



Do Ethicists Steal More Books?

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID:	draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	morality, ethics, reason, moral reasoning, Kohlberg



RUNNING HEAD: Do Ethicists Steal More Books?

Do Ethicists Steal More Books?

Abstract

If explicit cognition about morality promotes moral behavior then one might expect ethics professors to behave particularly well. However, professional ethicists' behavior has never been empirically studied. The present research examined the rates at which ethics books are missing from leading academic libraries, compared to other philosophy books similar in age and popularity. Study 1 found that relatively obscure, contemporary ethics books of the sort likely to be borrowed mainly by professors and advanced students of philosophy were actually about 50% *more* likely to be missing than non-ethics books. Study 2 found that classic (pre-1900) ethics books were about twice as likely to be missing.

Keywords: Morality, ethics, reason, moral reasoning, Kohlberg

Do Ethicists Steal More Books?

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle writes that the aim of studying ethics, 'is not, as in other inquiries, the attainment of theoretical knowledge: we are not conducting this inquiry in order to know what virtue is, but in order to become good' (4th c. BCE/1962, 1103b). In *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785/1998), Kant asserts that a philosophical understanding of morality is essential to a firm and unswerving hold upon morality, allowing one to avoid corruption by self-regarding desires and misdirection by irrelevant considerations. In *On Liberty* (1859/2003), Mill says that ethical doctrines become largely powerless to guide behavior unless their fundamental principles are grasped and the arguments both for and against them are rigorously considered. If Aristotle, Kant, and Mill are right, a lifetime's commitment to the study of ethics should have salutary effects on one's moral behavior. Philosophical moral reflection is not, or should not be if done properly, morally inert. Ethicists, by virtue of their long study and deep appreciation of the principles of morality, will behave better than non-ethicists. Even if the study of ethics is not itself morally beneficial, one might reasonably expect that people drawn to a career teaching and studying ethics will, on average, be more deeply committed to the importance of morality than those drawn to other careers either within or outside of philosophy.

But do ethicists actually behave better than non-ethicists in philosophy, or than non-philosophers of similar social background? The question has never been systematically studied.

Among contemporary philosophers, Nussbaum (1997, 2007) and Moody-Adams (1997) have argued that philosophical moral reflection is a crucial part of our moral

1
2
3 education, will tend to make us better citizens, and can give us the courage to stand up for
4
5 justice. Though their arguments have *a priori* plausibility, they offer no empirical
6
7 evidence in support of these claims. Posner (1999), a judge and philosopher of law,
8
9 argues in contrast that academic philosophy as normally practiced ‘has no prospect of
10
11 improving human behavior’ (p. 7) since (among other things) its motivational force is
12
13 feeble and it tends to traffic in rationalizations either of self-interest or of culturally
14
15 derived, arational intuitions. Opinion among ordinary professional philosophers appears
16
17 to be divided. [author’s manuscript] polled passersby at an American Philosophical
18
19 Association meeting in April 2007 and found that although a substantial minority
20
21 (especially among ethicists) expressed the view that ethicists do behave morally better on
22
23 average than non-ethicists of similar social background, a majority of respondents said
24
25 that ethicists do not behave better. In fact, a substantial minority of non-ethicists
26
27 suggested that ethicists behave on average *worse* than non-ethicists. Anticipating the
28
29 current research, several philosophers have shared with me their impression that ethics
30
31 books are missing from libraries more often than other philosophy books.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 In psychology, accounts of moral development that give a central role to moral
40
41 reasoning, such as Piaget’s (1932/1965) and especially Kohlberg’s (1984), should, it
42
43 seems, predict that ethicists will show excellent moral behavior, since there is no doubt
44
45 that professional ethicists are champions of moral reasoning – at least in the sense of
46
47 ‘moral reasoning’ researchers like Piaget and Kohlberg have in mind. (Accordingly, Rest
48
49 [1993] found that graduate students in moral philosophy show very sophisticated
50
51 reasoning about Kohlbergian moral dilemmas.) However, the nature and strength of the
52
53 relationship between Kohlbergian measures of moral reasoning and real-world moral
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 behavior remains unclear (Blasi, 1980; Kohlberg, 1984; Colby & Damon, 1992; Krebs &
4
5 Denton, 2005; Stams, Brugman, Deković, van Rosmalen, van der Laan, & Gibbs, 2006;
6
7 Emler, Tarry, & St. James, 2007). In contrast, accounts of moral development and
8
9 behavior that emphasize emotion or intuition and downplay the importance of reasoning
10
11 or explicit moral cognition (Haidt, 2001; Greene & Haidt, 2002), might predict that skill
12
13 in philosophical reasoning about ethics would have little bearing on actual moral
14
15 behavior.
16
17
18

