STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

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.

ETHICS AND VALUES IN THE ARMY TODAY

BY

COLONEL JAMES T. SCHROEDER
United States Army

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

19960603 244

USAWC CLASS OF 1996

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PAPER

ETHICS AND VALUES IN THE ARMY TODAY

by

Colonel James T. Schroeder
United States Army

Chaplain (Colonel) Tom Norton
Project Adviser

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

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: James T. Schroeder (COL), USA

TITLE: Ethics and Values in the Army Today

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 7 March 1996 PAGES: 26 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The purpose of this paper is to explore the changes in the Army ethic and individual soldier values since General Rodgers instituted The Army, Field Manual 100-1, in 1978. A survey of the USAWC Class of 1996, was conducted to determine senior officer perceptions of the Army's current ethical climate, the Army ethic, how to instill the Army ethic in subordinates, and what the Army needs to do to ensure soldiers understand the Army ethic and individual soldier values. The paper concludes that senior officers understand what is important when instilling ethics in subordinates; and the Army has confused the field with respect to what the Army ethic and individual values are because of the many changes during the past eighteen years.

INDEX

Topic	Page
Introduction	1
The Army Ethic (Ethos)	2
Field Manual 100-1 and the Officer Evaluation Report	2
Other Relevant Documents	4
Survey Demographics	7
Assumptions and Methodology	9
The Army Ethical Climate	11
Relationships	11
Ethical Conduct	12
Senior Level Perceptions of the Army Ethic	15
Teaching and Instilling Ethics at the Battalion Level	17
Values Based Organization	17
Instilling Ethical Principals	18
Communicating Ethical Philosophy	19
Zero Defects Mentality and Pressures	20
Summary and Conclusions	21
Endnotes	23
Bibliography	25

Introduction:

The purpose of this research paper is to trace the transition of ethics and values in the Army from the development of Field Manual (FM) 100-1 to the implementation of the Joint Ethics Regulation. These will then be compared and contrasted with the results of an ethics survey of former battalion commanders (senior officers) in the Class of 1996 at the Army War College (AWC). Their perceptions of ethics in the Army using the units they commanded and environment they were in will be discussed. Conclusions will then be drawn concerning senior officers perceptions of the Army ethic and ethical traits that are important. This paper will determine the most important ethical traits senior officers look for and how they imparted these to their units. The analysis should result in a view of the state of ethics and values in the Army today, methods to teach the Army ethic, and techniques for future battalion commanders to instill ethics in subordinates.

Ethics is defined as the discipline dealing with what is good and bad or right and wrong or with moral duty and obligation, a group of moral principles or set of values, or a particular theory or system of moral values.[1] This paper will approach ethics from the definition contained in FM 22-100, "A group of moral principles or standards that guide professionals to do the moral or right thing- what ought to be done."[2] Values are attitudes about the worth or importance of people, concepts or things.[3] Individual soldier values or qualities that are the facets of the soldier's character that undergird the Army ethic (ethos).[4]

The Army Ethic (Ethos):

Field Manual 100-1 and the Officer Evaluation Report:

The American Army has stressed a military ethic throughout its existence. The oath that each soldier takes is an example of the standards to which they are held. Robert E. Lee said, "Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less."[5] This paper will consider the Army ethic and soldier values from 1978 and the publication of FM 100-1 to the present. This period corresponds to the tenure of the senior officers who were surveyed for this study.

The first FM 100-1, The Army, was published in September of 1978, by then Chief of Staff Bernard Rodgers. This manual covered the ethical dimension of leadership but did not list a particular set of ethical traits. The manual stated, "Each commander needs to work towards an ethical philosophy of leadership that deals with organizational as well as personal issues."[6] This first FM 100-1 placed the development of an ethical philosophy for leadership on the unit commander and stressed setting the example for subordinates and serving the organization. The Officer Evaluation Form, Department of the Army (DA) Form 67-7, in effect during this period, stressed a number of professional attributes essential to the success of army officers. These included moral and character strength, honesty, concern for subordinates, subordination of personal interests and proper personal conduct.[7] While these characteristics were not called ethical traits, they fell in the category of proper moral conduct.

