Between 9/11 and Kandahar

Between 9/11 and Kandahar:
Attitudes of Canadian Forces Officers in Transition

Alan Okros, Sarah Hill
and Franklin Pinch

The Claxton Papers

The Queen's University Defence Management Studies Program, established with the support of the Canadian Department of National Defence (DND), is intended to engage the interest and support of scholars, members of the Canadian Forces, public servants, and participants in the defence industry in the examination and teaching of the management of national defence policy and the Canadian Armed Forces. The program has been carefully designed to focus on the development of theories, concepts, and skills required to manage and make decisions within the Canadian defence establishment.

The Chair of the Defence Management Studies Program is located within the School of Policy Studies and is built on Queen's University's strengths in the fields of public policy and administration, strategic studies, management, and law. Among other aspects, the program offers an integrated package of teaching, research, and conferences, all of which are designed to build expertise in the field and to contribute to wider debates within the defence community. An important part of this initiative is to build strong links to DND, the Canadian Forces, industry, other universities, and non-governmental organizations, in Canada and in other countries.

This series of studies, reports, and opinions on defence management in Canada is named for Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence from 1946 to 1954. Brooke Claxton was the first post-Second World War defence minister and was largely responsible for founding the structure, procedures, and strategies that built Canada's modern armed forces. As defence minister, Claxton unified the separate service ministries into the Department of National Defence; revamped the *National Defence Act*; established the office of Chairman, Chiefs of

Staff Committee, the first step toward a single Chief of Defence Staff; organized the Defence Research Board; and led defence policy through the great defence rebuilding program of the 1950s, the Korean War, the formation of NATO, and the deployment of forces overseas in peacetime. Claxton was unique in Canadian defence politics: he was active, inventive, competent, and wise.

This study grew from the continuing research relationship between the Defence Management Studies Program and the Centre for Security, Armed Forces, and Society at The Royal Military College of Canada. The end of the Cold War brought major changes to armed forces across NATO and not the least to the Canadian Forces. The Liberal government elected in 1993 faced severe budgetary difficulties on entering office and decided to begin to redress them thorough major cuts to defence spending. This "downsizing" policy resulted in significant reductions in defence capabilities as budgets fell, equipment rusted, and people left the services early.

Unfortunately, the hoped for more peaceful "new world order" failed to end aggression and conflicts and the Canadian Forces in the 1990s found itself on active service in the former Yugoslavia, Somalia, Iraq, and in East Timor and at sea in support of the United Nations, NATO and, after 9/11, the so-called "war on terror." As capabilities fell, missions in dangerous places increased. Members of the Canadian Forces struggled to complete their assignments but their efforts resulted in unaccustomed casualties and turmoil among all ranks of the services. The stresses and strains of the period on members of the Canadian Forces—most of which were hidden from citizens through decisions by the Liberal government and the inability of CF leaders to speak out— eventually identified the period 1993-2003 as the "decade of darkness" for the Canadian Forces.

Several government-sponsored studies and other external research projects in Canada provided important evidence of the adverse effects on members of the Canadian Forces of "downsizing" in a period of escalating conflict operations. For the most part they dealt with singular events and situations. This study, on the other hand, was intended to take a wider view of the attitudes of the Canadian Forces officer corps towards their society and their governments during this period. The aim was not simply to expose one of the costs of the "decade of darkness," but to provide insights into an important aspect of civil-military relations in Canada and to suggest how officers and governments might deal with situations such as those encountered in this troubling decade.

The authors thank Mark Howes and Valerie Jarus for their continued, accomplished efforts to change the work of "mere scholars" into an attractive, readable product. We all thank Heather Salsbury for her unflagging good spirits and willing support to the Chair of the Defence Management Studies Program. We would also like to thank the Canadian Forces College course participants who completed the survey to provide us with their perspectives. Finally, we acknowledge Dr Peter Feaver at Duke University and his colleagues at the Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies for their permission to use their original survey work for this Canadian replication.

The Chair acknowledges the support given to this *Claxton Paper* by the Department of National Defence, the Canadian Forces College, the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, the School of Policy Studies at Queen's University, and The Royal Military College of Canada.

Douglas L. Bland
Chair, Defence Management Studies Program
School of Policy Studies, Queen's University
Kingston, Canada, December 2007

Contents

Authors' Note

Introduction

The mid-1990s represented a tumultuous period during which the Canadian Forces (CF) was facing multiple external and internal challenges. Senior leaders were struggling to concurrently achieve significant force reductions as part of the post-Cold War 'peace dividend', adapt to novel 'peace enforcement' missions in such regions as the Balkans and Somalia, and to address questions and criticisms arising from unprecedented external scrutiny of the functioning of the CF.

As part of a comprehensive review of senior leadership requirements, a series of interviews were subsequently conducted with retired CF officers who had held very senior appointments during this period. The resulting report, labeled "The Decade of Darkness",[1] reflected the frustrations of those interviewed with both their own inability to have their advice heeded by their political masters and/or their capacity to implement necessary changes in a timely and coherent manner. While several commented that they had not been fully prepared to operate in the strategic political-military milieu, they expressed optimism that the CF would be successful in preparing their successors to do so in the future. At the time of these interviews, the CF had launched a series of initiatives based on the long-range Defence 2020 strategy produced in 1998. Of relevance for addressing some of the weaknesses of the mid-1990s, were the first-ever articulation of doctrine on the military as a profession[2] and the creation or updating of several professional development programs, including a new Advanced Military Studies Course for Lieutenant Colonels/Commanders and a National Security Studies Course, designed to prepare Colonels/Captain (N) for the responsibilities of General/Flag Officer duties.

Concurrent with these initiatives, a team of American researchers published a comprehensive review of the attitudes of senior United States (US) military officers on a range of issues related to civil-military relations. We recognized that this US "Gaps Project" provided a valuable method to compare the opinions of American and Canadian Officers and to serve as a benchmark for long-term analyses of the effectiveness of the doctrinal and professional development initiatives being implemented within the CF. Therefore, an amended version of the US Gaps survey was administered to students (Major to Colonel, and equivalent) of the three senior courses conducted at the Canadian Forces College (CFC) for the academic years 2001 to 2003. Owing more to chance than prescience, responses were collected starting immediately after the events of 9/11 and prior to the resultant commitment of CF troops to the on-going mission in Afghanistan and the launch of General Rick Hillier's CF Transformation initiatives.[3] As such, it represents a unique snapshot of the attitudes of senior CF Officers during a period when the need for change was apparent but the way ahead was, as yet, unclear. Incorporating results presented in earlier interim papers,[4] this report summarizes the major research findings on the similarities and difference between the US and Canadian military responses, as well as the implications for assessing the longer term success of CF Transformation.

The responses of the senior officers who participated in this study may be categorized and discussed under three broad groupings. The first category is their political views, including perspectives on government policies, confidence in political leaders and opinions on the political-military interactions that characterize civil control of the military. The second category contains their perspectives on Canadian society, including their impressions of how Canadians view the military and the state of military-civilian relations. The third bears on the internal functioning of the CF, including assessments of readiness, military culture, and the health of the profession of arms. Before presenting these results, the initial section provides an overview of the issues that shaped military officers' opinions in both Canada and the United States, followed by a brief summary of the findings of the US Gaps research project and a description of the Canadian research design.

Government, Society and the Armed Forces

In any democracy, the military is required to carry out all functions legally prescribed by the state and is expected to do so in a manner that is seen as legitimate and effective by society. At least theoretically, violations of these obligations could result in military coups, on one hand, or failure to defend the nation, on the other. More pragmatically, in functioning democracies, the central issue of interest to both academics and practitioners pertains to the relationship of the military with both society and the government.

Since the end of the Cold War, civil-military relations (CMR) have become an important topic of re-examination and debate among military analysts in both liberal-democratic societies of the West and those attempting to establish democratic regimes elsewhere.[5] Theoretical work has focused on relationships of the military to its host society and to governments/politicians and has long been an issue of interest to social scientists, especially political scientists and sociologists. The clearest early statements of this relationship were those of Samuel Huntington, a political scientist, and Morris Janowitz, a sociologist; both of whom based most of their observations on the US military profession in the conscription era.[6] In positions that are by now well-known among scholars of armed forces and society, Huntington saw the military as being set quite apart from its host society on a number of dimensions. He argued that this was as it should be, if the military was to effectively address its mission and perform its major professional role: that is, defend the nation through the management and execution of large-scale violence when legitimately called upon to do so. Huntington depicted civil and military spheres as separate areas of activity. A military profession that regarded its role strictly in military terms and was

conservative in its social values, beliefs and attitudes, would remain a politically neutral arm of government and thus would be more amenable to political direction and civilian control.

Janowitz, on the other hand, saw the military institution as deeply embedded in its host society and dependent on it to effectively perform its responsibilities—though its unique mission rendered it somewhat different from other societal institutions and organizations. However, it had to reflect the values and the sensibilities of liberal-democratic society, if it was to enjoy legitimacy and support from the citizenry. What this meant was that the military was to be adaptive to external change, which, indeed, he documented in *The Professional Soldier.* This included broadening the social base of the military profession and the ascendance of dominant leadership and managerial models more in keeping with those of democratic, technologically progressive society. Janowitz viewed the military in much broader terms than just a warfighting machine and the profession as more than just a group of conservative "heroic warriors", insulated from the rest of society. It was Janowitz who first saw the possibilities of the military playing a "constabulary role", which was based on the use of minimum force and conflict-avoidance strategies and tactics. While he did not see the military profession as usurping political roles, he believed that officers' competency- and skill-sets should include those associated with developing an understanding and appreciation of the social and political context, both domestically and internationally. Civilian control of the military was based on the military profession's values being embedded in those of its society and were expected to change according to transformations occurring therein.[7] This professional orientation that operated from an external rather than an internal reference point was to be reinforced by professional socialization.[8]

Janowitz' position (in contrast to Huntington's) has been closer to reality for most Western militaries throughout the second half of the 20th Century and up to the present.[9] For example, the view that the military, political and social spheres are not totally separate areas of activity but rather interpenetrate and overlap is in line with Janowitz' thinking. (To a large extent, the underlying assumptions of the US Gaps research project are based on the Janowitzian understanding of civil-military relations). The positions of both Huntington and Janowitz have been subjected to scrutiny and criticism, especially in terms of their utility in formulating a satisfactory theory of civil-military relations. Both theorists' approaches have been seen as lacking since they view

military professionalism as the primary vehicle through which civilian control can be effected—"objective control" for Huntington and "subjective control" for Janowitz—without clearly specifying the mechanisms through which that occurs.[10]

In established democracies at least, civilian control *per se* is not seen as the primary issue in civil-military relations.[11] As neither societies nor political realities are static, the military must continually evolve to respond to political direction and to maintain a special trust relationship with the citizenry. Importantly, the military is not restricted to being a neutral observer but is expected to conduct comprehensive analyses in order to provide sound military advice to government and to engage in authorized self-regulation to ensure that the profession retains the confidence of the people. In fact, Bland has argued that military leaders share the responsibility for civil-military relations and that this requires more or less constant interaction between politicians/ government officials and military leaders.[12] (The need to interact may also be extended to civilian elites or with societal groups in general). This places a premium on political understanding on the part of professional military leaders and on attention to military issues on the part of politicians. The CF has recently endorsed the concept that military leaders should be seen as sharing responsibility for civil-military relations, including engaging in collaborative exchanges with government in certain areas or specific instances.[13]

Not surprisingly, the requirement for politicians, government officials and military leaders to interact on an ongoing basis has resulted in disagreements from time to time. The central tensions in countries, such as Canada and the United States, typically involve two key issues.[14] The first pertains to establishing the boundaries that define appropriate advice to government. The understanding of when, where and how advice is provided can become problematic: especially when the senior military leadership is concerned that their political masters do not fully grasp the advice being provided or, conversely, when politicians view the military as entering the public arena to influence government policy. The net result is that, at times, the military may be seen as having over-stepped its role of simply offering professional advice to government as required, by more aggressively attempting to influence the public, advancing its own self-interested position or otherwise pandering to partisan agendas.

The second tension involves the degree of autonomy afforded the military in internal resource allocation and professional self-regulation.

Since a large part of the specialized institutional mandate is to generate military capabilities and command troops, those in uniform are afforded considerable latitude in distributing (often scarce) resources and in exercising stewardship of the profession. Such latitude is necessary to ensure that the military achieves the objectives articulated in government direction. For more than 50 years, military leaders and politicians (along with media commentators and the public at large) have frequently disagreed over two key topics. The first pertains to the effort (money, people, equipment, training time, etc.) devoted to achieving the current tasks assigned by the government of the day versus the effort allocated to preparing the military for a range of plausible but not defined future tasks that the government may call on the military to perform. In Canada, a recurring friction has been between the military's desire (or perceived professional obligation) to prepare for a range of potential mid- to high-intensity conflict roles versus the government's desire to have the CF allocate more effort to conducting currently assigned peace support and low intensity conflict missions.[15]

The second potential area of disagreement involves the relative balancing of priorities devoted to achieving broad social objectives versus optimizing the military capacity to apply over-whelming lethal force.[16] During more than a 40-year period, the CF has been strongly encouraged or directly ordered to implement changes to ensure that the military reflects evolving social norms and, in particular, to ensure that the needs, aspirations, and characteristics of different groups are effectively accommodated. These have included: initiatives to create a fully bilingual institution; the integration of women; the inclusion of gays/lesbians; and historical redress of marginalized groups, such as Aboriginal Peoples and visible minorities. Parallels exist in the US, starting with Truman's directions in the late 1940s to end racial segregation within the Armed Services. While the superficial arguments often involve the allocation of resources to achieve these goals and concerns over the erosion of unit-level cohesion and combat effectiveness, the core underlying tension pertains to the degree of autonomy that the military should be afforded in defining the preferred military culture and regulating professional practices. Integrated into the design of the US Gaps Project is the recognition that the government, the 'people' and the military may each have a distinct perspective on what kind of military they wish to have and, in particular, on what kind of military culture they wish to see.[17]

The net result of these two longstanding tensions is that Canadian and American military leaders have wrestled with their perceived

dilemmas over providing appropriate advice (versus "standing up for what is right and proper") and in exercising institutional stewardship to ensure that the nation always has the military it needs (versus generating one that sacrifices long-term effectiveness for short-term expediency).[18] Frustrations and concerns can arise when those in uniform do not believe that their advice is being given due consideration or that they are being provided direction that is unwise; when the politicians perceive that the military is not being forthcoming or is not responding appropriately when assigned missions; or, when the citizenry see their military conducting activities in a manner that does not reflect important societal values. These, in turn, can erode the trust, respect and confidence that each has of the other. Many of these issues surfaced in a number of reports on the CF in the 1990s, including the Somalia Inquiry, the Minister of National Defence (Douglas Young) Report to the Prime Minister, the Parliamentary Standing Committee (SCONDVA) Report on "Quality of Life" and a series of studies presented by the CF Ombudsman.[19]

The US Gaps Project also arose from questions regarding the military's willingness to implement government direction and a perceived growing divergence in values between the military and civilian society. Exemplified in a July 1997, *Atlantic Monthly* article by Thomas Ricks on attitudes favoring isolation amongst some in the Marine Corps; these sentiments were echoed, later in 1997, in Secretary of Defence Cohen's comments on a cultural chasm developing between the military and civilian worlds. It is important, however, to note two significant differences between the Canadian and US contexts. First, the absence of a clear threat to national security immediately following the end of the Cold War caused greater concerns in the US than Canada. Military leaders, in particular, worried that this could (1) result in declining public support for the military, and/or (2) encourage politicians to experiment with the Armed Forces by sending them on non-conventional missions (operations other than war, such as Bosnia and Somalia) or by implementing "odious" social changes (such as allowing homosexuals to serve openly). Second, the decision to move to an all-volunteer force (AVF) in the mid-1970s was resulting in a military that did not reflect the demographics of the American population. Hence there was concern that military values could become unrepresentative of, and discontinuous with, those of the overall society. Woven throughout the Gaps research project is the acknowledgement that current concerns over public support, military subordination to civil control and the politician's

use of the military in the US are often viewed in light of parallel concerns that arose during their experiences in Vietnam.

Of importance, the impetus for the US Gaps Project stemmed from concerns over the *future* state of: the American military, the effectiveness of civil control and the nature of relations between the military and society, especially if perceived trends continued. In contrast, the rationale for conducting a similar study in Canada arose from observations of the *current* circumstances for the CF. In particular, many of the characteristics of the plausible (and worrisome) future US case have been evident in Canada since the mid-1970s. Canadians had not perceived a direct threat to the nation since the early years of the Cold War; the last significant cohort of war veterans were 30 years older than in the US; public interest in the CF or in military service were comparatively low, as was the proportion of politicians with military service; the CF was used to being deployed on peacekeeping missions or in response to natural disasters; defence routinely received far less of a share of the public purse and a significantly smaller proportion of the national domestic product than most other NATO nations; and, the CF had already responded to social policies that military leaders believed were rushed or unwise.[20]

Many of the underlying issues presented in this introductory discussion also apply to other professions that claim to serve society. As articulated for the CF in *Duty with Honour*, a profession is seen as a unique group that addresses a particular social good by: applying a theory-based body of knowledge; meeting certain government-mediated obligations to society; and by drawing on a core set of values, beliefs and expectations to exercise ethical/moral judgement. Based on these characteristics, professions tend to: prefer a high degree of autonomy in regulating professional practice; often see themselves as the only experts in their domain; normally consider their function as essential to society; would prefer to see a larger share of the public purse devoted to their services; and maintain an uneasy relationship with political decision-makers who exercise varying degrees of control over the profession. Among others, policing, education and health care represent three public service sectors in which tensions exist among the heads of the profession, politicians and the public—especially regarding the manner in which the profession engages in public dialogue, funds are allocated, and the degree to which professional practices reflect societal values. Differences of opinion on these issues should, therefore, be expected. As highlighted in the following section, the critical issue is how they get resolved.

The US Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies Gap Project[21]

The "Project on the Gap between the Military and Civilian Society" was designed to examine the similarities and differences in values, attitudes, opinions and perspectives between the US military and American society. Sponsored by the Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies (TISS), it was comprised of faculty members from Duke University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and North Carolina State University. Drawing on commentary by political officials and coverage in news journals, as well as an extensive body of American attitudinal research, the study focused on a central and recurring problem for American policy makers: the need to reconcile the distinctive culture and mission of the armed forces with American democratic ideals and practices. Thus, the primary research objectives were to identify the nature of the value or culture 'gap', to examine whether (or how) it was changing, and to consider the implications for military effectiveness and civil-military cooperation. As identified by the researchers, this study represented a third 'wave' of academic interest in the nature of the 'gap', with debates around Huntington's and Janowitz' positions following the Second World War marking the first round, and the Vietnam Era studies marking the second.[22]

The US Gaps research design featured a multi- and inter-disciplinary approach that applied survey research, cultural and political analysis, and historical inquiry, to address a comprehensive set of questions about the nature and significance of the gap between military and civilian cultures. While the primary results and the component replicated in Canada are based on an attitudinal survey instrument, the Gaps Project generated 21 original studies. The topics addressed by the latter ranged from the coverage of the military in the mass communication

media and images presented in literature and film, through historical analyses of US civil-military relations, and specific case studies from different countries in which politicians exercised significant control over the military in war, to the examination of the curriculum of US entry-level, professional military education (PME) programs.

Although the overall objective was to compare military members to civilians, the researchers recognized the distinctive role and nature of specific sub-groups within each of these populations; of especial importance were the perspectives of those in positions of influence. Thus, while a shortened version of the survey was administered to a representative national sample, much of the focus of the research was on a comparison of the responses from a selected sample of military and civilian "elite". The responses of approximately 1,100 "military elite" were generated primarily from mid- and senior-level officers attending the staff college, war college or capstone courses that prepare those selected for responsibilities at the ranks from Lieutenant-Colonel/Commander through to General/Flag Officer. In order to provide longitudinal comparisons, the almost 1,000 "civilian elite" respondents were identified using procedures applied in the Foreign Policy Leadership Project.[23] The researchers developed eight subgroups drawn from "Who's Who in America" and other directories of prominent Americans in the categories of: "Clergy", "Women", "American Politics", "State Department", "Media", "Foreign Affairs", and "Labor".