19
20 Although the relationship between moral behavior and a professional career in
21
22 ethics remains unstudied, a number of researchers have examined the relationship
23
24 between professed religiosity or religious behavior (such as church-going) and self-
25
26 reported or objectively measured social deviance or criminality. An influential study in
27
28 1969 (Hirschi & Stark, 1969) found no relationship between high school students' self-
29
30 reported church attendance or belief in an afterlife and either police records or self-
31
32 reported criminal behavior. Subsequent studies have tended to find weakly negative
33
34 (often statistically insignificant) relationships between religiosity and criminality or
35
36 social deviance. A recent meta-analysis (Baier & Wright, 2001) puts the median effect
37
38 size at $r = -.11$, but even this small correlation is likely to be inflated by the file-drawer
39
40 effect (the fact that negative results, especially of small studies, are less likely to be
41
42 published) and bias on the part of religiously committed subjects (who may suspect the
43
44 hypothesis and unwittingly adjust their answers) and investigators. Also, many of the
45
46 studies included in Baier & Wright's meta-analysis are only correlational and control for
47
48 only a few potential confounding variables, and thus give insufficient basis for inferring a
49
50 negative causal relationship between religiosity and immorality or crime. Two recent
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 studies that attempted to get at the issue of direction of causation through temporal
4
5 analysis found results in the *opposite* of the predicted directions (Eshuys & Smallbone,
6
7 2006; Heaton, 2006).
8
9

10 The most closely related issue on which there are considerable empirical data is
11 the effectiveness of courses in business ethics. Research in this area generally examines
12 the relationship between business ethics courses and either self-reported attitudes about
13 business ethics or maturity of response to Kohlberg-like dilemmas. The results are mixed,
14 with some studies finding that students exposed to business ethics show more ethical or
15 more mature responses (Boyd, 1981; Glenn, 1992; Hildebeitel & Jones, 1992; Murphy &
16 Boatright, 1994; Loe & Weeks, 2000; Luthar & Karri, 2005) and others finding a very
17 limited relationship (Duizend & McCann, 1998; Conroy & Emerson, 2004; Bodkin &
18 Stevenson, 2007) or none at all (Wynd & Mager, 1989; Borkowski & Ugras, 1992; Smith
19 & Oakley, 1996; Martin, 2007). Many of these studies, unfortunately, lack control
20 groups or control questions. Without control questions, students can appear 'more
21 ethical' by means of simple strategies. For example, a number of studies simply measure
22 the degree of students' self-reported condemnatory attitudes about hypothetical violations
23 of ethical standards (either before and after a business ethics course or in comparison
24 with another group). Students may then appear more ethical simply by showing a bias
25 toward regarding any presented scenario or behavior as ethically problematic – a
26 response strategy that ethical training courses may tend to encourage but which need not
27 show any real improvement in moral understanding. I have been unable to find any
28 empirical studies attempting to relate business ethics instruction and real-world moral
29 behavior.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A few researchers have examined a complementary hypothesis: that the study of
4 rational choice theory in economics promotes selfish behavior. Frank, Gilovich, and
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A few researchers have examined a complementary hypothesis: that the study of rational choice theory in economics promotes selfish behavior. Frank, Gilovich, and Regan (1993, 1996) found economists to behave more selfishly in laboratory tests, in responses to hypothetical scenarios, and self-report. However, Laband and Beil (1999) found economists no more likely than sociologists or political scientists to underreport income to save on membership dues (graded for income) to professional societies; and Frey and Meier (2005) found that although economics majors at University of Zurich were less likely to give to charities than students in other majors, this tendency was present from the beginning of their education and did not increase with increased exposure to rational choice theory in class.

The present research aims to provide the first small bit of non-anecdotal, empirical data directly on the question of whether professional ethicists behave any better than non-ethicists, and thus the first direct empirical test of a model of moral cognition according to which philosophical moral reflection positively affects real-world moral behavior. In particular, the present research examines the theft and negligent treatment of library books. Are ethics books more, or less, likely to be missing from academic libraries than other philosophy books? I choose other *philosophy* books as the comparison class, rather than books in literature, chemistry, or some other discipline, and rather than the whole universe of non-ethics books, because it seems likely that by looking only within philosophy, the patterns of book use and the population using the books will be more closely matched, reducing the potential role of a variety of confounds.

I assume that the theft and negligent treatment of library books is, as a general rule, morally bad. Whether a book is missing for innocent reasons or instead due to

1
2
3 negligence or theft cannot be determined from library records, but no such assessment is
4
5 necessary if we assume that the rates of completely innocent loss are the same between
6
7 the two groups. (I will return to some potential problems with this assumption in the
8
9 conclusion.) Furthermore, most loss is not entirely innocent, I suspect: One can handle
10
11 library property with more or less respect and care, conscientiously keep library books
12
13 separate from one's personal property or mix them in. Some professors and graduate
14
15 students, when they change universities, negligently or intentionally bring some library
16
17 books with them. Even if a book is missing simply because it was misshelved by a
18
19 patron without having been removed from the library, that reveals negligence and a
20
21 disregard of most libraries' requests that patrons not reshelve books. Books specifically
22
23 described in library records as having been paid for by the patron were excluded from
24
25 analysis. Not all libraries display such data in their online records, but among those that
26
27 do, books recorded as 'lost and paid' constituted a small proportion of the missing books.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Accidentally misshelving a book, choosing not to return a library book one
35
36 notices after a move, not bothering to check out a book one has accidentally walked out
37
38 with – these and the like are of course only minor faults in the grand scheme of things.
39
40 Even if the results of the present research were completely decisive and free of confounds,
41
42 it would be absurd to confidently draw general conclusions about the overall moral
43
44 character of ethicists from such limited data (especially in light of situationist findings in
45
46 social psychology: Ross & Nisbett, 1991; Doris, 2002). The research reported here is
47
48 intended as the first of a number of projects that will explore the moral behavior of
49
50 ethicists in a variety of different ways. My collaborators and I are presently examining
51
52 rates of charitable giving among philosophy students (reanalyzing the data from Frey &
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Meier, 2005), the voting rates of ethicists and political philosophers, the responsiveness
4 of ethicists and other professors to student emails, and the honesty of philosophers and
5 other professors in reporting income to professional societies when reporting lower
6 income will mean paying lower membership dues (extending the research from Laband &
7 Beil, 1999). Several other studies are in various stages of design.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Two studies will be presented. The first examines the rates at which contemporary, relatively obscure philosophy books are missing from academic libraries. The second examines the rates at which classic pre-20th century texts are missing.

