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Abstract

Ethics education cannot guarantee the eradication of all unethical conduct. Nevertheless, the Department of Defense requires professional military education (PME) institutions to teach ethics, in part, to improve officers’ ability to “make ethical decisions based on the shared values of the Profession of Arms.” To this end, the true utility of ethics education lies in its ability to help students develop the requisite skills for ethical reasoning, which in turn offers reasonable hope for curbing misconduct. To determine the efficacy of Air Force efforts to teach ethics in officer PME, the author gleaned five components of effective ethics programs from published studies and then analyzed the curricula of seven Air Force Officer PME programs to determine the degree to which these components were present. Overall, Air Force Officer PME contains each component in varying degrees, but lacks efficacy in (a) convincing students of their risk for unethical behavior and (b) achieving unity of effort in ethics education throughout the PME continuum. The paper concludes with specific improvement recommendations.
Introduction

The Air Force has a problem with ethics, or so the headlines imply. Consider a 2014 USA Today article in which the Air Force Chief of Staff, General Mark Welsh, declared he was “very happy with the ethical fabric of the United States Air Force” despite a cheating scandal involving dozens of Air Force nuclear missile launch officers and a drunken binge by an Air Force 2-star general during an arms control mission.1 In pointing out that any organization as large as the Air Force is going to have incidents, General Welsh noted the Air Force does not have an “epidemic of bad ethical behavior…if you look at the numbers, that's simply not the case.”2 In response, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Personnel, found it "deeply troubling that he's 'very happy' with the ethical conduct of his force" given the Air Force's sexual assault incidents.3 "You have to wonder when he will finally get it," she said. "I hope his cavalier attitude to this crisis is not reflective of his superiors' position."4

In reality, neither General Welsh nor his superiors are being “cavalier” in their efforts to curb misconduct. The real question is whether their actions will prove effective. The Secretary of the Air Force, for example, has pledged to “go beyond immediate remedies” to reestablish an ethical climate in the nuclear corps while General Welsh challenged Air Force leaders “to be honest with ourselves about what causes these [integrity] issues and then change as an institution to keep it from happening again.”5 In 2013, the Secretary of Defense directed the creation of “appropriate character development programs throughout the professional military education [PME] continuum” as one of several initiatives affirming his department’s commitment to “values-based ethical conduct.”6 The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) later published six desired leader attributes to guide officer development across the services, to
include enhancing officers’ ability to “make ethical decisions based on the shared values of the Profession of Arms.”

While these are laudable endeavors, Senator Gillibrand’s comments nonetheless reflect a perception that the Department of Defense is not doing enough to break the bad trend of misconduct within its ranks. Defending organizational ethics based on an acceptable level of misconduct is obviously a tough sell. (Exactly how many “bad apples” are allowed?) On the other hand, ethics education does not guarantee eradication of misconduct, even when incorporated into PME. In fact, psychologists argue that efforts to instill values of how we should behave fail because they do not address the reasons why people actually behave.8

This research paper addresses a fundamental concern: what is the best way to teach ethics and is the Air Force doing it that way in officer PME? It begins by examining what it means to be “ethical” in light of philosophies that provide different perspectives on right versus wrong. It then presents several challenges to ethical reasoning as viewed through the lens of social science. Next, it addresses the debate on whether ethics can be taught and how best to do so. Finally, it assesses the ethics curricula employed in Air Force Officer PME using five components of effective ethics programs and concludes with ten improvement recommendations.

**Thesis**

Air Force Officer PME lacks efficacy by insufficiently emphasizing the situational and cognitive factors that influence ethical reasoning, and therefore fails to adequately convince students of their susceptibility to making wrong choices during moral temptations and ethical dilemmas.9 Air University (AU) exacerbates this condition by fostering seven separate ethics education programs which operate independently rather than comprehensively throughout the Officer PME continuum.
The Nature of Ethics

As an organized discipline, ethics involves finding the best reasons for making particular choices and is underpinned by the notion that some choices are better than others.10 From this perspective, few would disagree that an Air Force 2-star general who becomes publicly intoxicated and insults host nation dignitaries during an official trip to Russia made a poor ethical choice. The same could be said of anyone who cheats on a test. But what about the person who walks on the grass because it is faster than using the sidewalk (and no sign expressly prohibits it), or the person who performs a “rolling stop” at an intersection when the police are not present? Clearly, the spectrum of ethical behavior is wide and what constitutes an ethical action often depends on the philosophical approach used to frame the situation. In this regard, three philosophies are commonly used.

The first philosophy applies virtue theory, which commits to a universal standard of good and evil and a belief that “the life most worth living is the life of virtue.”11 It is concerned with who a person ought to be rather than what a person ought to do.12 The second philosophy is concerned not so much with what type of person one should be as to how that person should act. Thus, the value of any act is based on the consequences it will bring. Known as utilitarianism or consequentialism, it emphasizes that “a good act is good because it helps to advance happiness and an evil act is evil because it causes unhappiness.”13 It also underscores the belief that the subordination of individual interests for the greater good of many is an ethical act.14 The third philosophy is based on deontology, which focuses on how people ought to be treated. It differs from utilitarianism in its emphasis on individual actions rather the whole. To this end, right or wrong is based on adherence to rules or responsibilities (duties) rather than potential outcomes.
U.S. service members are subjected to behavioral expectations rooted in each of these philosophies. For example, a rules-based (deontological) approach to ethics is established for employees of the executive branch of the federal government by the Standards of Ethical Conduct, an 81-page document of rules to be adhered to so that “every citizen can have complete confidence in the integrity of the Federal Government.” On the other hand, service members are encouraged to apply consequentialist decision calculus in matters where competing ends are at stake. Hence, tactics, techniques, and procedures are lauded when they result in victory, as is sacrificing your life to save a fellow soldier in battle.

Virtues-based ethics for officers are found in the Constitution, oath of office, commissioning oath, and exemplary conduct requirement of Title 10, United States Code. These virtues include subordination, respect for the rights of others, obedience to rule of law and treaty, patriotism, valor, fidelity, competence, diligence and vigilance, virtue, and honor. Some even argue that a virtuous approach is the best way to ensure service members abide by the deontological constraints imposed by the laws of war. It should then be no surprise to hear the CJCS mix duty and virtue in saying that service members have a responsibility to “uphold the values that underpin our profession to maintain and enhance the trust of those we serve, our civilian leaders in government, and the American people.”

