Calhoun

Institutional Archive of the Naval Postgraduate School

Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Theses and Dissertations   Thesis Collection

2004-12

Understanding ethical dilemmas in the military workplace factors that influence the decision to take action

Blevins, Rodney D.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/1312

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

UNDERSTANDING ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN THE MILITARY WORKPLACE

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE DECISION TO TAKE ACTION

by

Rodney D. Blevins

December 2004

Thesis Advisor:	Leslie Sekerka
Second Reader:	Phil Candreva

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	*Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188*

1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	2. REPORT DATE December 2004	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Understanding Ethical Dilemmas in the Military Workplace: Factors that influence the decision to take action		**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**	
6. AUTHOR(S)			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE**	

13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)

This study examines ethical dilemmas in the workplace and how organizational members move to resolve these challenges. Existing research was reviewed to gain insight and determine current views of ethical dilemmas experienced at work. A study was then conducted with Supply Corps Officers in the U.S. Navy to better understand the dilemmas they face in their daily work life. Officers were asked to think of a critical incident when they faced a moral challenge and how they responded. Data procured from critical incident interviews is suggestive of how officers describe ethical dilemmas, how they identify options for action, and finally how they select a course of action. The dilemmas generally involved issues with financial accountability, fairness in performance evaluations, fraternization, homosexuality in the service, employee drug and alcohol abuse, fraudulent use of government property and funds, conflict between personal and military values, and managing important relationships. This initiative, supported by the Chief of the Supply Corps, is designed to be a promising start toward creating an informed strategy, one that will ultimately lead to the design of enhanced educational programming regarding moral behavior in the military.

14. SUBJECT TERMS Managers, ethical dilemma, workplace			**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 69
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	**18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE** Unclassified	**19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT** Unclassified	**20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT** UL

i

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

UNDERSTANDING ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN THE MILITARY WORKPLACE

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE DECISION TO TAKE ACTION

Rodney D. Blevins
Lieutenant Commander, Supply Corps, United States Navy
Bachelor of Science, University of Florida, 1994

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 2004

Author: Rodney D. Blevins

Approved by: Leslie Sekerka, PhD
                 Thesis Advisor

                 Phil Candreva, CDR
                 Second Reader/Co-Advisor

                 Douglas A. Brook
                 Dean, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

iii

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This study examines ethical dilemmas in the workplace and how organizational members move to resolve these challenges. Existing research was reviewed to gain insight and determine current views of ethical dilemmas experienced at work. A study was then conducted with Supply Corps Officers in the U.S. Navy to better understand the dilemmas they face in their daily work life. Officers were asked to think of a critical incident when they faced a moral challenge and how they responded. Data procured from critical incident interviews is suggestive of how officers describe ethical dilemmas, how they identify options for action, and finally how they select a course of action. The dilemmas generally involved issues with financial accountability, fairness in performance evaluations, fraternization, homosexuality in the service, employee drug and alcohol abuse, fraudulent use of government property and funds, conflict between personal and military values, and managing important relationships. This initiative, supported by the Chief of the Supply Corps, is designed to be a promising start toward creating an informed strategy, one that will ultimately lead to the design of enhanced educational programming regarding moral behavior in the military.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF TABLES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I.   INTRODUCTION

A.   BACKGROUND

Today's managers encounter a range of challenging ethical dilemmas. These moral issues require a range of skills in order to optimize one's ability to address them effectively and with moral fortitude (Holian, 2002).   Such complex issues encompass a wide range of situations and may elevate conflict between individual and organizational values, potentially related to differences between an individual's background and their organizational culture. Though various studies have been conducted to examine the kinds of dilemmas managers face, not enough is known about these situations, or what contributes to a manager's response action when faced with such challenges. Research from business management suggests that managers identify ethical issues as being related to their roles, professional affiliations, working relationships, personal qualities, and individual preferences (Holian, 2002).   Though prior research has been effective in identifying ethical dilemmas faced by managers, the reasons and thought processes behind a response to the dilemma remains largely unresolved.   While models exist to explain how personal moral philosophies, opportunities, cultures, and other constructs may impact decisions, there is no descriptive framework to explain how specific individuals make ethical decisions in specific situations (Baack, Fogliasso, & Harris, 2000; Ferrell & Fraedrich, 1994). As managers work to address their ethical issues today, how they resolve them, even those they routinely face, has not been fully explained.

Ethics is not only relevant to business organizations, it is essential to business success. Even within the origins of capitalism resides a moral imperative to improve society and create human progress (Seidman, 2004), therefore the existence of an ethical workplace is paramount to the creation of a profitable business system.   It is important for managers to respond to the dilemmas they encounter in the workplace and manage their response actions appropriately. Scholars attempt to study ethical dilemmas by emphasizing the individual role or situational variables that contribute to the production of ethical/unethical behavior (Trevino, 1986). Individual factors like emotional maturity

and experience (Kohlberg, 1969; McCoy, 1983; Rest, 1979; and Wright, 1995) appear to play a role in determining an individual's response actions. As cited in Devitt and Van Hise (2002), interactions between demographic variables like age (Kohut & Corriher, 1994), gender (Gilligan, 1982; Kohut and Corriher, 1994; Wolfinger, et al., 1999) academic discipline (Cohen et al., 1998; Nesteruk, 1996), and religion (Andolsen, 1997) have also been examined. As mentioned, managers may be influenced by any number of different factors when making a decision faced with an ethical dilemma, but regardless of whatever the focus of concern may be, they are ultimately responsible for responding and acting with moral resolve. Prior scholarship is important because it provides insight into what factors are at work in the minds of managers as they confront problems and decide whether to act or not.   Sekerka and Bagozzi carried this work forward to create a decision-making model which depicts the theoretical foundation for a response-action process. Their theory edifies existing knowledge, and reflects how personal and social influences, as well as specific individual reactions (cognition and effect), converge to reveal pathways to moral behavior (2004).

While research examines ethical decision-making to explain behavior and develop models to depict the process, many managers continue to rely on learning how to engage in this process through experiential means; that is, while on the job and by trial and error (Holian, 2002). Moreover, current models to describe ethical and unethical behavior within organizations are typically not very helpful in describing and explaining the response process (Bommer et al., 1987). Despite previous efforts, there is essentially very little known about the manager's rich cognitive processes regarding the process of facing and responding to ethical dilemmas in the workplace (Trevino, 1986).

To my knowledge, a study of this sort, one that has officers reflect upon their own personal dilemmas and reactions to them, has never been conducted in the military, specifically with business managers in the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy. The research I conducted revealed the kinds of dilemmas encountered by these officers are omnipresent, especially in regards to issues dealing with purchasing, accounting, personal activities, and achieving of financial goals. In addition to these challenges, dilemmas centered on fraternization, homosexuality, politics, and cross-cultural issues are also

often encountered. Such issues are experienced by managers from a wide range of sectors, all the way from accountants to police officers, and across all organizational forms. An examination of these issues, as presented through the eyes of the officers themselves, provided valuable insight to managers in other fields of business. The development of competences to effectively deal with ethical dilemmas within organizations requires the ability to identify root causes for the occurrence, healing the causes on the basis of a systematic understanding of the structurally deep and complicated causes, and reaching a level of creative behavior in ethical terms (Park, 1998). Thus, in order to understand the reactions and behavior that emerge from those facing an ethically challenging scenario, we must strive to not only understand the factors that influence behavior and choices for courses of action, but we must also understand the dilemma itself. This study provides a first step toward elevating our view into understanding the dilemmas and the associated responses, leading to final propositions that suggest potential linkages between different situations and the associated actions.

B.   PURPOSE

The principle goal of this study is to explore the kinds of dilemmas managers experience and identify factors that influence their actions in response to those dilemmas. This will be accomplished by interviewing officers of the Supply Corps in the United States Navy. The particular group of officers interviewed for this study represents middle management, complete with all the demands of supporting higher level leadership while nurturing relationships with subordinates and simultaneously managing one's own personal career. The intention of this work is to capture data across a broad range of experiences as officers recant their facing and dealing with ethical dilemmas. The research moves to analyze dominant factors in determining reaction and response. This thesis will progress from defining an ethical dilemma to examining the experiences of these officers with ethical dilemmas in the Supply Corps' workplace. Critical incident interviews were conducted to determine types of experiences encountered, thoughts and emotions experienced throughout the situation, process of identifying options and action taken, along with the officer's reasoning associated with their action (or decision to take no action). In the end, the goal is to create a rich picture, a story of Supply Corps moral

behavior, based on information from both the current literature and the personal experiences provided by these officers about the dilemmas they face and what motivates their response. This study further enhances our understanding of decision making and action in the face of an ethical dilemma. Ultimately, the underlying rationale for conducting this research is the assumption that with a better understanding of the dilemmas managers face and how they respond, we can better prepare organizational leaders to deal with these complex situations in the future

C. SCOPE

The scope of this study includes: (1) a review of the literature; (2) methods; (3) data analysis; (4) findings; and (5) propositions and recommendations for future research. This thesis will advance our knowledge of the topic as dominant themes are identified to extend theory.

The population of Supply Corps Officers is represented by a sample selected from members of the student body at the United States Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. At any one time, there are approximately 60 Supply Corps Officers in attendance. Supply Corps Officers are selected for two reasons. The sponsor of the project comes from the Supply Corps and is concerned with educating and training those officers to perform better with regards to responding to ethical dilemmas with professional courage. The second reason is that Supply Corps Officers are the Navy's business managers, so information learned from this set of officers is transferable to managers in other business firms. This data is more general as it relates to issues of purchasing, accounting for public funds, and achieving financial goals.

D. METHODOLOGY

To understand military officers' experiences as they face and respond to ethical dilemmas in the workplace, qualitative analyses is used to address research questions related to the kinds of dilemmas officers face and what motivates action in response to those dilemmas. By probing these questions, this research will add value to our understanding of the phenomena and build theory. Given that I have considered prior research to develop this inquiry, it is an informed grounded theory approach. Themes

4

will be identified as they emerge from the interview dataset and will contribute to the development of propositions, to be considered for further study.