In September of 1979, a new Officer Evaluation Report (OER) format was implemented that continues through the present. This OER lists eight professional ethical traits on which officers are rated and separates these traits from areas of professional competence. These ethical traits are (1)dedication, (2) responsibility, (3)loyalty, (4)discipline, (5)integrity, (6)moral courage, (7)selflessness, and (8)moral standards. Instructions for this section require rating officers by exception, that is to comment primarily on areas that are particularly outstanding or need improvement.[8] While these are all desirable traits for officers to exhibit, they do not correspond on a one to one basis with the Army ethic of FM 100-1 that emerged in 1981.

The 1981 update to FM 100-1 contained a professional Army Ethic along with professional soldierly qualities (values). The Army ethic provided a set of traits designed to assist soldiers in their duties and functions as professionals. The ethical traits were loyalty to the institution, loyalty to the unit, personal responsibility and selfless service. The ethic was undergirded by the individual soldierly core qualities (values) recognized as critical for success on the battlefield. These qualities were commitment, competence, candor and courage.[9] This edition of FM 100-1 was the first to state the Army ethic as a set of moral principles.

The next revision to FM 100-1 was instituted by Army Chief of Staff John A. Wickham in 1986. His forward states, "This field manual describes the enduring fundamental roles and precepts of our Army."[10] The professional Army ethic was changed by taking out personal responsibility and adding duty and integrity. This

resulted in an Army ethic of loyalty, duty, selfless service, and integrity. Professional soldierly qualities in the 1981 version were renamed individual values in the 1986 version of FM 100-1.[11] This version of the Army ethic was closer to the ethical traits contained in the officer evaluation report but again did not match it point for point.

The 1991 version of FM 100-1 was instituted by General Gordon Sullivan, and consisted of the same Army ethic and values espoused in the 1986 version.[12] General Sullivan commissioned a later version of FM 100-1 in 1994, and made some significant changes to the Army ethic. The Army ethic was changed to "The Army Ethos," and was changed to one word, "Duty." Inherent in duty, according to the FM, is integrity and selfless service. Soldier values outlined in the 1991 version became professional qualities in 1994, and compassion was added.[13] It is interesting to note here that the following quote from Douglas MacArthur's speech to the Corps of Cadets in 1963 is quoted as a sidebar. It outlines a different ethic found in the West Point Motto.

> "Duty, honor, country: Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be."[14]

Other Relevant Documents:

The Army policy document that defines the professional Army Ethic is Army Regulation (AR) 600-100 titled Army Leadership. As can be seen, the AR mirrors the ethics found in the 1991 FM 100-1. The definition follows:

> The professional Army ethic is the set of values that guide the way we live our lives and perform our duties. The essential values of our professional ethic are:

> (1) Loyalty to the nation, to the Army and to the unit.This means supporting the military and civilian chain of command, as well as devoting oneself to the welfare of others.
> (2) Duty. Duty is the legal and moral obligation to do what should be done without being told.
> (3) Selfless service. This means putting the welfare of the nation and accomplishment of the mission ahead of personal desires.
> (4) Integrity. This is the thread woven through the fabric of the Army ethic. Integrity means honesty, uprightness, the avoidance of deception and steadfast adherence to standards of behavior.[15]

Department of the Army Pamphlet 350-58, Leader Development for America's Army, states that we must continue to develop leaders who exemplify traditional Army values and professional ethics. It then outlines the Army ethic as "uninhibited loyalty, selfless service, unquestionable integrity, and a total commitment to fully performing assigned and implied tasks."[16]

Army Field Manual 22-103, Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, states "a firm ethical base is, therefore, the cornerstone of the Army." Senior leaders have the responsibility to ensure that they are worthy role models and promote the ethical development of their subordinates by teaching them how to reason clearly about ethical matters. The FM goes on to say that the Army ethic is most directly expressed in FM 100-1.[17]

Field Manual 22-100, Military Leadership also declares that the doctrinal statement of the professional Army ethic is FM 100-1 and lists the four elements of the professional Army ethic as loyalty, duty, selfless service and integrity.[18] Clearly FM 100-1 is the base document defining the Army ethic and FM 22-103 gives the responsibility for ethical development within units to commanders (senior officers). While the current FM 22-103 has a

chapter devoted to ethics, the proposed draft update to FM 22-103 titled Strategic Leadership dated July 1995, has taken the ethics chapter out and has very little to say about ethics and the ethical development of subordinates.[19] It instead, emphasizes strategy and strategic processes at the highest level. Table 1 illustrates the changes in the Army Ethic and Values since the FM 100-1 of 1978.