Again, the key point is that U.S. service members are subject to expectations stemming from several moral philosophies. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that their understanding of those philosophies influences their behavior and that they could “cherry-pick” those philosophies to explain or rationalize behavior. For example, some believe that all unethical behavior is the product of character failures (the “bad apple” theory) when in reality other causes can be found, such as deficiencies in institutions or practices. Others observe that rules-based
approaches to character education do not diminish unethical behavior because people tend to act based not on what is right but on what they can get away with. This is not to say that philosophical pluralism is wrong since multiple perspectives can actually help resolve ethical issues. Rather, the point is that philosophical insight alone does not guarantee moral action but should instead be coupled with “a keen awareness of the psychological dynamics illustrated by empirical research” to achieve better effect.

The Psychology of Ethics

Lawrence Kohlberg observed significant differences in the reasons people give regarding moral judgments or actions. “Whereas one person might indicate that cheating is wrong because one can get caught doing it, another person might indicate that cheating undermines the trust to preserve society.” He described six developmental stages for moral reasoning grouped into three levels, each more suitable for interpreting moral dilemmas than its predecessor: pre-conventional—based on self-interest such as avoiding punishment; conventional—motivated by peer pressure and gaining others’ approval, and post-conventional—driven by the desire to adhere to universal, abstract principles. Individuals move from one stage to the next because the later stage is “morally better” than the earlier stage and people prefer the highest stage of reasoning they can comprehend.

Critics of Kohlberg’s model note that research has found only a moderate relationship between moral reasoning and moral behavior. Although cognitive moral development may influence ethical decision making, “cognitions of right and wrong are not enough to explain or predict ethical decision-making behavior.” Rather, moral judgments are acted on by individual and situational factors that collectively determine an individual’s response to an ethical dilemma. James Rest further explained ethical decision making as a four-stage sequence
involving moral awareness, moral judgment, moral intent (to place moral concerns before other concerns), and moral action. Success in one stage does not imply success in any other, thus deficiencies in any component can lead to moral failure. However, critics debate Rest’s three assumptions that moral awareness is required for a decision to have moral implications, moral reasoning determines judgment, and moral intention is needed for moral action.

Others have investigated the moral issue itself as an independent or moderating variable of ethical decision making. Thomas Jones used the term *moral intensity* in arguing that ethical decision making is “issue contingent” and that people behave better when the moral issue is deemed important than when it is unimportant. He also studied the impact of *moral approbation* (the extent to which one seeks moral approval from self or others) and postulated four factors influencing our moral responsibility to act: severity of the act's consequences, certainty the act is moral or immoral, the actor's degree of complicity in the act, and the extent of pressure the actor feels to behave unethically. Jones concluded that the level of moral responsibility ultimately informs both a course of action and an estimate of moral approbation.

The degree to which our minds filter information during ethical reasoning is another area of research. *Ethical blindness* occurs when people are so unaware of the ethical dimensions of a decision that they temporarily deviate from their values. A corollary view holds that people selectively activate or disengage self-sanctions by rationalizing the acceptability of their behavior. Thus, “rationalizations facilitate moral disengagement by articulating reasons why the specific unethical acts are justifiable or excusable exceptions to the general normative rules.” In this context, moral justification and displacement of responsibility (“everyone else is doing it”) interfere with ethical reasoning. Hence, people who work in environments where cheating is tacitly permitted reduce the degree to which they view cheating as a problem.
All things considered, research strongly supports the notion that most people strive to behave ethically. Experts disagree, however, as to which theories adequately explain the disparity between what we decide is right to do and how we actually behave. This paper advocates no specific theory in this regard but presents several to show the pervasive impact of cognitive processes on ethical behavior and that it is possible to maintain a moral belief while acting contrary to it. In other words, Airmen may subscribe to the Air Force Core Values yet fail to act accordingly. Consideration is thus warranted as to how ethics education contributes to ethical behavior.

**The Efficacy of Ethics Education**

Many believe that ethics are “caught not taught” in that they are acquired through observation and imitation. Plato, for example, observed that virtue is “knowledge of the good” and can be taught *only because we already know it* and, therefore, teaching is more of a “calling out” than instruction. Aristotle distinguished between intellectual and moral virtues, believing that the former comes by teaching and the latter by habit. In that habits are acquired, we are not born virtuous but can become so by habits of choice formed by acts of choice. We learn virtue by choosing to follow rules of good behavior and imitating virtuous models. Thus, good character comes from living in communities and (by implication) working in organizations where virtue is encouraged and rewarded.

Proponents of ethics education cite its utility in developing the skills required for ethical behavior. For example, undergraduate and graduate students can be taught critical thinking skills that help them reason and formulate moral arguments and judgments. Studies show that individuals who reflect on decisions and choices often change their minds about how they should conduct their personal and professional lives. Studies also show that employees who complete
corporate ethics programs demonstrate heightened awareness of ethical issues and the
perspectives of others, as well as increased mindfulness of their own behaviors.\textsuperscript{51} In essence,
ethics education may not change values and opinions, but it does increase one’s appreciation for
opposing views.\textsuperscript{52}

As noted earlier, some psychologists believe that efforts to instill values of how we
\textit{should} behave fail because they do not address the reasons why people \textit{actually} behave.\textsuperscript{53} In this
regard, traditional approaches to ethics education are limited by the notion that merely
identifying the moral components of decisions is enough to inspire individuals to act morally.\textsuperscript{54}
Assuming that individuals can recognize an ethical issue when presented, it is still possible to
hold a moral belief while acting contrary to it.\textsuperscript{55} From a psychological perspective, simply
realizing the right thing to do will not always produce ethical behavior because a cognitive “gap”
exists between what we believe we should do and what we actually do.\textsuperscript{56} Bridging this gap
requires awareness of the cognitive biases that hinder ethical reasoning.\textsuperscript{57} Awareness is useless,
though, if individuals also underestimate how much their ethical reasoning is affected by
situational factors (e.g. financial incentives, peer pressure, etc.), and overestimate their ability to
resist moral temptations.\textsuperscript{58} Accordingly, ethics education is more effective if it explains the
situational and cognitive factors that influence ethical reasoning.\textsuperscript{59}

Course format is also important. A study of three separate approaches to ethics education
in an undergraduate nursing program found the approach which stimulated the highest level of
development in students’ moral judgment was a 14-week ethics class taught by an ethicist using
a format comprised of reading assignments, case studies, and class participation.\textsuperscript{60} The class
required each student to take a stance on an ethical issue and defend it orally and in writing; the
other approaches utilized a lecture format and required neither class participation nor an ethical
defense project. The researcher observed that lectures are satisfactory for teaching “scientific facts and procedures” but have not been shown to stimulate the development of moral judgment.61 Rather, moral judgment is enhanced when individuals participate in discussions and assume responsibility for the consequences of their actions.62 Ethical dilemma discussions, in particular, provide opportunities to practice moral problem solving and to “discover, understand, and appreciate higher level moral arguments,” which helps facilitate growth in moral judgment.63