Critical incident interviews (Flanagan, 1982) are particularly suited for this investigation and serve as the framework for the interview protocol. Interviewees are currently, or have been, military officers in the USN Supply Corps. Interviews were conducted by the Lead Researcher (R. Blevins) and are supported by thesis advisor and PI (L. Sekerka). The interview protocol was structured to explore the specific experiences with ethical dilemmas encountered by the interviewees. Each participant was asked to recount three instances when they faced an ethical dilemma in their military workplace. The intent was to allow for support of past theories and research and also allow additional issues to emerge. Glaser and Strauss's (1967) description of grounded theory development focuses on such an interplay between experience, induction, and deduction (compare and contrast).

In order to get a more in depth understanding of those experiences and responses, specific parameters were placed on the kind of scenarios requested. A script was used to introduce the study, ensure participants of their anonymity, and define key terms for uniformity throughout each interview. Each participant was asked to describe two scenarios in which they faced an ethical dilemma and took an overt action to resolve the dilemma and one scenario where they faced an ethical dilemma and no action was taken. All of the questions were open ended, then followed with probes that foster dialogue (see interview protocol in the Appendix). The interviewer focus was on the respondent's reflections upon the three different scenarios discussed. The questions were designed to probe and understand the respondent's perception of the scenario and their actions in response to the issue as well as garnering information about their belief and value system, as well as their rationale for responding in the manner they ultimately acted.

E.   DATA ANALYSIS

Forty interviews were conducted and a random sample of 15 was utilized for the study. Transcripts of the interviews were prepared and the results were analyzed in a three phase content analysis procedure for themes or concurring response patterns (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman 1984). First, I broke the transcripts down into

"thought units" (Gioia & Sims, 1986), each of which was kept in an electronic file which included the interview number, general concept of the thought, and category of dilemma associated with it. The thought units ranged from a few words to complete paragraphs. I wanted to let the data speak for itself and capture the full essence of what was being said.

Next, I combined the identified thoughts, themes that had been noted with some consistency across the transcripts, into relevant categories. The list was refined by sharpening the distinctiveness of the concepts and reducing the ambiguities, overlaps, and wording inconsistencies. After considerable deliberation, a tentative set of dimensions or categories were compiled which conveyed the basic concepts of the interview responses. Lastly, I used a compare and contrast technique moving from the themes and categories that emerged to prior theory in order to extend that theory and arrive at propositions for future research.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

A.   INTRODUCTION

To begin, it is important to outline the definitions of ethics and terms referenced in this study, so as to illustrate the complex nature of the topic. "Ethics are matters of personal perception. Hence, ethics have their roots in the personal moral standards and philosophies of professional people. Ethics can be defined as "using the tools of reason to generate rules which should guide our judgment in particular and general circumstances" (Parker 1998, p. 1). A definition of ethics is drawn from Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (1983):

> It is the study of standards of conduct and moral judgment, or the system of morals of a particular person, religion, group, etc.

> A definition of moral can be drawn from the same source:

> It is a situation dealing with, or capable of distinguishing between, right and wrong, of teaching, or in accordance with the principles of right and wrong, or good in conduct or character; specif., sexually virtuous or involving sympathy without action (moral support), virtually such because of   effects on thoughts or attitudes (a moral victory), or based on probability (a moral certainty).

If ethics serve as a system of morals, then ethical decision-making is the employment of that system to make choices. The longstanding view of ethical behavior is that it is actions shown to be objectively morally correct via appeal to a theory of morally correct (or permissible, obligatory, desirable, etc.) action, and that it is "ethical" precisely because it is the behavior which is required by the theory (Bommer et al., 1987). Badaracco (1998, p. 1) states "an ethical decision typically involves choosing between two options: one we know to be right and another we know to be wrong." McDevitt and Van Hise (2002, p. 262) define an ethical dilemma as "one that requires an individual to make a choice that has consequences for others." The idea of choice often between not particularly desirable options is conveyed in these definitions which is the critical concept involved in an ethical dilemma. For the purposes of this study, an ethical dilemma is defined as a conflict in which some level of tension, paradox, or conflict is

present in determining a right action and all solutions may appear to be unfavorable or have undesirable consequences (Sekerka & Bagozzi, 2004).

B.   RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To generate the framework for this study, we began with these two fundamental questions:

1. What types of ethical dilemmas do Supply Corps Officers face in the workplace?
2. What contributes to the decision to act when officers face an ethical dilemma?

C.   OVERVIEW OF THEORY

Aside from the more popular discussions regarding managerial decision making in terms of the corporation as a whole and its responsibilities toward society, there needs to be more of an informed dialogue about the every day decisions and challenges that collectively define the workplace.   Most managers do not posses the power to define company values and goals, but they do however make important decisions that contribute to the realization of those goals. So it is critical that we know and understand the kinds of tough, sometimes ethically challenging issues these managers face. First of all, what do they perceive as an ethical dilemma? And why do they see it that way?

In regards to the first question, managers from the fields of finance, medicine, human resource management, and the public sector described ethical dilemmas as centered on conflict of personal values, maintaining working relationships, and achieving organizational goals. For these types of dilemmas, managers described difficulties with coming up with options and courses of action, with dealing with risk and perceived consequences of action, and with managing various relationships on different levels of the organization. Dukerich et al., (2000) found that managers described dilemmas that involved issues with firing people, bribing officials of other countries, and dealing with theft and sexual harassment in the company. As cited in Baack, Fogliosso, and Harris (2000), other ethical topics in companies arise in the areas of hiring, promotion, retention, glass ceilings, discrimination, privacy, plant closings, labor negotiations, financial

decisions, product liability, and truth in advertising and sales tactics (Ferrell & Fraedrich, 1994; Hartley, 1993; Hosmer, 1991).

More information is needed regarding the kinds of dilemmas managers face in order to better prepare them to handle those dilemmas. This research study is an investigation of those types of problems encountered by Supply Corps Officers of the U.S. Navy in order to expand our understanding of them and contribute to and refine current theories that exist in the literature.

For some managers, making ethical decisions is easy and depending on the nature of the dilemma, is a straight forward process. They are able to examine situations and determine if the situation represents a moral or non-moral problem for them. Based upon that categorization, their behavior and response to the problem may be heavily influenced (Dutton & Duncan 1987). For example, Dukerich et al., (2000) found that managers had little trouble distinguishing between the moral and non-moral problems they encountered and played a part in resolving at work. This allowed the researchers to study the ramifications for the classification of an issue as moral or non-moral on the response to the issue. Though this study provided some insight on the types of problems managers face and how they are perceived, the researchers were only able to scratch the surface of relevant experiences and the process of response to them.

The process for responding to problems seems to work well for dilemmas that present clear data and facts from which to draw conclusions and make decisions. But in situations where the information is cloudy, and those in which personal and corporate goals and ideals conflict, the decision making process can become much harder. For these situations, which managers frequently experience, ethical decisions depend on both the decision-making process itself and on the experience, intelligence, and integrity of the decision maker (Andrews, 1989). In attempting to understand the process of decision making in response to ethical dilemmas, researchers have either focused on the ethical issue itself, the decision maker (personality and cognitive development), or the

environment (work and otherwise) of the decision maker and combinations thereof, to explain the thought pattern and ultimately behavioral pattern of managers facing these tough problems.

Baack, Fogliasso, and Harris (2000) attempt to develop a theoretical basis for studying individual decision making in the face of ethical problems using Social Penetration Theory (Altman and Taylor 1973), a theory which describes relationships as they change over time, usually becoming deeper as trust is developed and people reveal (in layers) more about their core personality. The model then describes different degrees of reaction to ethical challenges as potential layers of moral dilemma determined by an individual's personal characteristics, reward/cost assessments, and situational factors. So, the most salient moral challenges are those that penetrate to the inner core of the person's personality, causing them to respond. The key aspect of this study is in its description of the tendency of employees to divide issues into more or less salient ethical concerns. But that categorization of an issue is still an individual call. And every individual is different, so what one person may label as a serious concern, another may view as trivial and one is still left guessing as to how they may respond to the same issue.

Along the lines of research centered around the characteristics of the ethical issue itself and how the nature of that issue affects the decision making process is a study conducted by Carlson, Kacmar, and Wadsworth (2002) in which the influence of three of the six tenets of the Jones' (1991) model regarding moral intensity, concentration of effect, probability of effect, and proximity are tested on ethical decision making. The primary thought here is that the characteristics of the issue, whether the impact of the act will be felt by an individual or group, the likelihood the act will cause harm, or whether the decision maker feels close to the focal person, will effect the perceived ethicality of the situation and thus the decision making process. Jones (1991) goes on to state that the decision making process must begin in the recognition of the moral dilemma in an act or failure to act and the dimensions of moral intensity influence every step of the decision making process. The results of the study indicate that only proximity has a significant impact on moral judgment of a situation such that the closer the decision maker felt to the situation, the more the situation is perceived to be an ethical challenge. This particular

study is conducted using college students and not members of management, but it offers valuable and relevant insight for the present discussion on the topic. The model that results from the study conducted by Mc Devitt and Van Hise (2002) shows that individuals respond to different influences as the materiality of an ethical breach increases providing further support that the nature of the response or decision making process is influenced by the perceived nature of the conflict itself.

Another interesting approach toward describing and understanding how managers make ethical judgments is presented in a study conducted by Cole, Sirgy, and Bird (2000) who test propositions presented by Hunt and Vitell (1986-1991) where they model said judgments based on the combination of a deontological and a teleological evaluation. In a deontological evaluation, an individual examines the action itself to determine if it is good or bad. But the teleological evaluation is one centered on the results of the action and if those results are beneficial or not. When faced with an ethical dilemma, a manager will generate alternate reactions and either will evaluate those alternatives as being deontological or teleological. The more desirable the consequences are for a particular alternative, and the more likely those consequences are to occur combined with the relative importance placed on the consequences by the individual determines the teleological evaluation for that action. The results of the study support the central tenets of the Hunt and Vitell model, and managers are found to make judgment calls about ethical challenges based upon the desirability of anticipated consequences of the action. According to the authors, this finding is important because it can be used in training managers to deal with ethical issues by examining the consequences of their actions to themselves and others and by choosing only those actions that offer the greatest benefit to both. But the study is flawed in that it fails to explain the moderating affect of cognitive maturity as a determining factor in making teleological evaluations. The study is based on examining responses to a single ethical dilemma. And cognitive maturity, as a personality trait, should not be examined in the context of only one scenario but across many.