The project's survey instrument was designed to generate data that, in some areas, would be comparable to results produced in earlier surveys of attitudes about foreign and domestic policy. The survey questionnaire contained over 250 items covering a range of issues: from the respondent's social and religious values to views on national security policy, and from military professionalism to the civil-military relationship itself. It was mailed to civilian leaders and administered to military officers in person and electronically at various military educational institutions between the fall of 1998 and the spring of 1999. A shortened version of the survey instrument was also administered by telephone to a representative random national sample of over 1000 members of the general public during September and October 1998. Selected studies and/ or results were published in *The National Interest* (Fall 2000) and a special edition of *Armed Forces and Society* (Winter 2001) with the comprehensive project report *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* published in 2001.

Given the scope and nature of the research program conducted and, in particular, the multiple analyses applied, a few selected results of this work drawn from *Soldiers and Civilians* are presented. As with all social science research, the context in which these studies were conducted frames the meaning ascribed to the data generated. Simply stated, there are important differences between Canada and the United States regarding key elements of government policy and societal values; hence caution should be exercised in making direct comparisons from survey data. Further, it is quite likely that the responses on many items would change if this survey was replicated today with the same American sample, given the subsequent events of 9/11, the policies of the Bush Administration and the realities of Iraq. The following summarizes the key conclusions presented by the researchers, with an emphasis on the comparisons of the military and civilian elites. More specific comparisons between the US and Canadian military responses will be provided in the subsequent sections.

The survey examined the gap from three perspectives: the relative congruence of opinions among the military and civilian respondents; military respondents' unique views on particular issues related to governance; and, civilian respondents' unique views on particular military issues. The *civilian-military congruence* dimensions addressed:

- mutual respect,
- similarity of key values,
- general support for institutions, and
- similarity of views on economic and social issues.

The *unique military perspectives on governance* encompassed:

- acceptance of civil control of the military;
- agreement with government foreign policy;
- support for government military policy and programs (expenditures);
- agreement with government domestic policy and social programs; and
- support for elected representatives and, in particular, the US President as Commander-in-Chief.

The *unique civilian (elite and/or general) perspectives* related to the military covered:

- the military awareness needed by elected officials to exercise civil control,
- agreement with core military doctrine,
- agreement with military priorities and programs, and
- support for distinctive aspects of military culture.

The broad, overall conclusion reached was that there were, indeed, both convergences and gaps between the military and the civilian society. While some gaps were considered justified and others seen as acceptable, certain results were deemed troubling, with the potential to erode civil-military cooperation and/or military effectiveness, if not addressed. Reassuring results included those showing that military officers continued to see themselves as subordinate to civil control and tended to agree with the civilian elite on key issues of American defence policy; also, both elite groups expressed generalized respect and confidence for the other. Although the military respondents strongly supported the Republican Party and were more religious (in practice and belief) than the civilian elite, they strongly supported items seen as reflecting civil liberties, including freedom of speech.

Both the military and civilian elites expressed concerns over the "moral health" of the broader society, although the civilian elite did not support their uniformed counterparts' view that American society would benefit from adopting the military's values and beliefs. While military leaders expressed higher trust and confidence in government institutions than did the civilian elite, they were much more critical of the quality of political leadership and the news media. Somewhat mirroring the policies of the day, both the military and civilian elites were satisfied with the military's progress on gender integration and did not see a requirement or a role for the military to expand the employment of women into combat roles. The senior officers strongly opposed a more open policy for gays and lesbians while a plurality of the civilian elite and American society favoured such a move.

As illustrated in the Armed Services' response to the Clinton Administration policy on sexual orientation,[24] a key conclusion was that, while military officers accepted the principle of civil control, many military respondents felt that senior leaders should take a much more proactive, if not forceful, role in decisions, particularly those that involved committing military forces. Military officers believed that their seniors should dictate key aspects of mission planning, such as rules of engagement, exit strategies and the type of military units to be used

(rather than merely providing advice on these issues). These results were linked to the military's greater concern over the potential loss of American lives. Interestingly, a study of acceptable US military casualties across several scenarios included a potential mission to prevent Iraq from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. The elite military response was that the public would accept approximately 5,000 US deaths while the elite civilian estimates were about 17,000, the broader society (non-veteran) total was over 25,000 and members of society with military service provided the highest response at 40,000. Researchers concluded that while military leaders were being very pessimistic and the civilian elites were unduly concerned over battle losses, the broader society was far more prepared for high US military losses. However, recent events would suggest that academics should be cautious when predicting the public mood, especially when it involves complex moral and emotional issues that can be strongly influenced by political rhetoric and/or media coverage of events.

Several factors were noted to help increase our understanding of the results obtained. For the items examining the degree of congruence between the military and civilian elite, the two samples differed in several areas, and that may explain some of the divergent opinions. Differences include: education, income, religious belief, age, gender and race. None of these explained a large proportion of the variance reported. Factors seen to be related to the unique military view of civilian society included: political affiliation/ideology, rank, and professional military development. For civilians' views of the military: previous military service and/or general awareness of the military, along with political affiliation, were noted to be important.

The conclusions and implications broadly indicate that, while there were growing divides in the two key explanatory variables of military members' political affiliation and civilians' military service or awareness, the existing state of civilian-military relations was best represented as having a number of stress points but no evident fractures. These stress points and their potential implications appeared to fall into three domains. The first pertained to erosion of the apolitical role of military personnel with the increasingly visible alignment with the Republican party/platform; this was seen as potentially undermining public support for the military as an institution and the ability of the services to attract recruits who fully represent the American population. The second revolved around effective civil control, with a concern that low levels of mutual trust and confidence in the quality and motives of

military and civilian leaders would mitigate the frank dialogue needed to ensure effective decisions which might, in turn, impair military preparedness, effectiveness and responsiveness. The final conclusion addressed the original issue of the estrangement of military leaders from mainstream society. Thus, while the military trusted their government as an institution, they didn't like elected officials and, while they respected American society, they didn't think much of the average citizen. The researchers concluded that these attitudes could have potential impacts on the military profession, its core values, and its culture.

The authors of the above conclusions and implications assumed a continued post-Cold War environment: that is, a relatively peaceful international context, with the US military either increasingly engaged in non-traditional peacebuilding missions or entering a period of prolonged inactivity. While it would be anticipated that responses will have shifted for each of the groups surveyed over the course of President George W. Bush's administration, with its focus on combating terrorist activities and the decision to enter Iraq, it would be of great interest to examine whether the increased attention paid to the military over the last six to seven years has addressed either of the two significant fault lines revealed in this research. The first pertains to the general level of military understanding of, or interest and experience in, society as a whole—and the civilian elite in particular. The hypothesis that the emergence of a clear threat to national security, accompanied by increased numbers serving in uniform, would lead to a more informed, engaged and supportive public and civil elite is worthy of testing. The second item that was identified as representing a worrying gap within the military pertains to the professional norm emerging from mid-level officers that their seniors must take a strong stand when advising (or negotiating with) the government. TISS authors indicate that this misunderstanding may well be the result of deficiencies in junior and mid-level officer professional military education as to the nature of the real civil-military relationship; therefore, it would be of interest to examine how PME has been amended or whether mid-level officers still complete courses believing that their seniors should be more proactive.

Design of the Canadian Replication of the US Gaps Project

The Gaps Project was initially examined in light of CF initiatives to produce doctrine on the profession of arms and to update the professional development programs for senior officers, and it was concluded that there would be benefits in replicating this work in Canada. In order to conduct an effective study and produce meaningful results, three issues were considered in developing the research design. The first was to determine the populations to be sampled to ensure comparability with the US participants while also considering unique aspects in the Canadian context. The second was to examine the available literature on similar topics in Canada and to develop some initial hypotheses on possible differences between Canadian and American views. The third was to review the individual questionnaire items in the context of potential Canadian-American differences to determine whether certain items should be reworded, deleted or replaced with additional questions.

SURVEY POPULATIONS

In considering the potential populations to be sampled, it was determined that a full replication of the TISS design was not feasible as there were neither the resources nor the support for a broad survey of either a comparable civilian elite or broader society samples. Although not pursued, it was also considered that, if done, special consideration would need to be given to addressing the relations between senior military leaders and senior members of the Federal Government public service. Given the differences in systems of government, it was hypothesized that there might be important elements of the nature of views and exchanges involving public servants (rather than politicians and

their personal staff) within the Department of National Defence and with other Departments, such as Foreign Affairs and the Canadian International Development Agency, and Central Agencies, such as Treasury Board and the Privy Council Office.

Based on the decision to restrict the initial research to the military population, it was relatively easy to identify the three career development courses conducted at the Canadian Forces College in Toronto as containing the best representatives of the "up and coming" leaders, referred to in the TISS research as the "military elite". Given the strong similarities in both general career development models among many NATO nations and the constant benchmarking and cross-accreditation among allied War Colleges, the participants on the three courses selected are considered to closely mirror the American military elite samples. However, the Canadian sample did not include all of the recently promoted General/Flag Officers who typically attend a capstone seminar program. Canadian samples did include those attending the 10-month Command and Staff Course (CSC) for senior Majors, the four-month Advanced Military Studies Course (AMSC) for senior Lieutenant-Colonels, and the six-month National Security Studies Course (NSSC) for senior Colonels.

The Canadian version of the Gaps survey was administered to those who chose to participate during the initial stages of each course for the academic years commencing in fall 2001 through to fall 2003 (hence, in September of each year for the CSC and AMSC cohorts and in January of the following year for NSSC). A total of 215 individuals participated, including a small number of international officers and senior civilians from within DND. Overall, the sample closely mirrored the demographics of the CF senior officer cadre as overwhelmingly male (91%), Caucasian (93%), and serving in the Regular Force (95%) rather than as a member of the Reserve Component. In comparison to the US military elite sample, the Canadian respondents more closely represented the service/environmental distributions, with 37% each from the Army and Air Force, and 25% Navy. The Canadian participants also represented a larger proportion of the overall officer population serving in these rank levels than in the US case. Although not reported in the TISS data, in the previous five years, 56% of the Canadian sample had deployed abroad and 42% had deployed on operations within Canada. It was also noted that, in comparison to the proportional representation of entry plan on commissioning, graduates from the (then) three military colleges were over-represented at 40%.

HYPOTHESES

Although the TISS researchers were able to draw on an extensive body of previous American work in order to develop hypotheses and questionnaire items, the comparable Canadian literature is best described as sparse and fragmented. Generalized hypotheses were developed based on a review of published articles, internal Canadian Forces reports and discussions with Canadian academic colleagues working in the area of civil-military relations. The results of this initial work were presented and discussed by the first author at a special symposium on the US Gaps Project held in St Cyr, France, and organized by Dr. Peter Feaver and his TISS research colleagues.[25] Based on this work, it was expected that gaps in the Canadian context would not be found in the same areas or with the same magnitude as was observed in the US case. To a degree, these expectations reflect important differences in the influences of the socio-cultural context (such as the nature of national identity, the importance given to national symbolism, and the dominance of Christian beliefs in daily life and political discourse) and significant divergences in the two societies' perspectives on the role and purpose of the military (highlighted by the American focus on Green Berets defending the nation and the Canadian view of Blue Berets promoting international peace).

As already alluded to, it was concluded that there are significant differences between Canada and the US in the relations among the government, the people and their military on issues such as the type of society each wishes to create, the role of government on the national and international stage and, integrating these two, the type of military that the nations devise and maintain. Consequently, it was considered that the broad issue of a "worrisome gap" between the military and civilian cultures did not translate from the US to the Canadian setting with the same conceptual meaning or comparable practical implications. This hypothesis reflects differences on three key, taken-for-granted assumptions underlying the TISS research. The first is that Canadians have not seen the requirement to develop as complex a system of checks and balances to guard against the misuse of government power; hence they have developed alternate structural arrangements and understandings of the roles of the military, the legislature, and the judicial systems. The second is that, as a "middle power", Canada tends to view international events in a different manner and has pursued alternate strategies to gain influence beyond its borders. The strong preference for the use of multi-lateralism and political discourse highlighted by

compromise and consensus-building, combined with activism to create an architecture of international governance to resolve disputes, results in a significantly different approach to international affairs and variation in the role of the military. The third is that, by virtue of geography, Canadians do not perceive there to be the kinds of threats to national security that would require a robust military response. The Cold War belief that nobody was able to invade Canada without first going through the US, and a more recent one, that Canada's image as an international "good citizen" significantly reduces the likelihood of anyone using terrorist tactics to influence Canada's international agenda, have led to both a lower profile and a more modest role of the military as an agent of government foreign policy.

An additional factor that suggests a gap is less likely (or less problematic) in Canada stems from the concentration of power afforded the Prime Minister (particularly when provided by a majority government)[26] and the long standing prioritization of Defence as of lesser importance than domestic issues, such as health and social development. Consequently, the CF has not had the material or moral national salience[27] that could empower it to significantly diverge from political direction. Further, while elements of the Huntington-Janowitz debate are of relevance in Canada, the well established tradition of relying almost exclusively on volunteers and the demonstrated responsiveness of the CF in implementing programs to align the profession with the larger society (when prodded to do so), combined with a broader acceptance of pluralistic cultural norms, have led to far less concern over the military developing a culture that is disconnected from that of the larger society.[28] Thus, a possible civilian-military gap in the American context may, indeed, become cause for concern as the US relies heavily on the military to protect the nation from what are perceived as very real threats to both national security and exertion of the nation's influence on the world stage. Conversely, the question of how much of a military Canada needs ("just enough, just in case"), Canadian-US comparisons as to how much of a gap there may be between the military and civilian worlds and whether such a gap would erode civil control and/or military effectiveness, could be summarized as "not much and not really".

The assumption that a possible civil-military gap would not likely be very large or very important does not, however, mean that an examination of the attitudes and opinions of either group in Canada is not warranted. In particular, there are two main reasons why a replication

of the TISS Gaps research among comparable Canadian Officers was deemed to be of value. As illustrated in the introductory reference to the "decade of darkness" and subsequent efforts to strengthen the capacity of senior officers to operate effectively in the strategic political-military milieu, the first reason was to provide a baseline to monitor the effectiveness of doctrinal and professional development initiatives over time.

The second rationale arises from a consideration deemed to be of relevance to all NATO nations, with the exception of the US. While analyses of the inter-relations amongst the government, the people and the military can be constrained to the national context for the US, the dominance of American military doctrine, perspectives and engagement across NATO suggests that it would be wise to benchmark the opinions of CF officers against their US colleagues. Although the idea of the US Services adopting the values and beliefs of a foreign military are considered to be so unlikely as to not be worth even considering, the reverse is not true, particularly for a next-door neighbour with a military that likely values maintaining mutual trust and confidence with Canada's 'closest ally'. In particular, given cross-border influences and the reality of Canadians deploying alongside Americans, if not often under their command, an examination of the similarities and divergences between the Canadian and US military cultures was also seen as worthwhile.

Among others, three generalized hypotheses were formulated in this military-military comparison. The first was there would be a similar pattern of results suggesting that Canadian senior officers also did not hold either politicians or the media in very high esteem. However, Canadian respondents were not expected to share the same negative opinions over the general 'moral health' of Canadian society or the potential benefits of civilians adopting military values. The second was there would be significant similarities over the issue of how strongly the military should present its opinions to government (insisting on key elements of the so-called "Powell Doctrine"). In contrast, however, a much broader acceptance of the requirement for the CF to engage in a wide range of missions, including peacekeeping/stability operations and humanitarian relief, was expected. The third was that Canadian officers would more closely reflect national perspectives, rather than US military views, regarding the use of military force versus diplomatic or other means to address issues on the international stage.

QUESTIONNAIRE AMENDMENTS

Examination of the original survey items used by the TISS researchers suggested four necessary types of changes to questions. The first was to adapt item content to reflect the Canadian context. In addition to the simplistic substitution of 'Canadian' for 'American', several items were reworded to reflect differences in either Canadian legislation or in CF policies. Some of these changes resulted in questions that were in the opposite direction, such as amending 'placing stringent controls on the sale of handguns' to 'easing controls on the sale of handguns' and 'banning the death penalty' to 'reintroduction of the death penalty'. Other items were altered to measure degree of support for an existing policy rather than a policy change (such as replacing the question on whether gay men and lesbians should be allowed to serve openly in the military to relative agreement with the CF policy allowing gay men and lesbians to do so).

The second was to alter the focus or scope of certain items to reflect difference in Canadian policies, practices and institutions. For example, in assessing support for institutions, the reference to 'law enforcement agencies' was split into 'the RCMP', 'provincial police forces' and 'municipal police forces' and, in some instances, references to the President (as primary political decision maker) were replaced with Prime Minster, while other references to the President (as Commander-in-Chief) were replaced with Governor General. Of importance in this respect, several items that referred to 'civilian leaders' were amended to 'government officials' to measure the potential tensions between military leaders and senior members of the public service. Additionally, one set of amendments regarding military power shifted the focus from the US military to NATO or from the US military dominance to multi-purpose, combat capable Armed Forces as the more direct comparables in the Canadian context. Another set reflected Canadian approaches on the international stage and tapped into notions related to globalization by expanding some lists presented to include NATO, the UN, the International Criminal Court, G8 Leaders, NAFTA, etc.

Given the length of the survey, the third was that some items were deleted from the original as they were assessed to either be of much less relevance, likely to be seen as intrusive or just did not apply in the Canadian context. Amongst those deleted as not applicable were items tapping issues such as busing children to achieve social integration, support for the CIA in undermining hostile governments, the American response to the Embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, and

references to the draft. Those deemed to be of less relevance and seen as potentially intrusive included items measuring religious beliefs and practices, interpretation of the Christian Bible and the banning of certain books.

The purpose of the fourth set of amendments was to split some questions into a response for the Canadian context but to also measure a response for the US setting. Again, due mainly to chance, the items on attacks on Canada and on Canadian computer networks mirrored similar questions concerning attacks on the US or American computer networks. Also included under the list of institutions for which respondents expressed their confidence and their knowledge was the US Military.

The complete listing of all item amendments (including the general rationale for the change) is presented in Annex A. The tables containing the responses of participants for each item are presented in Annex B.

Canadian Findings:
The Political Arena

The first set of results pertains to a number of items that reflect opinions of the military respondents regarding both government policies and the nature of the military-political interface. While the focus of these questions was on security policies and the role of the military, questions were also included to measure support for broader fiscal and social policies to both gauge alignment with the general public and also to measure relative prioritization of government spending. Responses are grouped under three general categories: overall foreign and domestic policies; the role of the military; and perspectives on civil control of the military.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICIES

The respondents generally endorsed a wide range of foreign policy goals as being either very or somewhat important with combined endorsements ranging from a low of 69% to a high of 93% on the nine items presented. The top three items deemed to be very important were: preventing the spread of nuclear weapons (60%), fostering international cooperation to solve common problems (49%), and worldwide arms control (43%). Of interest, the two items that attracted the largest minority opinion as not important pertained to helping bring a democratic form of government to other nations (27% not important) and maintaining NATO military superiority worldwide (as the equivalent to the TISS item on US military superiority) (24%). In contrast to their American peers, Canadian officers tended to take a more balanced approach in considering international policies providing stronger support for a number of social policies while relatively fewer rated the nuclear

weapons or arms control items as very important. Differences emerged between Canadians and Americans in the percentage endorsing as very important the following items: promoting human rights (37% very important for Canadians vs. 13% for US), improving standards of living in less developed countries (26% Canadian vs. 8% US) and combating world hunger (26% vs. 15%). Conversely, the American sample was more in favour of maintaining military superiority (74% very important vs. 26% for Canadians), addressing nuclear weapons (90% vs. 60%) and worldwide arms control (72% vs. 43%).

This pattern of a more balanced perspective by the Canadian participants was also evident in their views on threats to national security. In considering these results, it should be recalled that the Canadian data collection occurred after the events of 9/11 while the US research was conducted prior to this event. Not surprisingly, a majority considered there to be very serious threats from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in less developed countries (57%) and international terrorism (55%) while 41% saw terrorist attacks on Canada to pose a very serious threat. Of note, while the Canadian respondents saw a greater likelihood of terrorist attacks on the US (50% very serious), 57% of the US military participants had seen terrorist attacks on the US as a very serious threat pre-9/11. On a related item, Canadians saw a degree of concern over the expansion of Islamic fundamentalism (27% very serious threat) while at the early date Americans had dismissed this concern (only 10% very serious). This perception has likely shifted significantly in the US in recent years.

Overall, Canadians tended to see the broad range of items presented as less of a threat to national security than did the Americans. The largest divergence pertained to a central issue in the TISS Gaps research: the threat posed by the decline of standards and morals in society (the focus of the 1997 Ricks' *Atlantic Monthly* article). While 42% of the US military officers saw this as a very serious threat, only 10% of the Canadians agreed, with 60% dismissing this issue as either slightly serious or not at all serious. Other differences included the emergence of China as a great military power (13% of Canadian endorsed very serious threat vs. 33% of Americans), proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (57% Canadian vs. 81% US) and international drug trafficking (16% Canadian vs. 30% US). Neither group tended to see issues, such as number of immigrants and refugees coming to the country, economic competition or environmental problems as presenting very serious threats to national security.