Studies also show that recognizing and dealing with ethical challenges requires significant personal awareness as enabled through the practice of ethical self-reflection and dialogue.64 Ethicist James Toner argues that ethics education is essentially an exercise in “consciousness-raising” to help students “think through their ethical codes and standards, and understand what matters.”65 Daniel Nyberg further notes that “learning does not necessarily take place through increased analytical interpretation of others’ behavior,” but purposeful reflection increases our understanding of human behavior just as questioning the “right” way of doing things encourages moral activities and practices.66 To this end, ethicist Marvin Brown describes ethical reflection as “thinking about our moral responses to situations” and advocates its use for raising awareness of the value judgments and assumptions which are intertwined with decision making.67 Unfortunately, self-reflection is “notoriously difficult to promote” because it is time-consuming and some are more comfortable with internal than written reflection.68 Nevertheless, documented reflection better helps us catalog and think deeply about our experiences.69

Thus, research shows that ethical reasoning skills can be taught and that effective ethics education programs do the following:

• Teach critical thinking skills.

• Expose students to other perspectives.
• Explain the situational and cognitive factors that influence ethical reasoning.
• Require student participation in ethical dilemma discussions.
• Provide opportunities to document ethical self-reflection.

This is not to say these are the only indicators of efficacy, but rather these components have utility in predicting the likelihood of success in developing skills needed for ethical reasoning. The next section will, therefore, assess Air Force Officer PME based on the degree to which these components are present.

Analysis

The Air Force offers three levels of officer PME. The first is Squadron Officer School (SOS), a 5-week course for Air Force captains, select federal service civilians, and a limited number of international officers. The resident curriculum dedicates six lessons to ethics, critical thinking, and reflection (Appendix A). Each lesson consists of small group discussions pertaining to assigned readings and case studies. The Distance Learning (DL) version is self-paced and offers nine lessons on ethics, critical thinking, and self-reflection which differ slightly in theme and content from resident program equivalents (Appendix B).

Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) is the intermediate level of officer PME. The 10-month resident program instructs Air Force majors/major-selects along with a select group of sister-service majors/major-selects (or equivalent), federal service civilians, and international officers. The resident program devotes 12 lessons to the topic of ethics: three are seminar-based, the rest are class lectures from senior leaders and experts in the field of ethics (Appendix C). Seminar instruction involves discussion of assigned readings and case studies, and requires reflective journaling on ethical topics. ACSC offers two different DL tracks: one leads to a master’s degree in Military Operational Art and Science and the other does not. The online
master’s degree program (OLMP) provides two lessons on ethics, two on critical thinking, and one on self-reflection; the non-degree track provides one lesson on ethics and two on critical thinking (Appendix D).

Air War College (AWC) provides the Air Force’s senior level of PME. The resident program lasts 10 months and instructs Air Force lieutenant colonels, colonels, sister-service equivalents, federal service civilian personnel, and international officers. The Joint Strategic Leadership (JSL) course is the primary vehicle for ethics instruction with seven lessons devoted to critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and self-reflection (Appendix E). Each lesson utilizes student discussion of assigned readings and case studies in seminar classrooms coupled with mass lectures to the entire class. Particularly relevant to the JSL course is the Right to Lead Assessment Model (RLAM), an organized method of self-reflection based on factors that enable trust, commitment, confidence, and respect. The course requires students to submit a paper using the RLAM to guide self-reflection on personal strengths and weaknesses. The JSL DL course is similar to the resident version but offers six lessons pertaining to ethics-related subjects (Appendix F). The key course deliverable is a written Personal Develop Plan that includes a self-assessment of leadership philosophy and personal strengths and weaknesses.

All programs place heavy emphasis on the development of critical thinking, not just through courses of instruction but also through oral and written assignments that help students practice higher-order thinking and prudent analytical skills. The format of resident officer PME, in particular, promotes critical thinking due largely to small group discussions in seminars and flights. Educational efficacy can thus be expected to the extent that each student actually participates in these discussions and instructors facilitate meaningful discussions. Officer PME, in general, also utilizes a wide variety of topical readings, case studies, and guest lectures to
provide a diversity of opinions on ethics-related issues. Nevertheless, lectures alone have not been shown to stimulate the development of moral judgment so one cannot assume that a program with a high number of guest lectures is necessarily an effective one.

The SOS and ACSC DL programs compensate for lack of face-to-face interaction by requiring students to contribute thoughts and opinions to instructor-facilitated discussions using online forums accessible by DL students and instructors. This has a distinct advantage over traditional classroom-based instruction in that no student has the option to remain silent. After an instructor posts a discussion topic, all students must provide their opinions. These online conversations sometimes promote dialogue on matters not shared in person. Unfortunately, the AWC DL department lacks the instructor manpower to allow utilization of this technology.

Each school provides an excellent variety of case studies on leaders who have “derailed.” As mentioned previously, however, efforts to instill values of how we should behave lack efficacy if they do not address the reasons why people actually behave. Appendix G identifies the specific lessons pertaining to the situational and/or cognitive influences on ethical reasoning compared to the total number of ethics-related lessons in each officer PME program. From this, it is clear that relatively few lessons or assigned readings cover this subject. Moreover, most materials that address the subject do so in the context of decision making in general, not ethical reasoning per se. This does not mean more readings should be added, but that their impact is softened when they are subordinate to topics other than ethical reasoning. Without an appreciation for just how much situational and cognitive factors influence ethical reasoning, students may simply shake their heads at case studies of derailed leaders and dismiss their own susceptibility to similar temptations.
Furthermore, course format lacks in two aspects. First, there are minimal opportunities for students to actively engage in robust ethical dilemma exercises, especially at the more senior PME levels. This is important in light of Kohlberg’s observation that engagement in “challenging moral decision making” facilitates advancement to higher levels of moral judgment.\textsuperscript{83} When ethical dilemmas are used, they are usually in the form of case studies requiring students to comprehend decisions already made or scenarios to be role-played. Few exercises require students to discuss what they would do in the same situations. Second, self-reflection opportunities abound but the requirement to document it varies among the programs.\textsuperscript{84} The SOS resident program, for example, requires two journal entries weekly while the ACSC resident program requires six over the course of ten months. SOS DL requires a Personal Leadership Plan, AWC a Personal Development Plan, and AWC residence program a Personal Assessment Paper. ACSC DL mandates no form of documented self-reflection on ethics. Of these, only ACSC resident journals require documented self-reflection on personal ethics.

