service) ☐ Senior service college

12. Most recent duty position _____.

13. How would you characterize your regular participation in organized religious activities (church services, Sunday school, study/discussion programs, etc)?

☐ I did not regularly participate as a child and have not as an adult.

☐ I regularly participated as a child but have not as an adult.

☐ I have regularly particpated both as a child and as an adult.

☐ I did not regularly participate as a child but have as an adult.

14. Indicate your religious preference.

☐ Protestant ☐ Catholic ☐ Jewish
☐ Other _____ ☐ None

15. We sometimes face ethical dilemas - situations which requires us to chose whether to do the "right" thing. How much would you say your participation in religious activites, either as a child, an adult or both, has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilema?

Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Greatly	Very Greatly
1	2	3	4	5

16. How much would you say your family upbringing has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilema?

Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Greatly	Very Greatly
1	2	3	4	5

17. How much would you say your civilian education has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilema?

Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Greatly	Very Greatly
1	2	3	4	5

18. How many total hours of ethical education or training (such as identifying the right thing to do, why you should do the right thing, and how to handle ethical dilemas) would you say you received as a part of your military education and training at the precommissioning level (service academy, OCS, ROTC)?

None	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Over 40

19. How many total hours of ethical education or training have you received as a part of your military education and training in service schools since commissioning?

None 1-10 11-20 21-30 31-40 Over 40

20. How much would you say military education and training in schools before and since commissioning has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilema?

Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Greatly	Very Greatly
1	2	3	4	5

21. About how many hours of ethical education or training per year have you received while assigned in units?

None 1-10 11-20 21-30 31-40 Over 40

22. How much would you say unit ethical education or training has influenced you to do the right thing when faced with an ethical dilema?

Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Greatly	Very Greatly
1	2	3	4	5

23. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statement. In my current (or last unit if no longer in the service), most of my peers are honest and try to do the right thing.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

24. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statement. In my current unit (or last unit if no longer in the service), those who choose to do the right thing are generally rewarded and those who choose not to do the right thing are generally not rewarded.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

25. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statement. In my current unit (or last unit if no longer in the service), my immediate commander or officer supervisor is honest and tries to do the right thing.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

12 November 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR Commandant, United States Disciplinary Barracks,
ATTN: Clinical Investigations, Directorate of
Mental Health, Ft Leavenworth, KS 66027

SUBJECT: Application for Research Project Comparing Levels of Moral Reasoning of Officer Inmates and Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS^3) Student Officers, Change 1

1. Project title. Moral Reasoning: A Comparison of Officer Inmates and CAS^3 Student Officers.

2. Investigators.

a. Principal investigator. LTC Marvin L. Nickels, Military Police, Student, United States Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA.

b. Associate Investigators:

(1) Bruce A. Leeson, Ph.D., Directorate of Mental Health, United States Disciplinary Barracks.

(2) Directorate of Mental Health staff, United States Disciplinary Barracks.

3. Location of study. Assessment and interviewing rooms of the Directorate of Mental Health, USDB and applicable CAS^3 classrooms.

4. Time required to complete.

a. Expected start date: December 1992.

b. Expected completion date: April 1993.

5. Introduction.

a. Synopsis.

(1) Summary of proposed study. Studies of the ethical aspect of military leadership tend to focus only on successful leaders. However, there is also much to learn from those who have failed - those who have "derailed" ethically. This is especially significant since U.S. Army leadership training doctrine is based on the idea that ethics can be taught. Progressive and sequential instruction in ethical decision-making is a part of the core curricula at pre-commissioning (U.S. Military Academy, Officer Candidate Schools, Reserve Officer Training Corps), Officer Basic and Officer Advanced Course levels of the Army officer education system. Standardized lessons in ethical development are published

SUBJECT: Application for Research Project Comparing Levels of Moral Reasoning of Officer Inmates and Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS^3) Officers

by the Center for Army Leadership (CAL), United States Army Command and General Staff College (USACGSC), Ft Leavenworth, Kansas, as a part of the Military Qualification Standards (MQS) System.