The Army Ethic and Values Since 1978		
Document	**Individual Values**	**Army Ethic**
FM 100-1, 1978	None	Ethical philosophy of leadership
FM 100-1, 1981	Commitment, Competence, Candor, Courage	Loyalty, Personal Responsibility, Selfless Service
FM 100-1, 1986	Commitment, Competence, Candor, Courage	Loyalty, Duty, Selfless Service, Integrity
FM 100-1, 1991	Commitment, Competence, Candor, Courage	Loyalty, Duty, Selfless Service, Integrity
FM 100-1, 1994	Commitment, Competence, Candor, Courage, Compassion	Duty, Integrity, Selfless Service*
AR 600-100, 1993	Commitment, Competence, Candor, Courage	Loyalty, Duty, Selfless Service, Integrity

Table 1.

* FM changes the Army ethic to Army ethos and states that integrity and selfless service are derived from duty.

The changes to the Army ethic over the past eighteen years is confusing and can result in leaders not knowing precisely what

the latest Army ethic or "Ethos" and soldier values are. The result of these many changes over the past eighteen years is that many soldiers do not know what the stated Army ethic is. Without a stated ethic, the practice and climate of ethical behavior is more difficult to directly assess.

The survey conducted in conjunction with this research project attempts to determine the ethical climate of the Army through the eyes of former battalion commanders. This is relevant to the Army because battalion commanders directly influence the ethical development of the enlisted soldiers and junior officers of the Army. Their views reflect what is happening in the Army now. The next section will cover the demographics of the survey participants.

Survey Demographics:

In order to determine what senior officers believe the Army ethic and Army values to be, and how to best instill these in our officers, Noncommissioned Officers (NCOs) and enlisted soldiers, a survey was conducted of all Army officers in the Army War College Class of 1996. A total of two hundred and twenty-three (223) surveys were distributed and one hundred and fifty-one (151) responses were returned.

The demographics of the respondents were as follows:

Sex: Male 96.6%, Female 3.4%
Average Age: 44.5 years
Marital Status: 92% married, 5.3% single and 2.7% divorced, separated or widowed.
Ethnic Background: 88.7% white, 7.3% black and 4% other minorities.
Rank: All were Lieutenant Colonels or Colonels.
Branch Category: 48% Combat Arms, 19.3% Combat Support, 29.3% were Combat Service Support, and 3.3% were Other Branches.

Average Years of Service: 20.4 years
Source of Commission: Reserve Officer Training Command (ROTC) 60.7%, United States Military Academy (USMA) 20.5%, Officer Candidate School (OCS) 10.0% and Other 8.7%.
Religious Background: Protestant 59.3%, Catholic 31.3%, Christian 7.3% and Other 2.0%.
Type Battalion or Equivalent Command: Table of Organization and Equipment (TOE) Command 71% and Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA) Command 29.0%.

There were a number of interesting observations from the demographic data. Senior female officers in the population were more likely to be single (40% were married compared to 93% of the male population). Because the survey represented all components, the number of years of active service ranged from seven to thirty years with the average being 20.4 years and the median being 20.6 years. The median is that point on a distribution with 50% of the respondents above and 50% of the respondents below. All respondents had a religious preference with 98% calling themselves Christian, Protestant or Catholic. The number of officers responding with battalion or equivalent level command was 87.3%. When broken into component categories, 91.7% of Active Duty officers had battalion command compared to 55.6% of Reserve and National Guard officers (33% of Reserve and 78% of National Guard officers had battalion command). The nineteen (19) respondents who had not been battalion commanders were excluded from the remainder of the survey analysis. Therefore, one hundred and thirty-two (132) responses (response rate of 65%) were analyzed and are reported here.

Two major comparisons were made with the data collected. The first was by component (Active Duty compared against the Reserve and National Guard combined) and the second was by branch

category (Combat Arms versus Combat Support versus Combat Service Support). Significant results of the comparisons as well as comparisons of means that are different were recorded.