Another area for improvement pertains to idea integration.\textsuperscript{85} Although informal discussions on ethics curricula occasionally occur between SOS, ACSC, and AWC faculties, there is no institutional mandate driving it. Lacking any oversight, seven separate yet similar ethics programs operate independently at AU with no impetus for a comprehensive approach to enhancing ethical reasoning at each level of Officer PME.\textsuperscript{86} This is not to say that schools should lose their abilities to plan and execute their own ethics courses. Rather, AU must promote unity of effort to ensure that each school’s curriculum builds on the ethics education received at prior levels of PME (or accession training), and that lessons are commensurate with students’ grade, experience, and cognitive moral development.\textsuperscript{87}
Moreover, each school administers student surveys as one method of determining whether desired learning outcomes were achieved (Appendix H), but student opinion alone is not a true indicator of course effectiveness. Just as wise doctors do not simply accept their patients’ opinions that they are healed but order additional tests for confirmation, AU could assess changes in students’ moral reasoning abilities via the Dynamic Issues Test (DIT) as an additional measure of effectiveness. Extensive studies indicate that moral reasoning is measurable and that the DIT is a viable way to do so.

Finally, the lack of a faculty ethicist at SOS, ACSC, and AWC distinguishes them from several other PME institutions. The Naval War College (NWC), Marine Corps University (MCU), and National Defense University (NDU) each employ an ethicist while the Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy has two professors on faculty to teach ethics. Fully-endowed Ethics Chairs also exist at NDU (Colin Powell Chair for National Security Leadership, Character and Ethics) and MCU (Donald Bren Chair of Ethics and Leadership). This is not an indictment of the abilities of those who currently administer ethics education at AU, nor is it an argument to employ ethicists just because others do so. Rather, ethicists bring legitimacy to ethics education, provide subject matter expertise, and are valuable in developing curriculum and faculty. In the words of NDU ethicist, Dr. Al Pierce, “If ethics is important enough to teach, then why not have someone with the credentials to do so”?

In short, the efficacy of ethics education depends more on the aggregate effect of course content and format than on the number of courses with “ethics” in the title. Each school’s efforts to develop critical thought and expose students to a variety of opposing viewpoints will promote skills necessary for ethical reasoning, but only to the extent that students exert effort toward their own development. Additionally, research shows it is possible to hold a moral belief while acting
contrary to it. Therefore, it is not enough to tell simply students how they should behave or show examples of derailed leaders. Efficacy diminishes without a concerted effort to explain why people fail to act ethically. In this regard, Air Force Officer PME has the components for a successful ethics program, but improvements are possible.

**Recommendations**

**First recommendation:** Provide more opportunities for documented ethical self-reflection as a path to personal awareness. An “ethics autobiography” is one way to do this. Another approach is to have students to write about ethical violations they have witnessed and what they would have done in the same situation.

**Second recommendation:** Insert a lesson into the ethics curricula that explains how situational and cognitive influences can lead people to act contrary to their moral beliefs. This will reinforce the fact that no one is immune to unethical behavior, legitimize the need for ethics education, and promote meaningful self-reflection.

**Third recommendation:** Create a framework to help students recognize their ethical “blind spots.” At a minimum, this framework should address cognitive biases, rationalizations, moral intensity, moral disengagement, moral approbation, and ethical blindness.

**Fourth recommendation:** Establish unity of effort by implementing a “building block” approach to ethics education throughout the PME continuum. To this end, faculty should meet regularly with representatives from the Air Force Academy and the Holm Center to discuss ways to build upon ethics education administered during officer accession training.

**Fifth recommendation:** Improve curriculum and faculty development by employing ethicists at SOS, ACSC, and AWC, and by establishing an endowed Air University Ethics
Chair. Whether full- or part-time, an Ethics Chair filled by a retired 3- or 4-star general/flag officer would be an important resource and signify the importance of ethics education at AU.  

Sixth Recommendation: Fund more instructors for the AWC DL department, thereby allowing use of Blackboard technology to facilitate online student interaction. More people will complete AWC via DL than in residence and should, therefore, receive the same quality of ethics education used by other DL programs.

Seventh recommendation: Foster cognitive moral development by having students perform an oral or written defense of an ethical position. To this end, also provide ACSC and AWC students more opportunities to engage in ethical dilemma exercises.

Eighth recommendation: Identify best practices from DL and resident programs for cross-utilization. For example, requiring resident students to post opinions to Blackboard about ethical dilemmas prior to class ensures that all opinions are expressed (no “free riders”) and enhances instructors’ ability to promote in-class discussions using those opinions.

Ninth Recommendation: Use the DIT or DIT-2 as an additional measure of ethics education effectiveness. These tests are relatively inexpensive and offered online.

Tenth recommendation: Expand ethics education beyond PME by including a contemporary book on ethics in the annual CSAF Reading List. Likewise, create an online ethics reference library with articles, key messages, and video case studies similar to the one maintained by Santa Clara University’s Markkula Center for Applied Ethics.

Conclusion

Breaking bad behavior is a complex endeavor and teaching ethics is not a panacea. The true utility of ethics education lies in its ability to develop the skills that enhance ethical reasoning, which is a positive step toward curbing misconduct. Of course, we cannot assume
that unethical behavior arises from a lack of ethics education or that ethical behavior is attributable solely to the completion thereof. Nevertheless, research shows that educational efficacy can be achieved if ethics programs teach critical thinking skills, expose students to other perspectives, explain the situational and cognitive factors that influence ethical reasoning, require student participation in ethical dilemma discussions, and provide opportunities to document ethical self-reflection.