Lawrence Kohlberg, Ph.D., theorized that individuals pass through six moral reasoning stages from the bottom, Stage 1, toward the top, Stage 6. According to Kohlberg's theory, individuals at Stage 1 do the right thing to avoid punishment while individuals at Stage 6 do the right thing because they have become committed to principles.

Research on moral development has long sought to define the relationship between moral reasoning and behavior. While some research has shown that individuals do not always act consistently with their moral understanding, most agree that moral reasoning has some effect on action.

At any given time, 30-50 military officers are confined at the USDB for serious violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). If there is a connection between Kohlberg's moral development stages and behavior, it should follow that moral reasoning levels attained by officer inmates would be lower than those of successful officers, a representative sample of which regularly pass through CAS^3. If so, there should be some discernible difference in family, social, educational and religious background and/or military ethical education.

To date, data on this question have not been gathered. Data collected from this study may have significant implications for military education and should be an important contribution to the body of knowledge which seeks to explain behavior in terms of moral reasoning.

(2) There are no major safety concerns for human subjects.

b. Military relevancy. This project should influence how the Army thinks of moral development of officers and officer candidates. It will tend to validate or refute the current notion that ethics can be taught to officers and candidates and that ethical education affects moral reasoning and ultimately, behavior.

c. Objectives. The objectives of this study are to determine whether the level of moral reasoning of officer inmates is below that of their successful counterparts and whether family, social and religious background and/or military ethical education affect progression through Kohlberg's moral reasoning stages. Additionally, it may help explain the effects of military ethical education on the development of moral reasoning.

SUBJECT: Application for Research Project Comparing Levels of Moral Reasoning of Officer Inmates and Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS^3) Student Officers

d. Status. While there have been a number of studies conducted to measure moral reasoning and to determine if moral reasoning affects behavior, apparently none have compared prison and nonprison populations and few studies have been conducted to assess the effects of moral education on moral reasoning. No previous studies have considered military subjects. The proposed study population is a unique one in that all individuals have presumably received training in ethics.

e. Bibliography.

(1) Burton, Roger V. (1976). Honesty and Dishonesty. In Thomas Licona, Editor, Moral Development and Behavior. (pp 173-197).

(2) Hill, Gloria and Swanson, H.Lee. (1985). Ethical Reasoning Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 45 (2), 285-292.

(3) Kohlberg, Lawrence (1981). Essays on Moral Development. Volume I: The Philosophy of Moral Development. New York: Harper and Row.

(4) Kohlberg, Lawrence (1976). Moral Stages and Moralization, The Cognitive-Development Approach. In Thomas Lickona, Editor, Moral Development and Behavior. (pp 31-54) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

(5) Page, Roger and Bode, James (1980). Comparison of Measures of moral Reasoning and Development of a New Objective Measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 317-329.

(6) Rest, James R. (1975). New Approaches in the Assessment of Moral Judgement. In Thomas Licona, Editor, Moral Development and Behavior. (pp 198-218).

6. Plan.

a. Number of subjects. Approximately 30 officer inmates and 30 CAS^3 officer students.

b. Age range. 22 years or older.

c. Sex. Male or female.

d. Inclusion criteria. Officer inmates confined to the USDB since January 1991. CAS^3 officer students as designated by the Director, CAS^3.

SUBJECT: Application for Research Project Comparing Levels of Moral Reasoning of Officer Inmates and Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS³) Officers

e. Diagnostic criteria for entry. None.

f. Evaluations before entry. None.

g. Exclusion criteria. None.

h. Source of subjects. See paragraph 6d.

i. Subject identification. Subjects will be identified by number in the database of the principal investigator. Inmate subjects may be identified by name and number in the files of the Directorate of Mental Health, USDB.

j. Analysis of risks and benefits to subjects; risks to those conducting the research. Inmate subjects may receive up to three days abatement, as determined by the Commandant, USDB, for participating in this project. There should be no risk to either the subjects or those conducting research.

k. Precautions to be taken to minimize or eliminate risks to subjects and those conducting the research. None (see paragraph 6j).

l. Corrective action necessary. None.

m. Special medical care or equipment needed for subjects admitted to the project. None.