As discussed, a logical approach towards understanding a manager's response to an ethical dilemma is to define and understand the factors that influence behavior. Elm

11

and Nichols (1993) study the impact of the interaction between the ethical climate of the organization and a manager's self-monitoring tendency on their ability for moral reasoning when faced with an ethical issue with surprising results. They find that the level at which a manager reasons through an ethical dilemma is not influenced by the ethical climate of the organization or his or her self monitoring tendencies nor the interaction between the two. Furthermore, their studies show that younger and less experienced managers reason at higher levels in regards to moral issues than do older more experienced managers. On the other hand, Victor and Cullen (1987) as cited in Forte (2004), determine that people learn to fit into their environment by learning the appropriate expected behavior through observation and perception. They state that managers are influenced by the corporate climate and that climate will influence behavior in regards to what problems are considered and the process utilized to deal with those problems.

So what is going on here? It appears there is a conflict in the literature about organizational climate and its affect on employees. Is the actual work environment a key influencer towards a manager's behavior given a certain ethical situation or not? Clearly, the topic is complex and contradictions in prior research exist. More comprehensive work needs to be undertaken to ascertain knowledge about the factors at play when managers make certain kinds of decisions. Relevant questions to elucidate work environment implications as well as individual belief implications need to be asked and responses examined for the insight required to advance our understanding of the topic.

We also know that while context is important, another influential factor is the personal decision making process. Other studies present models that describe the decision making process and the decision determinants. Trevino (1986) offers a model of the thoughts of managers regarding ethical dilemmas and also provides a system of classification for the decision making phenomena which is based on Kohlberg's empirically grounded cognitive moral development model (1969). Trevino's concept is that individual moderators like ego strength, field dependence, locus of control acting in conjunction with situational moderators such as immediate job context, organizational culture, and characteristics of the work upon and individual's cognitions will influence

ethical/unethical behavior. Bommer et al. (1987) presents a model where the decision process acts as a central processing unit with its own internal characteristics such as the individual's cognitive style, type of information acquisition and processing, and perceived levels of loss and reward that influence the decision. Many factors that the previous literature lists as being influential in ethical scenarios are grouped into several categories that must then be mediated by the decision making process itself.

In the study conducted by Holian (2002), approaches to decision making are divided into four categories or modes which are legalistic, entrepreneurial, navigational, and worried. She posits that the differences in decision making associated with the use of different modes are related to generation of options and assessment of expected outcomes. Others suggest that each person's whole ethical system is made up of many subsystems. And because of the various subsystems, people respond differently to similar situations at work (Mc Devitt & Van Hise 2002).

To summarize, it has been sufficiently established that managers encounter a wide range of ethical dilemmas that center around issues of conflicting views between the individual and the organization, managing and maintaining healthy working relationships, and achieving company goals to name a few. Specific managerial tasks, such as hiring and firing personnel and dealing with theft and sexual harassment for example have also been identified as ethical challenges. Manager's ability to identify certain problems as moral and non-moral concerns or to distinguish between ethical and non ethical challenges contributes to the response action towards resolution of the problem. Furthermore, if managers have accurate and clear information regarding the focal issue, they describe the decision making process as being more, straight forward and the problem itself a non-dilemma. To study the decision making process given an ethical dilemma, researchers have either focused on the individual, the situational factors, and to a much lesser extent, the dilemma itself. Individual factors such as personality and cognitive development have been demonstrated to be influential factors in the decision making process. Certain situational factors, organizational climate and size to name two have also been utilized to explain behavior when managers face tough problems at work.

13

The dilemma it self, in conjunction with the perceived risks associated with the dilemma, both contribute to a manager's willingness to positively respond to an ethical situation.

Given this review, we see that factors such as organizational culture, religious background, emotional development and maturity, and ability to identify and manage risks are all important in explaining and predicting manger's thought patterns and actions. Though the literature is rich with information, the short comings in current theory and research underline a lack of a full, clear understanding of the process and necessitate further inquiry.

III. FINDINGS

A.   TYPES OF DILEMMAS

The interviews began with the interviewer offering participants a description of an ethical dilemma. The definition of an ethical dilemma was accepted. No one challenged the definition. The assumption was they understood and had prior experience in facing an ethical dilemma event. The officers interviewed revealed a vast array of experiences in varied level of detail. Out of the three scenarios, they all were easily able to describe two scenarios where they took action in response to an ethical dilemma, but most had a difficult time describing a dilemma where they failed to act.   For example, one officer noted:

> My general nature is to do something. I simply can not think of a dilemma
> that I actually failed to do anything. #450A

Because so many of these officers were readily able to describe in detail numerous dilemmas they had personally encountered and responded to suggested that these kinds of issues occurred frequently and/or were considered a routine part of the job.   The observation that they had difficulty describing scenarios where they did not take action may be indicative of their training to be decisive problem solvers. During the course of several interviews, such training was regularly mentioned overtly or eluded to. But there is a difference between a non ethical and an ethical problem. And the training that was described seemed not particularly suited to decisions of an ethical nature. Another reason for not having as many responses to scenarios for inaction may be an indication of their reluctance to reveal a situation where they didn't know what to do or how to respond to an issue.   As such, they may not have been as willing to provide this information so candidly or unconsciously, such information was not as easily assessable in memory since it was not favorable.

Whether or not they took action, the analysis of issues faced by Supply Corps Officers suggested that the scenarios described can be placed into four general categories, conflict between personal and military values, decision making given partial information,

managing relationships, maintaining accountability of funds. The first category presents a conflict between personal held values and those held by the military itself in which the officer was forced to choose usually between values gained through family upbringing to include religion and values espoused as important to the military as expressed through various rules and regulations. Another general category of dilemma often faced is what to do in a situation given incomplete information about the facts regarding the issue in as much as officers were often placed in decision making moments and found them selves lacking the data to make an informed judgment, but still having to decide on a course of action.   And the third category of dilemmas boiled down to a management of relationships, as military careers were often made or broken based upon the quality of relationships an officer was able to establish.   Any situation that arouse that posed a serious threat to perceived important relationships, either up the chain or down the chain, was a difficult challenge for officers to handle.   The last category was generally about money and the situations these officers found themselves in as the personal, accountable representatives of the government for tracking and spending public funds appropriately.

The study demonstrated that all of these kinds of scenarios influenced officer's ability to act decisively and sometimes resulted in a non-action when clearly action was what was required. But given the sheer vast range of experiences and different responses to various problems, I found it difficult to capture all of the challenges I discovered into four tight categories. However, the various problems surfaced in the careers of these officers at different times during their careers. And no matter what the grade of the officer at the time, the issues were both challenging and caused more than just a moment of pause in determining the preferred course of action.

My interviews with the 40 officers supported the idea of an ethical dilemma being perceived as having no positive outcomes, and all of the officers agreed upon the fact that they often faced these kinds of problems on a daily basis. In a typical comment, one officer speaking of comments made by a member of his department at the time said:

16

My Disbo said to me point blank, If what you go through is my future, I don't want it! He had seen me agonize over those types of problems. He didn't want to face those types of situations. #450A

I describe the four types of dilemmas in more detail next and summarize the evidence for them.

1.   Category I: Conflict between Personal Beliefs and Military Tenants

My analysis revealed that personal values in regards to various issues such as homosexuality and marital infidelity differ from those held by the military, and situations that forced a decision based on one belief versus the other caused significant strain on officers.   The bedroom was still viewed as private domain, so when situations arose which caused officers to intrude upon that domain, there was great reluctance to do so. Even though, the military has very straight forward rules regarding these issues.   One officer stated:

> She was a civilian, he was in the military, there was no chain of command issue there.   It was just immoral and inappropriate, because he was married.   And I guess I had seen enough infidelity in my career at that point that it didn't shock me as much, didn't bother me as much as it should have. #450A

In regards to finding out that a member of his unit was gay, another officer stated:

> I guess I was always under the belief that as long as it didn't affect their job, it didn't affect their performance, then that's nobody's business.   So, but is that right, that that overrode what the military regulation at the time was? #458

This finding suggested that people have their own personal values regarding key issues, such as homosexuality and adultery, and they conflict with those of the military. That made it difficult for them to adhere to the military rules and regulations as to what is right and wrong (ethically) and what level of response should occur when faced with a certain situation. People have their own set of rules and they can direct disengagement rather than action. But the results showed they frequently had to make choices as issues of how one member of the team personally lived their lives became a matter upon which

17

another officer had to determine whether or not to act upon. This was a continual reoccurrence in the interviews.