The opinions of the Canadian and American military officers on a range of government domestic/social policies tended to mirror the similarities and differences between the two nations overall. Americans were more likely than Canadians to endorse more conservative or traditional approaches, such as permitting prayer in public schools (74% US vs. 49% Canadian), encouraging mothers to stay at home with children (51% vs. 39%), barring homosexuals from teaching in public schools (44% vs. 17%) or providing tax credits for children to attend private schools (53% vs. 32%); Canadians were more in favour of leaving abortion decisions to women and their doctors (82% Canadian vs. 65% US) and in redistributing income to the poor (37% vs. 24%). Both groups strongly endorsed debt reduction versus tax relief and neither was in favour of relaxing environmental regulations to stimulate economic growth or in reducing the defence budget to increase the education budget. (Conceptually, these three items are the same, but there are significant difference in real dollar terms on the size of the national debt, relative tax rates, and the defence and education budget allocations). The two items that were reverse-worded to reflect national policies could be considered to represent a degree of convergence. First, only 10% of Americans supported banning the death penalty with 55% of Canadian military officers supporting reintroduction. Second, only 9% of Canadians agreed with easing current controls on the sale of handguns while 69% of Americans favoured restricting handgun sales.

Asked to indicate how important various domestic issue were for them, the Canadian respondents tended to reflect the broader public opinions with the top three items listed as the Canadian economy (80%), protection of the environment (75%) and the health care system (72%). Mid-level importance was given to integrity among public officials (67%), illegal drugs (59%), immigration (53%), and the gap between rich and poor (52%) with the least important issues as resolving relations with Aboriginal people (39%) and the feminist movement (20%). Only five items were included in the US TISS survey with higher responses for integrity of public officials (79%) and illegal drugs (69%), a similar rating on the Social Security System (as a parallel for Canadian health care), and lesser importance attached to protection of the environment (64%) or the gap between rich and poor (48%).

ROLE OF THE MILITARY

Three questions tapped into perceptions regarding the role of the military. The first assessed aspects of the appropriate use of military

force versus other elements of political power hence tended to overlap with the previous sections coverage of foreign policy. Continuing the trend noted above, Canadians did not view international affairs in as much of a confrontational manner as their US counterparts thus also did not see the military as of equal importance in influencing events. American military officers were much more likely to strongly agree with propositions addressing: 'domino theory' where aggressor nations will influence nearby countries (52% vs. 7%), the need to take all steps including the use of force to prevent aggression by an expansionist power (77% vs. 25%) and the view of Russia as expansionist rather than defensive (27% vs. 1%). Similarly, the US respondents were more likely to strongly agree with a number of items on the use of force including: force should be applied quickly and massively (79% vs. 18%), and only in pursuit of total victory (42% vs. 9%) along with the view that military objectives rather than political goals should determine the application of force (27% strongly agreed vs. 9%).

Again recalling possible pre- vs. post-9/11 effects, perhaps surprisingly, the US respondents were much more likely to endorse the need to enlist the UN in settling international disputes (80% strongly agreed vs. 31% for Canadians), to give economic aid to poor countries at the expense of higher prices at home (34% vs. 3%) and that national security depends more on trade than military strength (37% vs. 16%). Canadians, however, did endorse a more external focus with only 4% strongly agreeing that we should concentrate more on our own national problems (vs. 21% strongly agreeing for the Americans).

Finally, to return to another of the original TISS research issues, Americans were much more likely to strongly agree that the public would not tolerate large numbers of casualties in military operations (78% vs. 44%). In considering this response, one should consider how the two nations may interpret the reference to 'large numbers'. It should also be noted that some of the Canadians completed this survey after the loss of four soldiers in Afghanistan due to fratricide[29], an event that generated political, public and media support for the military and recognition of the need to honour those killed in combat not observed in Canada since the Korean Conflict or even the Second World War. Although context and numbers are significantly different between the recent Canadian experiences in Afghanistan and the Americans' in Iraq, it is plausible to extend an earlier statement to suggest that both the Canadian and American military respondents may have been quite accurate in judging the responses of their respective publics to the loss of life.

A second question more closely linked the role of the military and a number of the potential threats to security reported on above by asking whether it was more or less effective to use military tools versus non-military tools such as diplomacy. Both Canadians and Americans endorsed the use of diplomacy with the use of the military seen as much more or somewhat more effective than non-military tools only for addressing international terrorism (54% endorsement from Canadians and 53% from Americans, noting again pre-/post-9/11). Military tools were not seen as the most effective in addressing issues including immigration, drug trafficking, attacks on computer networks, and expansion of Islamic fundamentalism. Americans were, however, more likely to see the military as more often effective in two domains: the emergence of China as a military power (33% military much more or somewhat effective for US vs. 13% for Canada) and weapons of mass destruction (49% US vs. 32% Canada).

The third question very directly measured the importance given to specific uses or roles for the military. While both groups overwhelming supported the core mission to fight and win the nation's wars, the Canadian responses also reflected long standing domestic roles with 53% seeing disaster relief within Canada as very important (vs. 26% from US)[30] and 38% endorsing dealing with domestic disorder as very important (vs. 9% US). Similarly, relative to the American responses, Canadians tended to give more support to a broader range of international roles including engaging in operations other than war (80% very important vs. 53% US), addressing humanitarian needs (18% vs. 5%) and intervening in civil wars (8% vs. 1%). Less than 1% in each country saw redressing historical discrimination as a very important role for the military.

The role of the military in addressing broader societal objectives will be discussed in greater detail in the two following sections; however, the outright dismissal of redressing historical discrimination should be noted. Recalling that the two domestic issues given the lowest importance were resolving relations with Aboriginal Peoples and the feminist movement, it would appear that these officers are viewing the CF in a narrow context as solely an element of foreign power and not recognizing either the military's historical role within Canada or a plausible current role in nation building.

CIVIL CONTROL

The third dimension covered under the broad category of the political arena pertains to the elements that characterize civil control of

the military with questions to assess both confidence in key institutions/office holders and the relative role of the government officials and military leaders in making important decisions regarding the military. The Canadian officers were generally critical of their political masters and, in fact, much more so than their American colleagues (recalling again that surveys were conducted with Jean Chrétien and Bill Clinton as the respective political leaders). Canadians did not see political leaders as knowledgeable about the military (89% endorsed somewhat or very ignorant while conversely 34% of Americans responded somewhat or very knowledgeable). While Canadians were more likely to agree that political leaders shared the same values as the public (52% agreed vs. 40% in the US), 64% believed that the primary motivation for government decisions regarding the military came from party politics rather than nation security requirements (vs. 49% in the US). This perspective is likely related to two pessimistic (or perhaps realistic) assessments of CF capabilities. Only 77% agreed or strongly agreed that the CF would perform well in wartime (vs. 98% for the US) and only 35% strongly or somewhat agreed that ten years from now Canada would have the a multi-purpose, combat capable military able to meets Canada's security challenges (vs. 89% endorsement from Americans that the US Services would still be the best in the world).

An issue that will explored further in subsequent sections pertains to relative confidence in and knowledge of key institutions. The Canadian respondents tended to be generally pessimistic across the board on these items providing confidence ratings that ranged from neutral to slightly negative for virtually all institutions listed. Within the political realm, on a 10 point scale with 5 as the neutral point, confidence ratings ranged from 3.9 for the Federal Government, federal commissions and senior public servants to 3.4 for the Prime Minister with Parliament, Cabinet Ministers and organized political parties ranged in between these scores. Reflecting the assessment of CF warfighting capability and the pessimistic forecast for the future, although given one of the higher mean ratings at 4.7, the average confidence in the CF from these military officers was, at best, neutral.

These views also surfaced in the series of items examining the relative roles and responsibilities of military leaders versus government officials. Responses on the "Powell Doctrine" items regarding the proper role of senior military leadership tended to echo what the TISS researchers concluded was a worrisome norm within the military elite cohort that the military should advocate or insist on key issues including:

selecting kinds of military units (68% of Canadians endorsed 'insist' vs. 63% in the US), developing an 'exit strategy' (53% Canadian 'insist' vs. 52% in the US) and setting rules of engagement (48% Canadian vs. 50% US). As noted in Annex A, the TISS item 'ensuring that clear political and military goals exist' was split into two with interesting results. Fully 80% of the Canadians endorsed insist for ensuring military goals existed and 40% did so for the political goals (67% in the US selected insist for the single item on political and military goals). As with their American colleagues, Canadians' opinions were more closely aligned with civil control theory as being generally neutral or simply providing advice regarding whether to intervene, deciding what the goals should be and generating public support for the intervention.

Further evidence of potential disconnects in the Canadian military-political arena come from additional items on the role of senior officers. 28% of Canadians somewhat or strongly disagreed that high ranking civilian officials rather than military officers should have the final say on whether to use military force (compared to only 9% in the US), 79% disagreed that civilian officials should have the final say on what type of force to use and 57% agreed that military leaders do not have enough influence in deciding policies with respect to other countries (vs. only 27% agreement in the US sample).

A somewhat puzzling result on another key indicator was the direct statement on civilian control of the military. As presented above, Canadian and American respondents tended to express similar views that suggest an erosion of civil-military control including low levels of confidence in their political leaders and a strong belief that military leaders should take a more forceful approach in insisting on key decisions. Despite these "worrisome" opinions, 93% of Americans somewhat or strongly agreed that civilian control of the military is absolutely safe and secure while only 79% of Canadians agreed. These differences are confusing when considered alongside other items. The first is that a majority of Canadians felt that their military leaders did not exert enough influence yet only 24% believed that military leaders might seek ways to avoid carrying out an order that they oppose. Conversely, 53% of US respondents agreed that, in wartime, civilian leaders should let the military take over the running of the war. To some extent, the US respondents on the civil control item ticked the correct response yet provided contradictory endorsements on other items while a sizable minority of Canadians indicated that civil control was not safe despite the fact that their leaders had neither significant influence nor an inclination to avoid

carrying out orders they oppose. Although it is only offered as specula-
tion, the Canadian responses may be a reflection of their lack of
confidence in the government of the day such that, while their Ameri-
can colleagues provided their overwhelming acceptance of the *principle*
of civil control, the Canadians may have signaled their pessimism of
the *effectiveness* of the actual direction being provided by the politicians.

SUMMARY OF THE POLITICAL ARENA

As with the conclusions presented by the TISS researchers, the
replication of this research with senior CF officers has also revealed
some perspectives that are reassuring, others that are confusing and a
few that have the potential to become problematic if not addressed.
Although this survey was not administered to any civilian populations,
it is considered appropriate to suggest that the Canadian military
officers' opinions on a range of domestic and foreign issues were not at
odds with the perspectives that the Canadian electorate has endorsed in
the last two national elections. The world is not seen as quite as threat-
ening an environment as the American military respondents believed
and there was general endorsement that Canada should use a range of
approaches to address a spectrum of problems. Importantly, the Cana-
dian officers did not adopt the dominant American military view that
the military should be used sparingly but, when deployed, sent with
overwhelming force. The endorsement of a more gradual escalation of
responses to possible threats and the use of the military in operations
other than war or for domestic disaster relief are assessed as much more
aligned with Canadian public perspectives and a mild rejection of the
perspective that Canadian officers are exposed to from their American
counterparts. In some regards, however, the Canadian military officers
may be positioned between the attitudes of their colleagues to the south
and the opinions of Canadian society. One indicator is that the CF
leaders' focus for the military is on warfighting while other research
clearly indicates the public's preference is for peace support and hu-
manitarian missions.[31] A second aspect is the relatively low priority
given to the use of the military in redressing historical discrimination,
despite the clear expectation from Canada's Aboriginal Peoples, in par-
ticular, for the CF to take a more proactive role in this regard.[32]

The problematic aspects of these responses clearly revolve around
the similar issues identified by the US research regarding confidence
in government and the relative role of government officials and military

officers in the day-to-day decision making, especially as they relate to the nature of military missions. At the time the survey was completed, the Canadian respondents clearly believed that their political masters were not very knowledgeable concerning the CF and were making decisions based on partisan expediency rather than on the good of the nation. We may speculate that some of these responses would be more positive following the decisions of both the Martin and Harper governments to re-invest in the CF and the subsequent CF Transformation initiatives launched by General Hillier, Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS), after these surveys were administered. However, these results paint a somewhat negative picture of military officers' trust and confidence in both their political masters and government decisions.

Whether in response to these concerns or also a result of influences from their colleagues in arms south of the Canada-US border, the Canadian military respondents also clearly believed that their most senior military leadership should be taking a much more vigourous role when interacting with government officials. One encouraging note here is that while almost half of the American officers also reported they would leave the military if the senior leadership did not stand up for what is right in military policy; only 29% of their CF colleagues reported the same intention (or frustration). It was the combination of the desire to see their leaders impose the military perspective on government decision makers and the intent to quit if they did not see this occur that led the TISS researchers to conclude that there was a worrisome norm developing amongst the next cohort of senior leaders. The same combination was not seen with the Canadian responses.

Clearly further research would be required to examine how and why a majority of Canadian officers have adopted a perspective that runs counter to civil control theory that the military only provide neutral advice with two plausible avenues of investigation suggested. The first would be to examine the professional discourse on this topic within the CF by reviewing the context of senior professional development courses and the perspectives presented in professional writing and/or journals. It is possible that, as was identified in the TISS research, within the confines of the military environment insufficient attention has been paid to ensuring that the profession communicates and reinforces a clear understanding of civil control in theory and in practice. The second area worthy of investigation would be to expand on the investigation of the opinions of military officers regarding the 'commitment-capability' gap in Canada. To extend the contrasting optimism of the American

respondents concern the current and future combat capability of their Armed Services versus the relative pessimism of the Canadians regarding the CF, it is possible that, while the US officers would like to see their seniors more forcefully imposing their views on the government, there are also some indications that they still have confidence that, when needed, the military will be appropriately supported by the government. Conversely, the Canadian officers may be reflecting the opinions expressed by external military advocacy groups that either out of ignorance or political opportunism, Canadian governments have tended to commit their military to activities with little or no willingness to provide what the military would define as the necessary resources.[33]

Canadian Findings: The Societal Arena

As discussed earlier, the TISS Gaps survey was designed to measure a range of different topics concerning the state of relations between the American military and the broader society. One aspect was the concern that a shift to an all volunteer military combined with a smaller number in uniform and an aging cohort of Vietnam veterans could result in fewer and fewer American citizens with an understanding of the Armed Services and the nature of military duties. Another was the growing perception that those in uniform increasingly and more actively associated with the Republican Party hence were eroding the preferred stance of maintaining an apolitical orientation. The third issue was triggered by the Ricks' *Atlantic Monthly* article that suggested, based on his interviews with members of the Marine Corps, that the military was simultaneously adopting isolating attitudes as a society apart and also saw themselves as the last bastion of moral authority with an obligation to ensure that an increasingly amoral society returned to traditional values.

While the tenor of the comments in the Ricks' article was viewed as alarming, one of the potential related factors is well known. A traditional position of Western militaries has been one of moral superiority in relation to the rest of society. In fact, one of the traditional notions governing the design of basic recruit and officer socialization and training was that civilian values and ways of doing things were inimical to becoming a good military member.[34] Thus, reminiscent of Irving Goffman's total institutional routines, efforts were geared toward stripping away civilian attitudes and behaviours (and identities) and inculcating military ones. This approach has been modified in recent years so that those values that are inherent in human rights and equality

legislation as well as tolerance of, and accommodation to, diversity norms have formed part of the socialization and training system.[35] However, they are still tightly wrapped in the traditional model of military service that emphasizes duty, honour, integrity and self-sacrifice in the service to the nation, and which are underpinned by an emphasis on both organizationally- and self-imposed discipline that place constraints on the range of behaviour that will be considered acceptable for those who wear the uniform. As concluded in the TISS report and presented elsewhere in relation to the CF,[36] it is expected that there should be some differentiation in attitudes and values between members of the profession of arms and the broader society. It was also anticipated, however, that there would some be strong convergence on other dimensions. This section will examine the Canadian responses on the items designed to examine these topics.

MILITARY-CIVILIAN VALUES

One of the items that assessed the 'gap' between the military and civilian society was a simple question as to which of a series of value-laden adjectives applied to civilian and military cultures. The Canadian military respondents tended to hold a rather high opinion of themselves as hard-working (87%), disciplined (85%), loyal (82%) and honest (73%) and, conversely, not corrupt (3%), materialistic (7%), self-indulgent (10%) or intolerant (19%). These results reflected the general pattern from the TISS results; however, the American military officers provided even stronger endorsement for the first four positive characteristics, ranging from 94% to 97%. Findings for the Canadian military officers also paralleled those of the US in their more critical view of civilian society as materialistic (89%) and self-indulgent (68%) and, conversely, not very loyal (6%) or honest (33%). To balance this perspective, the Canadian officers also recognized civilians as creative (62%) and hardworking (47%) and not being corrupt (16%) or intolerant (18%). Again, the American military perspective tended to mirror the Canadian results, although with slightly more extreme scores.

SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES

As incorporated in the TISS research, more direct measures of a potential gap were contained in a series of items regarding broader social

issues. Canadian military officers reported relatively positive attitudes on such items as "most people can be trusted" (71%) and "it is important that children be encouraged to think for themselves" (87%) rather than (just) being obedient (7%). On the central issue of the state of the military's role in influencing social values, Canadian responses were more moderate than the US results. Although 75% strongly or somewhat agreed that the decline in traditional values was contributing to the breakdown of our society, only one half agreed that, through leading by example, the military could help society become more moral or that, further, society would be better off adopting military values and customs. Their American peers were much more emphatic on these points.

There are clear differences between the US and Canada in the role of religion in society. Only 26% of the Canadian respondents (compared to 61% in the US) endorsed the idea that society would have fewer problems if people took God's will more seriously and only 22% responded that religion provides quite a bit or a great deal of guidance in their daily lives. Canadians were also more open to the idea that the world is changing and we should adjust our view of what is moral and immoral behaviour. They also tended to maintain regular social contact with civilian friends with only 17% saying they socialized mainly or exclusively with military colleagues and only 25% indicating that their three closest friends were all current or former service members.

POLITICAL ORIENTATION

Returning to another central issue in the TISS research that links the political perspective with broader social issues, the Canadian respondents did indicate that their views on political matters tended to reflect recent national elections and fairly well established patterns in several nations of the military tending to support more right wing/conservative parties. However, 32% of the sample were "moderates", 44% were very or somewhat conservative and 19% endorsed a very or somewhat liberal response. There are significant differences in what is considered to be a conservative or liberal stance in Canada versus the US. These results are seen as again representing a more balanced perspective than in the TISS research, where 66% of the American respondents selected very or somewhat conservative and only 4% endorsed a very or somewhat liberal response.

THE MEDIA

Recognizing the role of the mass communications media and journalists in informing the public, a series of questions examined perceptions in this domain. As with their US counterparts, the Canadian respondents were clearly split on how they thought the mass media depicted the military; 41% endorsed somewhat or very supportive, 44% endorsed somewhat or very hostile and only 12% assessed it as neutral. Recalling that 52% thought that politicians shared the same values as Canadians in general, they held the same view of journalists, with 50% agreeing and 16% not being sure. In contrast, 67% assessed military leaders as sharing the same values and 15% were unsure. Officers did not express confidence in most institutions, and the media (press and television) fell into the same range as most other institutions. Although they are below the neutral point, these results are more positive than the very negative opinions expressed by the US military officers towards the media.