Study 1: Rates at Which Recent, Relatively Obscure Philosophy Books Are Missing

Method

Compiling the list of titles. To generate the list of titles to be examined, I compiled a list of book reviews published in *Philosophical Review* (a leading philosophy journal) from 1990-2001. Based on book title and author, an independent coder – an ethics professor – coded the reviewed titles as either (1) ethics, (2) non-ethics, or (3) marginal / don't know. All titles rated by the coder as ethics (144) were added to the ethics list and one-third of the non-ethics titles (155) were added to the comparison list; marginal titles were excluded, as were titles originally published before 1985. Since the focus of the study is on the behavior of professional ethicists, I further excluded all books appearing at least five times in bibliographies in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (October 2006 edition), on the reasoning that these books would be more likely to be checked out by non-specialists. The final list thus contained 126 ethics titles and 149

1
2
3 non-ethics titles, all obscure works generally unknown outside philosophy and even
4 within philosophy to those not specializing in the subarea. Alphabetically, the first four
5 ethics titles are *Altruism*, ed. Paul; *Am I My Parents' Keeper?*, Daniels; *Animal Minds*
6 and *Human Morals*, Sorabji; and *Aquinas: Moral, Political, and Legal Theory*, Finnis.
7
8 The first four non-ethics titles are *Abstract Objects*, Hale; *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and*
9 *Averroes on Intellect*, Davidson; *Appearance and Reality*, Hacker; *Aristotle and*
10 *Neoplatonism in Late Antiquity*, Blumenthal. (See **** for the complete list.) Although
11 it was not possible to obtain information about the individuals checking out these books,
12 these relatively obscure works are likely only to be known to, recommended to, and
13 sought by specialists and students receiving advanced training in those areas.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *The lending libraries.* I examined online status information for every copy of
28 these titles in 13 U.S. and 19 British academic library systems. The U.S. libraries
29 included the six University of California libraries that provided online due date
30 information (Berkeley, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Cruz) and
31 seven other library systems chosen on the basis of their large collections, eminent
32 philosophy departments, and easy-to-use online records (Columbia, Cornell, Harvard,
33 Michigan, Princeton, Stanford, and Texas). Satellite libraries were included if due date
34 information was easily available alongside that of the main libraries. The British libraries
35 were those included in the COPAC national online catalog, excluding those libraries not
36 listing due date information. Nineteen of these British library systems had significant
37 holdings in philosophy: Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Edinburgh, Glasgow,
38 King's, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham, Oxford, Sheffield,
39 Southampton, Trinity College Dublin, University College London, University of London,
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and Warwick. Oxford had by far the largest of the British collections, accounting for
4
5 approximately one-third of all British holdings.
6
7

8 *Collecting the data.* A research assistant and I collected the ethics and non-ethics
9
10 data in tandem between October 17 and December 13, 2006, when all schools were in fall
11
12 session. We coded each copy of each title as either *on shelf* (neither checked out nor
13
14 missing), *within period* (checked out but not overdue), *overdue* (overdue by no more than
15
16 one year), or *missing* (including books more than one year overdue). The following
17
18 composite categories were defined for the purpose of analysis: *delinquent* (overdue or
19
20 missing), *off shelf* (within period, overdue, or missing), and *held* (on shelf, within period,
21
22 overdue, or missing; that is, all categories combined). I excluded from analysis books in
23
24 repair, books listed as lost and paid, and books whose status was unclear.
25
26
27
28

29 I will use the term *books* (or sometimes, for additional clarity, *copies* of books) to
30
31 refer to individual copies of books (e.g., ‘I excluded books in repair’) or collections
32
33 considered as collections of individual copies (e.g., ‘8.5% of all ethics books’). When I
34
35 intend to refer to a class of books sharing the same title and author or aggregates of such
36
37 classes, I will use the term *titles* (e.g., ‘I examined 126 ethics titles’ and ‘a title-by-title
38
39 analysis’).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Results*