Assumptions and Methodology:

The population surveyed was in the Class of 1996 at the Army War College (AWC) and was narrowed to former battalion commanders or battalion equivalent commanders. Because they had been selected for attendance at AWC, an assumption was the respondents had completed successful Battalion Command tours and had-over their career-incorporated the professional Army ethic as a part of their value system.

When asked how enjoyable they found battalion command to be eighty-three percent responded with the comment "very enjoyable" (ninety-eight percent found battalion command to be either enjoyable or very enjoyable). The mean on a one to five scale with five being very enjoyable, three being neutral and one being not enjoyable was 4.8.

A fifty-seven (57) question survey was administered and the data statistically analyzed. Questions covered demographic data, opinions on the ethical climate in the units while they were battalion commanders, how they taught and instilled ethics while in command, their opinion of the most important attributes of the Army ethic and Army individual values, and what should be done to impart the proper ethical climate in a battalion organization.

A seven point scale with seven being the highest, four being neutral, and one being the lowest score was used for the majority of measurements. A rating scale example of is at Figure 1.

Example of Rating Scale

Very Strong			Neither Strong Nor Weak			Very Weak
:___	:___	:___	:___	:___	:___	:___ :
* 7	6	5	4	3	2	1

*Numbers were not contained on the survey sheet.

Figure 1

The descriptive statistics analysis performed on each item indicated frequency of responses, the mean, the standard deviation, and the maximum and minimum response values. In addition, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques were utilized to compare subgroups of respondents. Means that were significantly different between groups were noted. The ANOVAs of Active Duty Senior officers versus Reserve and National Guard Officers combined and the three branch categories (Combat Arms, Combat Support, and Combat Service Support) were considered to be statistically significant if the $P<.05$ (probability that the result was by chance alone would be less than five in one hundred trials). Comparisons were considered to be trends if the probability was greater than .05 but less than or equal to 15%. See Table 2.

Comparison Analysis of Results	
Statistical Analysis	One-way analysis of variance
Significant	< or = to 0.05
Trend	> 0.05 but < or = to 0.15

Table 2

The Army Ethical Climate:

Relationships:

Satisfactory relationships among superiors, peers and subordinates attest to a good working environment within the Army. Senior officers responded that they were satisfied with superior, peer and subordinate relationships. Peer and subordinate relationships were generally higher than relationships with superiors and the range of responses (standard deviation) for superior relationships was wider than the other two (See Table 3). When compared by components, active duty personnel did not have as good relationships with their

Battalion Command Relationships With...				
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Maximum Value of Responses	Minimum Value of Responses
Superiors	5.56	1.48	7	1
Peers	6.05	.979	7	1
Subordinates	6.23	.926	7	1

Table 3

subordinate commanders (Active officer mean was 6.19 versus 6.8 for Reserve and National Guard). When compared to more

junior officers (Lieutenant through Major collected during the 1992 Army Survey) the senior level officers surveyed were more satisfied with each of the three relationships.[20] See Table 4.

Positive Relationships With ...		
	Army Survey (Officers 0-1 to 0-4)	**Senior Officers**
Superiors	68.2%	84%
Peers	87.2%	93.9%
Subordinates	88.3%	95.4%

Table 4

Ethical Conduct:

When senior level officers were asked if as battalion commanders they had ever been pressured by superiors to do something they considered to be unethical, 77% responded never. This response was analyzed on a component basis by comparing the Reserves and National Guard as a group to the Active group. The Reserves and National Guard had a significantly lower group mean when compared to the Active officers (Mean of 4.40 versus 4.75 for the Active Army on a scale of one to five where one was "always" and 5 was "never"). The conclusion drawn was that Reserve and National Guard officers perceived more pressures as battalion commanders to do unethical things. Additionally the mean for the Reserve and National Guard officers when compared to Active officers for ethical conduct of superiors was lower (5.6 compared to 6.1).

Senior leaders were asked to evaluate the ethical conduct of superiors, peers, subordinate commanders and subordinate officers

(Means were 6.06 for superiors, 6.05 for peers, 6.16 for subordinate commanders and 5.81 for subordinate officers). Generally, they felt that these individuals were very ethical. The same results were recorded when they were asked about the ethical conduct in their higher headquarters, their battalion headquarters, and their companies (Means were 5.82 for higher headquarters, 6.37 for battalion headquarters and 6.22 for subordinate companies). The overall mean for ethical conduct in the higher headquarters was slightly lower than for the other categories.