Air Force Officer PME contains these components to varying degrees, but lacks overall efficacy in convincing students of their risk for unethical behavior. It is not enough to provide leadership case studies and discuss how officers should or should not behave. People sometimes make decisions that run counter to their own values and principles, and PME must provide better instruction as to why this occurs by describing the situational and cognitive factors that affect ethical reasoning. Furthermore, AU must promote unity of effort between SOS, ACSC, and AWC so that their ethics curricula function as part of a comprehensive approach to improving ethical reasoning at each level of Officer PME rather than as separate approaches unique to each school. Now is the time for reform. Implementing the recommendations set forth in this paper will go a long way toward establishing a new standard for professional military ethics education at AU and provide civilian overseers with tangible proof of the Air Force’s commitment to improving its ethical climate.
# Appendix A

Squadron Officer School (Resident Program) Ethics-Related Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **P-5240 Personal Ethics**          | • Comprehend ethical frameworks and how they apply to the profession of arms.  
• Comprehend how Title 10 requirements illustrate the expectations of military members.  
• Apply ethical frameworks in scenarios to understand your personal ethical model and how this impacts your leadership style.                                                                                                                                           | X X        |
| **P-5250 Core Values**              | • Comprehend how Air Force core values were formed through Airman Culture and how this culture lives through to today.  
• Analyze how leaders develop Airmen who embrace Air Force core values.                                                                                                               | X X        |
| **P-5270 Organizational Leadership**| • Comprehend the impact of leadership and culture on ethical behavior.  
• Comprehend the importance of accountability and effective followership to promote positive ethical practices in a unit.  
• Apply a theoretical framework of ethics to a leadership strategy that promotes ethical behavior within an organization.  
• Synthesize principles for identifying, understanding and reconciling ethical dilemmas to build a strong set of personal ethics.                                                                                                                                 | X X        |
| **C-5120 Critical Thinking: Theory and Practice** | • Comprehend the principles of various critical thinking techniques.  
• Comprehend the use of intellectual models and tools to improve critical thinking.  
• Apply critical thinking skills to analyze international security events.  
• Comprehend the importance of effective written communication to team success and the Air Force mission.                                                                                                          | X X        |
| **L-5100 Introspection: Personalized Leadership** | • Comprehend introspection as a tool to develop behaviors that exemplify professionalism, humility, self-control, personal discipline, and values.  
• Apply introspective techniques to analyze personal leadership traits and anticipate potential outcomes of leadership styles and decisions in the context of mission accomplishment. | X          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L-5135       | **Decision Making**
               | • Comprehend the models and strategies people use to make decisions.
               | • Analyze information sources available to Air Force leaders to distinguish what is important, and how information influences a leader’s actions and decisions.
               | • Analyze situations critically to anticipate second- and third-order effects of proposed policies or actions.
               | • Analyze decision-making concepts and techniques to make sound, well-informed, and timely decisions despite conditions of ambiguity, risk, and uncertainty. | X | X |
# Appendix B

Squadron Officer School (Distance Learning) Ethics-Related Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaches Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Course 22A Module 1 Lesson 1 Critical Thinking** | • Comprehend the various approaches to critical-thinking.  
• Comprehend the use of tools to improve critical thinking.  
• Comprehend the tenets of common international relations theories and how they shape individual and national views of international security.  
• Analyze international security events using critical-thinking skills and tools through the lenses of common international relations theories. | X | X |
| **Course 22A Module 2 Lesson 1 Having a Point and Proving It** | • Comprehend the elements of a strong argument and the value of maintaining cooperative relationships in the presence of conflicting goals.  
• Apply the elements used to build effective arguments by producing and analyzing arguments.  
• Comprehend the role and importance of research in solving practical problems, advancing knowledge in an academic field, and enhancing individual professional development.  
• Comprehend the various research methods utilized in accomplishing operational, professional and educational goals.  
• Comprehend how warrior-scholars employ professional ethics and Air Force core values when conducting research. | X | X |
| **Course 22B Module 1 Lesson 1 Introspection** | • Comprehend introspection as a tool to develop behaviors that exemplify professionalism, humility, self-control, personal discipline, and values.  
• Comprehend introspective techniques relating to personal leadership traits and anticipate potential outcomes of leadership styles and decisions in the context of mission accomplishment. | X | * |
| **Course 22B Module 1 Lesson 3 Full Range of Leadership** | • Comprehend personal leadership traits and how FRLM concepts can be used to enhance leadership effectiveness.  
• Comprehend leadership concepts and theories represented in the FRLM and applications of FRLM to various organizational settings.  
• Comprehend leadership situations to select appropriate and effective leadership behaviors using the FRLM to ensure mission accomplishment. | X | + |

* This lesson addresses the importance of introspection in developing personal leadership but there is no requirement for documented self-reflection pertaining to ethics (e.g. journaling, self-assessment paper).