RESPECT

The final group of items tapped into general levels of trust and respect. While the Canadian respondents strongly believed that most members of the military have a great deal of respect for civilian society, they did not perceive this respect to be reciprocated. Only 50% strongly or somewhat agreed that most civilians had a great deal of respect for the military and 78% felt that the military gets less respect than it deserves from Canadians. Further, only 26% believed that the Canadian people understand the sacrifices made by those in uniform. Finally, in response to a question regarding the military in time of war, 84% believed that Canadians' lack of trust in uniformed leaders would somewhat or greatly hurt military effectiveness. However, public opinion polling data from a similar period (1998-2000) provided a much different perspective.[37] When pollsters asked Canadians if they believed the military was doing a good job, over 80% of poll respondents said yes. Similarly, a positive evaluation of CF members was given by 88% of poll respondents. Further, an average of 60% of polled Canadians across these three years' worth of data expressed a positive evaluation of the performance of CF leadership. Interestingly, this polling was commissioned by DND and presented to the senior CF leadership. Our results suggest that this information either was not disseminated internally or was not believed by this cohort of military officers. More recent

polling not only continues to reflect a positive view of the military but, unlike the past, shows that Canadians also endorse increases in expenditures on military equipment. In addition, military personnel who have served in Afghanistan or on ships that have been involved in the "war on terrorism" have been welcomed home after deployment as conquering heroes.[38]

SUMMARY OF THE SOCIETAL ARENA

The items designed to measure the military's perspectives on the state of relations between the CF and Canadian society provided a pattern of responses similar, but somewhat more moderate in strength, to those of their American colleagues. These Canadian military officers view military members as a group that fosters a different set of values; in fact, the results provide a strong validation of the military ethos facets of *service before self, loyalty* and *discipline*. Given that the majority identify themselves as politically moderate or conservative, the expressed concern over the decline in traditional values and potential harm to society is not surprising. However, to return to an earlier point, these individuals do not see the CF as having the level of moral saliency for society as is the case in the US Armed Services. While they might hope that society could be improved if more civilians adopted core military values, the Canadian officers did not believe that the military should attempt to impose its orientation on others. Nor, for most parts, do they see Canadian "society" as being sufficiently worrisome to need "rescuing".

In the absence of an equivalent measure of how civilians see themselves and the military, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from these particular results. As indicated in the complementary public opinion polling data cited, a survey of Canadian civilians' attitudes might reflect the TISS finding that the civilian perspective is slightly more balanced: i.e., they tend to see both groups as generally hard-working and honest but recognize the military stands apart in being highly disciplined and loyal, and neither corrupt nor materialistic. Overall, the extreme differences in how military officers viewed themselves, in contrast to civilians, may be an indication of broadly held stereotypes rather than a serious disconnect between the military and civilian cultures. A key element of professional socialization is the assumption that members will internalize the profession's value set and strive to live by higher behavioural standards. However, there may also be a concern that this will lead to elitism, moral superiority

and profession-based ethnocentrism, which can be reflected in simplistic classifications of all civilians or all military members as sharing certain pre-defined characteristics.

There is no evidence in these responses to suggest that the alarm raised by Ricks about the US military is at all warranted in the Canadian context; nevertheless, there are some potential concerns arising from Canadian officers' misperceptions about the media's and society's views of the CF versus the way in which they would like to be seen. The overwhelming majority who (inaccurately) feel that the military does not receive sufficient respect from civilians, along with the numbers who perceive the media as hostile to the CF, represent a potential leadership challenge in the Canadian context. One of the TISS Gaps project studies compared depictions of the military by 'elite' civilian news media, such as the *New York Times* and *Washington Post,* and either professional military journals (e.g., *Proceedings)* or newspapers with a primarily military audience (e.g., *Army Times)*. While elite civilian media most often portrayed the military in a positive manner, with a smaller portion of articles seen as ambiguous or negative, the military publications were overwhelmingly positive. The authors concluded that the lack of balance in the military publications actually exacerbated the gap between the military and civilian cultures. A similar comparison of the coverage in the main Canadian daily newspapers with the internal *Maple Leaf* or *Canadian Military Journal* might be instructive in helping explain the disconnect between officers' perceptions and reality in terms of public sentiment toward the CF.

Canadian Findings:
The Military Arena

The final major focus of the research conducted was to examine the beliefs and perceptions of senior military officers regarding the state of the CF as an institution. As highlighted in the introductory comments, the two recurring tensions in civil-military relations pertain to transmitting military advice to government and the degree of autonomy granted by government to senior military leaders to enable them to make decisions on resource allocation and shaping culture. While aspects of these two topics have been touched on in the previous sections, the critical issue in addressing these two tensions is one of professional alignment with the external world. As highlighted in civil-military relations theory, the military does not get to create the profession it wants but the one that the people, through their elected representatives, have chosen to support. To return to the opening comments on the "Decade of Darkness", perceptions that the profession is being unduly restricted in the nature of advice that may be given to government and in exercising internal self-regulation represent disconnects in ensuring that the profession is appropriately aligned with political processes and/or societal expectations. These issues will be examined in the introspective component presented here.

READINESS

As an initial focus, a number of questions addressed central aspects of military capabilities. Expanding on earlier comments that the Canadian military respondents were pessimistic concerning the future combat capability of the CF, there were a number of indicators that key aspects of operational effectiveness were not as strong as might be

desired. Only 14% assessed morale in their current/last unit as very high with a further 43% selecting high. Dissenting opinions mainly assessed morale as moderate. Further, just 35% were strongly confident in the ability of the military to perform well in wartime with another 41% somewhat confident. While 98% indicated that they were proud of the men and women who serve in the military, a mere 11% strongly agreed that the CF attracted high-quality, motivated recruits, with a further 50% agreeing somewhat but 35% disagreeing. Ratings from the US military respondents were much more positive in these areas.

Two other comments related to military effectiveness are illustrative in the context of current CF transformation initiatives. The first was that only 23% strongly agreed that the emphasis on joint education, training and doctrine has improved the effectiveness of the CF. The second was that only 2% strongly agreed that an emphasis on university education in the officer corps benefits the CF. As both are key elements in the long range Defence 2020 strategy developed in response to problems encountered in the 1990s, it may be of benefit to examine them in greater detail.

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

Part of the military professional identity is focused on those structural or cultural aspects that define the traditional military but which recently have been called into question as one explanation for resistance to change initiatives within military organizations.[39] The current sample responded in ways that are somewhat consistent with traditional stereotypes. Endorsement of the importance of a structured military hierarchy or "chain of command" (96%), of symbols of uniformity, status, distinction and tradition, such as relying on ceremonies and parades to build morale and loyalty (95%), and of characteristics related to extreme physical performance that include strength, toughness, physical courage and sacrifice (95%) are all consistent with common depictions of military members as traditional, conservative, and stereotypically masculine. Again, ratings from US respondents were even higher on these items. Other indicators of a distinct military identity included agreement that the bonds and sense of loyalty that support units in combat were different from those found in civilian organizations (88%), that military leaders care more about their people than do civilian leaders (81%) and that military bases and family amenities were necessary to maintaining a sense of identity in the military community (78%).

DIVERSITY

Despite the strong similarities between the Canadian and American responses on issues related to readiness and professional identity, the two groups provided rather different perspectives on a number of items related to diversity and gender roles. Only a minority (21%) of Canadian survey respondents embraced the idea that "the military should remain basically masculine, dominated by male values and characteristics" whereas 41% of their American peers had agreed. Very few believed that military effectiveness was greatly hurt when women entered the workplace (3%), due to the military becoming less male dominated (3%) or due to bans on language and behaviour that encouraged traditional patterns of camaraderie (7%).

The divergent views of the two militaries were evident in responses on the roles of women in uniform. 78% of Canadians agreed that women should be allowed to serve in combat jobs while only 38% of Americans supported such a policy. Asked which factors were important in shaping their opinion on women in combat roles, 69% of Canadians indicated that they did not identify any factor while 34% in the US identified physical qualifications (vs. only 8% in Canada), 26% US thought the presence of women would disrupt small unit cohesion (vs. 4% Canadian) and 18% believed that the deaths of female soldiers would demoralize male soldiers and the public (vs. 4% in Canada). Finally, 81% of Canadians reported that they would be equally confident with a female, as they would with a male, Commanding Officer (CO) (vs. 67% in the US).

As one measure of the tensions surrounding professional autonomy and self-regulation of workplace practices and culture management for the CF, the perceptions of survey respondents regarding sexual harassment were mixed. Many were satisfied with the current state of policies and procedures: only 9% believed that there was more sexual discrimination in the CF than in civilian society and just 7% felt that the military had not done enough to deal with sexual harassment. Further, 61% agreed that the military justice system dealt appropriately with sexual harassment while only 36% saw the civilian justice system in the same light. On the other hand, more indirect indicators suggested lingering resistance; for example, 46% perceived standards to be easier for women and 31% indicated that expanding opportunities for women was not worth the cost.

The differences between Canadian and American respondents in openness were even more marked regarding the employment of gays and lesbians in uniform. While 68% of the Canadian respondents agreed

with the CF policy allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly in the military, only 18% of their American colleagues supported adopting such a policy. Although only 28% of Canadians indicated that they would be more comfortable with a straight CO than with a gay CO, 65% in the US preferred a commander who was straight.

"VOICE" AND ETHICAL DECISION MAKING

A series of four questions were designed to tease out the operant ethical culture. A generalized scenario of a senior military leader or civilian Defence official was presented and respondents were asked to do something that was legal but perceived as unethical, or was legal but seen as unwise. The responses available ranged from simple compliance through the use of some form of internal appeal to more extreme 'career ending' options. As with the US results, Canadian respondents clearly saw unethical directions as more problematic than those that were unwise. Although there was slightly greater compliance when either came from a military superior, CF officers were most likely to handle unwise direction by 'saluting and carrying on'. Most commonly, they would attempt to persuade the individual to change their mind but, failing that, they would carry out the order anyway (endorsed by 87% when coming from a senior military officer). While approximately half were prepared to also enlist the support of others up the chain of command if the order came from a civilian boss, very few were willing to resign in protest, risk court-martial or report it to the Judge Advocate General (JAG) or the CF Ombudsman.

The picture was markedly different for a legal but unethical order. In this circumstance, the most common response was to appeal to a higher authority (76% when the order came from a military superior and 82% when issued by a civilian). Other responses with over 50% endorsement included refusing and facing court-martial and reporting the matter to the JAG or CF Ombudsman. One-third was prepared to resign in protest.

In considering these responses, two observations are offered. First, as with the US results, CF officers may be confusing the concept of illegal orders with those that are legal yet perceived as unethical. A possible explanation as to why both groups would balk at carrying out legal, but perceptibly unethical, orders may well be knowledge of previous media and public scrutiny of specific incidents regarding civilians taken into custody by Canadians in Somalia and Americans in Iraq, My

Lai, etc. As an illustration of the dilemmas presented, while both CF and US officers overwhelmingly rejected addressing the unethical order through "whistle blowing", in a separate question, about one-third agreed with leaking unclassified information to the press in four of five cases. The latter ranged from revealing a crime that was not being addressed to disclosing a course of action that was morally or ethically wrong. Clearly, both groups were sensitized to ethical issues and prepared to speak up when confronted with perceived ethical dilemmas. Second, a significant body of literature on moral and ethical reasoning has shown that the problem of deciding what to do is only relevant when the individual has recognized an ethical dilemma in the first place.[40] To a large extent, the responses provided on both of the questions summarized above are best interpreted as indicating what respondents would hope to do if they were able or willing to recognize an order or situation as actually or potentially unethical. Neither their capacity to do so nor the effectiveness of the military's efforts to provide the requisite professional development on moral reasoning was assessed in this survey.

The third question that assessed aspects of professional norms was one of maintaining an apolitical orientation versus taking a stand in the public arena on political issues. As with their American colleagues, Canadian respondents gave broad general support to the two key principles: that the military should not criticize senior government officials (77% agreement) or Canadian society (72%). However, when the questions became more specific, almost 50% agreed that military members should be able to publicly express their political views and that it is proper for the military to explain and defend in public the policies of the government. To return to the previous discussion of the 'Powell Doctrine', 68% believed it was proper for the military to advocate publicly for those military policies it believes are in the best interests of the country. Relatively speaking, the US sample tended to more critical of civilian society; although the majority (64%) of US respondents agreed that they should not criticize society, fully 89% (25% more) agreed they should not criticize the government. Canadian respondents took a much more balanced perspective.

VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION

A major concern in professions that purport to serve the public relates to the inculcation of values that support a vocational orientation

(a strong affiliation with the profession and a commitment to providing service to society) versus an occupational orientation (seeing their employment as "just a job").[41] There were several strong indicators that, for this group of senior military officers, the vocational orientation remained strong. When asked to select their primary motivation for joining, three of the four reasons commonly given represented a service focus. These included: having a career in the military, doing challenging work and serving my country. The fourth response was to obtain an education: not surprising, as subsidized university education has been a key feature of the Regular Officer Training Plan. As a partial validation of the emphasis on service provided to those who attended one of the then three Military Colleges, 40% of this sample was comprised of 'MilCol' graduates compared to an historical average of approximately 25% of officers who were commissioned through this program.

A second indicator was a question on the reasons why these officers would leave military service. The overwhelming response (74%) was reduction in the challenge and sense of fulfillment they derive from military service. Given generalized concerns voiced elsewhere and reflected in this survey that the government had not invested sufficiently in either military personnel or equipment, along with stressors caused by frequent deployments, only a minority identified either deployment schedules or inadequate facilities or weapons, only 21% selected pay and benefits and a mere 10% endorsed reduced chances for promotion. The final item in this domain that clearly illustrated a strong difference between the Canadian and US responses pertained to the 'bell weather' item of resigning if the senior uniformed leadership did not stand up for what is right in military policy. While the TISS researchers pointed to the almost 50% agreement amongst the American sample as a worrisome norm, only 29% of their Canadian peers agreed on this item. In assessing this response, it should be noted that, when asked to characterize their experience in the military, only 68% of the Canadians saw it as very positive. Further, it should be recalled that Canadians expressed greater concern over the current and future combat capability of the CF and who really felt that their seniors did not have sufficient influence when dealing with government. Hence, this item is interpreted as a fairly strong endorsement of a vocational orientation in the face of factors that could easily erode commitment to the profession and service to the nation.

SUMMARY OF THE MILITARY ARENA

As with the overall TISS project conclusions, the perceptions of Canadian military leaders provided certain information that was reassuring, other results that were disquieting and some that could represent longer-term issues if not addressed. Based on their self-description, this group of senior officers may be seen as proud, committed, ethical and professional. As regards possible tensions around the provision of military advice and degree of autonomy afforded to regulate the profession, the Canadian respondents were much less concerned with the latter. While they still valued many of the traditional characteristics of the military (e.g., customs and symbols), they were neither as dismissive of broader social changes nor as concerned about military evolving internal practices to accommodate historically marginalized groups, as had been found in the past.[42] Responses suggest that most did not oppose on-going gender integration or the cultural change that may have to accompany it. In this regard, they were more in step with the values, attitudes and opinions that have existed for some years in Canadian society on gender equality and that are also consistent with government policy.[43]

Although these Canadian officers appear more open to internal and external change than their American counterparts, it is an open question as to whether or not they had sufficiently adopted the views and leadership styles articulated in the recent Canadian Forces Leadership Doctrine; the latter are designed to make it easier for leaders to embrace, lead and advocate change in this post-modern era.[44] In particular, although this group did not oppose the inclusion of individuals on the basis of gender or sexual orientation, they were somewhat complacent in assessing that the CF had achieved what is required to fully accommodate these groups. Some of their responses represented a latent resistance with perceptions that standards were easier for women and that the initiatives to integrate women had eroded military performance. Of more importance, the assessment of the CF's progress was rather optimistic and over-stated. A series of recent reports have continued to point out that women, Aboriginal Persons and visible minorities have had greater success reaching senior/executive levels in the Public Service, academic institutions and in private industry than in the CF.[45] Thus, while there were not signs of overt resistance, there appeared to be a 'perception gap' between what these military leaders believe had been accomplished and what may actually be required to achieve CF diversity objectives.

These officers also had grave concerns about the current and future state of the CF as an institution. For example, they did not perceive that their most senior leaders had enough influence when dealing with their political masters. Further, their assessments of unit morale, quality of recruits, readiness to perform in wartime and effectiveness of the CF in 10 years all leave us with their perception that the military had been marginalized by the government and society.

Conclusions: The State of the Profession of Arms in Canada

Both the Canadian Forces and the US Armed Services found themselves undergoing a significant transition following the end of the Cold War. In both countries, issues arose during the 1990s that caused politicians, the public, engaged academics and even senior military leaders to question whether or not their respective militaries were evolving in an appropriate manner. This report has provided one attempt to answer some of the questions raised. The original Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies (TISS) "Gaps Project" data collection, which occurred in 1998, and the Canadian replication, conducted from late September 2001 through early 2004, provide valuable, comparative snapshots of attitudes, values and opinions regarding the military—at a time when the imperatives for change were clear but the desired end state was still fuzzy. Owing almost entirely to chance, these data were generated just prior to the short-term answers being provided for the American Services via the US War on Terrorism and for the CF through the significant Canadian commitment to stability operations and reconstruction efforts in Southern Afghanistan.

The impetus for the original TISS research came from disquieting concerns that the US military was becoming alienated from American society and, in the process, adopting unhealthy internal attitudes stemming from a misplaced sense of moral superiority. The 1997 *Atlantic Monthly* article by Thomas Ricks depicted service members' 'private loathing for public America', open identification with the Republican Party and the perceived mission to lead US society back to the values, morals and standards that had traditionally defined American culture raised alarms concerning a potential 'gap' between the military culture and broader society. Compounded by internal interpretations of the so-

called 'Powell Doctrine' and reinforced by the core messages in McMaster's 1997 work, *Dereliction of Duty*, academics studying the state of civil-military relations in the US became focussed on the nature and effectiveness of the actual civil control of the military. It was these themes and the potential that rifts between the military and either society or their political masters could ultimately erode readiness that led to the TISS Gaps research project and selection of specific items.

In contrast to the US case, the rationale for the Canadian replication came from a different quarter. The concerns expressed by a group of the very senior officers charged with leading the CF through the transitions of the 1990s—the so-called "decade of darkness"—were more internally focused. Their expressed frustrations over their inability to work effectively in the political milieu or to implement needed changes in timely and coherent manner had been recognized within the CF. As a result, a series of initiatives were undertaken to strengthen military professionalism and to increase the collective capacity of the most senior leadership cadre to discharge their responsibilities as the stewards of the profession. Although these factors are markedly different from those that triggered the US Gaps project, both cases arose from the two fundamental tensions underlying civil-military relations. The first pertains to the provision of credible military advice or, more often, the willingness of the military to implement policies that they do not believe are based on a full consideration of the advice offered. The second relates to the amount of autonomy that the military is given to engage in professional self-regulation, or, more often, the degree to which the military should be required to implement social policy changes that they believe could erode combat effectiveness. These are the points of tension at which the American and Canadian cases overlap and for which the Gaps survey instrument provides valuable information.

The results of these research initiatives provide a rich and textured view of the perspectives of a group of senior military officers who, at the time, represented the next cohort of very senior officers. Whether viewed in the context of the ideal state of civil-military relations or in contrast to the views of their American colleagues, the results are considered to be illuminating. The Canadian respondents appeared to be in tune with the Canadian public and generally accepting of the imperative that the military must evolve to reflect the society it serves. The results are seen as a strong endorsement of the philosophy articulated in the CF doctrine on the profession of arms, *Duty with Honour*, published

just before this project was cancelled. In particular, while they did see the military as inculcating a specific set of 'martial' values, they also accepted their responsibilities to ensure that the profession reflects fundamental beliefs in Canadian society.

There were, however, indications that a 'perception gap' existed in two areas of concern. The first is that the leaders surveyed appeared complacent as regards their role in removing barriers to military participation of historically disadvantaged groups. There was a tendency to believe that the CF had done as much as was needed to further the careers of these groups, even though the record remains questionable. The second was their sense that Canadians at large did not value or respect their military when evidence from polling data, published in Canada, revealed strong public support. To a large extent, however, this research depicted a military that is *neither alienated from, nor dismissive of*, *Canadian society*. In this regard, there are important differences between the Canadian and American military perspectives.

The results pertaining to the effectiveness of political-military interactions are considered to be mixed. On a positive note, Canadian military officers accepted a broad range of roles and missions for the military—including extending a helping hand to those in need; and they generally endorsed the use of all available tools to influence the international arena. In contrast, their American counterparts tended to see the international domain in terms of threats to national security, with a not-surprising preference for the use of overwhelming military power to bring order to the world. Less positive for Canadians is the fact that they were much more pessimistic concerning the current and future state of their organization/profession, the CF. In contrast to the American military results that confirmed *some indication of alienation from US society*, the Canadian military results showed *a greater level of alienation from the political process*. CF leaders expressed extremely low levels of confidence in either their political masters or senior government officials, and they clearly did not believe that their seniors in uniform were being listened to or that government decisions were being based on the best interests of the nation. Simplistically, while their American counterparts were generally satisfied with the status of combat readiness in the US Armed Services, these Canadian leaders were not pleased with the state of the CF and rather dubious that things would improve in the future. Although these officers were clearly proud, dedicated professionals, they saw themselves leading a somewhat demoralized and rather marginalized profession.