47
48 Raw numbers and key percentages are listed in Table 1. Ethics books are more
49
50 likely to be missing than non-ethics books both when considered as a percentage of
51
52 holdings (χ^2 , 1.3% missing vs. 0.9% missing, $p = .047$) and when considered as a
53
54 percentage of books off shelf (8.5% missing vs 5.7% missing, $p = .03$) – the latter being
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 probably the more valid measure, since it takes into account the popularity of the books.
4

5 The odds ratio of missing as a percentage of off shelf is 1.48 to 1. In this sample, an
6
7 ethics book is about 50% more likely to be missing than a non-ethics book, if it is off
8
9 shelf.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table 1

Study 1: rates at which relatively obscure philosophy books are missing

	Ethics	Non-Ethics
Titles	126	149
Holdings	4,964 (39.4/title)	5,628 (37.8/title)
Off shelf	778 (6.17/title)	910 (6.11/title)
Delinquent	94 (0.75/title)	91 (0.61/title)
Missing	66 (0.52/title)	52 (0.35/title)
Within period as % of holdings	13.8%	14.6%
<u>Delinquent</u>		
as % of holdings	1.9%	1.6%
as % of off shelf	12.1%	10.0%
<u>Overdue</u>		
as % of holdings	0.6%	0.7%
as % of off shelf	3.6%	4.3%
<u>Missing</u>		
as % of holdings	1.3%	0.9%
as % of off shelf	8.5%	5.7%

The popularity of the books does not appear to play a confounding role. Ethics and non-ethics titles are checked out at very similar rates; and in any case, more popular books (defined by number off shelf not missing) are no more likely to be missing than less popular books, when measured as a percentage of books off shelf (missing as a

percentage off shelf is 7.6% for less popular books [titles with 7 or fewer off shelf but not missing, accounting for 49% of off shelf] vs. 6.4% for more popular books, χ^2 , $p = 0.32$). Nor are older books detectably more likely to be missing, despite presumably having had longer to disappear from the shelves (7.3% vs. 6.7% for 1993 and older [51% of off shelf] vs. 1994 and newer, $p = 0.65$); and in any case, the average off shelf but not missing ethics book is somewhat newer than the average non-ethics book (1993.9 vs. 1992.6), so compensating for age would, if anything, make the effect larger.

No difference was detectable in the rates at which books were merely overdue without being missing (3.6% of off-shelf for ethics vs. 4.3% for non-ethics, $p = 0.47$), but the numbers are too small for any definite conclusions.

Use in law. In conversation, several philosophers suggested that the effect might be driven largely by law students and professors, who presumably borrow ethics books more often than non-ethics books in philosophy and may have different library habits. The data do not bear out this hypothesis. In the U.S. sample, four law libraries were included (from the Berkeley, Cornell, Harvard, and UCLA systems). Of the 157 ethics books off shelf from these four law libraries only 11 (7.0%) are missing – lower than the overall rate at which ethics books are missing. I also generated a list of 19 ‘law’ titles from the ethics list – titles with at least 10% of their U.S. holdings at the 4 included law libraries. These books were missing at approximately the same rate as the ethics books (8.9% vs. 8.5%). Removing them from the data set does not change the overall estimated effect: Ethics books were missing at an 8.4% rate vs. 5.7% for non-ethics, for an odds ratio of 1.47 to 1 ($p = .04$).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Failure of independence? The χ^2 tests I have been using assume the trials to be statistically independent. The present data might fail to be independent in two different and cross-cutting ways: Some titles might be more likely than others to go missing. (Consider Abbie Hoffman's [1971] counterculture classic *Steal This Book* [not included in this survey].) Also, some libraries might be more likely to have missing books – if, for example, their security is lax or if a single patron is appropriating many books. (By the way, 13 copies of *Steal This Book* are held in the selected libraries. Of the four off shelf, three are missing.) Unfortunately, standard statistical tests for independence cannot be applied here due to the small number of relevant events for each title and for the smaller libraries.

However, we can examine the data by title and by library, to see if just a few titles or just a few libraries are driving the effect. If not, it may be reasonable to conclude that the independence assumption is approximately satisfied. I calculated missing as a percentage of off shelf for all titles with at least five books off shelf across all the sampled libraries. Ethics titles are more likely to be missing, with a median of 8.3% for ethics vs 0.0% for non-ethics (Mann-Whitney, adj. for ties, $p = .046$).

Given a sample of only 32 libraries, many of which have only one or a few books missing, library-by-library comparisons will only be able statistically to detect large or consistent effects – especially since the data turn out to be non-parametric (with five libraries missing only ethics books and one missing only non-ethics books). Looking library by library, 12 libraries have more ethics books missing than non-ethics books and 6 have more non-ethics books missing (the remaining libraries either have one of each missing or none) – a non-significant trend (binomial test, $p = .14$).