7. Evaluations made during and following the project.

a. Data to be collected. All subjects will complete an Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI), an instrument developed by Page and Bode, which assesses the subject's level of moral development using Kohlberg's moral dilemas (Enclosure 1). In addition to completing the ERI, all subjects will complete a questionnaire designed to collect general background information, including: family, social and religious background; military education and training; assessment of unit climate of the subject's current or most recent military unit; and assessment of ethical education. A copy of the questionnaire is at Enclosure 2. Additionally, other elements of information such as offense, sentence length, and amount of sentence served may be collected for inmate subjects from records of trial, correctional treatment files and military records.

b. Disposition of data.

(1) The results of the study will be recorded as a military study project report as a part of the Military Studies Program

SUBJECT: Application for Research Project Comparing Levels of Moral Reasoning of Officer Inmates and Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS^3) Student Officers

(MSP), United States Army War College (USAWC). The MSP proposal and necessary travel has been approved by the USAWC. A copy of the approved MSP proposal is at Enclosure 3. The report may be further disseminated to appropriate DOD and Army agencies, as determined by the Commandant, USAWC or by official request to the USAWC. The results may also be disseminated through professional journals and conferences.

(2) The records collected will be provided to the Research Psychology Division, Directorate of Mental Health, USDB, for storage or destruction. A copy may be retained by the principal investigator.

(3) Subjects will be provided copies of their ERI scores on request. ERI scores for inmate subjects will be provided through the Directorate of Mental Health, USDB.

8. Funding requirements.

a. Personnel. None.

b. Equipment. None.

c. Consumable supplies. None other than office supplies.

d. Travel. Travel and per diem for the principal investigator will be paid by the USAWC.

e. Modification of facilities. None.

Marvin L Nickels

MARVIN L. NICKELS
LTC, MP
U.S. Army

3 Enclosures
as

CF:
Director, CAS^3 (encls wd)
Chaplain (COL) Norton, USAWC (encls wd)

APPENDIX F

I am LTC Nickels, a student at the United States Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA. As a part of my studies there, I'm conducting a study of social judgement of military officers and former officers.

You were selected to participate in the study because you are either officers or former officers and you volunteered to be a part of the project. I appreciate your participation and thank you for helping us with the research project.

I have given each of you several documents. I'll go over each of them and explain what you need to do with each.

- The first document is a request for abatement form. I have been told that the Commandant will grant abatement for participation in this study. You should complete this form if you want to request abatement. Do not put your subject number on this form.

- The next document is a three page questionnaire. This form is designed to collect several items of information about you and about your family, religious, educational and military background. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Notice the subject number in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaire. The numbers were assigned to you randomly as you entered the room. DO NOT put your name on this questionnaire so that you may remain anonymous.

- The next item is the Ethical Reasoning Inventory or ERI booklet. The ERI was developed by Page and Bode based on the theories of Lawrence Kohlberg. There is an answer sheet in the booklet. The subject number on the answer sheet should match the number on the questionnaire. Again, DO NOT put your name on the booklet or the answer sheet. The authors of the ERI do have a place for name on the booklet. DO NOT complete it. Please open your booklets to the first page of text and let's go over the instructions. Please mark your answers on the answer sheet - not in the book.

- The next document you should have in front of you is a form for you to request the results of the ERI. It is entirely up to you whether or not you want to request the results. However, if you want your ERI score with information on how to interpret it, you must fill out this form and turn it in to me before you leave. So that I know who to send the score to, you must agree to put both your name and subject number on the form. You will still remain anonymous in the data base. I will use your form only to know who to send the score to. I am not interested in your names for the research and will return your request with the results. (You will receive your results through your DMH case worker). If you want the results, please fill out the form.