The respondents were asked about the ethical conduct of four supporting offices. These were the Inspector General (IG), the Chaplain, the Equal Opportunity (EO)/ Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) representative and the Judge Advocate General (JAG). In general, all were rated to be ethical by the surveyed senior officers (Means were 6.05 for the IG, 6.46 for the Chaplain, 5.32 for the EO/EEO and 6.08 for the JAG). The supporting EO/EEO had a significantly lower score than the other supporting organizations. When compared by component, the JAG was rated significantly higher in ethics by the Active Force than the Reserve Components (Mean for Active was 6.14 versus 5.22 for the Reserve and National Guard).

The survey group was also asked to rate their subordinate officers on the seven ethical traits (dedication, responsibility, loyalty, discipline, integrity, moral courage and selflessness) outlined in the Officer Evaluation Form (OER) DA 68-1 and the Army individual values (commitment, competence, candor, compassion and courage). The responses were in the strong to

very strong range for all ethical traits and values except compassion. The response for compassion was well above neutral but below strong. See Table 5.

Ethical Traits/ Values in Subordinates				
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Maximum Range Value of Responses	Minimum Range Value of Responses
Dedication	6.45	.738	7	4
Responsibility	6.26	.742	7	3
Loyalty	6.39	.918	7	2
Discipline	6.13	.830	7	2
Integrity	6.43	.853	7	2
Courage	6.24	.843	7	3
Selflessness	6.05	.987	7	2
Commitment	6.19	.869	7	3
Competence	5.95	.893	7	3
Candor	6.12	.917	7	3
Compassion	5.70	1.03	7	2
Courage	6.19	.814	7	3

Table 5

Finally, when questioned if unethical behavior is a problem in the officer corps, the responses indicated that it was a "small problem" (Mean was 3.74 on a five point scale with 1 being a "large problem" and 5 being "not a problem"). When compared the 1992 Army survey, the survey sample has a slightly higher percentage responding in the "not a problem" and "small problem" categories (This survey had 74.8% for senior officers compared to 64.9% for Officers in the 1992 Army Survey).

Overall, the ethical climate in the Army is good. Senior leaders believe that officers do a good job demonstrating the

ethical traits and Army values outlined above.

Results from this part of the survey determined significant differences between the Active and Reserve components on their perceptions of senior level pressures to do things unethical. Additionally, the Judge Advocate General had a significantly higher rating for ethical conduct by the Active than Reserve Officers. The EO/EEO was rated relatively lower than other supporting agencies with respect to ethical conduct. In all of these differences, it should be noted that the ratings were positive (above the midpoint of the scale) and the differences lie between relative positive ratings.

Senior Level Perceptions of the Army Ethic:

The senior leaders had a number of interesting answers to their perceptions of the Army ethic. The seven ethical traits were listed and the senior officers were asked to identify the one most important to them, to readiness and mission accomplishment, to being a good army officer, and to the Army. Senior leaders responded that integrity was their most important ethical trait (66% listed it as the number one choice followed by loyalty with 12%). When responding to the most important traits for readiness and mission accomplishment, dedication, responsibility and integrity each had twenty-five percent of the responses followed by discipline with fifteen percent. The most important ethical trait to being a good army officer was listed as integrity with sixty-five of the responses. No other response was greater than eight percent. Finally the most important professional ethic for the Army was integrity with fifty-eight

percent followed by dedication with eleven percent and loyalty with nine percent. We are truly a service that feels integrity is the most important ethical trait for ourselves, all Army officers and the Army.

When asked what was the most important Army individual value, commitment received forty-three percent followed by competence with twenty-eight percent. Compassion was last with only five percent.