1
2
3 No particular topical subgroup of titles stands out post-hoc as particularly more or
4 less likely to be missing than any other – not applied ethics, nor feminism, nor meta-
5 ethics, nor books with a demanding as opposed to a lenient ethical view. However, there
6 are too few titles in most of these categories and too little power to test this systematically.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 *Discussion*

16
17 These results suggest that ethics books are actually *more* likely to be missing than
18 non-ethics books in philosophy. The effect does not appear to be driven by just a few
19 titles or just a few libraries. With these results in hand, I decided to do a second study
20 examining prominent pre-20th-century philosophy texts. Are classic texts in ethics also
21 more likely to be missing than other classic texts in philosophy?
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Since undergraduates likely check out a high proportion of classic titles, Study 2
30 is not directly a measure of the moral behavior of professional ethicists. However, it
31 seemed advisable to confirm the trends of Study 1 on a different population of books, and
32 it's not unreasonable to suppose (looking at my own shelves and recalling those of others)
33 that a substantial proportion of classic text checkouts are in fact by professors and
34 advanced students of philosophy. We cannot afford to purchase every version of every
35 classic text – especially when those texts are regularly reissued in important new editions
36 or translations. In any case, undergraduates reading ethics texts are presumably by virtue
37 of that very fact engaged in more explicit philosophical cognition about ethics than
38 undergraduates reading other sorts of philosophy, though of course there may also be
39 other important social, cognitive, or situational differences between the two groups.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Study 2: Rates at Which Classic Philosophy Texts are Missing

Method

Compiling the list of titles. The preliminary lists were composed of texts written before 1900 that appeared in at least five ethics bibliographies in the October, 2006, edition of the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* or five mind-and/or-language bibliographies (philosophy of mind and language being the only other subfield of philosophy comparable in size and scope to ethics). I removed titles prominent both in and outside of ethics (such as Hume's *Treatise*) and that normally appear anthologized with books of the other type (such as Hume's *Enquiries* and most of Plato's dialogues). To flesh out the very short non-ethics list and to compensate for the mind and language bias in that list, I perused the historical entries of the SEP and added Bacon's *New Organon* and Kant's *Critique of Judgment*. All English and original-language editions were included; so also were anthologies in which the book in question appeared as the first-listed or most prominent work, unless the anthology included both ethics and non-ethics texts. I also made a third list of Nietzsche's most prominent works. Although Nietzsche is in some sense an ethicist, he condemns conventional morality. The final list of books appears in Table 3.

The lending libraries. I examined the same U.S. library systems as in Study 1. The British library catalog system proved impractically unwieldy, listing, for example, over a thousand separate catalog entries for author 'Locke' and title 'Understanding'.

Collecting the data. A research assistant and I collected the data in late December, 2006, and early January, 2007, when most schools were between sessions, and then again

1
2
3 in late February and early March, 2007, when all schools were in session. The Nietzsche
4 data were collected only in March. Since undergraduates presumably borrow these books
5 at high rates, I thought it might be informative to compare between-session and mid-
6 session data. Books were again coded as *on shelf*, *within period*, *overdue*, or *missing*.
7
8 Multi-volume works were coded separately if the library had a separate status line for
9 each volume, unless the work was split into more than three volumes. (Some editions of
10 Aquinas's *Summa*, for example, are divided into many small volumes.) When volume
11 data were combined, the highest coding number of all the individual volumes was used,
12 with on shelf being 1, within period 2, overdue 3, and missing 4.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Results*

28
29 As expected, a greater proportion of books was checked out in February-March
30 than in December-January, though the effect was not large: 13.5% of ethics holdings and
31 15.9% of non-ethics holdings were off shelf during break, while mid-session the
32 percentages were 16.7% (χ^2 , $p < .001$) and 18.4% ($p = .02$) respectively. As is evident
33 from these percentages, non-ethics books were slightly more likely to be off shelf than
34 ethics books. This difference was statistically significant over winter break ($p = .006$)
35 and marginally significant mid-session ($p = .08$). In contrast to Study 1, there are
36 substantial differences in holdings, with ethics holdings (5541 mid-session) about twice
37 that of non-ethics holdings (2324 mid-session).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Overall, the mid-break and mid-session data look very similar, apart from the
51 slightly higher off shelf rates mid-session and more copies of Plato's *Republic* found
52 mid-session (1119 vs. 884, probably due to different search strategies). The remaining
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

analysis will treat the mid-session data only, since the Nietzsche data were only collected mid-session, and since the missing rates for the *Republic* are substantially lower mid-session, bringing them closer to the mean and thus erring on the side of statistical caution.

Table 2

Study 2: classic texts

	Ethics	Non-Ethics	Nietzsche
Holdings	5,541 (462/title)	2,324 (232/title)	1,035 (345/title)
Off shelf	926 (77.2/title)	427 (42.7/title)	298 (99.3/title)
Delinquent	191 (15.9/title)	53 (5.3/title)	63 (21.0/title)
Missing	155 (12.9/title)	36 (3.6/title)	58 (19.3/title)
Within period as % of holdings	13.3%	16.1%	22.7%
<u>Delinquent</u>			
as % of holdings	3.4%	2.3%	6.1%
as % of off shelf	20.6%	12.4%	21.1%
<u>Overdue</u>			
as % of holdings	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%
as % of off shelf	3.9%	4.0%	1.7%
<u>Missing</u>			
as % of holdings	2.8%	1.5%	5.6%
as % of off shelf	16.7%	8.4%	19.5%