The primary conclusion reached from the data presented is that while Canadian military officers' support for civil control of the military as a concept is reassuring, their understanding of what it means in practice is lacking. It is understandable that the Canadian military profession might be influenced by the perspectives emanating from those in uniform south of the Canada-US border; but it is not clear from these results that Canadian officers were sufficiently aware of the geo-fiscal realities that inform political decision-making on the national stage. In contrast to the US imperatives of being the world's current superpower, Canadian military leaders did not appear to understand the implications when the government can afford to see its military as a vehicle to attain the maximum political benefit with the least political investment and lowest political risk. Their assessments of current and future military capabilities along with their evident questioning of the logic and rationale behind Defence policy decisions suggests that, when interpreting government pronouncements on Canadian Force capabilities, these officers may be applying the yardstick used for measuring the military capabilities of major powers rather than occasional middle powers.

These results present a particular concern when viewed in the context of the shifts in government policy and military directions that occurred shortly after these data were collected. It would be easy for those in uniform to interpret the combination of: increased budget allocations and authorized force expansion; the emergence of a charismatic Chief of the Defense Staff with a clear vision and a national presence; the commitment of troops to a mission that was recognized to include major combat operations; and, the visible support of Canadians to honour those who died in Afghanistan as all pointing to the dawn of an age of enlightenment with the military finally restored to its rightful place in the political-social order. While this is possible, another view is that this may represent a rare confluence of events that has propelled the military to an unusual and potentially short-lived status in the affairs of the nation.

This report does not presume to forecast the future of the CF, however, the results obtained do suggest that, at the time these data were collected, this cadre of senior officers had not acquired a firm understanding of the political nuances that inform the evolution of defence policy over time. As a result, they may not possess the perspective of the strategic political-military milieu need to be able to anticipate and/or adapt to upcoming changes. Thus, the results observed do not indicate

that the CF is fully prepared to avoid the frustrations expressed by the "Decade of Darkness" leadership participants should government policies shift in the future. 9/11 and Kandahar notwithstanding, it is plausible that Canadians will continue to cling to their image of the CF member as the cherished Blue Beret deploying to countries in need to commit random acts of kindness. To a large extent, this research would suggest that the CF pay attention to a potential 'gap' between the image that the military would like to have and the one that Canadians prefer.

To the extent that such a gap exists, it could be reduced if CF leaders more fully understood two key principles in civil-military relations: that elected politicians serve to mediate the relations between the military and society; and, that ultimately "the people" have the right to choose the kind of military they want to have. Thus, the key conclusion from this study is that the plausible fracture is not a failure of the politicians to understand the military but an inability of the senior military leadership to properly align the profession with the expectations and wishes of the citizenry.

Notes

[1] The Sharpe & English (2003) report summarized the comments from six senior officers who held the responsibilities of Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff and Associate Deputy Minister (Personnel).

[2] *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada* developed during this period and formally promulgated in 2003.

[3] Appointed Chief of the Defence Staff in 2005, General Hillier has led a significant restructuring of the command and control of the CF along with implementation of the first real increases in authorized force strength and defence budget in decades. The Federal Government decision to take a lead role in stabilization operations in Kandahar and nearby provinces in Southern Afghanistan have become a major focus of the application of these transformation initiatives.

[4] Initial work on this project along with preliminary results have been presented by all three authors. Details are presented in the references at Okros (2000), Okros (2001), Hill (2002), and Hill and Pinch (2004).

[5] As presented below, the seminal work in this domain was generated by Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz. For recent extensions and reviews, see the works by Bland (1999), Cottey, Edmunds & Forster (2002), and Burk (2002) presented in the references.

[6] The original works were Huntington's (1957) *The Soldier and the State* and Janowitz' (1960) *The Professional Soldier*.

[7] This concept is discussed in the CF doctrine manual *Duty with Honour* (2003) and, in particular, is reflected with the incorporation of Canadian Values, Expectations and Beliefs in the Chapter Two statement of the military ethos.

[8] For further discussion of the role of professional socialization in aligning the military to the external society, see Cottey, Edmunds & Forster's (2002) discussion.

[9] See Burk's (2002) discussion for the US Armed Services and Harries-Jenkins' (2003) broader review in other nations.

[10] For a complete discussion and some of the initial thinking underlying the TISS Gaps project, see Feaver's (1996) review article.

[11] For recent considerations of the central issues in the US see Burk (2002) and, in the Canadian context, see Bland (1999 and 2001).

[12] Amongst others, see Bland's discussions in both the 1999 and 2001 articles listed in the references.

[13] As articulated in *Duty with Honour* Chapter Three, "Military professionals advise on what military capabilities are necessary to support national programs and help formulate security policies that provide the stability and international influence necessary to facilitate long-term success. ... Civil authorities must integrate consideration of the means to achieve political objectives and military professionals must be cognizant of how political factors will influence strategic plans. Vigorous, non-partisan debate makes a major contribution to policy decisions. In the final analysis, however, the civil authority decides how the military will be used by setting political objectives and allocating the appropriate resources, while military professionals develop the force to achieve these objectives." p 42.

[14] Amongst other reviews of these issues, see Feaver (1996) and Pinch (2000).

[15] For a full discussion of these issues, see Pinch (1994).

[16] This issue was the subject of a comprehensive international comparison presented in Moskos, Williams & Segal's (2000) *The Post-modern Military: Armed Forces After the Cold War.* The overview of the Canadian context is provided in the chapter by Pinch "Canada: Managing change with shrinking resources" (pp. 156-182).

[17] Again, see Feaver's (1996) for his initial discussions of the tensions in this domain that form part of his approach to the TISS Gaps project.

[18] These perspectives are presented in the Sharpe & English's "Decade of Darkness" paper cited earlier.

[19] In particular, the 2002 Report of the Office of the Canadian Forces Ombudsman *Special Report on Systemic Treatment of Canadian Forces Members with PTSD* highlighted concerns regarding the reputation of the CF in protecting the wellbeing of soldiers.

[20] For one of the more recent reviews of the consequences of these various factors, see Bland's (2004) discussion in *Canada without Armed Forces?*

[21] Much of information presented throughout this report on this project is drawn from Feaver and Kohn's (2001) *Soldiers and civilians: The civil-*

military gap and American national security. Unless otherwise noted, references to the Gaps project including the US data presented are drawn from *Soldiers and civilians*.

[22] The fact that all three 'waves' have occurred when American foreign policy and the role of the military were in transition should be noted as not just coincidental.

[23] The Foreign Policy Leadership Project has tracked the opinions of American 'elites' every four years since 1976. See Holsti (1996) for details.

[24] The specific treatment of this topic in *Soliders and Civilians* is presented in Miller and Williams' chapter "Civil Rights vs Combat Effectiveness? Military Policies on Gender and Sexuality."

[25] As incorporated in the paper presented at this symposium, several of the topics considered have not been the subject of formal investigation in Canada hence some of the hypotheses developed are considered to be more speculations or inferences than research hypotheses.

[26] Donald Savoie provides a detailed treatment of this issue in *Governing from the Centre: The Concentration of Power in Canadian Politics*.

[27] See, in particular, Burk's 2002 discussion of the indicators and implications of moral and material salience.

[28] For one presentation of the increasing divergence between Canadian and American culture, see Adams' (2003) *Fire and Ice* in which he suggests that the US is the only fully developed nation that is not evolving to incorporate post-modern, pluralistic perspectives. To some extent, the fundamental assumption of the need to examine a potential 'gap' between a definable military culture and a monolithic national culture may only be of relevance in the US case.

[29] Details of the Canadian Forces Board of Inquiry report into this incident are currently available at: http://www.vcds.forces.gc.ca/BOI/intro_e.asp.

[30] While the events of Hurricane Katrina might influence US responses if re-administered, it should be noted that the 1878 *Posse Comitatus Act* generally prohibits members of the US Armed Services or units of the United States National Guard under Federal authority from acting in a law enforcement capacity within the United States. Interpretation of this Act within the military could result in a perception that the US Armed Services are legally prohibited for engaging in domestic responses.

[31] See again Pinch's reviews (1994 and 2000). The two different perspectives are being played out, yet again, in media coverage and public debate on the relative emphasis given to establishing physical security versus investing in reconstruction and development in the current Canadian involvement in Afghanistan.

[32] In an unpublished Master's thesis title *The Court of Last Resort: The Canadian Forces and the 1990 Oka Crisis*, Winegard provides a detailed treatment of this issue from the perspectives of both the Canadian Forces and the First Nations involved in the 1998 confrontation at Oka.

[33] Again, among many commentaries, see Bland's discussion in *Canada without Armed Forces*.

[34] Among other presentations of the socialization of new CF members see Fodor (1970) and Gaudet (1983).

[35] See, in particular, the discussion in *Duty with Honour* Chapter Two.

[36] These ideas were discussed in a panel session at the Inter-university Seminar on the Armed Forces and Society (IUS) Biennial Conference and summarized in Okros (2001).

[37] These results are from polling data compiled by Pollara and are cited, in particular, as this research was commissioned by the Defence Department and reported to the senior leadership in the fall of 2000. The contrasting results clearly indicate that this information was not accurately disseminated internally.

[38] The evolution of Canadian opinions towards the military are presented in Pinch and Segal's (2003) report.

[39] For a more complete discussion of the structural aspects, see Pinch (1994) with the implications for change initiatives presented in Peckan and Ruddock (2001).

[40] The academic literature in this domain is best summarized in the works of Keegan (1982) and Kohlberg (1972).

[41] For a comprehensive review of these issues and a valuable baseline measure, see Cotton's (1979) review and presentation of research data.

[42] Pinch's (1982) review provides a valuable reference as to the changes noted over the last two decades.

[43] For a presentation of perspectives on gender integration, see Davis' (1996) review of CF research and Winslow and Dunn's (2002) overview.

[44] The requirements to lead change are presented in the concept of Leading the Institution as presented in the CF Doctrine manual *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations*. The theoretical background of this work and analyses of previous and future leadership requirements are presented in a series of four papers listed in the references that were produced by Karol Wenek, the primary author of the CF Leadership Doctrine manuals.

[45] Amongst other reports see Pinch (2000) and Davis (2004).

References

Adams, M. (2003) *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values*. Toronto: Penguin.

Bland, D.L. (1999) "A unified theory of civil-military relations" *Armed Forces and Society,* 26, 7-26.

Bland, D.L. (Ed.) (2000). *Backbone of the Army: Non-commissioned officers in the future Army*. Kingston, ON: Queen's University School of Policy Studies.

Bland, D.L. (2001) "Patterns in Liberal Democratic Civil-Military Relations". *Armed Forces and Society,* 27, 525-540.

Bland, D.L. (Ed.) (2004) *Canada without Armed Forces?* Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Burk, J. (2002) "Theories of democratic civil-military relations." *Armed Forces and Society,* 29, 7-29.

——— *Canada's International Policy Statement: A role of pride and influence in the world* (2005). Ottawa: Office of the Prime Minister.

Cottey, A., Edmunds, T. & Forster, A. (2002) "The second generation problematic: Rethinking democracy and civil-military relations." *Armed Forces and Society,* 29, 31-56.

Cotton, C.A. (1979) *Military Attitudes and Values of the Army in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.

Davis, K.D. (1996) *Women and military service in Canada: 1885-Present*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.

Davis, K.D. (2004) "Research and Organizational Change: Women in the Canadian Forces". *Canadian Journal of Police and Security Studies*, 2-3, pp 1-10.

———— *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of the Canadian Forces to Somalia Affair* (1997) Ottawa: Public Works & Government Services.

———— *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada.* (2003). Ottawa: Chief of the Defence Staff.

Feaver, P. (1996) "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control". *Armed Forces and Society*, 23-2, pp 149-178.

Feaver, P.D. & Kohn, R.H. (2001) *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Fouder, D. (1970) *The socialization of a professional military officer in Canada: A case study of the Royal Roads Military College intake*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, ON.

Gaudet, W. (1983) *Socialization of a military professional: A study of the impact of different modes of socialization on the value orientation of CF Officers*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, ON.

Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patnients and other inmates*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.

Harries-Jenkins, G. (2003) *Professional groups and subgroups in the contemporary military: Challenges and opportunities*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute

Hill, S.A. (2001) *Identification of women's leadership in the Canadian Forces*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Hill, S.A. (2002) *Pilot phase survey preparation for the Armed Forces and Society Project*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Hill, S.A. and Pinch, F.C. (2004) *Perceptions of Social and Cultural Gaps: Perspectives of Senior Canadian Forces Officers*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Holsti, O.R. (1996) *Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Huntington, S. (1957) *The Soldier and The State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Janowitz, M. (1971) *The Professional Soldier: A social and political portrait*. New York: Free Press

Keegan, R. (1982) *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1972) *Collected papers on moral development and moral education*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Moral Education.

——— Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations (2004). Ottawa: Chief of the Defence Staff.

McMaster, H.R. (1997) *Dereliction of Duty: Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Lies that led to Vietnam.* New York: Harper Collins.

Moskos, C.C., Williams, J.A., and Segal, D.R., eds., (2000) *The Post-Modern Military: Armed Forces after the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University.

Okros, A.C. (2000) *The gaps between military and civilian societies: A Canadian view on military professions in a global society*. Paper presented at the symposium on The Gaps Project Research, St. Cyr, France, October 2000.

Okros, A.C. (2001) *Different Missions, Different Values? A Canadian View on Military Professions in a Global Society.* Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the Inter-University Seminar on the Armed Forces and Society, Baltimore, MD, October 2001.

Peckan, L. & Ruddock, J. (2001) *Change, vision and leadership: Surviving RMA*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Pinch, F.C. (1982) "Military manpower and social change: Assessing the institutional fit". *Armed Forces and Society,* 8, 575-600.

Pinch, F.C. (1994) *Perspectives on organizational change in the Canadian Forces*. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Pinch, F.C. (2000) "Canada: Managing change with shrinking resources". In C. Moskos, J. Williams & D. Segal (Eds.) *The Post-modern Military: Armed Forces After the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, (pp 156-182).

Pinch, F.C. & Segal, D. R. (2003) *Postmodernism, modernism and the military organization*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Pollara (2000) *Canadians' opinions on the Canadian Forces (CF) and related military issues*. Presentation to the Department of National Defence.

——— *Quality of Life Report* (1998) (Report by the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans' Affairs). Ottawa: Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans' Affairs.

Ricks, T.E. (1997) "The Widening Gap Between the Military and Society". *The Atlantic Monthly* 280 (July): 66-78.

——— *Shaping the Future of the Canadian Forces: A Strategy for 2020*. (1999) Ottawa: Chief of the Defence Staff.

Sharpe, G.E. & English, A.D. (2003) *The Decade of Darkness*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Savoie, D. (1999) *Governing from the Centre: The Concentration of Power in Canadian Politics*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

———— *Special Report on Systemic Treatment of Canadian Forces Members with PTSD*. (2002). Ottawa: Office of the Canadian Forces Ombudsman.

Wenek, K. (2002a) *Looking back: Canadian Forces leadership problems and challenges*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Wenek, K. (2002b) *Looking ahead: Contexts of Canadian Forces leadership today and tomorrow*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Wenek, K. (2003a) *Defining leadership*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Wenek, K. (2003b) *Defining effective leadership in the Canadian Forces*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Winegard, T. (2006) *The Court of Last Resort: The Canadian Forces and the 1990 Oka Crisis*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario.

Winslow, D. & Dunn, J. (2002) "Women in the Canadian Forces: Between legal and social integration". *Current Sociology*, 50, 641-647.

Young, M.D. (1997) *Report to the Prime Minister on the State of Leadership and Management in the Canadian Forces*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of National Defence.

Annex A

Table A1
Changes to the TISS Gaps survey instrument prior to administration to the Canadian military sample

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
Q01	Wording	Instructions changed from "Here is a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. Please indicate how much importance you think should be attached to each goal" to "Using the scale provided, for each item in the following list of foreign policy goals that Canada might have, please indicate how important you consider each goal."
Q01f	Deleted	Item "containing communism" deleted from list of foreign policy goals
Q01j	Wording	Item changed from "Maintaining superior military power worldwide" to "Maintaining NATO military superiority worldwide".
Q02	Wording	Instructions changed from "This question asks you to indicate your position on certain propositions that are sometimes described as lessons that the United States should have learned from past experiences abroad" to "The following propositions are derived from military experiences abroad. Using the scale on the right, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with each proposition".
Q02c	Wording	Item changed from "Russia is generally expansionist rather than defensive in its foreign policy goals" to "… rather than defensive in setting its foreign policy goals"
Q02d	Deleted	Item "There is nothing wrong with using the CIA to try to undermine hostile governments" deleted from list of lessons learned.
Q02e,f	Wording	Items reworded to replace "U.S." with "Canada"
Q02g	Deleted	Item "Any Chinese victory is a defeat for America's national interest" deleted.
Q02l	Wording	Items reworded to replace "American … U.S." with "Canadian … Canadian".
Q02m	Wording	"American" changed to "Canadian"

Table A1
(Continued)

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
Q03	Wording	Instructions changed from "This question asks you to evaluate the seriousness of the following as threats to American national security" to "Using the scale provided, please evaluate the seriousness of the following as threats to Canadian national security".
Q03c	Wording	Item changed from "American interventions in conflicts that are none of our business" to "Canadian interventions in conflicts that do not involve vital Canadian national interests".
Q03d,f,l	Wording	"U.S." and "American" changed to "Canada" and "Canadian"
N/a	Addition	New item reads "Terrorist attacks on Canada".
N/a	Addition	New item reads "Attacks on international computer networks"
Q04	Wording	Instructions clarified. Old wording reads "Reviewing some of the earlier list of possible threats to national security, how effective is the use of military tools compared to non-military tools for coping with them?". New wording reads "Reviewing some of the previous list of possible threats to national security, how effective is the use of military tools (compared with non-military tools such as diplomacy) for coping with them?
Q04c	Wording	"U.S." changed to "Canada".
Q04g	Wording	"American" changed to "Canadian"
Q07	Item order and wording	This question was moved up in the sequence to improve the logical flow of questions. Old instructions read "The following are some possible uses of the military. Please indicate how important you consider each potential role for the military." New instructions read "Using the scale provided, please indicate how important you consider each of the following possible uses/roles for the military.
Q07c	Wording	Item changed to reflect Canadian context by changing "African-Americans" to "Aboriginal people".
Q07d,f	Wording	"U.S." changed to "Canada".
Q05	Wording	Instructions changed from "This question asks you to indicate your position on certain domestic issues" to

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
		"Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the stated position on each of the following domestic issues".
Q05a	Deleted	Item "Busing children in order to achieve school integration" deleted as not applicable in Canada.
Q05l	Wording	Item changed from "Banning the death penalty" to "Reintroduction of the death penalty" in order to reflect legal differences in Canada.
Q05m	Wording	Item changed from "Placing stringent controls on the sale of handguns" to "Easing controls on the sale of handguns" in order to reflect legal differences in Canada.
Q06	Deleted	Item "The American missile strikes against suspected terrorist sites in Afghanistan and Sudan were a legitimate response to the bombing of American Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania" deleted as not applicable to Canadian respondents.
Q08	Wording	Instructions changed from "This question asks you to indicate your position on a variety of social issues" to "Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements about social issues" for clarity.
Q08b,e,f	Wording	"American" changed to "Canadian".
Q09	Wording	Instructions changed to reduce redundancy with response options.
Q11-Q13	Deleted	These items addressed censorship on the basis of non-normative stances or characteristics of the authors of books (i.e., books by authors advocating anti-religious, communist, or pro-homosexual positions). The utility of these items was not considered to be high and they were removed to reduce the overall length of the survey.
Q14-Q15	Deleted	These items dealt with feelings about the Bible, and beliefs about life after death respectively. The researchers felt that their utility was marginal in the Canadian context, and they were removed to reduce the overall length of the survey.
Q16	Wording	Instructions changed to reduce redundancy with response options.