- Lastly, you have a volunteer form. By completing this form you confirm that you volunteered for the project. Let's go

over the form together. If you still want to volunteer, please complete this form at this time and I'll collect them from you before we proceed. I will answer questions about the study at this time.

When you are finished, please leave all the papers, whether you chose to complete all of them or not, on your desk. I'll collect them after you leave. Again, I truly appreciate your help in completing this project. Thank you very much.

VOLUNTEER AGREEMENT AFFIDAVIT

For use of this form, see AR 70-25 or AR 40-38; the proponent agency is OTSG

PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

Authority: 10 USC 3013, 44 USC 3101, and 10 USC 1071-1087

Principle Purpose: To document voluntary participation in the Clinical Investigation and Research Program. SSN and home address will be used for identification and locating purposes.

Routine Uses: The SSN and home address will be used for identification and locating purposes. Information derived from the study will be used to document the study, implementation of medical programs, adjudication of claims, and for the mandatory reporting of medical conditions as required by law. Information may be furnished to Federal, State and local agencies.

Disclosure: The furnishing of your SSN and home address is mandatory and necessary to provide identification and to contact you in future circumstances indicates that your health may be adversely affected. Failure to provide the information may preclude your voluntary participation in this investigational study.

PART A(1) - VOLUNTEER AFFIDAVIT

Volunteer Subjects in Approved Department of the Army Research Studies

Volunteers under the provisions of AR 40-38 and AR 70-25 are authorized all necessary medical care for injury or disease which is the proximate result of their participation in such studies.

I, _____, SSN _____

having full capacity to consent and having attained my 18th birthday, do hereby voluntarily consent as legal representative for myself to participate in _____

Type Protocol: Officer Ethics

(Research study)

under the direction of LTC Marvin Nickels & Bruce A Leeson, Ph.D.

conducted at Directorate of Mental Health, USDB, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-7100

(Name of Institution)

The implications of my voluntary participation/consent as legal representative; duration and purpose of the research study; the methods and means by which it is to be conducted; and the inconveniences and hazards that may reasonably be expected have been explained to me by

I have been given an opportunity to ask questions concerning this investigational study. Any such questions were answered to my full and complete satisfaction. Should any further questions arise concerning my rights/the rights of the person I represent on study related injury, I may contact

The Office of the Command Judge Advocate, Telephone # (913)684-3348

USDB, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-7100

at _____

(Name, Address and Phone Number of Hospital (Include Area Code))

I understand that I may at any time during the course of this study revoke my consent and withdraw/have the person I represent withdrawn from the study without further penalty or loss of benefits; however, if/the person I represent may be *required (military volunteer) or requested (civilian volunteer)* to undergo certain examination if, in the opinion of the attending physician, such examinations are necessary for my/the person I represent's health and well-being. My/the person I represent's refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am/the person I represent is otherwise entitled.

PART A (2) - ASSENT VOLUNTEER AFFIDAVIT *(MINOR CHILD)*

I, _____, SSN _____ having full capacity to assent and having attained my _____ birthday, do hereby volunteer for _____ to participate in _____

(Research Study)

under the direction of _____

conducted at _____

(Name of Institution)

(Continue on Reverse)

PART A(2) - ASSENT VOLUNTEER AFFIDAVIT (MINOR CHILD) (Cont'd.)