In addition to the previously mentioned issues, fraternization also came up often as a potentially challenging situation in which officers had to decide between their own personal beliefs about people who they should socialize with, and military rules. Officers who perceived themselves as "cool" and who wanted to be perceived by others as "cool" had a difficult time avoiding social situations with enlisted personnel. Often times the enlisted personnel were in the same age group, ethnic group, or from the same geographic part of the country, so there was a natural connection between the officer and the enlisted which led to social inclinations. One officer stated:

> It's a non-command function, a non-divisional function, and they thought that—a lot of these guys, first-class and chiefs—they thought that hey, he's cool. Let's invite him out to hang out with us… And I did go for a short period of time, to one bar, had two or three drinks, and then I was gone after that. I could have continued on with my command not saying nothing at all. #459

Even though the rules were explicitly written, close, friendly working relationships did sometimes create the tendency to want to socialize outside of work. And for some officers, avoiding those situations was troublesome. It was especially difficult for officers who happened to be the only one of their race or gender at the command. Enlisted members of the same race felt inclined to get to know the officer. This added another dynamic to the issue of fraternization. The officer felt obligated to demonstrate a commonality or a familiarity with those particular members. This made it even more difficult to avoid the appearance of fraternization or favoritism, while trying to be a trusted counsel. An officer described the situation like this:

> And after two port visits, the XO called me into his stateroom and basically said that I was , uh, displaying inappropriate behavior toward the enlisted personnel, particularly the…the young black, uh, personnel. Basically, he told me that that had to stop. It was a dilemma because I thought I was doing something right to help them, and at the same time, I was accused of doing something wrong. #455

18

The Navy also has strict rules regarding its policies on dealing with alcohol related issues, especially DUI violations. These rules have evolved over the years and many military members have run into problems with trying to help others deal with these kinds of violations or trying to get out of a situation themselves. An officer describing a dilemma he had to deal with in this regard had this to say:

> But for both of us, it would have been more of a moral thing, or an ethical thing. If he would have kept it silent and just between us; me, that person, and the city. The Navy would have had on its hands a situation where the person whom we found out had a problem with alcohol would not have--- who would not have identified that problem. # 460

2.   Category II: Decision Making Given Partial Information

The second category of dilemmas involved situations where the officers didn't have all the information needed for action or that information was not clear or complete. Many situations came up that fit this description, where the essence of the dilemma was that the interviewee thought something should be done, but felt strained in making a decision because they could not "put all the pieces to the puzzle together". In discussing a situation where a superior officer handed in his measurements for the Navy's physical readiness test vice actually getting measured by the coordinator in accordance with proper procedure, one officer said

> It's a dilemma because of the morale of the command. I mean, it's all about standards! He's not within the standards, but here he is trying to pass his self as if he was. I guess it turned into a dilemma for me because I'm sitting here weeks after the weigh-in, should I say something or shouldn't I, and how do I know..? I don't have proof that he really did get measured. I believed the ensign, but the fact was I simply didn't know what happened. #451

Similarly, another officer caught in a situation where he suspected his Captain was making fraudulent phone calls to sustain an adulterous relationship reported:

> And I had a suspicion that maybe he had something going on with this woman, but I didn't have any evidence to suggest that these calls were unbusiness like, that they were personal. Picture a jigsaw puzzle with four or five pieces, and a different officer, each has a piece, and we can't understand the whole picture, we just see a piece of the picture. #450A

When speaking of a particular situation he faced at his first command in which he had to decide whether to advise his CO to not accept an invitation to an elaborate and expensive dinner extended by the husbanding agent who was counting on the CO to later give a recommendation about his services , this officer had this to say:

> Even though it was a personal feeling, it was a gut feeling on my part. It was in the performance of my professional duties that I was offering my advice. I thought maybe that there might be retribution based on he wants to do something, I recommend against it. # 462

The data suggest that officers were frequently placed in an uncomfortable position where they felt like something was not quite right, but they did not have all the information to decide what to do, but a decision had to be made. In particular, with situations involving wrongful actions of others in which only partial information was known about the issue, especially the actions of those of a superior rank than the interviewee, respondents reported having difficulty managing those situations. In contrast, if the officer had enough information or could research the problem enough to gather enough information, it appeared as if the issue was not nearly as difficult to handle, and in many cases just became a routine decision vice an ethical dilemma.

3. Category III: Managing Relationships

Dilemmas involving professional and personal relationships were the third category. They were dilemmas because the relationships frequently determined success or failure in their current jobs or contributed to future assignments. As a result, any problem that required an action that could tarnish a perceived important relationship caused strain and became an ethical dilemma. The existence of the relationship was not a problem, but resolving the ethical challenge given that the relationship existed and was vital for the decision maker's success was. In these situations, officers perceived themselves as "caught between a rock and hard place".   Often the perceived right thing to do had severe consequences attached to it, and the dilemma could not easily be resolved.   One officer, while describing a problem he faced with a husbanding agent over seas in which he felt the agent was overcharging for services he provided, put it like this:

People who have been in that situation understand that you have to rely on that husbanding agent. I mean, these are really where the ethics come in, I think. You rely on them for almost everything at all these port visits. So you always feel like you're balancing a fine line, do I challenge him on this? Where those are ethics? It sets boundaries on my forcefulness of action. That was always in the back of my mind. #458

Similarly, another officer discussed a dilemma that occurred when he had to make a decision that may have affected an important relationship:

Um, at first when all I was aware of was inappropriate telephone use, the risk was straining our working relationship. The level of abuse I didn't think was great enough to take the risk. #450A

Examine what another officer had to say about dealing with a situation in which one of his guys tested positive for drug use:

By having that one person, the CO gets to know that person on a different level than any other guys within the division, he builds up kind of a relationship with that person. And this situation caused a little more conflict in that relationship, because it kind of biased his opinion of this person. Because I know that the CO called me up and told me that this couldn't be the same person. Something must be wrong. We might need to retest. Because he didn't want to accept the fact that this occurred. So it was a very difficult situation. # 460

Clearly in the previous examples, the original problem stemmed from the behavior of the presumed guilty party. The intensity of the ethical dilemma was increased due to the nature and importance of the relationship between that party and the interviewee. The term "whistle blower" only came up once in the interviews, but being placed in that position caused a great deal of strain for these officers, especially when the guilty party was a close peer or supervisor. For example, when determining whether or not to turn in a friend who tried to charge the Navy for a huge phone bill wrongfully accumulated due to personal use of the internet for downloading porn, one officer said this:

My dilemma was do I be a team player here and stick with my buddy, or do I be a team player and do the right thing for the command? I would say that I was torn between loyalty to a shipmate and knowing what was the right thing to do. # 480A

21

Still other dilemmas can be more of an internal nature. An officer struggling to find a workable management style with the rest of his department after catching his postal clerk who just so happened to be pregnant at the time stealing money using the ship's money orders said this:

> It might only be a small area, but the whole supply department knew that they got painted with that paintbrush in my eyes. I didn't yell at them, I got my senior enlisted and said "Hey, you guys now gotta convince me that there's no other problem. # 478

### 4.	Category IV: Maintaining Accountability for Public Funds

Supply Officers are business managers and many of the kinds of problems they encountered dealt with accounting for public funds in the way of inventories (spare parts), merchandise, and money (cash). Issues with missing inventory, money, or unbalanced books were the fourth category. Determining the right course of action was often difficult because often times the options for resolving the problem involved severe risk to the officer's reputation as a knowledgeable professional and to the officer's career development. One officer stated:

> Um, the dilemma was that here I am, been in this job for about two years, you think that I know all the ins and outs, how everything is run, and they pretty much knew how everything was run, but the problem just eluded me. I just could not figure this amount. And there was the issue of going ahead and just being honest and saying, yes, we've been looking, we just can not find it. Or just cover it up and make it go away. #463

Another officer had this to say:

> What we closed out with and what the books showed we should have had did not match for months. That's when I started auditing the MS3 who was the records keeper. It's all about accountability. Granted I'm not the one touching the money, closing out, and writing everything down. But I'm the one accountable. So that's why it was a dilemma. We didn't balance! And it's the end of the year! Wow. I'm going to have to explain myself to the big dog. #451

The rules for dealing with these kinds of issues were well known. When discussing problems of this nature, officer's frequently began the dialogue by saying something like "the rules say to do this when you encounter this." But even though they could quote the

rule, they often had difficulty following it. The greatest deterrent for executing procedure as written seemed to be a desire to avoid the consequences of a loss in financial accountability.

To sum, I found that the dilemmas that officer's described were problems involving difficult choices related to the perceived risks involved and the options for resolution. The dilemmas fell into one of four categories: 1.conflict between personal and organizational values; 2. decision making situation with lack of data; 3. managing important relationships; and 4. financial accountability. Though centered on different circumstances, all of the dilemmas required that officers make tough choices that not only affected the lives of others, but their own as well.

Table 1.   Four Categories of Ethical Dilemmas Faced by Supply Officers

Category	Description
Category One - Conflict personal and military values	Situation in which personal views oppose military views
Category Two – Decision making scenario where necessary data unknown	Decision has to be made, yet decision maker lacks required information to make an informed decision
Category Three – Managing working relationships	Situation involving a threat to important working relationships
Category Four – Financial accountability	Situation involving loss of money(inventory)

B.   WHAT CONTRIBUTED TO DECISION TO ACT/INACTION

Each individual differed in his or her ability and willingness to think through the situation, identify and measure the risks involved, communicate with others the facts and their feelings regarding the situation, and then ultimately make a decision and act. But the key findings for this research is the identification of what the individuals had in common, because based upon those commonalities, we can best determine how to motivate managers to respond on a consistent and positive bases. The thoughts that

generally preceded action were thoughts of self, thoughts of others, and the risks involved for both sets of parties as a function of who was the focal point of the dilemma and the nature of the dilemma. The emotions that generally preceded action/inaction often indicated the direction the participant was going to go in response to the dilemma. Next, the actions taken before the decision on what to do was made were important. And then finally, the nature of the dilemma itself was an influential factor in the decision to act. Although the main contributors to the decision to act fell into these four categories, content and context of cognitive reflections, ability to leverage negative emotion, willingness to build a case for action, I found it impossible to examine these categories of the respondent's behavior without linking that examination to the nature of the dilemma, who was involved in the dilemma, and the perceived risks in the various alternatives for resolving the dilemma, because more often than not, the nature of the dilemma influenced the thoughts, feelings, and actions surrounding it.