1
2
3
4 As is evident from Table 2, ethics books are about twice as likely to be missing in
5
6 this sample as non-ethics books, whether measured as a percentage of holdings (2.8% vs.
7
8 1.5%, $p < .001$) or as a percentage of books off shelf (16.7% vs. 8.4%, $p < .001$). The
9
10 Nietzsche books are also more likely to be missing than the non-ethics books (5.6% vs.
11
12 1.5% as a percentage of holdings, $p < .001$; and 19.5% vs. 8.4% as a percentage of off
13
14 shelf, $p < .001$). Measured as a percentage of holdings, the Nietzsche books are more
15
16 likely to be missing than the ethics books ($p < .001$), but by the more important measure
17
18 of percentage missing among those off shelf, the difference is not statistically detectable
19
20 ($p = .28$). Though the numbers are small, overdue as a percentage of off shelf and of
21
22 holdings is fairly similar between the three groups.
23
24
25
26

27 All libraries have at least twice as many ethics as non-ethics books missing – but
28
29 there are also twice as many ethics books off shelf within period. This was corrected by
30
31 comparing the proportion, by library, (ethics books missing) / (ethics books missing + 2.0
32
33 * non-ethics books missing) vs. .5. The difference is statistically significant (t test, M
34
35 = .71 vs. .5, $p < .001$). Twelve of the 13 libraries are missing a greater proportion of
36
37 ethics books than expected.
38
39
40

41 By title the differences are also striking. Table 3 ranks titles by missing as a
42
43 percentage of off shelf, with titles with fewer than 25 total off shelf in brackets. With the
44
45 exception of Frege's *Foundations of Arithmetic*, each of the 12 most-missing titles is
46
47 either an ethics or a Nietzsche book. Likewise, of the eight titles least missing, only one
48
49 is an ethics title. The mean percentage missing is 16.7% for ethics titles (not including
50
51 Nietzsche) vs. 7.9% for non-ethics titles (odds ratio 2.1 to 1). Even with the tiny sample
52
53 size (12 ethics titles, 9 non-ethics), this difference in means is statistically significant (t
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 test, $p = .01$). The three Nietzsche titles are missing at about the same rate at the ethics
4
5 titles (mean percentage missing 19.0%).
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table 3

Study 2: Classics texts, by title

Author, Title	Missing as % of off- shelf	Ethics / Non / Nietzsche
[Brentano, <i>Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint</i>]	0.0%	Non
[Frege, <i>Translations from the Philosophical Writings</i>]	0.0%	Non
Bacon, <i>New Organon</i>	3.4%	Non
Kant, <i>Critique of Judgment</i>	3.8%	Non
Descartes, <i>Meditations</i>	5.6%	Non
Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologica</i>	5.9%	Ethics
James, <i>Principles of Psychology</i>	7.1%	Non
[Berkeley, <i>Principles</i>]	9.5%	Non
[Kant, <i>Metaphysics of Morals</i>]	10.0%	Ethics
Kant, <i>Critique of Practical Reason</i>	10.3%	Ethics
Kant, <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i>	10.6%	Non
Bentham, <i>Principles of Morals and Legislation</i>	11.1%	Ethics
Locke, <i>Essay Concerning Human Understanding</i>	12.1%	Non
Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>	14.8%	Ethics
Hobbes, <i>Leviathan</i>	15.0%	Ethics
Plato, <i>Republic</i>	15.8%	Ethics
Nietzsche, <i>Thus Spoke Zarathustra</i>	15.9%	Nietzsche
Kant, <i>Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals</i>	16.2%	Ethics

Nietzsche, <i>Beyond Good and Evil</i>	18.9%	Nietzsche
Nietzsche, <i>On the Genealogy of Morals</i>	21.8%	Nietzsche
Mill, <i>On Liberty</i>	23.2%	Ethics
Rousseau, <i>Social Contract</i>	23.5%	Ethics
Locke, <i>Two Treatises of Government / Second Treatise</i>	23.8%	Ethics
[Frege: <i>Foundations of Arithmetic</i>]	26.3%	Non
Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i>	31.3%	Ethics

The lists can be made more comparable by cutting the outliers: books with fewer than 25 off shelf (see Table 3) and those with more than 100 (Aristotle, Hobbes, and Plato). The eight remaining ethics books have an average of 402 held, 62.5 off shelf, and 11.4 missing. The six remaining non-ethics books have an average of 329 held, 61.5 off shelf, and 4.8 missing. Missing as a percentage of off shelf on this reduced list is 18.2% for ethics and 7.9% for non-ethics, for an odds ratio of 2.3 to 1 (χ^2 , $p < .001$). The difference in mean, title-by-title, of missing as a percentage of off shelf – 18.2% vs. 7.1% (odds ratio 2.5 to 1) – remains significant (t test, $p = .01$). The difference in means remains if missing is calculated as a percentage of holdings (mean 2.6% vs. 1.3%, odds ratio 2.0, $p = .02$).