Surveyed senior officers were asked what the Army ethic was. FM 100-1 calls the Army "Ethos," the 1994 update term for Army ethic, the term "Duty." This is in turn divided into Duty, Integrity, and Selfless Service.[21] The survey offered five responses to a question concerning the Army ethic as stated in FM 100-1. The "correct" response of Duty, Integrity and Selfless Service received a twenty-seven percent response (the word Duty by itself received 2%). The response of Loyalty, Duty, Selfless Service and Integrity received thirty-one percent and Duty, Honor and Country received the highest response of thirty-two percent. This survey shows a lack of understanding of exactly what the current Army ethic is. The changes to the Army ethic over the past sixteen years coupled with changes to the way the information is presented in the current FM 100-1 probably contributed to this.

The Department of Defense (DOD) Joint Ethics Regulation (JER), DOD 5500.7 was published in 1993 to replace the DOD Standards of Conduct Regulation. The forward to the regulation states, "It provides a single source of standards of ethical conduct and ethics guidance,...."[22] In fact it is more closely

aligned to a standards of conduct regulation. When asked if this could serve as a substitute for the Army ethic in FM 100-1, thirty-five percent (35%) of the senior officers surveyed stated "yes" while fifty-five percent (55%) were "unsure" and ten percent (10%) stated "no".

The survey shows there is an understanding among senior leaders concerning the ethical traits that are important to the Army to provide for an ethical organization. The perception is the officer corps has high ethical standards and behavior. Integrity emerged as the most important ethical trait. The Army ethic, however, has not been communicated consistently or well. A need exists for understanding that publications such as the JER may have ethics in their title but are more appropriately called standards of conduct.

Teaching and Instilling Ethics at the Battalion Level:

Values Based Organization:

General Reimer, Chief of Staff of the Army, refers to the Army as a values-based organization. At last year's Association of the U.S. Army (AUSA) luncheon, he stated, "Values are important to us; selfless service, dedication, sacrifice, duty, honor, country are not just words but a code by which we live."[23] He also stated in Army magazine that "Values are the foundation of this institution. Loyalty, duty, selfless service, courage, integrity, respect for human dignity and a sense of justice are all part of the Army's identity."[24] While he calls the Army ethic values, these are institutional values rather than individual soldier values. We can draw from his statements that

the Army ethic should be important for all members of this institution.

Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, FM 22-103, states that senior leaders have specific responsibilities to their organizations. They are responsible for sustaining an ethical climate that promotes trust and confidence. They are also responsible to ensure that they are worthy role models, and promote the ethical development of their subordinates by teaching them how to reason clearly about ethical matters.[25]

Instilling Ethical Principals:

Ninety-five percent (95%) of the officers surveyed stated that they issued a command philosophy while in battalion command. For the battalion commander, a published command philosophy is an excellent tool to begin the process to instill ethical principals and the Army ethic to subordinates. When asked if they would change the method they used to communicate their ethical philosophy, the vast majority stated that they would not. The published philosophy puts something in writing, places it where unit personnel can see it and it establishes ethical behavior as a priority.

There are a number of additional methods the surveyed senior leaders used to teach values and ethics to their battalions. Leading by example received the most number of responses.Additionally, commanders should uphold the Army ethic, even when it may cost them something. The saying, "Ethics is easy until it costs you something," is certainly applicable. Soldiers see this and they take note.

Commanders also used verbal communications, whether it was in daily talks with soldiers, at staff meetings, operations order briefs, or any other occasion the commander is with subordinates. Noncommissioned Officer Development Programs (NCODP) and Officer Development Programs (ODP) were other good methods to teach ethics. Punishing violations of ethical standards was next. Senior officers were adamant that ethical breaches should be dealt with and used as a teaching tool for other soldiers. A number of other methods were used: repetition, reading and case studies, institutional training, and feedback mechanisms.

Communicating an Ethical Philosophy:

The next discussion question concerned how these senior officers communicated their ethical philosophy to their commands. The most popular method was the written command philosophy, followed by personal example on a day to day basis. Other methods used to communicate ethical philosophy were briefings to new personnel, daily communication to all personnel, and professional development classes (NCODP and ODP). Other responses included elimination of personnel who violated ethical standards, use of feedback mechanisms, supporting EO/EEO, and using the unit chaplain.

When asked if they would change the method used to communicate their ethical philosophy, unit commanders responded overwhelmingly "no". The few that stated "yes" said they would put their philosophy in writing, communicate more with their unit, and perform more effective counseling.