1. Category I: Content and Context of Cognitive Reflections

What the interviewees thought about in regards to dealing with the situation indicated how they framed and perceived the dilemma. To elaborate, my findings suggested that when officers described their thoughts upon initial realization of the problem, they often talked about themselves and how the dilemma affected them, but they also talked about how the dilemma affected the other people involved. Sometimes that discussion presented a balanced view of thoughts for self and others. Sometimes the view was unbalanced and one train of thought was at the forefront while the other was more of an after thought. For example when deciding what to do about seeing a member of his unit engaged in homosexual behavior at a theme park away from work, one officer remarked:

> If I told my boss and I was wrong, do I risk credibility. And for the sailor, he could have been found guilty, and even if he wasn't found guilty, I think it would have some sort of repercussions as far as how he's dealt with, with other people on the ship. And I wasn't willing to risk this kid's career and everything that, all the repercussions that might occur after I came forward. # 454

24

I assume if one was able to see a problem from many sides, then he or she should have been able to make a more informed decision about what to do. Officers appeared to sometimes think about the other person and how the Navy rules or the situation in general would affect the other person, and when those kinds of human aspects entered into their thinking, varied results occurred. In deciding whether to immediately report a four million dollar discrepancy found during an inventory of a storeroom filled with high value parts, this officer said the following:

> Up to this point, we had been 100% validity, and then in the last storeroom there were 14 aviation DLRs that were missing that totaled about 4.5 million. The actual dilemma I faced was do I bring this to my Captain's attention? If so, when? And if I find the DLRs prior to telling my supervisor, do I even bring the issue up? And that was real tough for me, because again, the person responsible for this particular store room was the number one E-6 onboard the ship. I felt that particular situation, that whatever I decided, If I decided to come forward with the information, that he would take a big hit in his credibility on the ship. As I said, this guy was pretty much carrying the load for me in that particular division. I guess the biggest thing was I felt bad for the guy. #454

This finding was also associated with certain situations, for example, when the focal person was the "number one" person on the ship, department, or division, there was more of a tendency for the officer to sympathize or empathize or see the dilemma from that person's point of view and not want to act to hurt that person's career. Comments like "this is a good guy and he works hard, and perhaps as the number one sailor on the ship, she had too many responsibilities" indicated that officers can rationalize their own behavior based on the reputation, performance, command ranking of the focal person in the dilemma. A good example of this kind of thinking can be found in this officer's comments about deciding how to deal with a subordinate breaking certain rules about using the government purchase card:

> Um, do I want to make an example of this guy? Take him to the Captain's Mast? What would that do for him? He's a big guy. He was a good guy, he was personable, he works hard, he was always fair, and he's always there when you need him. So I didn't really want to discipline him, or be strict with them. So I said we're going to do it this way. The Master Chief with 20 some-odd years, doing this, went on to become the Fleet Master Chief. He was a good guy again. # 480A

This officer commented on his petty officer who tested positive for drugs during a surprise urinalysis:

> This one individual was one of my best guys. He was my go-to guy, the one that I could depend on to get the job done. We had a few people that were still a little new to the situation. Didn't have the type of knowledge and abilities that this person did. It was something that I would have never expected of him, from him. And it placed me and the chain of command in a very delicate situation, where we were going to be without this person in the very near future, because of the Navy's zero-tolerance for drugs. # 460

In addition to the kinds of thoughts previously mentioned, officers also tended to reflect upon their own lives, careers, and personal experiences as well as those of the other stakeholders involved in the situation when faced with an ethical dilemma. They thought about previous challenges that they witnessed or were personally involved in and they thought about factors involved in those situations and the ramifications of actions to people involved. They compared those situations to the ones they currently were involved with to get an indication of what they should do. An officer recounting a scenario where he was being pressed by his Commanding Officer to spend operational funds for non operational items said this:

> I thought of an instance in the previous deployment where I had to tell the Captain that we can't use OPTAR to buy a crew morale item like ribbons or books, and certain other things overseas where actually at the time there was like a special satellite for television overseas. In that instance we utilized an alternative route. # 479B

By having the previous experience with the Captain and reflecting back to the situation, the officer was able to come up with some ideas about how to approach the current situation that he was dealing with. He was able to identify some additional resources that could help him out, and he had the benefit of having gone through this process before and could draw on the previous experience of trying to convince his Captain that he could not use that money in the way he wanted to.

Other comments about reflecting upon previous experiences to deal with the present went like this:

26

Like I said, I looked at my past experience in the Navy. I looked at what the causes and effects were for this type of situation. I reached into my ethical ideals about it. My morals. My background. I guess as a Christian and a person. And decided that my best course of action would be to let the system play out as it deemed necessary. # 460

Another officer had this to say:

And for me, uh, I'd been involved—in the university setting, I'd been involved in witnessing a cheating incident. And making a call. Earlier on, this was five or six years removed from that. But I made where I thought at the time was a tough call to turn in somebody based on their action at the time. And I kind of used that, and the past incident, in addition to the training that we received, to again ground myself to appearance of impropriety, and yeah, that's enough, I need to bring it up to the skipper. # 462

Interestingly enough, only two officers mentioned prior ethics training as being one of the things they reflected back upon to help them deal with a present situation. That could be an indication of the quality of the training received by these officers. Or that could indicate the value that the officers placed on the information received from the training.

These officers not only think about previous scenarios they have witnessed, they also think about the focal person's past performance and reputation. Similar to before, these thoughts were not self centered; the focus is on others. One officer commented:

I took a look at the past as far as the actions of the guys that were involved. Took a look at their history and so forth to see, and I took a look at my situation, if ever I put myself in situations where something could have went wrong, would I get in trouble for it, or would there be some ramification? That's why---I won't say that's why I decided, but I said it's better to be safe. # 459

And regarding another incident, the same officer put it like this:

Um. I thought about—not necessarily my past, but I thought about the past of the person who brought the pictures in. This person had a particular, she had been in trouble several times before for different things, and she

27

was making headway to improve her reputation and so forth. So I thought about her past, not necessarily about anything that I had done in the past. # 459

When placed in a situation of having to decide what to do about a crew member who was picked up for a DUI, an officer stated the following:

> Well, in this situation, I knew the person. I knew that the only way that this problem would be addressed properly was by informing the military who I knew would chastise the individual, but in the process would also seek to help the individual. # 460

Also, one of the biggest things that officers thought about was command climate. What was the tone of the working environment? How were mistakes and variant points of views tolerated? How did the supervisor receive bad news? These were the kinds of questions that they asked themselves and the answers they used to judge how they should respond to a certain situation. For example, this particular officer noted:

> And I think for this particular incidence you look at the culture that you're working in, the environment that you're working on that particular ship. I had been on this ship for two and a half years already, and knew the type of culture and climate we were working in. So the climate definitely dictated how I …what standards or how I react to certain situations. # 454

And another officer said this:

> I think,uh, just the decisions I'd seen him make as the Commanding Officer had been pretty rational up to that point. He wasn't the type to fly off the handle, and just do something on emotional grounds. I don't think that would have changed my actions. But it would have changed my apprehension level about some retribution that might have been forthcoming. # 462

The command climate in a military unit is primarily a function of the personality and standards set by the Commanding Officer. Often when these officers spoke about their thoughts of the command climate, they were really talking about the CO and what kind of standards he or she used to run the ship or unit. Officers often spoke of basing their behavior in regards to different situations on the "command norm" which was

largely dictated by the CO and immediate chain of command. Further evidence of this kind of thinking can be found in this officer's comments:

> These were all good officers above me. So I felt that if I put my stake in the ground and stood on the regulations, or how I read the regulations, I thought that they were rational decision makers. And nothing bad would happen. # 462

Also, when officers talked about their thoughts, they often spoke about their perception of who they were. How they see themselves in the present was one of the more influential thoughts weighing on their minds. This officer said it like this:

> I approach the leadership responsibility, is as a covenant between the leader and the subordinate. And there's a commitment there. I wasn't about to break that trust making an artificial scenario O.K. just because people wanted it for a PR ploy. My subordinates knew that I'd stand up for them, and I'd stand up for what was right! But by the same token, they had to act appropriately. # 462

Officers also thought about the ramifications and potential results of their action, good or bad, due to their response. My analysis indicated that some officers spent a good deal of time thinking about how they would be perceived if they acted a certain way. How would their supervisors, peers, or subordinates view them? They also spent a considerable amount of time going through the potential outcomes to any number of possible alternative courses of action. One officer stated:

> I was thinking about the precedent it would set if I succumbed to a request that was unethical or not the right decision to make. If it wasn't
>
> legal then I needed to make sure I stood firm because in future if I bend or didn't make the right decision, then it could set a precedent for me doing it in the future. # 480A

Future consequences of present actions weighed heavily in the minds of the respondents. They said things like:

> If we would have stepped in and absolved him, or tried to say that the test would have been wrong, I think that would have sent the wrong kind of message out to the crew. Saying that, like I said before, if you're an outstanding worker, do a good job, and are well-liked by the chain of

command, we will go above and beyond what we should do to make sure that you're cared for. Now that is what we want to do, but when it comes to breaking rules that we know that we shouldn't do in that situation, that's a dilemma that can be a moral and ethical challenge. # 460

Then, in the future, I think, in this case, the future is really what was key. Because in the future, how could I look my subordinate in the eye and again, ask him to enforce those rules for everyday people, when I'd just said "NO, it's O.K. for the special circumstance." So the future in this case was, I think, a pretty big one. # 462

Many times, the driving motivation to act was the thought that if they didn't do something at the time the problem occurred, this issue could come back to haunt them and be even worse. Many officers exhibited a "nip it in the bud" type mentality when trying to figure out what to do about the tough challenges they encountered. An example of such thinking can be found in these comments:

I knew that if I didn't say anything, then more than likely no one would have known anything. But by not reacting, by not saying anything, just in the back of my head I was thinking, hey, something probably would have come up again later and this situation would have come back to haunt me, and I probably would have gotten it handed to me later. #460

To sum, it seems that officers focus on various aspects of the scenario when determining how to proceed. The focus of their cognitive concern is relevant to the way they frame the issue. And the way that they frame the issue will influence the action taken. The results present a wide range of thoughts (selfish vs. non selfish, past experience vs. present situation, etc.), but the vastness of the content does not demean the importance of the finding. For if we can understand and comprehend the range of possibilities, we can move to create boundaries and direct the thoughts that lead to positively responding to these kinds of problems.

2. Category II: Leveraging Negative Emotions

Although officers were able to describe the feelings they felt upon recognition of the problem and throughout the decision making process, they used limited and less vivid terms to do so. The emotions were apparently there, but either the willingness to talk about them or deal with them was not. A few key feelings, did however, keep coming up

throughout the interviews. In particular, officers talked about feelings of anger, loneliness, fear, and being conflicted.