Discussion

The results of Study 2 support the conclusion of Study 1. Looking at this very different selection of books, ethics books are again more likely to be missing. The effect

1
2
3 is so large and consistent that it shows up even in low power title-by-title and library-by-
4
5 library analyses.
6

7
8 Unlike Study 1, the effect may plausibly be driven mainly by undergraduates.
9
10 However, the small difference between mid-term and between-term checkout rates
11
12 suggests that few patrons are checking these books out by mid-term and returning them at
13
14 term's end, which one might expect to be a typical checkout pattern if undergraduates are
15
16 borrowing the books for use in classes.
17
18

19 20 21 22 General Discussion

23
24 These data suggest that ethics books are more likely to be missing from academic
25
26 libraries than other types of philosophy books. This effect appears to hold both for
27
28 obscure books likely to be checked out mostly by professional philosophers and their
29
30 advanced students and for widely read classics like Mill's *On Liberty* and Descartes's
31
32 *Meditations*. If these data are representative, a philosophy book not on the shelf is
33
34 anywhere from 50% to 150% more likely to be missing if it is an ethics books than if it is
35
36 not.
37
38
39

40
41 The effect does not appear to be attributable to law faculty and students, since law
42
43 books and ethics books in law libraries seem to be missing at about the same rate as other
44
45 ethics books. Nor does it seem that ethicists are especially more absent-minded than non-
46
47 ethicists, since ethics books are no more likely to be simply overdue than ethics books.
48
49

50 The effects show up whether the data are analyzed by χ^2 , by title, or by library.

51
52 Furthermore, it does not appear that books endorsing conventional morality are less likely
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to be missing than books challenging conventional morality: Kant and Mill are missing as
4
5 much as Nietzsche.
6
7

8 With respect to their treatment of library books, then, it does not appear that the
9
10 people reading philosophical ethics behave any better than those reading other sorts of
11
12 philosophy; indeed, the opposite seems to be the case. It surely does not follow that
13
14 ethicists and their students *generally* behave the same as, or worse than, people interested
15
16 in other areas of philosophy. To draw this general conclusion would require more studies
17
18 examining a diverse range of moral behavior. However, in one domain in which ethicists
19
20 *could have* displayed superior conscientiousness, honesty, and concern for others'
21
22 property, they failed to do so.
23
24
25
26

27 There are potential confounds this study cannot control. Readers might more
28
29 dearly love ethics books than other philosophy books. Readers of ethics books might be
30
31 poorer than readers of other philosophy books and so more tempted to theft; or they
32
33 might be wealthier and so more willing to risk fines. Ethics books may take longer to
34
35 read and so be more likely to leave campus; or they may be more pleasant to read and so
36
37 more exposed to the hazards of the cafe, the beach, and the bedstand. They may have
38
39 been more popular ten years ago than they are now. They may be more likely reported
40
41 missing if a patron can't find them on the shelf. A patron's friends and spouses may be
42
43 more likely to borrow them. Ethicists and their students might be busier than non-
44
45 ethicists and their students. However, I see no a priori or empirical reason to accept any
46
47 of these hypotheses. While it is surely the case that ethics books are assigned for
48
49 different sorts of undergraduate courses than non-ethics books, the relatively obscure and
50
51 technical books examined in Study 1 must be rarely if ever assigned in courses – and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 when they are assigned it should only be to advanced students in the subarea.
4

5
6 Furthermore, the data run in the opposite direction of the effect that would be predicted
7
8 on a model according to which philosophical moral reflection improves overall moral
9
10 behavior, implying that such confounding factors must be large if ethicists are indeed
11
12 generally more conscientious with their library books than non-ethicists.
13
14