Zero Defects Mentality and Pressures:

A final discussion question concerned the short times that company commanders and operations officers spend in their jobs and the ethical pressures to do well because so much of their career rides on their performance. The majority of senior officers stated that the time factor did not have an effect on their ethical performance. Comments from those who stated that there are ethical pressures included the following, listed in order of total responses. Commanders need to allow for mistakes to occur as long as they are unintentional (honest in nature). Also, they should be completely honest with subordinates even when this is not easy, stabilize personnel in positions if possible, establish a good command climate, and protect their officer evaluations.

A related survey question asked if the Army was moving towards a zero defects mentality. Seventy-nine (79%) percent responded in the agree or strongly agree categories (the responses had a mean of 6.02 with standard deviation of 1.17, with a response of 7 being strongly agree, 4 being neutral and 1 being strongly disagree). A similar question asked if the short times that company commanders and operations officers spend in their positions were detrimental to the command they were in because they could not afford to make any mistakes, seventy-six percent (76%) responded positively (the mean was 5.36 on a seven point scale with a standard deviation of 1.6).

It is clear that senior leaders were satisfied with the methods used to communicate their command philosophies and to train and instill ethics in their commands by their negative

responses to change if given another battalion command opportunity. Senior leaders also perceive the Army has entered the age of a zero defect mentality and the short times that key battalion personnel spend in their positions are detrimental to soldiers.

Summary and Conclusions:

This paper has traced the Army ethics and values since the appearance of The Army, FM 100-1, in 1978, and the changes associated with them through the latest FM 100-1 in 1994. A survey was then conducted of senior officers in the AWC Class of 1996, that asked their opinions of the state of ethics in the officer corps; relationships and ethical conduct of superiors, subordinates and peers; perceptions of ethical traits and values that were the most important; perceptions of what the Army ethic was; and how to best impart and teach ethics as a battalion commander.

The background information on changes to the Army ethic has shown that the official Army ethic and values have changed a number of times over the past eighteen years. These changes have contributed to the confusion concerning exactly what the Army ethic and values are. The Army currently has a number of official documents that have different variations of the ethic and values. Some standardization of these for the long term is necessary to promulgate an ethic understood by all soldiers in the same way. The Army should promulgate the ethic and values in simple terms and not continually change them.

Senior officers stated that ethical conduct in the Army is strong overall. This includes seniors, subordinates, peers, supporting offices, and units. They also understand the most important ethical characteristics to keep the Army strong. The most important trait that emerged was integrity. This trait the was most important for themselves, the Army and to be a good Army officer.

Responsibility, integrity, and dedication were the most important for readiness and mission accomplishment. These can be related directly to duty, integrity and selfless service. The United States Military Academy motto of "Duty, Honor and Country" can also be related almost directly to the Army ethic. The West Point strategic guidance states, "It (the motto) is an affirmation of personnel integrity and dedication to the service."[26]

General Gordon R. Sullivan, in one of his last addresses as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, at the graduation ceremonies for the West Point Class of 1995, stated, "Duty, Honor, Country is much larger than this place .... much larger than this place. It represents strength of character, and we need officers such as you who encompass the values of integrity and selfless service."[27] The way the Army ethic of duty, integrity and selfless service corresponds to the West Point motto and the thoughts of our senior leaders are good reasons for the Army ethic to remain three separate elements not one rolled up under duty.

Senior leaders know how to use methods to instill the Army ethic. This is demonstrated by their responses to questions

concerning how to communicate ethics and instill ethics in their commands and their responses that if they had to do it over they would not change their methods.

The Army should take its stated ethic and individual values and not change them. The chief Army ethical precept according to senior officers is integrity. Senior officers do not separate duty into integrity and selfless service as FM 100-1 does. The Army ethic should be stated as duty, integrity and selfless service and it should remain that. The changes we have gone through in the past eighteen years to Army Field Manuals, Army Regulations, and other documents, only serve to confuse the soldiers of the Army.

---

1. Philip B. Gove, Ph. D., ed., Webster's Third New International Dictionary, (Springfield: Merriam- Webster Inc., 1986), p. 780.

2. Department of the Army, Military Leadership, Field Manual 22-100 (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 31 July 1990), 30.