+ This lesson addresses the link between ethics and leadership by positing that “the daily demonstration of ethical soundness creates the conditions of trust upon which all leadership influence depends” and offers Five Ethical Steps for enhancement.¹⁰⁹
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 22B Module 2 Lesson 2</td>
<td>• Comprehend the models and strategies people use to make decisions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>• Analyze situations critically to anticipate second- and third-order effects of</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed policies or actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 22B Module 4 Lesson 2</td>
<td>• Comprehend the role that problem solving, critical thinking and decision-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Tools</td>
<td>making methods play in developing effective strategies to maximize mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accomplishment and to manage risk appropriately.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 22B Module 4 Lesson 3</td>
<td>• Comprehend critical thinking skills to respond quickly and proactively to</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
<td>ambiguous and emerging conditions, opportunities, and risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend problem solving skills to identify opportunities when experiencing</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>major changes in work tasks or environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend decision-making skills to leverage opportunities when experiencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes within new work structures, processes, requirements and cultures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend vision building and innovation to come up with creative solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for guiding and directing organizations to institutional needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 22C Module 2 Lesson 1</td>
<td>• Comprehend the source of personal, institutional, and professional values.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Values and Airmanship</td>
<td>• Comprehend how leaders develop Airmen who embrace Air Force core values and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>embody the principles of the Airman’s creed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend how the Airman’s Creed exhibits the concept of the warrior ethos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>among Airmen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend the unique traits of Airmanship which all Air Force personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should strive to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend how maintaining professional relations is a trait of Airmanship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 22C Module 2 Lesson 2</td>
<td>• Comprehend how to employ the Full Range Leadership Model within a theoretical</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>framework of ethics to assess the moral development of an Airman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend how a theoretical framework of ethics promotes acceptable behavior,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards, responsibilities, and expectations for Airmen.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze ethical dilemmas stemming from uncertainty, competing values, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential harm.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C
### Air Command and Staff College (Resident Program) Ethics-Related Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LC-501 Ethics, Leadership and Command: A Senior Leader Perspective          | • Comprehend the purpose and value of self-reflection and preparation for future leadership roles.  
• Analyze course intent, requirements and graded instruments.                |                                               |
| LC-502 Leadership and Ethics: A Senior Leader Perspective                  | • Comprehend leadership challenges and ethical standards.  
• Analyze how senior leaders’ experiences may generate solutions to current leadership and ethical problems.                                        | X                                             |
| LC-503 Ethical Decision Making and Military Values                          | • Comprehend ethical standards of the military profession and challenges to those standards.  
• Analyze how ethical standards and military values might conflict.  
• Analyze problems and solutions regarding ethical behavior in the military profession.                                                  | X                                             |
| LC-504 Ethics Introduction: An Overview                                    | • Comprehend the foundations of values and ethics.  
• Comprehend ethical standards of the military profession and challenges to those standards.  
• Analyze how ethical standards and military values might conflict.  
• Analyze problems and solutions regarding ethical behavior in the military profession.                                                  | X X                                            |
| LC-505 Ethics and the Applied Art of Negotiating                           | • Comprehend the foundations of negotiations.  
• Comprehend ethical standards of the military profession and challenges to those standards, including how ethics (or a lack of) can “muddy” negotiations.  
• Analyze how ethical standards/military values might cause conflict in negotiations.  
• Analyze problems and solutions regarding ethical behavior in negotiations.                                                       | X                                             |
| LC-506 The Art and Science of Negotiations                                  | • Assess the utility of various negotiating approaches within the leadership environment.  
• Assess the elements of the Cooperative Negotiating Strategy as an option when engaging in complex environments.  
• Describe ethical concepts essential to successful negotiations and apply them to an exercise.                                      | X X                                            |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC-507 Organizational Ethics in a Transforming</td>
<td>• Comprehend ethical standards of the military profession and challenges to those standards.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>• Analyze how ethical standards and military values might conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend and analyze how a commander’s personal ethics and his unit’s organizational ethics interact and evolve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze problems and solutions regarding ethical behavior in the military profession as it transforms and we move forward in the 21st century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-508 Organizational Ethics: A Senior Leader</td>
<td>• Comprehend ethical standards of the military profession and challenges to those standards.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>• Analyze how ethical standards and military values might conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend and analyze how a commander’s personal ethics and his unit’s organizational ethics interact and evolve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze problems and solutions regarding ethical behavior in the military profession as it transforms and we move forward in the 21st century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-509 Organizational Ethics Discussion</td>
<td>• Comprehend critical thinking and decision-making skills needed to implement change and sustain innovation.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend the ethical dimension of operational leadership and the challenges that it may present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-510 Ethics in Command and Legal Authority</td>
<td>• Comprehend ethical standards of the military profession and challenges to those standards.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze how ethical standards and military values might conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehend and analyze how a commander’s legal authority and his personal/organizational ethics interplay and may conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze problems and solutions regarding ethical behavior in the military profession in regards to legal authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-511 Command and Consequences</td>
<td>• Apply the principles of ethics in command.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a framework for ethical decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate the ethical context and consequences of personal and professional decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-512 Ethics in Command</td>
<td>• Discuss sources of legal, moral, and ethical guidelines.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze how legal, moral, and ethical “lenses” affect the decision-making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examine solutions to common/uncommon situations faced by military leaders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Synthesize responses to common/uncommon situations faced by military leaders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-600 Personal Leadership Journal</td>
<td>• Analyze leadership principles through reflection on personal experience.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze challenges of command based upon personal thought, education &amp; experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop application principles for command challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

### Air Command and Staff College (Distance Learning) Ethics-Related Lessons

#### Non-Degree Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LC-01 Introduction to Leadership    | • Comprehend the Air Force’s leadership competencies.  
• Comprehend the various leadership models that a leader can use.  
• Comprehend the relationship between critical thinking and effective leadership.                                                                 | X  X        |
| LC-02 Personal Leadership           | • Understand the importance of ethical leadership and its application to organizations.  
• Comprehend how self-development enhances your leadership.  
• Comprehend the relationship between followership and leadership.                                                                                     | X  *        |
| LC-04 Organizational Leadership     | • Comprehend the importance of resource stewardship.  
• Comprehend how change management, continuous improvement and strategic vision contribute to organizational success.  
• Comprehend factors surrounding the military decision making process.                                                                                   | X           |

* LC-02 discusses the utility of reflection and requires students to complete the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. However, there is no requirement for documented self-reflection pertaining to ethics (e.g. journaling, self-assessment paper).

#### Online Master’s Degree Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LC-01 Introduction to Command       | • Assess the responsibilities and authorities of a commander.  
• Analyze the values of the Profession of Arms and the role of the commander in upholding these values.  
• Analyze your ethical values and apply them to ethically ambiguous command situations.                                                                 | X           |
| LC-06 Accountability                | • Analyze the level of the commander’s accountability for the squadron’s overall mission accomplishment.  
• Assess the commander’s role in maintaining discipline in the squadron and the tools available to carry out legal punishments.  
• Understand the role of the Staff Judge Advocate plays in assisting the commander to maintain good order and discipline. | X  X  X     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LC-07 Development and Transition   | • Assess how self-reflection can help you identify and understand your strengths and areas for improvement.  
                                 | • Analyze the responsibility commanders have for developing the forces under their command.  
                                 | • Understand the actions a leader should take to ensure a successful transition of command.  |            |
| LW-02 Introduction to Leadership Competencies | • Compare and contrast the leadership competencies prioritized by the US Air Force and other Services.  
                                         | • Analyze the role of critical and creative thinking in leader effectiveness.  
                                         | • Analyze the leader’s role in decision making and problem solving.  | X X        |
| LW-07 Developing Yourself and Others | • Comprehend the importance of a solid ethical foundation and how leaders can experience derailment.  
                                         | • Synthesize the elements of self-reflection and its role in effective leadership.  
                                         | • Analyze how leaders can develop others and themselves, while at the same time seeking balance.  | X + *      |

* LW-07 uses an ethical dilemma as an exam question which requires students to assess what they would do in a particular situation.