Anger frequently surfaced as the dominant emotion during the scenario. When something happened that put the officers in an uncomfortable position, anger resulted. I heard comments like these:

> Uh, I was a little bit angry at the supply chain of command. Just because they let the word filter down that this was going to happen. But in this specific situation, I thought they'd sort of turned a blind eye to it. Sort of, you know, this is a special situation, we're going to go ahead and we're going to forget about the rules here. So I was a little bit angry, up the chain of command, to be honest. # 462

Officers sometimes felt lonely or described feeling "out on a limb" when they acted to resolve a problem or as they were working towards a resolution. This feeling was expressed as uncomfortable and not particularly desirable. It came across in our discussions like this:

> Yeah, definitely it's not a comfortable zone to be in! So even though there was that no-man's land of –it wasn't personal doubt, but it was definitely aloneness in knowing that the decision could go either way, and again, had I presented everything the way I meant to? I was not eager to get into a situation like that again! But by the same token, if it presented itself, I thought I could probably make a similar decision. # 462

Other comments were:

> It was hanging yourself out there and almost waiting for the other shoe to fall. Emotion was definitely "Hey, I'm sticking myself out there again! And the loneliness. How is it all going to play out. # 479B

Fear as an emotion felt during the dilemma frequently surfaced. The fear was often associated with the thought of pursuing unpleasant options to their anticipated negative ends. It was fear of retribution or being wrong about certain inclinations and assumptions. It was also fear of getting involved in some cases and having to deal with the issues associated with it. And it was at times, simply the fear of being fired. One officer said it like this:

Yes. I could have possibly been fired. Could have been implicated in some kind of criminal investigation or something, or one of my guys that worked for me could have. I really never did consider that maybe one of them had done something illegal. So I was very afraid. #463

So, officers described feeling several negative emotions when faced with an ethical dilemma. None of the interviewees described a positive emotional response to a dilemma, though they did talk about feelings of joy, pride, and relief after the problem was resolved. The anger, fear, and anxiety often contributed to the decision to act in one way or another which largely depended upon the individual's ability to deal with their own emotions.

3.   Category III: Willingness to Build a Case for Action

The decision to act was often times affected by the officer's actions that preceded their decision. In other words, the officer's decision making process included a relatively small set of behaviors to gather more information about the problem, discover and sort through any potential options, or simply get a fresh point of view on the matter and exchange thoughts with someone either directly or indirectly involved with the dilemma. I classified this as the "gathering evidence" stage as the officer tried to build a case for what he or she should do. Once the problem surfaced, officers understood the situation to be more than just a normal problem but an actual dilemma. And as such, the dilemma required additional problem solving techniques to resolve. One of the bigger issues was with working through all the options and determining the risks. One officer stated:

I basically do what I still do today. I wrote down the pros and cons of my actions if I did one thing or the other and the pros outweighed the cons, so that is why I decided to go back and talk with the XO after he had called me into his office. # 455

Another officer put it like this:

I took all the inputs and I weighed the consequences plus I identified the outcomes of two scenarios, one if I did the right thing, and one if I did the wrong thing. And it was simple for me. I identified that, hey, this is the right thing to do based on all my research, and this is what they want, and it would be wrong to do it, and I presented the options to the Captain who was the ultimate authority. # 479B

32

The act of actually writing down the pros and cons of the options to resolve a problem is an indication of recognition that something needed to be done in response to the dilemma. Figuring out what to do or if to do anything at all was the issue. Officers indicated having the need to make a decision through other actions as well. Often times, they sought counsel from mentors, other officers, or even spouses and significant others.

When the focal person in the dilemma was the boss or a close peer that was suspected of some wrong doing, officers showed a tendency to avoid taking the necessary actions to confirm or refute their suspicions. One officer stated:

> And I had a suspicion that maybe he had something going on with this woman, but I didn't have any evidence to suggest that these calls were unbusinesslike, that they were personal. But I thought it was interesting, unusual. But I didn't feel compelled to act—yet. # 450A

The point here is that in situations where officers become aware of a potential problem, they may or may not desire to act to determine if there really is a problem or not depending on the focal person for the dilemma. Additionally and regardless of the focal person, some officers expressed a desire to simply avoid the "hassle" of conducting the necessary fact finding to get the information needed to make a decision.

4. Category IV: Nature of the Dilemma

All dilemmas are not alike. They differ in how they can be resolved, who is involved, and the consequences that may occur as a result of actions taken. Consideration of these factors made a marked difference in the behavior of the decision maker. Situations perceived to have potentially harmful results to the decision maker's career caused the officer to be concerned about losing their job or of getting poor fitness reports. This in turn affected their choices for handling certain situations. And dilemmas that potentially could hurt a co-worker's career also weighed heavily on their minds. The point here is that officers demonstrated a tendency to act if the perceived consequences of their actions were acceptable. One officer noted:

> I was the junior officer of the watch on board, under the OOD. And were at night on the way back from Puerto Rico to port in Florida, and I'm on watch, standing my watch as I've been taught to do. And I come into the bridge to find the OOD asleep. Not just a little nap, I mean out. The lives

33

of all the crew members on that ship are in our hands. But more directly, his. And here he is, asleep. On watch! But It's like I just said, I guess I was in a position where I didn't want to cause any turmoil or conflicts so I just said, O.K., let me pick up the slack and be more vigilant on my watch and make sure that nothing does occur. #463

Another officer noted:

I would say that I was torn between loyalty to a shipmate and knowing what was the right thing to do. But I just felt strange turning in a friend. I would say that I felt sorry for him, because I know there was going to be career ending. #480A

This officer commented:

If I was wrong, it would have gotten out to the ship, and it would have made life incredibly difficult for this individual, and that's not something I wanted to be responsible for without having all the facts. #454

These results clearly indicate that these officer's actions were influenced by their perception of the outcome of a particular option for resolving the issue. That perception happened to be negative, so the officers avoided the action. And so it was with the other aspects of the dilemma. If the boss was involved and the officer didn't want to confront the boss, then they simply avoided action unless forced to act by other circumstances. So the nature of the dilemma itself was indeed a critical influencer of action.

Table 2.   Factors That Contribute to Decision to Act

Category	Description
Category One – Content and context of cognitive reflections	Represented by the cognitive focus (self vs. non self, past vs. present)
Category Two – Ability to leverage negative emotions	Represented by ability to identify emotions and allow emotions to trigger action
Category Three – Willingness to build a case for action	Represented by propensity to investigate, gather information, and discuss dilemma
Category Four – Nature of the dilemma itself	Represented by stakeholders involved, anticipated consequences, and perceptions of options for resolution

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. DISCUSSION

A. HOW THEMES RELATE TO EXISTING THEORY

The primary aim of this study was to learn about and explore ethical dilemmas in the military workplace and the factors that influence action or inaction to resolve these problems. The findings have face validity with and provide support for previous research identifying dilemmas that managers face as involving conflict between personal and organizational beliefs, issues with working relationships, achieving organizational goals, and financial accountability among others.

Interestingly, however, the findings indicate that the range of experiences and problems encountered are so vast, it is very difficult to capture them all and sort them into a few simple categories. In particular, the very nature of the military itself, in that it is very rule based, often caused a dilemma when the person came up against one of those rules and had to decide whether or not to follow the rule or find an acceptable "loophole" to avoid it. But at least in those situations, there was a rule that delineated the right procedure to follow given a certain circumstance. My findings suggest that having a rule or guidelines did not necessarily make resolving the problem any easier than if there were no guidelines. Rules did not necessarily affect the officer's perception of whether the issue was an ethical dilemma or not.

B. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Using the definitions of an ethical dilemma provided in the literature by scholars like Badaracco (1998), Sekerka and Bagozzi (2004), McDevitt and Van Hise (2002), I began my study with the assumption that an ethical dilemma involves tough choices that have consequences for self and others. This assumption is based on previous research that suggest that managers in the public and private sectors face problems dealing with issues that go above and beyond the trivial and routine. This study supports the idea that issues related to working relationships, promotion, retention, fraternization, discrimination (race and sexual orientation based), financial decisions, etc, are viewed by managers as ethical dilemmas. My findings also extend previous research by identifying

37

other specific scenarios perceived as dilemmas in the unique organizational setting of the U.S. Navy. Further, I would argue that the kinds of dilemmas experienced by the managers that I studied are a considerably richer resource for understanding decision making and moral action.

Research about decision making in response to ethical dilemmas generally focuses on the influence of personal and organizational forces upon the decision maker. The personal influences typically at play are work experience (Kohlberg, 1969; McCoy, 1983; Rest, 1979; and Wright, 1995), personal ethical disposition, age (Kohut & Corriher, 1994), personality and cognitive development (Trevino, 1986) to name a few. My findings provide evidence to support work experience, particularly experience with making ethical decisions, as a major factor in influencing reasoning given a moral challenge. Specifically, I found that an officer's ability to reason through a dilemma and decide on a course of action significantly improves with experience. This implies that age is a factor. It seems that wisdom increases with age, and the older an officer is, the better equipped they feel to handle these kinds of problems.

A significant number of these officers describe themselves as either being a Christian or having some sort of religious background or upbringing. They credit their religious exposure with providing them a moral compass by which to judge the various implications associated with the problems they face at work. They often express definite thoughts about right and wrong (black and white thinking) and tend to avoid seeing issues as grey. This way of viewing problems hints at a level of moral sensitivity. And the evidence seems to indicate that moral sensitivity is at least a factor that should be considered when attempting to predict behavior in ethical situations.

Beyond the personal attributes that may or may not influence the decision maker are the organizational influences. These influences can include command climate, command size, nature of the work being done, etc. My findings suggest that moral reasoning by officers is a complex process that can be influenced by the command climate. Every ship, every unit, every command is different and in order to fit in, officers describe a tendency to adjust behavior to match that of the organization at large. Whatever the set standard for the command, the officer would attempt to assimilate.

Those standards apply to how problems are identified and handled. If the command, specifically the Commanding Officer, has high standards in regard to personnel issues, then problems concerning employees are given greater consideration and the reasoning utilized to resolve those problems tended to be of a higher quality. I view this finding as consistent with and supportive of the research conducted by Victor and Cullen (1987) regarding the affects of corporate climate on behavior. This evidence does not support the findings of Elm and Nichols (1993) who argued that command climate does not influence moral reasoning of the managers at the command.