The implications of my voluntary participation; the nature, duration and purpose of the research study; the methods and means by which it is to be conducted; and the inconveniences and hazards that may reasonably be expected have been explained to me by

_____

I have been given an opportunity to ask questions concerning this investigational study. Any such questions were answered to my full and complete satisfaction. Should any further questions arise concerning my rights I may contact

_____

at _____

(Name, Address, and Phone Number of Hospital (Include Area Code))

I understand that I may at any time during the course of this study revoke my assent and withdraw from the study without further penalty or loss of benefits; however, I may be requested to undergo certain examination if, in the opinion of the attending physician, such examinations are necessary for my health and well-being. My refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

_____

PART B - TO BE COMPLETED BY INVESTIGATOR

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ELEMENTS OF INFORMED CONSENT: *(Provide a detailed explanation in accordance with Appendix C, AR 40-38 or AR 70-25.)*

1. Purpose. The purpose of this study is to quantify the social judgement of officers in the U.S. military.

2. Participation of Subjects. Participants will be volunteers from among the officer inmates of the U.S.D.B. and from the Combined Arms & Services Staff School (CAS3), Ft Leavenworth, Kansas.

a. Filling out questionnaires regarding social judgement.
b. Granting permission to release psychological test scores from your official records to the Research Branch, Directorate of Mental Health, USDB.
c. A possible individual interview.

3. Possible Benefits to Subject. Inmate subject satisfactorily completing the objective assessment and interview will receive three (3) days abatement. Active duty officers will receive no direct benefit. The results of this study may be of benefit to the U.S. Army and society as a whole.

4. Assurance of Confidentiality. We will not individually identify you in what we publish. Your identity will remain anonymous to the general public. This includes any information that could be used to specifically identify you, such as your name, home address, place of growing up, branch, or details of confining offense. If the study results are published, information will only be reported in grouped form, such as averages. For example, instead of stating who was depressed, we would state the percent of the subjects who were depressed. As a further safeguard, only two people have access to research information.

5. Voluntary Participation. Your participation in this project is voluntary. If you are an inmate, your decision to participate or not will have no effect favorable or unfavorable on restoration, parole, clemency, or early release. Further, participation will not adversely effect any consideration for parole or clemency. If you are an active duty officer your decision will have no effect, favorable or unfavorable on assessment, promotion or retention. With the exception of the abatement stipulated in paragraph three, you will not receive monetary or any other compensation for your participation in this study. You may revoke your consent and withdraw at any time during the course of the study without prejudice.

6. Participation in this psychosocial research project involves minimal physical or medical risks or hazards. Furthermore, every effort will be made to keep your inconvenience to a minimum.

I do ☐ do not ☐ *(check one & initial)* consent to the inclusion of this form in my outpatient medical treatment record.

SIGNATURE OF VOLUNTEER	DATE	SIGNATURE OF LEGAL GUARDIAN *(If volunteer is a minor)*
PERMANENT ADDRESS OF VOLUNTEER	TYPED NAME OF WITNESS	
	SIGNATURE OF WITNESS	DATE

REVERSE OF DA FORM 5383-R, MAY 89

REQUEST FOR SURVEY RESULTS

_____ _____

(name) (subject number)

_____

(street number)

_____

(city, state, zip code)

1. I recently voluntarily participated in a study of social judgement.

2. Request my Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI) score be provided to me at the above address.

3. I understand that while study subjects will remain anonymous in the data base created for the study, my name and subject number must be cross-referenced in order for me to receive ERI results.

_____

(signature)

_____

(printed name)

_____

(date)

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

AUTHORITY: AR 70-25

PRINCIPAL USES: To request results of Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI)

ROUTINE USES: To identify individuals who desire results of the ERI administered during a research project. Identification is both by name and study subject number.

MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION. Disclosure is voluntary, but necessary to obtain ERI results. Individuals who do not provide information will not receive ERI results.

REQUEST FOR SURVEY RESULTS

_____ _____

(name) (subject number)

_____

(reg number)

1. I recently voluntarily participated in a study of social judgement.

2. Request my Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI) score be provided to me.

3. I understand that while study subjects will remain anonymous in the data base created for the study, my name and subject number must be cross-referenced in order for me to receive ERI results.