* LC-07 and LW-07 address the importance of self-reflection but there is no requirement for documented self-reflection pertaining to ethics (e.g. journaling, self-assessment paper). LW-07 does, however, recommend students complete the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
## Appendix E
Air War College (Resident Program) Ethics-Related Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6202 Strategic Thinking</strong></td>
<td>• Analyze the importance, components and methods of strategic thought.</td>
<td>X * X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6203 Ethical Reasoning</strong></td>
<td>• Analyze the elements of ethical reasoning; comprehend how ethical reasoning supports strategic thinking and senior leader success.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6204 Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td>• Evaluate, and think strategically, about your own leadership to increase self-awareness.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6205 Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>• Evaluate the decision making process in an ever-changing environment to achieve mission accomplishment.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6211 Providing Advice and Dissent</strong></td>
<td>• Analyze the mandated responsibilities of the professional military officer in providing advice to civilian officials and, if, when, and how dissent is appropriate.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6213 Why Senior Leaders Fail</strong></td>
<td>• Evaluate the potential pitfalls that associated with senior leadership and assess the competencies required to avoid or overcome those pitfalls leading to success where others fail.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSL 6214 Senior Leader Accountability</strong></td>
<td>• Analyze both the causes of leadership failure and the impact of cultural accountability practices and decision-making at the Group, Wing, Numbered AF and higher levels of command/leadership, with a special emphasis on the nuclear enterprise.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* JSL 6202 addresses creativity and systems thinking but not the specific situational or cognitive factors associated with ethical reasoning and behavior.
Appendix F  
Air War College (Distance Learning) Ethics-Related Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Lesson Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 2 <em>Why Senior Leaders Fail</em></td>
<td>• Evaluate the potential pitfalls that accompany senior leadership and assess the competencies required to avoid or overcome those pitfalls leading to success where others fail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 3 <em>Reflection, Ethics, Character, and Professionalism</em></td>
<td>• Analyze principles of military ethics as they apply to strategic leadership and decision-making.</td>
<td>X X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 4 <em>Assessment, Balance, and Reflection</em></td>
<td>• Evaluate your own strengths and weaknesses as a senior leader for the purpose of increasing self-awareness and identifying potential areas for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 9 <em>Decision-Making and Prioritization</em></td>
<td>• Assess the decision making process and assess possible frameworks to prioritize limited resources in order to achieve mission accomplishment.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 11 <em>Providing Advice and Dissent</em></td>
<td>• Analyze the mandated responsibilities of the professional military officer in providing advice to elected and appointed political officials and, in extremis, if, when, and how dissent is appropriate.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 12 <em>Senior Leader Accountability</em></td>
<td>• Analyze both the causes of leadership failure and the impact of cultural accountability practices and decision-making at the Group, Wing, Numbered AF and higher levels of command/leadership, with a special emphasis on the nuclear enterprise.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lesson 3 discusses the utility of reflection but there is no self-reflection assignment (e.g. journaling, paper).
+ Lesson 4 requires a self-assessment but there is no requirement to specifically reflect on ethics or ethical shortcomings.
## Appendix G

Lessons that Address Situational and/or Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning

### Squadron Officer School (Resident Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
                          | Zimbardo, Philip. *The Psychology of Evil.* (TED Talk video)                          | • Impact of peer pressure on ethical decisions  
| # Ethics-Related Lessons: 7 |                                                                          | • Bad apples vs. bad barrels                              |
| # Assigned Materials: 15 |                                                                          | # Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 2 |

### Squadron Officer School (Distance Learning Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 22C, Module 2 Lesson 2 - Ethics</td>
<td>W.C. Crain, “Kohlberg’s Stages of Moral Development”</td>
<td>• Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ethics-Related Lessons: 9</td>
<td></td>
<td># Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Assigned Materials: 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air Command and Staff College (Resident Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC-504</td>
<td>N/A - Guest Lecture from Dr. Christian Miller</td>
<td>• Influence of situational variables on moral behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Introduction: An Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-509</td>
<td>Martin L. Cook, “Moral Reasoning as a Strategic Leader Competency”</td>
<td>• Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Ethics Discussion</td>
<td>Stefan Eisen, Jr., “Challenges for the Senior Leader: Potential Landmines in the Senior-Leader Decision-Making Landscape</td>
<td>• Mental maps, cognitive comfort zones, narcissism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ethics-Related Lessons: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td># Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Assigned Materials: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air Command and Staff College (Distance Learning - On-line Master’s Program)

| # Ethics-Related Lessons: 4 | # Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 0 |
| # Assigned Materials: 55 |                                                          |

### Air Command and Staff College (Distance Learning - Non-Degree Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC-04</td>
<td>Blair S. Williams, “Heuristics and Biases in Military Decision Making”</td>
<td>• Cognitive biases and heuristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ethics-Related Lessons: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td># Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Assigned Materials: 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Air War College (Resident Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin L. Cook, “Moral Reasoning as a Strategic Leader Competency”</td>
<td>• Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL 6205 Decision Making</td>
<td>Col Tom McCarthy, “AWC Critical Thinking &amp; Decision-Making Primer”</td>
<td>• Cognitive biases, mental frameworks, intuition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Ethics-Related Lessons: 7  # Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 3

# Assigned Materials: 38

### Air War College (Distance Learning Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 3 Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>Martin L. Cook, “Moral Reasoning as a Strategic Leader Competency”</td>
<td>• Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL Lesson 9 Decision Making and Prioritization</td>
<td>Dan Lovallo and Olivier Sibony, “The Case for Behavioral Strategy”</td>
<td>• Cognitive Biases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Ethics-Related Lessons: 6  # Assigned Materials re: Situational/Cognitive Influences on Ethical Reasoning: 2

# Assigned Materials: 35
Appendix H
Officer PME Student Survey Questions Pertaining to Ethics*
(Source: Spaatz Center ESS/XA)

### Squadron Officer School (Resident Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Confidence**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY13 Data Collected from AY11 SOS Resident Program Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Completing SOS enhanced my abilities to synthesize the Air Force core values, ethics, and principles of officerliness distinctive to the profession of arms and service in the US Air Force.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY15A SOS Exit Survey (addresses Core Values, not ethics)</td>
<td>1. Completing SOS enhanced my abilities to exercise leadership that reflects the AF core values and employs concepts of accountability, diversity, and coaching/mentoring to facilitate effective mission execution. 2. At this time, I would assess my competence to perform the SOS learning outcomes as follows: I have the knowledge and will to adhere to Air Force core values in my day-to-day endeavors.</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY13 Data Collected from AY11 SOS DL Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Completing SOS enhanced my abilities to comprehend ethics, core values, and leadership model influences on company grade officer development</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air Command and Staff College (Resident Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY14 Data Collected from AY12 ACSC Resident Program Alumni Survey</td>
<td>ACSC Resident Program enhanced my abilities to make ethical decisions based on shared values of the profession of arms</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY14 ACSC Exit Survey</td>
<td>No questions pertaining to ethical decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air Command and Staff College (Distance Learning Program - On-line Master’s Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Confidence **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY14 Data Collected from AY12 ACSC OLMP Alumni Survey</td>
<td>ACSC OLMP enhanced my abilities to make ethical decisions based on shared values of the profession of arms</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air Command and Staff College (Distance Learning Program - Non-Degree Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY14 Data Collected from AY12 ACSC DL Alumni Survey</td>
<td>ACSC DL enhanced my abilities to make ethical decisions based on shared values of the profession of arms</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air War College (Resident Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY14 Data Collected from AY12 AWC Resident Program Alumni Survey</td>
<td>AWC enhanced my abilities to make ethical decisions based on shared values of the profession of arms</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY14 AWC Joint Strategic Leadership (JSL) End of Course Survey</td>
<td>Completing Joint Strategic Leadership has helped enhanced my abilities to discern the causes and effects of personal and professional ethical lapses</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY14 AWC Exit Survey</td>
<td>AWC enhanced my abilities to make ethical decisions based on shared values of the profession of arms</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air War College (Distance Learning Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY14 Data Collected from AY12 AWC DL Alumni Survey</td>
<td>AWC enhanced my abilities to make ethical decisions based on shared values of the profession of arms</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Survey data collection normally occurs each year. The results contained in this chart are from the most recent data collection attempts.