My findings also affirm research on how social norms derived from organizational climate (as directed and set by leadership) influence moral reasoning. Officers take cues about what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior from the Commanding Officer himself. The Commanding Officer is a figure unlike many others that you will find in corporate America. He is part father, role model, judge and jury in mast cases at sea. So how that person deals with problems, accepts bad news, and reacts to uncertainty will trickle down into the behavioral pattern of his junior officers. When the Commanding Officer was unapproachable or greets bad news with screams and shouts, that affects the way some officers dealt with problems. Officers tend to base their behavior upon the expected behavior of the Captain.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, my findings suggest that the dilemma itself (including all the attributes of the issue) influences moral reasoning. Officers report responding differently to problems depending on who is involved, risks and potential consequences involved, and nature of the available options to resolve the problem. Specifically, I found that officers assess a problem based on risks to themselves and others, based on likely hood of achieving desired or undesired results, and based on probability of problem getting worse with time or coming back around and having to be addressed at a later time with even more dyer risks at play. This finding is consistent with and supportive of the research conducted by Jones (1991) in which he posits that the characteristics of the dilemma will effect the perceived ethicality of the situation and thus the decision making process.

C.   PROPOSITIONS

While the decision making process for responding to ethical challenges is complex, there are relevant clues as to what factors are at play in such situations and how those factors can be manipulated to generate a response. The first consideration for predicting or examining a response should be the nature of the dilemma itself as perceived by the decision maker. The value placed on the stakeholders (people involved) as well as the materiality of the potential consequences of actions will influence the emotions felt during the scenario, the willingness to exercise a higher lever of cognitive discernment regarding the scenario, and the willingness to research for information, thus ultimately influencing course of action. Taken together, this information leads me to propose the following:

> Proposition 1:   If the dilemma involves a situation of conflict between personal and organizational values, the desire to act is influenced by feelings for anticipated consequences.

For instance, if the decision maker has strong views about other people's sexual preferences being their own business, then they may not feel comfortable taking actions that will get a homosexual employee fired.

> Proposition 2: If the dilemma involves a situation where the decision maker has to act but does not have all the information to do so, the desire to act and the decision to act are influenced by the individual's willingness to build a case for action. If the information is limited but the individual wants to build a case for action and does so, he or she is more likely to act.

Here, the decision maker takes action before he actually decides what to do about the dilemma. The subtlety is in the fact that I have separated the actions into two steps in the process- acting to get more information to support a decision and then acting on the dilemma itself. For example, if a manager suspects a co-worker of wasting or abusing company property, but does not have all the evidence required to make a decision about what to do, he could dismiss it altogether or he could take actions to verify his suspicion. Then once he has built a case or he has the information required, the dilemma is how to handle it from that point. If a manager is unwilling to build a case for action, for whatever reason, then he or she is less likely to act.

Proposition 3: If the dilemma involves a situation where an important relationship (with boss, peer, or subordinate) is threatened, individuals experience negative emotions, and the decision to act is influenced by the perceived egregiousness of the focal person's actions.

For instance, if the boss gets caught doing something illegal and the primary option for resolving that problem involves direct confrontation with the boss, the decision maker tends to have negative emotions associated with pursuing that course of action. But if the offense is perceived to be too great to be ignored, then action can result despite the negative emotions.

Proposition 4: If the dilemma involves a loss of accountability, the decision to act is influenced by the individual's personal integrity and ability to handle criticism/punishment.

For instance, if the decision maker is supposed to have $50,000 in his safe and he counts his money and there is only $49,900 and he can't find the other $100, he may be tempted to use his own money and replace the missing $100. The tendency to act in such a manner is strongly dependent upon the integrity of the individual and how much he or she fears retribution for their mistakes, especially as it concerns key issues of their career.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V.   CONCLUSION

A.   LIMITATIONS

Although a qualitative analysis allows a researcher to learn a great deal about a topic of inquiry, the sample size may generally prohibit making broad generalizations about the total population based upon information gathered from the small sample size. This is certainly the case with this study. Forty officers were interviewed, but due to time and other resource constraints, a sample of fifteen was chosen from the original set for this study. There may be more useful data in the other twenty five interviews and future studies should consider the entire data set.

My primary objective was to gain a better understanding of ethical dilemmas in the workplace via critical incident interviews, but the limitations created by imperfect recall due to the passage of time could have affected the data that I collected. Furthermore, leaps of abstraction were made based upon my observations and experience, but not familiarity with the literature from the field of social psychology. Therefore, my associations and links of causality are all hypothetical.

B.   RECOMMENDATIONS

Presently most models of decision making behavior deal primarily with the individual himself (personal attributes) or the situational variables or the two combined. But it is apparent that the depiction of the process based upon those variables alone is less valuable and accurate as one that includes a depiction of the scenario it self. So I recommend that any further research to describe the phenomena include this very valuable influential component. Furthermore, a goal of future researchers should be to determine which elements are most relevant for certain categories of dilemmas. The knowledge of these factors can pay huge dividends in training managers to positively act to resolve ethical challenges at work.

Perception is reality as it relates to a manager's response to an ethical dilemma. Those better able to perceive and articulate the perplexities of the dilemma, are better able to deal with that dilemma. Experience with making tough decisions is accepted as

helpful, especially by the participants of this study, with particular benefit to one's ability to recognize stakeholders, options, and potential ramifications associated with the dilemma. Younger managers and officers don't have that experience to draw upon, so often their process towards resolution is more troubled. My recommendation is that organizations (training and work) use more case based training (specific to the organization) to artificially increase experience level and to help all managers better deal with the problems they face. The cases should be realistic and the intent should be to get the manager to feel the emotions that would be associated with a given situation. Then press him to make a decision and talk about the ramifications of the decision he or she made. That will give the young manager experience with making tough decisions before they are encountered.

It is apparent that officers need emotional intelligence training in their preparatory programs to help them manage their emotions as they deal with problems in the workplace. Officers experience difficulty expressing themselves where their emotions are concerned, yet their emotions weighed heavily upon their decisions to act given an ethical challenge. More work needs to be done in this area to empower officers to explore their emotions (positive and negative), reflect upon them, and then use to achieve moral action.

C. CONCLUSION

Using qualitative analysis, this study discovered that the kinds of dilemmas faced by Supply Corps Officers fall into four categories, conflicts between personal and military values, decision making scenario where necessary data is unknown, managing working relationships, and financial accountability. The factors that affect the decision to act also can be sorted into four categories, content and context of cognitive reflections, ability to leverage negative emotions, willingness to build a case for action, and nature of the dilemma itself. The paper concludes by offering four theoretical propositions that link the decision to act to a particular type of dilemma.

Management has the responsibility of inspiring creativity, performance, excellence, and integrity in its employees. Managers set the standard for ethical behavior largely through their actions and decisions when faced with morally challenging

dilemmas. Based upon the results of this study, it is my assertion that they routinely face tough issues requiring deep reflection and consideration of conflicting loyalties and goals, personal and corporate ideals, and rules and procedures. Each manager has an individual charge to act responsibly as their actions will reverberate throughout every facet of the organization at large. The objective then is for the individual to understand himself and the factors that weigh on him as he responds to the challenges that arise at work. If knowledge is indeed power, then a command of the information about him self and how he is moved from recognition of a problem to action should empower towards positive response when required. Officers are perceptive and sensitive to the emotions, issues, and risks involved in the ethical challenges they face. They utilize widely varying processes to come to a decision about what to do about a problem. And the process that they use is largely dependent on the issue itself as opposed to the person. Therefore being savvy about the way problems are perceived and framed could make the difference between a positive and proactive response to a dilemma and no action at all.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Demographics

Participant ID_____
Service_____
Rank_____
Gender_____
Age_____
Religious affiliation_____
Ethnicity_____
Family service record_____ (Mother/Father/Brother/Grandparent in service)

Part 1. Introduction (read out loud to the participant)

Thank you for your time today. This interview is part of a research project designed to gather information about ethical dilemmas faced by military officers. We will be conducting approximately 100 interviews over the course of the next year. The idea is to learn more about the ethical challenges that may occur in daily military work life.

Nothing you say will be identified with you. All of the data will be summarized and presented in general themes or descriptive statistics. While some example quotes may be used, no names will be associated with any of this information and you will not be identified as a participant. I would like to have your permission to record what you say. It is important that I capture your exact words. Remember, no statements will be directly attributed to you. All names, commands, identifiers, etcetera will be removed. If you want me to turn off the recorder at any time, just let me know.

Part 2. Setting the scene (read out loud to the participant)

Let's begin by you taking a moment to pause and reflect, thinking back to a time in your military career when you were faced with an ethical dilemma. In order to get a full picture of the kinds of scenarios officers face, I will ask you to think of three different scenarios. For now, let's focus on one. This is a time when you faced an ethical dilemma, a situation where none of your options at the time seem favorable.

To help you think of an incident, let me define an ethical dilemma for you. An ethical dilemma may be defined as a conflict between your values and those presented (implicitly or explicitly) by your organization. The very nature of an ethical dilemma is that some level of tension, paradox, or conflict is present in determining a right action. It seems as though all solutions appear to be unfavorable or have undesirable consequences.

An example might be that you are presented with a situation where there is a conflict between doing what you think you should do and what the organizational norms suggest. This situation might involve a conflict between your personal ideology and your organization's goals. In short, an ethical dilemma makes it difficult to act, or to know what to do, or how to resolve the situation. As you think back about such encounters that you experienced on the job, this is a situation where you may have been unsure how to act or you did not know what to do. The situation may have been undesirable, based upon the risks you perceived to be present.

Please remember that the experience does not have to be a major occurrence or career event, just something that stands out in your mind as being a dilemma. To summarize, this is a time when you had a situation where it presented a moral challenge and, at the time, none of the options seemed particularly favorable.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

__TIP:__ Give participant a few moments to think about it. When it looks like they have thought of something, or 3 minutes have gone by, proceed. IF the participant appears to have trouble thinking of a situation, at any time during the interview, use the following prompts.

__PROMPTS:__ *Use these prompts if the person cannot think of a situation – or – you are on the 2nd or 3rd scenario and you want a situation when they <u>did NOT respond</u>.* ***Be sure to check off the prompts used.***

*Let's take a step back for a moment. Perhaps the situation was not so much a dilemma. Think of it this way, it was a time where you may have been a bit confused about what to do. The situation may have been <u>ambiguous</u>. Think about situations where they were uncertain, you didn't act right away, and you needed more thought…you delayed a response and put it on the back burner.