15
16 Since these data pertain only to a small bit of moral behavior, they do not directly
17
18 conflict with models of moral cognition that permit explicit moral cognition of the sort
19
20 characteristic of professional ethicists to positively affect moral behavior under particular
21
22 conditions or in particular domains. It would be a dark day for moral philosophy if it
23
24 turned out that explicit moral cognition of this sort is generally harmful. Would we then
25
26 discourage the study and teaching of moral philosophy, for the good of society? I believe
27
28 the following model, consistent with the data above, has some a priori appeal: Explicit
29
30 moral cognition is bivalent. Although in certain conditions it promotes moral behavior,
31
32 in other conditions it undermines morality – for example, when it either supports or
33
34 becomes rationalization, that is, the deployment of explicit reasoning to justify a pre-
35
36 determined and normally self-serving conclusion. Rationalization may be especially
37
38 likely when conventional norms and ordinary behavior are both morally good and
39
40 contrary to self-interest – as in the case of the return of library books.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Aristotle. 4th c. BCE/1962: *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. M. Ostwald. New York:
7
8 Macmillan.
9
10 Baier, C.J., & Wright, B.R.E. 2001: 'If you love me, keep my commandments': A meta-
11
12 analysis of the effect of religion on crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and*
13
14 *Delinquency*, 38, 3-21.
15
16
17 Blasi, A. 1980: Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the
18
19 literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 1-45.
20
21
22 Bodkin, C.D., & Stevenson, T.H. 2007: University students' perceptions regarding
23
24 ethical marketing practices: Affecting change through instructional techniques.
25
26 *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72, 207-228.
27
28
29 Borkowski, S.C., & Ugras, Y.J. 1992: The ethical attitudes of students as a function of
30
31 age, sex, and experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 961-979.
32
33
34 Boyd, D.P. 1981: Improving ethical awareness through the business and society course.
35
36 *Business & Society*, 20, 27-31.
37
38
39 Colby, A., & Damon, W. 1992: *Some Do Care*. New York: Free Press.
40
41
42 Conroy, S.J., & Emerson, T.L.N. 2004: Business ethics and religion: Religiosity as a
43
44 predictor of ethical awareness among students. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50,
45
46 383-396.
47
48
49 Doris, J.M. 2002: *Lack of Character*. Cambridge: Cambridge.
50
51
52 Duizend, J., & McCann, G.C. 1998: Do collegiate business students show a propensity to
53
54 engage in illegal business practices? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 229-238.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Eckles, R.E., Meslin, E.M., Gaffney, M., & Helft, P.R. 2005: Medical ethics education:
4
5 Where are we? Where should we be going? A review. *Academic Medicine*, 80,
6
7 1143-1152.
8
9
10 Emler, N., Tarry, H., & St. James, A. 2007: Post-conventional moral reasoning and
11
12 reputation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 76-89.
13
14
15 Eshuys, D., & Smallbone S. 2006: Religious affiliations among adult sexual offenders.
16
17 *Sexual Abuse*, 18, 279-288.
18
19
20 Frank, R.H., Gilovich, T.D., & Regan, D.T. 1993: Does studying economics inhibit
21
22 cooperation? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5: 171-177.
23
24
25 Frank, R.H., Gilovich, T.D., & Regan, D.T. 1996: Do economists make bad citizens?
26
27 *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10: 187-192.
28
29
30 Frey, B.S., & Meier, S. 2005: Selfish and indoctrinated economists? *European Journal*
31
32 *of Law and Economics*, 19: 165-171.
33
34
35 Glenn, J.R. 1992: Can a business and society course affect the ethical judgment of future
36
37 managers? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 217-223.
38
39
40 Greene, J., & Haidt, J. 2002: How (and where) does moral judgment work? *Trends in*
41
42 *Cognitive Sciences*, 6, 517-523.
43
44
45 Haidt, J. 2001: The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to
46
47 moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108, 814-834.
48
49
50 Hildebeitel, K.M., & Jones, S.K. 1992: An assessment of ethics instruction in accounting
51
52 education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 37-46.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kant, I. 1785/1998: *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*. Trans. M. Gregor.
4
5 Cambridge: Cambridge.
6
7
8 Kohlberg, L. 1984: *The Psychology of Moral Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harper &
9
10 Row.
11
12 Krebs, D.L., & Denton, K. 2005: Toward a more pragmatic approach to morality: A
13
14 critical evaluation of Kohlberg's model. *Psychological Review*, 112, 629-649.
15
16
17 Laband, D.N., & Beil, R.O. 1999: Are economists more selfish than other 'social'
18
19 scientists? *Public Choice*, 100: 85-101.
20
21
22 Loe, T.W., & Weeks, W.A. 2000: An experimental investigation of efforts to improve
23
24 sales students' moral reasoning. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales*
25
26 *Management*, 20, 243-251.
27
28
29 Luthar, H.K., & Karri, R. 2005: Exposure to ethics education and the perception of
30
31 linkage between organizational ethical behavior and business outcomes. *Journal*
32
33 *of Business Ethics*, 61, 353-368.
34
35
36 Martin, T.R. 2007: Do courses in ethics improve the ethical judgment of students?
37
38 *Business & Society*, 20, 17-26.
39
40
41 Mill, J.S. 1859/2003: *On Liberty*. In M. Warnock (ed.), *Utilitarianism and On Liberty*,
42
43 *2nd ed.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.
44
45
46 Moody-Adams, M.M. 1997: *Fieldwork in Familiar Places*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
47
48
49 Murphy, P.R., & Boatright, J.R. 1994: Assessing the effectiveness of instruction in
50
51 business ethics: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Education for Business*, 69,
52
53 326-333.
54
55
56 Nussbaum, M.C. 1997: *Cultivating Humanity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nussbaum, M.C. 2007: On moral progress: A response to Richard Rorty. *University of*
4
5 *Chicago Law Review*, 74, 939-960.
6
7
8 Piaget, J. 1932/1965: *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. Trans. M. Gabain. New York:
9
10 Free Press.
11
12 Rest, J.R. 1993: Research on moral judgment in college students. In A. Garrod (ed.),
13
14 *Approaches to moral development*. New York: Teachers College.
15
16
17 Ross, L., & Nisbett, R.E. 1991: *The Person and the Situation*. Philadelphia: Temple.
18
19
20 Smith, P.L., & Oakley, E.F. 1996: The value of ethics education in business school
21
22 curriculum. *College Student Journal*, 30, 274-283.
23
24
25 Stams, G.J., Brugman, D., Deković, M., van Rosmalen, L., van der Laan, P., & Gibbs,
26
27 J.C. 2006: The moral judgment of juvenile delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal*
28
29 *of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34, 697-713.
30
31
32 Wynd, W.R., & Mager, J. 1989: The business and society course: Does it change student
33
34 attitudes? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8, 487-491.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60