Table A1
(Continued)

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
Q17	Deleted	This question about frequency of prayer was of little perceived utility and of high perceived intrusiveness, and was therefore removed to reduce the overall length of the survey.
Q18	Wording	Instructions changed to reduce redundancy with response options.
Q19	Deleted	This item asked individuals to identify their religious affiliation and was removed because of its limited utility, high intrusiveness, and to reduce overall survey length.
Q20	Wording	Instructions changed from simple identification of top three media sources of information about the military to a rank ordering of top three sources.
Q20.6, Q20.8	Deleted	Two options removed ("radio talk shows", "special news magazines") to reduce length of list.
Q20.7, Q20.9, Q20.13, Q20.14	Wording	Examples were changed to include Canadian publications for "general news magazines (e.g., Maclean's, Time)", "opinion magazines (e.g., Saturday Night)", "military trade/professional publications (e.g., Canadian Military Journal)", and "military newspapers/newsletters (e.g., The Maple Leaf)"
Q22	Deleted	Rank ordering format adopted for Q12 made asking for single preferred media source for military information redundant.
Q23	Wording	Instructions amended to reduce redundancy with response options.
Q25-Q27	Wording	"the American people" changed to "Canadians in general" for all three items.
Q28, Q29	Wording	Instructions simplified to reduce redundancy with response options.
Q31	Wording	Instructions reworded to reduce redundancy with response options; "Americans" changed to "Canadians".
Q32	Wording and content additions	Instructions changed for clarity and to reduce redundancy with response options. Original list of 17 institutions amended to include 14 additional institutions. Some of these additions were for clarity (e.g., "law enforcement agencies" was split into "provincial police forces", "municipal police forces", and "the RCMP", "primary and

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
		secondary education" was split into "public primary and secondary education" and "private primary and secondary education" items). Others were intended to broaden the list for comparability with other databases (e.g., the World Values Survey database), reflect the Canadian context (e.g., inclusion of "CSIS", "the Presidency" changed to "the Prime Minister"), and tap into notions related to globalization (e.g., inclusion of "trade agreements (e.g., NAFTA)", "NATO", the G8 Leaders (as a group)", "the International Court", "the United Nations") and social change (e.g., inclusion of "the Women's movement"). See Question 23 at Annex B for complete list.
Q33	Wording	Instructions reworded to reduce redundancy with response options.
Q33g,h,i	Wording	"American" changed to "Canadian".
Q33j	Wording	Item reworded from "I expect that ten years from now America will still have the best military in the world" to "I expect that ten years from now Canada will have a multi-purpose, combat capable armed forces able to meet challenges to Canada's security both at home and abroad" to conform to official CF strategy documents.
Q35.1,.7	Deleted	Items "to avoid being drafted into another service" and "I was drafted" deleted as not applicable in the Canadian context
Q35.4	Wording	Reworded "to earn veteran's benefits" to "to obtain the benefits (e.g., travel, pay)" to better reflect the Canadian situation
N/a	Addition	More options for joining were provided to participants (comradeship, discipline, responsible job, good leadership, challenging work, job security, obtain a job).
Q36.3	Wording	Item bias reduced by removing "further" from the option "the pay and benefits [further] lagged behind compensation in the civilian economy".
Q36.4	Wording	Changed "military specialty" to "military occupation (MOC)" to reflect Canadian context
Q36.6,.7	Deleted	Items "women were allowed to serve in ground combat units" and "homosexuals were allowed to serve openly in the military" removed because they do not apply in the CF.

Table A1
(Continued)

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
Q36.8	Wording	Item bias reduced by changing "were less" to "become less".
Q37	Wording	"Morale in my service" changed to "Morale in the unit I currently/most recently work with" to realistically reflect individual's sphere of personal experience.
Q38	Deleted	Item regarding casualty tolerance/aversion removed because issues not believed to be the same in the Canadian context and a single item is insufficient for diagnostic purposes.
Q40a	Wording	"Financial stability of Social Security" changed to "Financial stability of the Canadian pension fund"
Q40b,d	Wording	"U.S." and "American" changed to "Canada" and "Canadian"
N/a	Addition	Scope of opinion broadened by including items relating to the health care system, the feminist movement, immigration to Canada, relations with Aboriginal peoples and the economy.
Q41a	Wording	"American" changed to "Canadian"
Q41e	Wording	Item "A ban on language and behavior that encourage comradery among soldiers" changed to "A ban on language and behavior that encourage adherence to traditional patters of camaraderie among soldiers" in order to increase clarity.
Q42	Wording	Instructions changed from "Here are some statements people have made about the American military" to "The following are a series of statements that have been made about the military. Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with each statement".
Q42d,j	Wording	"U.S. military", "American" and "Armed forces" changed to "The Canadian Forces", "Canadian", and "Canadian Forces" respectively.
Q42h	Wording	Original item "On most military bases there are company stores, childcare centers, and recreational facilities right on the base. It is very important to keep these things on military bases in order to keep a sense of identity in the military community" reworded to reflect Canadian situation: "It is very important to keep military housing,

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
		recreational facilities, and other family services/amenities on military bases in order to keep a sense of identity in the military community".
N/a	Addition	Item "An emphasis on university education in the officer corps benefits the Canadian Forces" added to broaden the scope of the question.
Q43,44	Wording	"senior civilian Department of Defense leader" changed to "senior civilian Department of National Defence official" to better reflect the Canadian context.
Q43,44d	Wording	"retire or leave the service in protest" changed to "retire/resign in protest" to reflect Canadian usage.
Q43,44g	Wording	"report the matter to an Inspector General Judge Advocate General office or officer" changed to "report the matter to a legal (JAG) representative or the CF ombudsman" to reflect differences in process and structure in the CF.
N/a	Addition	Original questions 43 and 44 (Canadian q35, q37) referring to action to be taken when an unethical or unwise request is made by a civilian of a military officer were posed again, changing the issuer of the request to a "senior military officer" to broaden the scope of inquiry. All response options are the same (incorporating changes as indicated above).
Q45	Wording	For clarity, instructions amended to read "Using the scale provided, for each item, indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree that it is acceptable for a military member to leak unclassified information or documents to the press if he or she believes that:" .
Q46c	Wording	Option "ensuring that clear political and military goals exist" split into two options, one dealing with political goals, the other with military goals, for clarity.
Q47a	Wording	"senior members of the civilian branch of government" changed to "senior government officials" for clarity.
Q47b,e	Wording	"American" and "United States" changed to "Canadian" and "Canada" respectively.
Q48	Wording	Instructions changed from "relations between the military and senior civilian leaders" to "relations between the military and senior government officials" for clarity.

Table A1
(Continued)

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
Q48c	Wording	Item "When civilians tell the military what to do, domestic partisan politics rather than national security requirements are often the primary motivation" changed to "When civilian government officials tell the military what to do, party politics rather than national security requirements are often the primary motivation for decisions" for clarity and to use more familiar terminology for Canadian samples.
Q48e	Wording	"President" replaced with "Governor General" to reflect the Canadian position holder of 'commander in chief of the military'.
N/a	Addition	Item "To be respected by the military, the Prime Minister should have served in uniform" added to capture aspects of the American question about the President not captured by the changed item regarding the commander in chief of the military.
Q48f	Wording	"United States" changed to "Canada".
Q48g	Wording	Item "…our policy with other countries" changed to "…our policy with respect to other countries" for clarity.
Q49	Wording	"civilian leaders" changed to "government officials" for clarity.
Q50, Q51	Addition	Option "no opinion" added to response list.
Q52	Wording	Additional phrase added to Canadian instructions: "The Canadian Forces has a policy to fully integrate women into all military occupations and environments, including combat roles." Instructions further reworded to replace "combat roles" with "all roles".
Q52.6	Wording	"combat specialties" and "on subs" changed to "some roles" and "in submarines" respectively.
Q52.8	Wording	"women soldiers" and "American public" changed to "female soldiers" and "Canadian public" respectively.
Q52.10	Wording	"combat roles" changed to "all roles" for consistency and applicability to the Canadian context.
Q53	Wording	Instructions reworded for consistency with previous item. Specifically, "If you support opening combat roles to women…" changed to "If you support women serving in all roles…".

TISS item number	Nature of change	Details of change
Q53.5	Wording/ Addition	Item "having women in combat units will improve morale and motivate men to outperform them" split into two items ("having women in combat units will improve morale" and "having women in combat units will motivate men to outperform them") for conceptual clarity.
Q53.7	Wording	"American" changed to "Canadian".
Q53.10	Wording	"I do not support opening combat roles to women" changed to "I do not support women serving in all roles" for applicability to the Canadian context.
Q54	Wording	"commander" changed to "commanding officer" for item and response options to reflect Canadian terminology.
Q56	Addition	Two additional response options added ("modest, and probably not worth it for the benefits the effort generates" and "sizable and probably not worth it for the benefits the effort generates") to provide a full spectrum of response options (reducing possible bias in responses).
Q57, Q58	Wording	Content of items retained, but wording changed for grammatical and conceptual clarity.
Q59	Wording	"Do you think gay men and lesbians should be allowed to serve openly in the military?" changed to "Do you agree with the CF policy allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly in the military?" to better reflect the Canadian context.
Q60	Wording	"Commander" changed to "Commanding officer" for item and response options to reflect Canadian terminology.
Q61, Q62	Wording	Content of items maintained, but language modified to be less inflammatory (e.g., "more concerned the guilty are getting away with it" changed to "more concerned that it might be allowing too many people to get away with sexual harassment").

Demographic Information was amended taking into consideration comparability with standard demographic information collected on other surveys of CF members and also to ensure comparability with information contained in the American instrument to facilitate comparisons across national samples.

Annex B: Frequency tables by item

Question 1: Using the scale provided, for each item in the following list of foreign policy goals that Canada might have, please indicate how important you consider each goal.

Foreign Policy Goal	Very Important		Somewhat important		Variable — Not important		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Helping to improve the standard of living in less developed countries	56	26	130	60.5	23	10.7	4	1.9	2	0.9	215
B Worldwide arms control	92	42.8	108	50.2	13	6.0	1	0.5	1	0.5	215
C Combating world hunger	56	26.0	128	59.5	25	11.6	5	2.3	1	0.5	215
D Strengthening the United Nations	62	28.8	122	56.7	25	11.6	4	1.9	2	0.9	215
E Fostering international cooperation to solve common problems such as food, inflation and energy	105	48.8	95	44.2	10	4.7	2	0.9	3	1.4	215
F Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons	129	60.0	71	33.0	8	3.7	3	1.4	4	1.9	215
G Promoting and defending human rights in other countries	80	37.2	113	52.6	15	7.0	4	1.9	3	1.4	215
H Helping to bring a democratic form of government of other nations	44	20.5	105	48.8	59	27.4	3	1.4	4	1.9	215
I Maintaining NATO military superiority worldwide	55	25.6	98	45.6	52	24.2	5	2.3	5	2.3	215

Question 2: The following propositions are derived from military experiences abroad. Using the scale on the right, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with each proposition.

Propositions	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A There is considerable validity in the "domino theory" that when one nation falls to aggressor nations, others nearby will soon follow a similar path.	14	6.5	110	51.2	63	29.3	18	8.4	9	4.2	1	0.5	215
B It is vital to enlist the cooperation of the U.N. in settling international disputes.	66	30.7	101	47	41	19.1	5	2.3	1	0.5	1	0.5	215
C Russia is generally expansionist rather than defensive in setting its foreign policy goals.	1	0.5	22	10.2	124	57.7	51	23.7	16	7.4	1	0.5	215
D Canada should take all steps, including the use of force, to prevent aggression by any expansionist power.	53	24.7	93	43.3	52	24.2	10	4.7	6	2.8	1	0.5	215
E Canada should give economic aid to poorer countries even if it means higher prices at home.	6	2.8	92.	42.8	67	31.2	46	21.4	2	0.9	2	0.9	215
F We shouldn't think so much in international terms, but concentrate more on our own national problems.	8	3.7	41	19.1	83	38.6	80	37.2	1	0.5	2	0.9	215
G Military force should be used only in pursuit of the goal of total victory.	20	9.3	41	19.1	87	40.5	61	28.4	6	2.8	0	0	215

Question 2 (Continued)

Propositions	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
H Use of force in foreign interventions should be applied quickly and massively rather than by gradual escalation.	39	18.1	74	34.4	64	29.8	29	13.5	7	3.3	2	0.9	215
I When force is used, military rather than political goals should determine its application.	20	9.3	37	17.2	81	37.7	69	32.1	7	3.3	1	0.5	215
J The Canadian public will rarely tolerate large numbers of Canadian casualties in military operations.	95	44.2	81	37.7	27	12.6	6	2.8	6	2.8	0	0	215
K Canadian national security depends more on international trade and a strong domestic economy than on our military strength.	34	15.8	89	41.4	62	28.8	27	12.6	3	14	0	0	215

Question 3: Using the scale provided, please evaluate the seriousness of the following as threats to Canadian national security.

Potential Threats	Variable												Total (N)
	Very serious		Moderately serious		Slightly serious		Not at all serious		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A The emergence of China as a great military power	28	13.0	90	41.9	83	38.6	11	5.1	2	0.9	1	0.5	215
B The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to less-developed countries	122	56.7	69	32.1	19	8.8	3	1.4	1	0.5	1	0.5	215
C Canadian interventions in conflicts that do not involve vital Canadian national interests	8	3.7	50	23.3	95	44.2	51	23.7	11	5.1	0	0	215
D Large number of immigrants and refugees coming to Canada	28	13	56	26	75	34.9	55	25.6	1	0.5	0	0	215
E International terrorism	119	55.3	73	34	20	9.3	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	215
F The decline of standards and morals in Canadian society	21	9.8	58	27	89	41.4	41	19.1	6	2.8	0	0	215
G International drug trafficking	34	15.8	86	40	84	39.1	10	4.7	1	0.5	0	0	215
H Economic competition from abroad	10	4.7	54	25.1	102	47.4	47	21.9	2	0.9	0	0	215
I Environmental problems like air pollution and water contamination	34	15.8	81	37.7	83	38.6	16	7.4	1	0.5	0	0	215
J Expansion of Islamic fundamentalism	58	27.0	80	37.2	59	27.4	13	6.0	5	2.3	0	0	215
K Terrorist attacks on Canada	87	40.5	77	35.8	44	20.5	6	2.8	1	0.5	0	0	215
L Attacks on Canadian computer networks	61	28.4	98	45.6	47	21.9	7	3.3	2	0.9	0	0	215
M Terrorist attacks on the United States	108	50.2	72	33.5	29	13.5	5	2.3	1	0.5	0	0	215
N Attacks on international computer networks	52	24.2	111	51.6	44	20.5	7	3.3	1	0.5	0	0	215

Question 4: Reviewing some of the previous list of possible threats to national security, how effective is the use of military tools compared with non-military tools such as diplomacy) for coping with them?

Potential Threats	Variable													Total (N)
	Military much more effective		Military somewhat more effective		Military/ Other equally effective		Military somewhat less effective		Military much less effective		No Opinion		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A The emergence of China as a great military power	8	3.7	20	9.3	61	28.4	52	24.2	67	31.2	6	2.8	1	0.5	215
B The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to less-developed countries	22	10.2	46	21.4	65	30.2	43	20.0	35	16.3	3	1.4	1	0.5	215
C Large number of immigrants and refugees coming to Canada	3	1.4	11	5.1	25	11.6	41	19.1	122	56.7	12	5.6	1	0.5	215
D International terrorism	40	18.6	75	34.9	70	32.6	21	9.8	5	2.3	3	1.4	1	0.5	215
E International drug trafficking	18	8.4	48	22.3	79	36.7	46	21.4	19	8.8	4	1.9	1	0.5	215
F Expansion of Islamic fundamentalism	9	4.2	25	11.6	32	14.9	55	25.6	79	36.7	14	6.5	1	0.5	215
G Attacks on Canadian computer networks	12	5.6	17	7.9	52	24.2	58	27.0	68	31.6	7	3.3	1	0.5	215

Question 5: Using the scale provided, please indicate how important you consider each of the following possible uses/roles for the military.

Roles of the military	Variable										Total (N)
	Very Important		Somewhat important		Not important		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A As an instrument of foreign policy, even if that means engaging in operations other than war	171	79.5	37	17.2	3	1.4	4	1.9	0	0	215
B To fight and win our country's wars	198	92.1	14	6.5	1	0.5	2	0.9	0	0	215
C To redress historical discrimination, for instance against aboriginal people and women	2	0.9	29	13.5	176	81.9	207	96.3	8	3.7	215
D To provide disaster relief within Canada	114	53.0	94	43.7	5	2.3	1	0.5	1	0.5	215
E To address humanitarian needs abroad	39	18.1	142	66.0	33	15.3	1	0.5	0	0	215
F To deal with domestic disorder within Canada	82	38.1	113	52.6	19	8.8	1	0.5	0	0	215
G To intervene in civil wars abroad	17	7.9	115	53.5	78	36.3	4	1.9	1	0.5	215
H To combat drug trafficking	34	15.8	139	64.7	40	18.6	2	0.9	0	0	215

Question 6: Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the stated position on each of the following domestic issues.

Domestic Issues	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Using any budget surpluses to reduce the national debt rather than to reduce taxes	87	40.5	98	45.6	16	7.4	8	3.7	5	2.3	1	0.5	215
B Relaxing environmental regulations to stimulate economic growth	1	0.5	15	7.0	62	28.8	133	61.9	2	0.9	2	0.9	215
C Providing tuition tax credits to parents who send children to private or parochial schools	25	11.6	45	20.9	54	25.1	84	39.1	5	2.3	2	0.9	215
D Leaving abortion decisions to women and their doctors	135	62.8	41	19.1	9	4.2	15	7.0	14	6.5	1	0.5	215
E Encouraging mothers to stay at home with their children rather than working outside the home	22	10.2	62	28.8	43	20.0	61	28.4	25	11.6	2	0.9	215
F Permitting prayer in public schools	32	14.9	74	34.4	33	15.3	45	20.9	30	14.0	1	0.5	215
G Reducing the defence budget in order to increase the federal education budget	4	1.9	14	6.5	54	25.1	136	63.3	5	2.3	2	0.9	215
H Barring homosexuals from teaching in public schools	15	7.0	21	9.8	64	29.8	90	41.9	24	11.2	1	0.5	215
I Easing restrictions on the construction of nuclear power plants	19	8.8	55	25.6	55	25.6	69	32.1	13	6.0	4	1.9	215
J Redistributing income from the wealthy to the poor through taxation and subsidies	11	5.1	69	32.1	65	30.2	64	29.8	5	2.3	1	0.5	215
K Reintroduction of the death penalty	50	23.3	69	32.1	28	13.0	60	27.9	7	3.3	1	0.5	215
L Easing controls on the sale of handguns	7	3.3	12	5.6	25	11.6	168	78.1	2	0.9	1	0.5	215

Question 7: Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements about social issues.

Social Issues	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A The decline of traditional values is contributing to the breakdown of our society.	44	20.5	118	54.9	37	17.2	13	6.0	2	0.9	1	0.5	215
B Through leading by example, the military could help Canadian society become more moral.	33	15.3	87	40.5	45	20.9	36	16.7	13	6.0	1	0.5	215
C The world is changing and we should adjust our view of what is moral and immoral behavior to fit these changes.	9	4.2	69	32.1	72	33.5	57	26.5	6	2.8	2	0.9	215
D Civilian society would be better off if it adopted more of the military's values and customs.	18	8.4	100	46.5	57	26.5	27	12.6	12	5.6	13	6.0	215
E Canadian society would have fewer problems if people took God's will more seriously.	12	5.6	44	20.5	44	20.5	82	38.1	32	14.9	1	0.5	215
F All Canadians should be willing to give up their lives to defend our country.	58	27	84	39.1	46	21.4	20	9.3	6	2.8	1	0.5	215

Question 8: Generally speaking, would you say that? (please circle one):

Variable								Total (N)
Most people can be trusted		You can't be too careful in dealing with people		Uncertain where I stand on this issue		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
153	71.2	49	22.8	13	6.0	0	0	215

Question 9: Which of these would you say is more important in preparing children for life? (please circle one):

Variable								Total (N)
To be obedient		To think for themselves		Can't chose		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
15	7.0	187	87.0	13	6.0	0	0	215

Question 10: Would you say your religion provides you with? (please circle one):

Variable										Total (N)
No guidance in your day-to-day life		Some guidance in your day-to-day life		Quite a bit of guidance in your day-to-day life		A great deal of guidance in your day-to-day life		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
62	28.8	103	47.9	29	13.5	18	8.4	3	1.4	215

Question 11: Outside of weddings and funerals, do you go to religious services? (please circle one):

	Variable													Total (N)
More than once a week		Every week		Almost every week		Once or twice a month		A few times a year		Never		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	0.5	18	8.4	12	5.6	23	10.7	87	40.5	73	34.0	1	0.5	215

Question 12: This question asks you bout the information you obtain from the media about the military. Please indicate your top three sources of information about the military (rank them by putting a 1 beside your top source, a 2 beside the next best source, and a 3 beside your 3rd best source).