*Perhaps if we reframe this it will help. Think back to a situation that made you <u>tense or worried</u>.

*Before taking action you really had to <u>pause and reflect</u>, in order to determine what actions you would take.

*Maybe there was a situation when you felt <u>ambivalent</u> about the course of action you would take.

*Perhaps there was a situation when it was hard to take the action, considering all things, yet you proceeded anyway, <u>despite the difficulty</u>.

</div>

__Part 3. The Ethical Dilemma scenarios (read out loud to the participant)__

Do you have your first situation in mind now? OK, good. At this time I would like to explore this first situation with you, and ask you some specific questions about this particular event. Please tell me details about the circumstances as I ask you about different aspects of the ethical dilemma, to help me understand what happened.

A. First ethical dilemma scenario

Situation, thinking, feeling

1) When did this situation occur?
2) What was going on?
3) What were you doing?
4) What were others doing?
5) What happened?
6) **What were you thinking at the time? (Pre action featured Question)**
7) Describe why this was a dilemma.
8) What caused it?
9) Who were the primary stakeholders?
10) Who was involved?
11) Who was affected by the situation?
12) Who were the ones most affected by the dilemma?
13) Where there any risks involved in the situation?
14) **What were you feeling at the time? (Pre action feature question)**
15) What specific emotions did you feel?

Framing the issue

16) What did you do?
17) Did you identify your options on what you could do?
18) What were they?
19) How did you go about identifying your options?
20) What specifically did you do to help you think through your final decision about what to do?
21) Did you think about the past?
22) Did you think about the present?
23) Did you think about the future?
24) How did you come to your decision?
25) What thought process helped you to reach a conclusion?
26) What were you thinking about exactly, in terms of how you framed the situation to make a decision?
27) How much time did you have before action had to occur?
28) Were there risks in the situation?

Action/no action

29) What did you do?

30) How do you think your peers would have responded?
31) What was the dominant factor in determining your action (or no action)?
32) What was the result?
33) **What were you thinking at the time? (Post decision feature question)**
34) **What were you feeling at the time? (Post decision feature question)**
35) What specific emotions did you feel after you took action (<u>or no action</u>)? (NOTE: offer these examples of emotion words: sad, angry, happy, worried, fearful, excited.

ASK THESE QUESTIONS IF THE SCENARIO DESCRIBED NO ACTION or the person did not respond to the ethical dilemma:

36a) What were the pros <u>of not acting?</u>
37a) What were the cons <u>of not acting</u>?

ASK THESE QUESTIONS IF THE SCENARIO DESCRIBED TAKING ACTION or the person responded to the ethical dilemma:

36b) What were the pros <u>of acting</u>?
37b) What were the cons <u>of acting</u>?

Review and segue

---

38) What if you had had a desire to act and not done so? That is, what would the consequences have been for the Navy, the others involved, your immediate CO, your peers, you?
39) When you first recognized the dilemma, did you want to act? If no, you eventually chose a course of action (do something or do nothing) what moved you from having no desire to having the desire to act?
40) Anything else you wish to add? Have we covered all of the details about this situation? Have I learned everything about what happened, what you were thinking, and what you were feeling at the time? (If yes, move on to the next scenario.)

NOTE: If participant's first scenario was a non-response, ask for a response example in the second scenario.

OK, moving on then, this time I'd like for you to think of another situation when you were faced with an ethical dilemma, <u>but this time you did not respond (NOTE: pick the</u> **opposite of first scenario**). Again, this was a challenging ethical dilemma, but this time you took no action (opposite from first scenario).

B. Second ethical dilemma scenario (most likely *NON-response* type)

Repeat same questions (1-40; remember to use the appropriate 36-37 a or b version).

C. Third ethical dilemma scenario

In this third scenario, this time reflect back to a time when you were presented with an ethical dilemma, again, this is a situation where none of your options seemed favorable. Yet in this scenario you had no particular desire to act. That said, you still felt some need to have the desire to act. It's as though you didn't feel like doing anything but you knew you should. It may have been a strong or vague sense, but in the back of your mind you knew you ought to have the desire to do something. You may have felt some uneasiness or tension from not having a desire to act. As with any ethical dilemma, either direction presented drawbacks.

1) With no desire to move to resolve this dilemma, what were you thinking?
2) As you moved forward, what was your thought process?
3) What did you do?
4) Did you eventually develop the desire to do something?
5) If not, what evolved?
6) If so, what thought process specifically helped you to muster the desire to take action? Please describe this process in full detail.
7) What evolved?

Part 4. Moral courage (read out loud to the participant)

OK, just a few more questions and the interview will be complete. To close, I want to ask you about "moral courage" in the military. I'd like to hear your response and learn more about your ideas. Thank you for your continued patience.

1) Do you think your first experience with an ethical dilemma had an impact on how you reacted, when next faced another ethical dilemma?
2) If yes (no), how did it influence you?
3) Do you generally associate ethical dilemmas with risk? Please explain.
4) Do you see yourself as being morally courageous?
5) Do you see your peers as morally courageous?
6) Can you tell me about a time when you exemplified moral courage?
7) What were you thinking?
8) What were you feeling at the time?
9) What specific emotions did you feel?
10) Describe a time when you observed someone else demonstrate moral courage?
11) Please give me your definition of moral courage.
12) Is moral courage important? Why?
13) What makes it important (or not) to you?
14) Considering your definition, can a service member be a "good officer" who is not morally courageous?

Thank you, this concludes our interview. To remind you, your name will not be used in this study. Each transcript is assigned a number and names are never used, nor included with any of the data. Please remember you have agreed **NOT TO DISCUSS** any part of the interview dialogue, or the questions, with any other Supply Corps officers. This is to ensure the validity of our data; any advance notice of the questions may alter participants' responses. ***Thank you again for your time and help with this research.***

LIST OF REFERENCES

Altman, I., Taylor, D. 1973. Social Penetration:The Development of Interpersonal Relationships (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York).

Andrews, K. 1989. Ethics in Practice. Harvard Business Review on Ethics, 67-83.

Badaracco, J. 1998. The Discipline of Building Character. Harvard Business Review on Ethics, 139-163.

Baack, D., Fogliasso, C., & Harris, J. 2000. The personal impact of ethical decisions: A social penetration theory. Journal of Business Ethics, 24: 39-50.

Bommer, M., Gratto, C., Gravander, J., Tuttle, M. 1987. A Behavioral Model of Ethical and Unethical Decision Making. Journal of Business Ethics, 6:265-280.

Carlson D., Kacmar, K., Wadsworth, L. 2002. The impact of moral intensity dimensions on ethical decision making: Assessing the relevance of orientation. Journal of Managerial Issues, 14:15-31.

Cole, D., Sirgy, M., Bird, M. 2000. How do managers make teleological evaluations in ethical dilemmas? Testing part of and extending the Hunt-Vitell model. Journal of Business Ethics, 26: 259-260.

Dukerich, J., Waller, M., George, E., Huber, G. 2000. Moral Intensity and managerial problem solving. Journal of Business Ethics, 24:29-39.

Elm, D., Nichols, M. 1993. An investigation of the moral reasoning of managers, 12:817-825

Ferrell, O. C., Fraedrich, J. 1994. Business Ethics: Ethical Decision Making and Cases, 2nd ed. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA

Forte, A., 2004. Business Ethics: A Study of the Moral Reasoning of Selected Business Managers and the Influence of Organizational Ethical Climate. Journal of Business Ethics, 51:167-175.

Gioia, D., Sims, H. 1986. Cognition-behavior connections: Attribution and verbal behavior in leader-subordinate interactions. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 37:197-229

Glaser, B., Strauss, A. 1967. The discovery of grounded theory, Chicago:Aldine. Greenberg, J. 1987. A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12:9-22.

Holian, R. 2002. Management decision making and ethics: practices, skills and preferences. Management Decision, 40: 862-870

Hunt, S., Vitell, S. 1986. A General Theory of Marketing Ethics. Journal of Macromarketing, 6:5-16.

Hunt, S., Vitell, S. 1990. The General Theory of Marketing Ethics: A Partial Test of the Model. Research in Marketing, 10: 237-265.

Jones, T. 1991. Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue contingent model. Journal of Business Ethics 25(3):366-395/

Kohlberg, L. 1969. Stage and Sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. Handbook of Socialization theory and research: 347-480.

McCoy, B. H. 1983. Applying the Acts of Action Oriented Decision Making to the Knotty Issues of Everyday Life. Management Review, 72:20-24.

McDevitt, R., Van Hise, J. 2002. Influences in ethical dilemmas of increasing intensity. Journal of Business Ethics, 40:261-274.

Miles, M., Huberman, M. 1984. Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Park, H. 1998. Can business ethics be taught?:A new model of business ethics education. Journal of Business Ethics, 17:965-977.

Parker, M. 1998. Introduction:ethics, the very idea? Ethics and Organizations, Sage, London, 1-14.

Rest, J. R. 1979. Revised manual for the defining issues test: An objective test of moral judgment development. Minneapolis: Minnesota Moral Research Projects.

Siedman, D. 2004. The case for ethical leadership. Academy of Management Executive, 18: 134-138

Sekerka, L. E., Bagozzi, R. 2004. Preparing for virtuous action: Exercising moral courage in response to an ethical dilemma. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, All Academy Session, August, New Orleans, LA.

Trevino, L. 1986. Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. The Academy of Management Review, 11: 601-617

Wright, M. 1995. Can Moral Judgement and Ethical Behavior Be Learned: A Review of the Literature. Management Decision, 33: 17-29.

Weber, J. 1996. Influences upon managerial moral decision making: Nature of the harm and magnitude of consequences

Webster's. (1983). New World Dictionary of the American Language. New York:Warner Books.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1.   Defense Technical Information Center
        Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

2.   Dudley Knox Library
        Naval Postgraduate School
        Monterey, California

3.   Rodney Blevins
        Pickeringrton, Ohio