4. I understand my results will be provided to me through my Directorate of Mental Health case worker.

_____

(signature)

_____

(printed name)

_____

(date)

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

AUTHORITY: AR 70-25

PRINCIPAL USES: To request results of Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI)

ROUTINE USES: To identify individuals who desire results of the ERI administered during a research project. Identification is both by name and study subject number.

MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION. Disclosure is voluntary, but necessary to obtain ERI results. Individuals who do not provide information will not receive ERI results.

ETHICAL REASONING INVENTORY (ERI) RESULTS

_____
_____
_____

1. Your ERI score with explanation is provided per your request. Your ERI score is _____.

2. The following table of information is provided to assist you in interpreting your score. It was adapted from Table 2.1, The Six Moral Stages, Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization, The Cognitive-Development Approach," in Moral Development and Behavior, ed. Thomas Licona, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), 34-35.

3. Additional information on moral stages as described by Lawrence Kohlberg may be found in:

a. Kohlberg, Lawrence (1976). Moral Stages and Moralization, The Cognitive-Development Approach. In Thomas Licona, Editor, Moral Development and Behavior. (pp 31-54) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

b. Page, Roger and Bode[illegible]s (1980). Comparison of Measures of Moral Reasoning and Development of a New Objective Measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 317-329.

THE SIX MORAL STAGES

Content of Stage

Stage	What is Right	Reasons for Doing Right
Stage 1 Heteronomous Morality	To avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obedience for its own sake, and avoiding physical damage to persons and property.	Avoidance of punishment, and the superior power of authorities.
Stage 2 - Individualism, Instrumental Purpose, and Exchange	Following rules only when it is to someone's immediate interest; acting to meet one's own interests and needs and letting others do the same. Right is also what's fair, what's an equal exchange, a deal, an agreement.	To serve one's own needs or interests in a world where you have to recognize that other people have their interests, too.

Stage	What is Right	Reasons for Doing Right
Stage 3 - Mutual Interpersonal Expectations, Relationships, and Interpersonal Conformity	Living up to what is expected by people close to you or what people generally expect of people in your role as son, brother, friend, etc. "Being good" is important and means having good motives, showing concern about others. It also means keeping mutual relationships, such as trust, loyalty, respect and gratitude.	The need to be a good person in your own eyes and those of others. Your caring for others. Belief in the Golden Rule. Desire to maintain rules and authority which support stereotypical good behavior.
Stage 4 - Social System and Conscience	Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases where they conflict with other fixed social duties. Right is also contributing to society, the group, or institution.	To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the breakdown in the system "if everyone did it," or the imperative of conscience to meet one's defined obligations.
Stage 5 - Social Contract or Utility and Individual Rights	Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, that most values and rules are relative to your group. These relative rules should usually be upheld, however, in the interest of impartiality and because they are the social contract. Some nonrelative values and rights like life and liberty, however, must be upheld in any society and regardless of majority opinion.	A sense of obligation to law because of one's social contract to make and abide by laws for the welfare of all and for the protection of all people's rights. A feeling of contractual commitment, freely entered upon, to family, friendship, trust, and work obligations. Concern that laws and duties be based on rational calculation of overall utility, "the greatest good for the greatest number."
Stage 6	Not used in this study since it rarely occurs.	

_____
(date)

SUBJECT: Request for Abatement

Commandant
United States Disciplinary Barracks
ATTN: Directorate of Inmate Administration
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

1. I recently voluntarily participated in a study of social judgement.

2. Request three (3) days abatement be granted for my participation in the research project.

_____
(signature)

_____
(printed name)

_____
(reg number)

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

AUTHORITY: AR 70-25

PRINCIPAL PURPOSES: To request special abatement for participating in a research project.

ROUTINE USES: To verify voluntary participation in the research project and to award special abatement.

MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION. Disclosure is voluntary, but necessary to the award of special abatement. Individuals who do not provide the information will not receive abatement.