Source of information	Variable						Total (N)
	Ranked First		Ranked Second		Ranked Third		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Newspapers	60	27.9	73	34.0	31	14.4	215
B Television network news	62	28.8	45	20.9	37	17.2	
C Television local news	1	0.5	4	1.9	6	2.8	
D Television talk shows	0	0	0	0	8	3.7	
E Radio news	3	1.4	9	4.2	13	6.0	
F General news magazines	3	1.4	6	2.8	28	13.0	
G Opinion magazines	0	0	2	0.9	2	0.9	
H Movies	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	
I Fiction books (novels)	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	
J Non-fiction books	5	2.3	6	2.8	5	2.3	
K Military trade/professional publications	27	12.6	18	8.4	23	10.7	
L Military newspapers/newsletters	27	12.6	23	10.7	31	14.4	
M Internet newsgroups	11	5.1	14	6.5	14	6.5	
N Other (specify)	4	1.9	3	1.4	3	1.4	
O Missing	11	5.1	12	5.6	13	6.0	

Question 13: In general, do you think mass media depictions of the military are? (please circle one):

	Variable							
Very supportive	Somewhat supportive	Neutral	Somewhat hostile	Very hostile	No opinion	Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
6	2.8	82	38.1	25	11.6	91	42.3	8	3.7	1	0.5	2	0.9	215

Question 14: Please circle the response which best indicates how closely you tend to follow issues involving the military (e.g. weapons systems, military deployments abroad, armed forces capabilities)?

	Variable					
A great deal	Some	A little	Almost/None at all	Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
141	65.6	64	29.8	8	3.7	1	0.5	1	0.5	215

Question 15: How knowledgeable do you think our political leaders are about the modern military? (please circle one):

	Variable					
Very knowledgeable	Somewhat knowledgeable	Somewhat ignorant	Very ignorant	No opinion	Missing	Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	0.5	19	8.8	90	41.9	101	47.0	3	1.4	1	0.5	215

Question 16: Do you think our political leaders, in general, share the same values as Canadian in general? (please circle one):

Yes		No		Variable Not sure		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
112	52.1	55	25.6	43	20.0	4	1.9	1	0.5	215

Question 17: Do you think journalists, in general, share the same values as Canadian in general? (please circle one):

Yes		No		Variable Not sure		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
108	50.2	70	32.6	34	15.8	2	0.9	1	0.5	215

Question 18: Do you think military leaders, in general, share the same values as Canadian in general? (please circle one):

Yes		No		Variable Not sure		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
145	67.4	36	16.7	32	14.9	1	0.5	1	0.5	215

Question 19: Of the people you come in contact with in the social or community group to which you belong, are they? (please circle one):

	Variable							Total (N)
	All civilians	Mostly civilians with some military	About half civilian, half military	Mostly military with some civilians	All military	No opinion	Missing	
N	18	103	54	37	1	1	1	215
%	8.4	47.9	25.1	17.2	0.5	0.3	0.5	

Question 20: Of the people you come in contact with at work, are they? (please circle one):

	Variable							Total (N)
	All civilians	Mostly civilians with some military	About half civilian, half military	Mostly military with some civilians	All military	No opinion	Missing	
N	1	2	19	171	21	0	1	215
%	0.5	0.9	8.8	79.5	9.8	0	0.5	

Question 21: Think of three adult friends you most enjoy spending time with. How many of these friends currently serve, or have served preciously, in the military? (please circle the appropriate option):

	Variable						Total (N)
	Zero	One	Two	Three	Uncertain	Missing	
N	23	59	65	54	14	0	215
%	10.7	27.4	30.2	25.1	6.5	0	

Question 22: Thinking about the way most Canadian view the military, would you say the military gets? (please circle one):

	Variable									Total (N)
More respect than it deserves		Less respect than it deserves		About as much respect as it deserves		No opinion		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	0.5	167	77.7	41	19.1	6	2.8	0	0	215

Question 23: The following is a list of some institutions in this country. For each institution, please indicate the degree of confidence you have in each institution (0=no confidence - 10= every confidence) AND how much knowledge you feel you have about each institution (0=no knowledge - 10=complete knowledge).

Note: Responses are presented for Confidence then Knowledge

Institutions	Variable				Total (N)
	Confidence		Confidence - Missing		
	Mean	Stand. Dev	N	%	
A The Prime Minister	3.4	2.3	6	2.8	215
B Provincial police forces	4.8	3.2	7	3.3	215
C The Supreme Court	4.7	3.5	6	2.8	215
D Parliament	3.8	2.2	6	2.8	215
E Major companies	3.8	2.0	9	4.2	215
F Primary and secondary (public) education	4.4	2.5	7	3.3	215
G Primary and secondary (private) education	5.0	2.8	8	3.7	215
H Cabinet ministers	3.7	2.0	9	4.2	215
I Universities	4.8	2.9	9	4.2	215

Question 23 (Continued)

Institutions	Variable				Total (N)
	Confidence		Confidence - Missing		
	Mean	Stand. Dev	N	%	
J Senior civil servants/public service executives	3.9	2.3	9	4.2	215
K Municipal police forces	4.6	2.9	8	3.7	215
L CSIS	4.4	2.5	17	7.9	215
M The legal profession	3.8	2.1	9	4.2	215
N Organized political parties (as a group)	3.5	1.8	9	4.2	215
O The military	4.9	3.4	8	3.7	215
P The medical profession	4.7	3.2	8	3.7	215
Q Voluntary organizations	4.4	2.7	9	4.2	215
R Television	3.7	1.8	8	3.7	215
S Federal commissions	3.9	2.3	10	4.7	215
T The RCMP	4.8	3.3	9	4.2	215
U Labour Unions	3.3	1.6	9	4.2	215
V The Press	3.6	1.9	8	3.7	215
W Organized religion	3.6	2.3	8	3.7	215
X Trade agreements	4.0	2.3	8	3.7	215
Y The United Nations	3.7	2.0	7	3.3	215
Z The Federal Government	3.9	2.2	7	3.3	215
AA The United States military	4.3	3.0	7	3.3	215
BB NATO	4.3	2.7	7	3.3	215
CC The International Court	4.1	2.5	8	3.7	215
DD The G8 Leaders (as a group)	4.0	2.2	7	3.3	215
EE The Women's Movement	3.6	2.0	25	11.6	215

Institutions	Variable				Total (N)
	Knowledge		Knowledge - Missing		
	Mean	Stand. Dev	N	%	
A The Prime Minister	6.8	2.0	102	47.4	215
B Provincial police forces	5.9	2.0	102	47.4	215
C The Supreme Court	5.9	2.0	102	47.4	215
D Parliament	7.0	1.8	102	47.4	215
E Major companies	5.4	2.0	105	48.8	215
F Primary and secondary (public) education	7.4	1.7	103	47.9	215
G Primary and secondary (private) education	5.2	2.6	103	47.9	215
H Cabinet ministers	6.3	2.0	105	48.8	215
I Universities	7.4	1.5	105	48.8	215
J Senior civil servants/public service executives	6.5	1.8	105	48.8	215
K Municipal police forces	6.0	1.8	104	48.4	215
L CSIS	4.7	2.4	108	50.2	215
M The legal profession	5.9	2.0	104	48.4	215
N Organized political parties (as a group)	5.7	2.0	105	48.8	215
O The military	9.4	0.9	104	48.4	215
P The medical profession	7.1	1.8	104	48.4	215
Q Voluntary organizations	5.9	1.9	105	48.8	215
R Television	6.5	2.1	104	48.4	215
S Federal commissions	5.5	1.9	105	48.8	215
T The RCMP	6.8	1.6	104	48.4	215
U Labour Unions	5.3	2.1	104	48.4	215
V The Press	6.3	2.0	104	48.4	215
W Organized religion	6.3	2.1	104	48.4	215
X Trade agreements	5.7	2.0	104	48.4	215

Question 23 (Continued)

Institutions	Variable				Total (N)
	Knowledge		Knowledge - Missing		
	Mean	Stand. Dev	N	%	
Y The United Nations	6.8	1.7	103	47.9	215
Z The Federal Government	7.1	1.5	103	47.9	215
AA The United States military	6.9	2.0	103	47.9	215
BB NATO	7.1	1.7	103	47.9	215
CC The International Court	5.1	2.2	104	48.4	215
DD The G8 Leaders (as a group)	5.7	1.9	103	47.9	215
EE The Women's Movement	4.0	2.3	104	48.4	215

Note: The large number of missing items was due to an omission of the knowledge field on the first administration that contained 101 participants.

Question 24: Here are common statements that have been made about the military. Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with each statement.

Statements	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Most members of the military have a great deal of respect for civilian society.	100	46.5	91	42.3	20	9.3	1	0.5	3	1.4	0	0	215
B Most members of civilian society have a great deal of respect for the military.	13	6.0	95	44.2	83	38.6	20	9.3	4	1.9	0	0	215
C All male citizens should be required to do some national service.	36	16.7	79	36.7	35	16.3	58	27.0	7	3.3	0	0	215

Statement	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Total
D All female citizens should be required to do some national service.	27	12.6	74	34.4	42	19.5	64	29.8	8	3.7	0	0	215
E I am proud of the women and men who serve in the military.	171	79.5	39	18.1	3	1.4	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	215
F I have confidence in the ability of the military to perform well in wartime.	76	35.3	89	41.4	38	17.7	10	4.7	2	0.9	0	0	215
G The Canadian Forces are attracting high-quality, motivated recruits.	23	10.7	108	50.2	61	28.4	14	6.5	8	3.7	1	0.5	215
H Even if civilian society did not always appreciate the essential military values of commitment and unselfishness, the Canadian Forces could still maintain required traditional standards.	72	33.5	87	40.5	40	18.6	8	3.7	8	3.7	0	0	215
I The Canadian people understand the sacrifices made by the people who serve in the Canadian military.	7	3.3	49	22.8	103	47.9	55	25.6	1	0.5	0	0	215
J I expect that ten years from now Canada will have a multi-purpose, combat capable armed forces able to meet challenges to Canada's security both at home and abroad.	22	10.2	53	24.7	82	38.1	49	22.8	9	4.2	0	0	215
K I would be disappointed if a child of mine joined the military.	4	1.9	15	7.0	54	25.1	134	62.3	8	3.7	0	0	215

Question 25: If you do not currently and never have served in the Canadian Forces, please check here _____ and go to question 30.

Variable					
Checked		Unchecked		Total (N)	
N	%	N	%		
3	1.4	212	98.6	215	

Question 26: How would you generally characterize your experience in the military? (please circle one):

Variable														Total (N)
Very positive		Somewhat positive		Mixed		Somewhat negative		Very negative		No opinion		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
146	67.9	49	22.8	16	7.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.9	215

Question 27: How would you characterize your primary motivation to join the military? (Please circle the *one* option closest to your primary motivation).

Primary motivation	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A To gain skills valued in the civilian job market	9	4.2			
B To have a career in the military	49	22.8			
C To enjoy the comradeship	0	0			
D To serve my country	38	17.7			
E To obtain an education	37	17.2			
F To gain discipline	1	0.5			
G To obtain the benefits (e.g., travel, pay)	6	2.8	5	2.3	215
H To have a job with some responsibility	5	2.3			
I To work with good leadership	2	0.9			
J To do challenging work	44	20.5			
K To have some job security	2	0.9			
I To find a job	4	1.9			
M Other	13	6.0			

Question 28: I will/would leave military service if (please circle all that apply):

Statement	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A The senior uniformed leadership does not stand up for what is right in military policy	63	29.3			
B The country does not provide adequate facilities and weapons for the military to succeed	59	27.4			
C The pay and benefits lagged behind compensation in the civilian economy	45	20.9			
D There are reduced opportunities to train in my military occupation (MOC)	13	6.0	N/A	N/A	215
E Deployment schedules keep me away from my family too much	76	35.3			
F Chances for promotion become less than they are now in my service	22	10.2			
G The challenge and sense of fulfillment I derive from my service were less	161	74.9			
H Other	17	7.9			

Question 29: Morale in the unit I currently/most recently work with is (please circle one):

Variable														Total (N)
Very low		Low		Moderate		High		Very high		No opinion		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
6	2.8	8	3.7	74	34.4	92	42.8	29	13.5	1	0.5	5	2.3	215

Question 30: This question asks you to make some judgements about civilian and military culture in Canada. Please circle all the terms that you believe apply to civilian culture and than do the same for military culture.

Statement	Variable						Total (N)
	Civilian		Military		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Honest	71	33.0	156	72.6			
Intolerant	39	18.1	40	18.6			
Materialistic	192	89.3	14	6.5			
Corrupt	35	16.3	7	3.3			
Generous	51	23.7	59	27.4			
Self-indulgent	147	68.4	21	9.8	1	0.5	215
Hard-working	102	47.4	187	87.0			
Rigid	12	5.6	67	31.2			
Disciplined	10	4.7	183	85.1			
Creative	134	62.3	48	22.3			
Loyal	12	5.6	176	81.9			
Overly cautious	40	18.6	82	38.1			

Question 31: Please indicate on a scale from 1 (least important) to 100 (most important) how important each of the following issues are to you:

Issue	Variable					Total (N)
	Rating			Missing		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	N	%	
A Financial stability of the Canadian pension fund	70.3	25.3		3	1.4	215
B The illegal drug problem in Canada	58.5	26.6		3	1.4	215
C Protection of the environment	75.0	17.3		3	1.4	215
D The growing gap between rich and poor Canadians	51.9	26.0		3	1.4	215
E The decline in integrity among public officials	67.2	24.2		6	2.8	215
F Problems with the Canadian health care system	72.2	19.5		3	1.4	215
G The feminist movement in Canada	19.6	19.4		4	1.9	215
H Immigration to Canada	53.1	26.3		4	1.9	215
I Resolving relations with Aboriginal people	39.3	26.4		3	1.4	215
K The Canadian economy	79.9	17.8		3	1.4	215

Question 32: There are many different things that people say might keep the military from being effective during times of war. For each of the following, please indicate on the scale to the right if the statement describes something that might greatly hurt military effectiveness, somewhat hurt military effectiveness, have no effect on military effectiveness, or it not happening at all in the Canadian Forces.

Statements	Variable												Total (N)
	Greatly hurts		Somewhat hurts		No effect		Isn't happening		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
A Canadians' lack of trust in the uniformed leaders of the military	71	33	111	51.6	19	8.8	11	5.1	2	0.9	1	0.5	215
B The tensions created when women enter a new workplace	6	2.8	49	22.8	120	55.8	27	12.6	11	5.1	2	0.9	215
C The military becoming less male-dominated	6	2.8	37	17.2	144	67.0	20	9.3	7	3.3	1	0.5	215
D The military getting too involved in non-military affairs	25	11.6	96	44.7	44	20.5	38	17.7	11	5.1	1	0.5	215
E A ban on language and behavior that encourage adherence to traditional patterns of camaraderie among soldiers	15	7.0	74	34.4	80	37.2	21	9.8	22	10.2	3	1.4	215
F A system for promotions and advancement in the military that does not work well	84	39.1	93	43.3	10	4.7	24	11.2	2	0.9	2	0.9	215
G Non-military people getting too involved in military affairs	61	28.4	100	46.5	33	15.3	12	5.6	7	3.3	2	0.9	215
I The military trying to hold on to old-fashioned views of morality	52	24.2	100	46.5	39	18.1	8	3.7	13	6.0	3	1.4	215

Question 32 (Continued)

Statements	Variable												Total (N)
	Greatly hurts		Somewhat hurts		No effect		Isn't happening		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
J A military culture and way of life that is very different from the culture and way of life of those who are not in the military	11	5.1	73	34.0	78	36.3	37	17.2	13	6.0	3	1.4	215
K The military's lack of confidence in our political leadership	12	5.6	69	32.1	99	46.0	19	8.58	13	6.0	3	1.4	215
L Inaccurate reporting about the military and military affairs by the news media	61	28.4	107	49.8	26	12.1	10	4.7	7	3.3	4	1.9	215

Question 33: The following are a series of statements that have been made about the military. Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with each statement.

Statements	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A An effective military depends on a very structured organization with a clear chain of command.	168	78.1	39	18.1	4	1.9	2	0.9	1	0.5	1	0.5	215
B Military symbols (e.g., uniforms, medals) and military traditions (e.g., ceremonies, parades) are necessary to build morale, loyalty and camaraderie within the military.	130	60.5	73	34.0	6	2.8	1	0.5	2	0.9	3	1.4	215

Statement													Total
C Even though women can serve in the military, the military should remain basically masculine, dominated by male values and characteristics.	18	8.4	26	12.1	57	26.5	105	48.8	8	3.7	1	0.5	215
D The Canadian Forces have done a much better job of eliminating discrimination within the military than has Canadian society in general.	57	26.5	102	47.4	34	15.8	7	3.3	14	6.5	1	0.5	215
E Even in a high tech era, people in the military have to have characteristics like strength, toughness, physical courage, and the willingness to make sacrifices.	162	75.3	43	20.0	7	3.3	0	0	2	0.9	1	0.5	215
F The bonds and sense of loyalty that keep a military unit together under the stress of combat are fundamentally different than the bonds and loyalty that organizations try to develop in the business world.	139	64.7	51	23.7	16	7.4	6	2.8	2	0.9	1	0.5	215
G Since military life is a young person's profession, the chance to retire with a good pension at a young age is very important in the military.	66	30.7	99	46.0	31	14.4	7	3.3	11	5.1	1	0.5	215
H It is very important to keep military housing, recreational facilities, and other family services/ amenities on military bases in order to keep a sense of identity in the military community.	77	35.8	91	42.3	33	15.3	8	3.7	4	1.9	2	0.9	215
I Military leaders care about the people under their command more than leaders in the civilian sector care about the people under them.	103	47.9	72	33.5	27	12.6	7	3.3	6	2.8	0	0	215

Question 33 (Continued)

Statements	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
J The new emphasis on joint education, training, and doctrine across branches of the military has improved the effectiveness of the Canadian Forces.	50	23.3	115	53.5	29	13.5	4	1.9	17	7.9	0	0	215
K An emphasis on university education in the officer corps benefits the Canadian Forces.	69	2.1	100	46.5	31	14.4	8	3.7	7	3.3	0	0	215

Question 34: Consider the situation where a senior civilian Department of National Defence official asks a military officer to do something that the military officer believes is unethical, but legal. Using the scale provided, please indicate how appropriate you would consider each of the following possible actions the military officer might take.

Statements	Variable									Total (N)
	Appropriate		Not appropriate		No opinion		Missing			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
A Carry out the order anyway.	11	5.1	194	90.2	8	3.7	2	0.9		215
B Attempt to persuade the individual to change her/his mind but, failing that, carry out the order anyway.	57	26.5	150	69.8	7	3.3	1	0.5		215
C Attempt to change the individual's mind by informing other civilian or military officials who might disagree with the original order/policy.	129	60	72	33.5	11	5.1	3	1.4		215
D Retire/resign in protest.	76	35.3	119	55.3	18	8.4	2	0.9		215
E Refuse to carry out the order even if it means facing a court-martial.	137	63.7	57	26.5	19	8.8	2	0.9		215
F Appeal the matter to higher authority, even if it means leaping the chain of command.	176	81.9	32	14.9	6	2.8	1	0.5		215
G Report the matter to a legal (JAG) representative or the CF ombudsman.	149	69.3	50	23.3	15	7.0	1	0.5		215
H Leak the matter to the press to alert others to this problem.	13	6.0	192	89.3	9	4.2	1	0.5		215

Question 35: Consider the situation where a senior military officer asks a military officer to do something that the military officer believes is unethical, but legal. Using the scale provided, please indicate how appropriate you would consider each of the following possible actions the military officer might take.

Statements	Variable								Total (N)
	Appropriate		Not appropriate		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Carry out the order anyway.	26	12.1	179	83.3	8	3.7	2	0.9	215
B Attempt to persuade the individual to change her/his mind but, failing that, carry out the order anyway.	86	40.0	120	55.8	6	2.8	3	1.4	215
C Attempt to change the individual's mind by informing other civilian or military officials who might disagree with the original order/policy.	116	54	87	40.5	9	4.2	3	1.4	215
D Retire/resign in protest.	73	34.0	121	56.3	19	8.8	2	0.9	215
E Refuse to carry out the order even if it means facing a court-martial.	131	60.9	64	29.8	17	7.9	3	1.4	215
F Appeal the matter to higher authority, even if it means leaping the chain of command.	163	75.8	44	20.5	6	2.58	2	0.9	215
G Report the matter to a legal (JAG) representative or the CF ombudsman.	137	63.7	62	28.8	13	6.0	3	1.4	215
H Leak the matter to the press to alert others to this problem.	10	4.7	197	91.6	6	2.8	2	0.9	215

Question 36: Consider the situation where a senior civilian Department of Defence official asks a military officer to do something that the military officer believes is legal but unwise. Using the scale provided, please indicate how appropriate you would consider each of the following possible actions the military officer might take.