** Confidence level indicates the statistical probability that the responses reflect the opinion of the entire student population within a 5% margin of error.
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6. Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense, to Secretaries of the Military Departments, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Undersecretary for Personnel & Readiness, Chiefs of the Military Services, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and General Counsel of the Department of Defense, memorandum, 26 February 2013.
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79. Dr. Marcia M. Ledlow, interview by the author, 5 February 2015. Students must post comments to at least three different discussion questions per lesson. Instructors monitor student participation and grade based on quality of contribution. Dr. Ledlow also notes that many students participate more than required.

80. Ibid.
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87. If Kohlberg’s theory is true, officers may better comprehend ethical concepts later in their careers, hence, the advantage of building on instruction from previous levels of education. Military ethicist Dr. Al Pierce said he believes “the military’s efforts in ethical development are trying to get people to move from Kohlberg’s Stage 3 (looking to peers, significant others for what is right) to Stage 4 (look to the organization or society for direction on what is right). The question is how do you prepare people to move from Stage 3 to Stage 4? Or more importantly, how does one act in accordance with Stage 6 (universal principles of right and wrong). Let me put it another way--what do you do when the institution you trusted in Stage 4 tells you to do something that is not right? It’s rare, but sometimes you have to rise above what the institution tells you is right and move to Stage 5 or 6.” Dr. Albert C. Pierce, interview by the author, 23 January 2015.
88. The DIT and DIT-2 require respondents to consider a series of moral dilemmas and choose the items representing the most important moral considerations in each case. For more information, see Rest and Narvaez, *Moral Development in the Professions*, 12.

89. Krawczyk, “Teaching Ethics: Effect on Moral Development,” 61. The University of Indiana observed that “when administered at the beginning of the curriculum, the [DIT] results help students see the need for instruction. Administered at the end of the…curriculum, results help students evaluate their personal growth.” For more information, see Bebeau, Pimple, Muskavitch, Borden, and Smith, “Moral Reasoning in Scientific Research,” 9.

90. One civilian and one chaplain (adjunct faculty member) teach ethics at the Eisenhower School who teach ethics.

91. The Colin Powell Chair at NDU is an academic chair devoted to scholarship in national security leadership, character, and ethics. Established in 2006, the chair is used to “augment traditional strategic training with moral education drawn from the wisdom, experience, and scholarship of principled leaders.” (For more information, see http://www.ndufoundation.org/programs/colin-powell-chair-national-security-leadership-character-and-ethics#sthash.980auiZg.dpuf.) The Donald Bren Chair of Ethics and Leadership at MCU “provides a resident scholar who focuses on the moral and ethical aspects of war, military service, service to a free democratic society and Just War Theory.” Duties include incorporating professional military ethics into the curricula for all ranks within the Marine Corps’ educational continuum and advising the MCU President on all matters relating to military ethics. (For more information, see http://www.mcuf.org/support_programs.html.)


95. Tara L. Kuther, "Promoting Positive Ethics: An Interview with Mitchell M. Handelsman." *Teaching of Psychology*, no. 4 (2003): 340. An ethics autobiography requires students to “write about what it is in their backgrounds that helps them think through and identify what is right and wrong professional behavior.” The creator of this idea found that “when students explicitly relate professional ethics to their personal morality they develop a good foundation for dealing with the inevitable conflicts that arise.”


97. See note 58.

98. An excellent resource for introducing and discussing these psychological factors is the documentary film, “The U Part 2.” Produced in 2009 by ESPN for its "30 for 30" series, this show depicts the good and bad aspects of the University of Miami's football program, picking up in the 1990s with its recovery from NCAA sanctions and showing the ethical issues faced in light of illegal donations to the university and its football players. Those interviewed provide insightful comments that can be analyzed in light of cognitive biases and rationalizations that
influence ethical reasoning. For more information, see http://espn.go.com/30for30/film?page=theupart2.


100. Although military officers, particularly chaplains, may have the credentials to serve as ethicists, Dr. Al Pierce at NDU recommends that ethicists at PME institutions be civilian (versus military) for the purpose of continuity. In short, “you can keep a civilian on the faculty longer than you can keep a military officer.” Pierce, interview by the author, 23 January 2015.

101. One way to endow the Ethics Chair is through the Air University Foundation, Inc., a 501(C)(3) tax-exempt, non-profit educational foundation. One of its stated purposes is to “promote, enhance, and expand the intellectual experience of all class members and faculty within the Air University...by providing financial resources when, for policy or budgetary reasons, government funding is not available.” Air University Website, http://www.airuniversityfoundation.org/ (accessed 31 January 2015).

102. In AY2014-15, only 122 Air Force officers attended AWC in residence compared to approximately 8,000 enrolled in AWC DL as of February 2014. See note 79.

103. As cited in Krawczyk, “Teaching Ethics: Effect on Moral Development,” 61, Kohlberg found that students need to be involved in ethical decisions in order to advance to higher levels of moral judgment.

104. In so doing, students must be warned against rationalizations that occur when moral temptations are erroneously framed as ethical dilemmas. See note 9.

105. Dr. Marcia Ledlow (ACSC) has used this approach while teaching at a different university and testifies to its utility.

106. The price for 200 online DIT/DIT-2 tests is $220. The complete price list is found at http://ethicaldevelopment.ua.edu/prices-for-online-use/. For more information on the entire DIT/DIT-2, visit the Center for the Study of Ethical Development at http://ethicaldevelopment.ua.edu/using-the-dit-online/.

107. The author recommends the following books: Blind Spots: Why We Fail to Do What’s Right and What to Do About It by Bazerman and Tenbrunsel; The Power of Professionalism by Wiersma; and Giving Voice to Values by Gentile.


109. Fil J. Arenas, Lt Col Daniel Connelly, and Maj Michael D. Williams, “Developing Your Full Range of Leadership: Leveraging a Transformational Approach” (Squadron Officer College custom student reading, Air University, 2014), 33-34.
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