3. Ibid., 23.

4. Department of the Army, The Army, FM 100-1, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 14 June 1994), 7.

5. Harold D. Graves, West Point 2002 and Beyond, Strategic Guidance for the United States Military Academy (West Point, NY: United States Military Academy, 1 October 1993). unnumbered.

6. Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual 100-1 (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 29 September 1978), 29.

7. Lawrence P. Crocker, The Officer's Guide, 39th ed. (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1977), 234.

8. U.S. Army Officer Evaluation Report, DA Form 67-8, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 September 1979).

9. Department of the Army, The Army, FM 100-1, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 14 August 1981), 23-26.

10. Department of the Army, The Army, FM 100-1, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 29 August 1986), i.

11. Ibid., 22-23.

12. Department of the Army, The Army, FM 100-1, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 10 December 1991), 16-17.

13. The Army, FM 100-1, 14 June 1994, pp. 5-10.

14. Ibid., 5-10.

15. Department of the Army, Army Leadership, Army Regulation 600-100, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 17 September 1993), para. 1-8.

16. Department of the Army, Leader Development for America's Army, DA Pamphlet 350-58, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 13 October 1994), 1-2.

17. Department of the Army, Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, FM 22-103,(Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 21 June 1987), 18.

18. Military Leadership, FM 22-100, 31 July 1990, p.29.

19. Department of the Army, Strategic Leadership (Draft), FM 22-103, (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, July 1995), i.

20. Beverly Harris, Ph.D., 1992 U.S. Army Survey, (Washington: U.S. Army Research Institute, Army Trends Analysis Group, 22 January 1996).

21. The Army, FM 100-1, 14 June 1994, 5-10.

22. Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Ethics Regulation (JER) with Change 1, DoD 5500.7, (Washington: The Secretary of Defense, 2 November 1994), i.

23. Dennis Reimer, Association of the Army (AUSA) Luncheon Speech, 17 October 1995.

24. Dennis Reimer, "Maintaining a Solid Framework While Building for the Future," Army Magazine, (October 1995): 21-26.

25. Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, FM 22-103, 22.

26. Graves, no page number.

27. Gordon R. Sullivan, "Victory of Values," a speech given to the graduating class at the United States Military Academy, Speech File Service, (3rd Qtr, FY 1995): 19.

Bibliography

Crocker, Lawrence P., The Officer's Guide, 39th ed. (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1977.

Gentemann, Michor M., Setting the Ethical Climate in an _____ Organization. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, May 1991.

Gove, Philip B. Ph. D., ed. Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1986.

Graves, Howard D., West Point 2002 and Beyond, Strategic Guidance for the United States Military Academy. West Point, NY: United States Military Academy, 1 October 1993.

Harris, Beverly, Ph. D., 1992 U.S. Army Survey. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute, Army Trends Analysis Group, 22 January 1996.

Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Ethics Regulation (JER) with Change 1. DoD 5500.7. Washington: Office of the Secretary of Defense, 2 November 1994.

Reimer, Dennis, "Maintaining a Solid Framework While Building for the Future." Army Magazine (October 1995): 21-26.

_____. Speech to Association of the U.S. Army Convention Luncheon, 17 October 1995.

U.S. Department of the Army, Army Leadership. Army Regulation 600-100. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 17 September 1993.

_____. Leader Development for America's Army. DA Pamphlet 350-58. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 13 October 1994.

_____. Leadership and Command at Senior Levels. FM 22-103. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 21 June 1987.

_____. Strategic Leadership (Draft). FM 22-103. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, July 1995.

_____. Military Leadership. FM 22-100. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 31 July 1990.

_____. The Army. FM 100-1. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 29 September 1978.

_____. The Army. FM 100-1. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 14 August 1981.

_____. The Army. FM 100-1. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 29 August 1986.

_____. The Army. FM 100-1. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 10 December 1991.

_____. The Army. FM 100-1. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 14 June 1994.

_____. U.S. Army Officer Evaluation Report. DA Form 67-8. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 September 1979.

United States Military Academy, Cadet Leader Development System, USMA Circular 1-101. West Point, NY: United States Military Academy, July 1994.

_____. The Honor Code and Honor System, United States Corps of Cadets Pamphlet 632-1. West Point, NY: United States Military Academy, October 1995.