Statements	Variable								Total (N)
	Appropriate		Not appropriate		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Carry out the order anyway.	65	30.2	139	64.7	8	3.7	3	1.4	215
B Attempt to persuade the individual to change her/his mind but, failing that, carry out the order anyway.	171	79.5	35	16.3	6	2.8	3	1.4	215
C Attempt to change the individual's mind by informing other civilian or military officials who might disagree with the original order/policy.	115	53.5	88	40.9	8	3.7	4	1.9	215
D Retire/resign in protest.	19	8.8	176	81.9	17	7.9	3	1.4	215
E Refuse to carry out the order even if it means facing a court-martial.	26	12.1	172	80.0	14	6.5	3	1.4	215
F Appeal the matter to higher authority, even if it means leaping the chain of command.	96	44.7	106	49.3	9	4.2	4	1.9	215
G Report the matter to a legal (JAG) representative or the CF ombudsman.	56	26.0	143	66.5	13	6.0	3	1.4	215
H Leak the matter to the press to alert others to this problem.	5	2.3	200	93.0	7	3.3	3	1.4	215

Question 37: Consider the situation where a senior military officer asks a military officer to do something that the military officer believes is legal but unwise. Using the scale provided, please indicate how appropriate you would consider each of the following possible actions the military officer might take.

Statements	Variable								Total (N)
	Appropriate		Not appropriate		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Carry out the order anyway.	86	40.0	118	54.9	9	4.2	2	0.9	215
B Attempt to persuade the individual to change her/his mind but, failing that, carry out the order anyway.	188	87.4	20	9.3	5	2.3	2	0.9	215
C Attempt to change the individual's mind by informing other civilian or military officials who might disagree with the original order/policy.	91	42.3	112	52.1	8	3.7	4	1.9	215
D Retire/resign in protest.	19	8.8	177	82.3	17	7.9	2	0.9	215
E Refuse to carry out the order even if it means facing a court-martial.	22	10.2	176	81.9	13	6.0	4	1.9	215
F Appeal the matter to higher authority, even if it means leaping the chain of command.	77	35.8	126	58.6	9	4.2	3	1.4	215
G Report the matter to a legal (JAG) representative or the CF ombudsman.	47	21.9	154	71.6	11	5.1	3	1.4	215
H Leak the matter to the press to alert others to this problem.	3	1.4	103	94.4	5	2.3	4	1.9	215

Question 38: Using the scale provided, for each item, indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree that it is acceptable for a military members to leak unclassified information of documents to the press if he of she believes that:

Circumstance	Variable								Total (N)
	Agree		Disagree		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A A crime has been committed and the chain of command is not acting on it.	76	35.3	117	54.4	14	6.5	8	3.7	215
B Doing so may prevent a policy that will lead to unnecessary casualties.	74	34.4	114	53.0	17	7.9	10	4.7	215
C Doing so discloses a course of action that is morally or ethically wrong.	66	30.7	125	58.1	15	7.0	9	4.2	215
D He or she is ordered to do so by a superior.	26	12.1	164	76.3	15	7.0	10	4.7	215
E Doing so brings to light a military policy or course of action that may lead to a disaster for the country.	69	32.1	114	53.0	22	10.2	10	4.7	215
F It is never acceptable to do so.	81	37.7	111	51.6	17	7.9	6	2.8	215

Question 39: This question asks you to specify the proper role of the senior military leadership in decisions to commit the Canadian Forces abroad. The following are typical elements of the decision the Prime Minister and Cabinet make. Using the options provided, please specify what you believe to be the proper role of the military in each element.

Decision element	Variable												Total (N)
	Be neutral		Advise		Advocate		Insist		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Deciding whether to intervene	15	7.0	166	77.2	21	9.8	8	3.7	4	1.9	1	0.5	215
B Setting rules of engagement	0	0	47	21.9	59	27.4	103	47.9	4	1.9	2	0.9	215
C Ensuring that clear political goals exist	43	20.0	37	17.2	42	19.5	85	39.5	7	3.3	1	0.5	215
D Ensuring that clear military goals exist	2	0.9	7	3.3	29	13.5	172	80.0	4	1.9	1	0.5	215
E Deciding what the goals or policy should be	25	11.6	115	53.5	51	23.7	17	7.9	5	2.3	2	0.9	215
F Generating public support for the intervention	98	45.6	53	24.7	39	18.1	12	5.6	9	4.2	4	1.9	215
G Developing an "exit strategy"	3	1.4	41	19.1	49	22.8	114	53.0	5	2.3	3	1.4	215
H Deciding what kinds of military units (e.g., air vs. naval, heavy vs. light) will be used to accomplish all tasks	0	0	31	14.4	32	14.9	146	67.9	3	1.4	3	1.4	215

Question 40: Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statement concerning the military's role in civilian society.

Military roles in civilian society	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Members of the military should not publicly criticize senior government officials.	106	49.3	60	27.9	34	15.8	12	5.6	3	1.4	0	0	215
B Members of the military should not publicly criticize Canadian society.	85	39.5	69	32.1	37	17.2	20	9.3	4	1.9	0	0	215
C Members of the military should be allowed to publicly express their political views just like any other citizen.	28	13.0	67	31.2	67	31.2	49	22.8	4	1.9	0	0	215
D It is proper for the military to explain and defend in public the policies of the government.	14	6.5	83	38.6	55	25.6	56	26.0	7	3.3	0	0	215
E It is proper for the military to advocate publicly the military policies it believes are in the best interests of Canada.	61	28.4	86	40.0	41	19.1	21	9.8	6	2.8	0	0	215

Question 41: Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statement concerning relations between the military and senior government officials.

Statement	Variable												Total (N)
	Agree strongly		Agree somewhat		Disagree somewhat		Disagree strongly		No opinion		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A In general, high ranking civilian officials rather than high ranking military officers should have the final say on whether or not to use military force.	104	48.4	42	19.5	26	12.1	35	16.3	5	2.3	3	1.4	215
B In general, high ranking civilian officials rather than high ranking military officers should have the final say on what type of military force to use.	8	3.7	29	13.5	38	17.7	132	61.4	6	2.8	2	0.9	215
C When civilian government officials tell the military what to do, party politics rather than national security requirements are often the primary motivation for decisions.	37	17.2	100	46.5	39	18.1	17	7.9	19	8.8	3	1.4	215
D In wartime, civilian government leaders should let the military take over running the war.	23	10.7	47	21.9	72	33.5	63	29.3	7	3.3	3	1.4	215
E To be respected as "Commander in Chief", the Governor General should have served in uniform.	25	11.6	23	10.7	71	33.0	75	34.9	19	8.8	2	0.9	215
F To be respected by the military, the Prime Minister should have served in uniform.	8	3.7	19	8.8	65	30.2	107	48.4	17	7.9	2	0.9	215
G Civilian control of the military is absolutely safe and secure in Canada.	124	57.7	45	20.9	26	12.1	10	4.7	7	3.3	3	1.4	215
H Military leaders do not have enough influence in deciding our policy with respect to other countries.	38	17.7	85	39.5	46	21.4	25	11.6	19	8.8	2	0.9	215

Question 42: If government officials order the military to do something that is opposes, military leaders will seek ways to avoid carrying out the order (please circle one):

				Variable							Total (N)
All of the time		Most of the time		Some of the time		Rarely		Never		No opinion		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
4	1.9	12	5.6	35	16.3	104	48.4	49	22.8	11	5.1	0	0	215

Question 43: Do you think women should be allowed to serve in all combat jobs? (please circle one):

	Variable					Total (N)
Yes		No		No opinion		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
169	78.6	40	18.6	6	2.8	0	0	215

Question 44: Do you think women should be required to serve in all combat jobs? (please circle one):

	Variable					Total (N)
Yes		No		No opinion		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
62	28.8	147	68.4	6	2.8	0	0	215

Question 45: The Canadian Forces has a policy to fully integrate woman into all military occupations and environments, including combat roles. If you oppose women serving in all roles, which of the following factors is most important in shaping your opinion? Please circle the one reason that matters the most to you.

Reasons	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A Religious/moral convictions	0	0	17	7.9	215
B The presence of women disrupts small unit cohesion	8	3.7			
C Women could be taken prisoner and abused	2	0.9			
D Most women are not physically qualified	18	8.4			
E Women are not as readily deployable as men because of pregnancy	2	0.9			
F There is little privacy for men and women in some roles, like the infantry or serving in submarines	1	0.5			
G Men will not fight as effectively with women present in combat units	5	2.3			
H The deaths of female soldiers will demoralize male soldiers and the Canadian public	9	4.2			
I Other (please specify)	4	1.9			
J I do not oppose women serving in all roles.	149	69.3			

Question 46: If you support woman serving in all roles, which of the following factors is most important in shaping your opinion? Please circle the one reason that matters most to you.

Reasons	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A To exclude women is discrimination/morally wrong	58	27.0			
B The most capable soldiers should be assigned to combat roles, and some women are more capable than some men	66	30.7			
C Technology/modern warfare has made physical abilities less relevant for combat	2	0.9			
D Women should have the same obligation to serve and risk their lives as do men	27	12.9			
E Having women in combat units will improve morale	0	0			
F Having women in combat units will motivate men to outperform them	0	0	9	4.2	215
G Women's performance in recent military operations has proven them to be an asset	8	3.7			
H The Canadian public will not consider women first class citizens until they serve in combat roles under the same circumstances as do men	0	0			
I Excluding military women from combat roles would hurt their promotion opportunities and prevent them from filling top leadership positions	1	0.5			
J Other (please specify)	9	4.2			
K I do not support women serving in all roles.	35	16.3			

Question 47: If, under present standards, your commanding officer were female, how would you feel? (please circle one):

Variable					
As confident with a female commanding officer as with a male commanding officer	More confident with a male commanding officer than with a female commanding officer	More confident with a female commanding officer than with a male commanding officer	No opinion	Missing	Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
173	80.5	27	12.6	0	0	14	6.5	1	0.5	215

Question 48: How do you think the military has done in dealing with the problem of sexual harassment? (please circle one):

Variable					
It has done what it should	It has not done enough	It has gone too far	No opinion	Missing	Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
156	72.6	15	7.0	37	17.2	5	2.3	2	0.9	215

Question 49: How would you characterize any costs associated with the effort to expand opportunities for women in the military? (please circle one):

	Variable								Total (N)
	Trivial or non-existent	Modest, but worth it for the benefits the effort generates	Sizable, but worth it for the benefits the effort generates	Modest, and probably not worth it for the benefits the effort generates	Sizable and probably not worth it for the benefits the effort generates	Excessive and certainly not worth it	No opinion	Missing	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
15	7.0	79	36.7	21	9.8	27	12.6	27	12.6	13	6.0	28	13.0	4	1.9	215

Question 50: How much sexual discrimination do you believe exists in the military as compared to civilian society at large? (please circle one):

	Variable					Total (N)
	More than in civilian society	Less than in civilian society	About the same as in civilian society	No opinion	Missing	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
19	8.8	105	48.8	89	41.4	2	0.9	0	0	215

Question 51: Overall, do you believe that men and women are held to the same standard in the military? (please circle one):

Yes		No, easier for men		No, easier for women		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
96	44.7	10	4.7	98	45.6	9	4.2	2	0.9	215

Question 52: Do you agree with the CF policy allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly in the military?

Yes		No		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
146	67.9	50	23.3	17	7.9	2	0.9	215

Question 53: If, under present standards, your commanding officer were gay, how would you feel?

As confident with a gay commanding officer as with a straight commanding officer		More confident with a gay commanding officer than with a straight commanding officer		More confident with a straight commanding officer than with a gay commanding officer		No opinion		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
127	59.1	1	0.5	61	28.4	25	11.6	1	0.5	215

Question 54: Consider how the military justice system deals with sexual harassment. Are you? (please circle one):

	Variable					*Total (N)*
More concerned that it might be allowing too many people to get away with sexual harassment	*More concerned that the system too often punishes the innocent*	*Satisfied that the system is doing the best it can in balancing these two concerns*	*No opinion*	*Missing*		
N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	
9	4.2	54	25.1	130	60.5	21	9.8	1	0.5	215

Question 55: Consider how the civilian justice system deals with sexual harassment. Are you? (please circle one):

	Variable					*Total (N)*
More concerned that it might be allowing too many people to get away with sexual harassment	*More concerned that the system too often punishes the innocent*	*Satisfied that the system is doing the best it can in balancing these two concerns*	*No opinion*	*Missing*		
N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	
54	25.1	29	13.5	77	35.8	53	24.7	2	0.9	215

DEMOGRAPHICS

Data Collection Phase

Year	Respondents		Total (N)
	N	%	
2001	101	47.0	215
2002	81	37.7	
2003	11	5.1	
2004	22	10.2	

Language of questionnaire

English		French		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	
194	90.2	20	9.3	1	0.5	215

Question A: What is your sex?

Variable						Total (N)
Female		Male		Missing		
N	%	N	%	N	%	
17	7.9	195	90.7	3	1.4	215

Question B: What is your year of birth?

Note: Table not presented due to length

Question C: What is the highest level of education that you have obtained?

Level of education	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A High school	3	1.4	3	1.4	215
B Some college	5	2.3			
C College graduate	1	0.5			
D Some university	7	3.3			
E University graduate (e.g., BA BSc)	84	39.1			
F Some graduate work (including professional schools)	38	17.7			
G Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D., M.D.)	74	34.4			

Question D: What is/was your primary occupation? Please circle only one.

Occupation	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A Business executive	0	0			
B Military officer	207	96.3			
C Foreign service officer	0	0			
D Labour official	0	0			
E Communications	0	0			
F Public (municipal, provincial, federal) official	1	0.5	3	1.4	215
G Health care professional	2	0.9			
H Lawyer	0	0			
I Educator	1	0.5			
J Clergy	0	0			
K Student	0	0			
L Other	0	0			

Question E: If you have served, or are currently serving in the military, please indicate:

Regular Force		Reserve Force		Variable Never served		Member of Foreign Military		Missing		Total (N)
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
204	94.9	2	0.9	1	0.5	1	0.5	8	3.7	215

Question F: If you serve or have served in the military, during what years have/did you served?

Note: Table not presented due to length

Question G: If you have military service, what is/was your primary service or DEU?

Variable		Army		Navy		Air Force		Other		Missing		Total (N)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	78	36.3	52	24.2	77	35.8	0	0	8	3.7	215

Question H: What is/was your primary military occupation (MOC)?

Note: Table not presented due to length

Question I: What is the highest rank you have reached?

Variable		Rank indicated		I never served		Missing		Total (N)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	203	94.4	0	0	12	5.6	215

Question I (Continued)

Highest Rank	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
Lt/Slt	2	1.0			
Maj/LCdr	133	61.9			
LCol/Cdr	41	19.1	12	5.6	215
Col/Capt(N)	26	12.1			
General Officer	1	0.5			

Question J: If you are/were an officer, what was the source of you commission?

COMMISSIONING PLAN	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A RMC/CMR/RRMC graduate	86	40.0			
B ROTP (civilian university)	23	10.7			
C OCTP	32	14.9			
D DEO (Direct entry)	54	25.1	8	3.7	215
E Commissioned after prior service as a non-commissioned member	2	0.9			
F Other	9	4.2			
G Never an officer	1	0.5			

Question K: Have you deployed abroad for a military operation as part of the Canadian Forces within the last five years?

Variable					Total (N)
Yes		No		Missing	
N	%	N	%	N	%	
120	55.8	91	42.3	4	1.9	215

Question L: Have you deployed within Canada for a military operation as part of the Canadian Forces within the last five years?

Variable					Total (N)
Yes		No		Missing	
N	%	N	%	N	%	
91	42.3	119	55.3	5	2.3	215

Question M: Has a member of your immediate family (e.g., parent, spouse, sibling, child) served, or do they currently serve, in the military?

Variable							Total (N)
Yes		No		Not sure		Missing	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
106	49.3	105	48.8	0	0	4	1.9	215

Question N: How would you describe your views on political matters? (Please circle one):

Views	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		*Missing*		
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	
A Far left	0	0			
B Very liberal	6	2.8			
C Somewhat liberal	35	16.3			
D Moderate	69	32.1			
E Somewhat conservative	76	35.3	2	0.9	215
F Very conservative	20	9.3			
G Far right	0	0			
H Other	1	0.5			
I No opinion	6	2.8			

Question O: What is/was the main kind of schooling (before college/university) that your children receive/d?

Views	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		*Missing*		
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	
A Do not have children	30	14.0			
B Public school	149	69.3			
C Private, nonparochial school	8	3.7	8	3.7	215
D Private, parochial school	7	3.3			
E Home-school	3	1.4			
F Other	10	4.7			

Question P: What is the highest level of education that your parents obtained (check appropriate level for each parent.

MOTHER

Level of Education	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
Elementary	9	4.2			
High school	115	53.5			
Some college	14	6.5			
College graduate	19	8.8	17	7.9	215
Some University	7	3.3			
University graduate	25	11.6			
Some graduate work (including professional schools)	3	1.4			
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., M.D.)	6	2.8			

Question P (Continued)

FATHER

Level of Education	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
Elementary	10	4.7	20	9.3	215
High school	91	42.3			
Some college	13	6.0			
College graduate	16	7.4			
Some University	11	5.1			
University graduate	34	15.8			
Some graduate work (including professional schools)	7	3.3			
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., M.D.)	13	6.0			

Question Q: Where did you live most of the time when you were growing up?

Province	Variable					Total (N)
	Selected			Missing		
	N	%		N	%	
A Newfoundland/Labrador	3	1.4				
B Prince Edward Island	9	4.2				
C Nova Scotia	8	3.7				
D New Brunswick	64	29.8				
E Quebec	61	28.4				
F Ontario	3	1.4				
G Manitoba	4	1.9		7	3.3	215
H Saskatchewan	7	3.3				
I Alberta	15	7.0				
J British Columbia	2	0.9				
K Yukon/North West Territories/Nunavut	8	3.7				
L Other	5	1.4				
M Moved around	27	12.6				

Question R: What is your racial/ethnic identity?

Racial/ethnic identity	Variable				Total (N)
	Selected		Missing		
	N	%	N	%	
A Caucasian	200	93.0			
B East Asian	1	0.5			
C South Asian	1	0.5			
D Black/African-Canadian	0	0	7	3.3	215
E Hispanic	0	0			
F Native/Aboriginal	2	0.9			
G Other	4	1.9			

About the Authors

Dr. Alan Okros (Captain (Naval), retired) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Military Psychology and Leadership and the Executive Director of the Centre for Security, Armed Forces and Society at the Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston with a cross-appointment as Deputy Chair – Command, Leadership and Management at the Canadian Forces College, Toronto. He is also the current Chair of the Interuniversity Seminar on Armed Forces and Society (Canada). His last military appointment was as the founding Director of the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute where he led the team that produced the Canadian Forces manuals *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada* and *Leadership Doctrine: Conceptual Foundations*. He is currently engaged in a number of research projects centred around leadership in the public domain including examining expeditionary air operations; the implications of Canadian demographics for the CF; and applying a model of professions to explain tensions between the military and humanitarian NGOs. Since 2002, he has been involved in activities to strengthen leadership and professionalism in the Bolivian military by developing policies and applied programs to address the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and women as leaders in the Armed Forces.

Dr. Sarah Hill completed her doctoral studies in psychology at Queen's University in 2000, specializing in Personality, Psychometrics, Social Psychology and Leadership studies. Her first position as a Defence Scientist was as part of the stand-up team for the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute in Kingston. She then assumed responsibilities as an analyst within the Directorate of Military Personnel Strategy in

Ottawa, working on projects related to organizational culture within the CF and DND. Dr. Hill is currently employed at the Canadian Forces Experimentation Centre in Ottawa, where she is integrating social sciences with traditional operational research (OR) in the context of military experimentation. Her publications and academic presentations encompass a range of conceptual and applied projects linking social science theories and models to the evolving requirements of the military.

Dr. Franklin C. Pinch (Colonel, retired), a sociologist and human resources professional, is currently a Research Associate at the Queen's University School of Policy Studies and Associate Editor of the international journal, *Armed Forces and Society*. Formerly, he served as Senior Research Fellow at the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute and Chair of the Interuniversity Seminar on Armed Forces and Society (Canada). Over the past 30 years, he has written or edited reports, papers, articles, book chapters and books on issues of social change in armed forces and society and on virtually all areas of military human resource management. His most recent publications deal with postmodern trends, change issues in military professionalism, trends in military sociology in Canada, perceived social and cultural gaps between the military and society, and gender and diversity in the military institution.