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Introduction

The value of social science research to the Canadian Forces (CF) is evidenced by the existence of a Department of National Defence (DND) Social Science Research Review Board (SSRRB) that requires researchers to submit formal proposals for their research projects. Researchers attempting to complete the necessary documentation might wonder, however, if the DND's understanding of 'Social Science' is comparable to how social scientists understand the term. The 'External Research Submission Form'\(^1\) includes a host of terminology indicative of quantitative research, including 'Testing Hypothesis/Relationships,' 'List Independent Variables,' and 'List Dependant Variables', and emphasizes 'survey' or questionnaire based research. Quantitative approaches, such as survey and questionnaire research, are common in social science disciplines and they fit relatively well with the DND ethics review. The ethics review process does not fit well, however, when it comes to research that is more qualitative in nature.

\(^1\) The External Research Submission Form can be found in Annex A of this paper.
nature, despite the fact that the DND has expressed a desire for a greater presence of qualitative research in the CF. Our intent in this paper is to shed light on some of the issues that arise for qualitative researchers interested in studying the CF, and to outline an innovative research approach that has the potential to contribute something new to the field of military and defence studies.

Ethnography is the fundamental research approach in social-cultural anthropology. The approach includes a host of different methods, although observations and interviews are the most common techniques. Ethnographers tend to advocate a primary method of data collection that they refer to as “participant observation”. This method entails the researchers taking both an objective stance, through reporting and analysis, but also a participatory role in the everyday activities of the people they study. The end-goal of such an exercise is to become as familiar with the participants’ lives as possible. According to Burgess, the vast majority of literature regarding participant observation emphasizes a necessity for researchers to conduct their work from a vantage of objectivity.

Given the priority of objectivity, how does a person who is a member of the society he/she wishes to study conduct social research? Are the experiences and findings of such “insider” inquiry less valuable than findings from research from an outsider perspective? Some critics of qualitative social research have indeed taken the stance that “insider” research is questionable, but this might be due, in part, to the researcher’s tendency to dismiss different forms of research because of their own “academic backgrounds, professional socialization patterns, and career structures”. As Lockford describes, academic disciplines create “comfortable perimeters” that serve to restrict and prevent group members from conducting other forms of meaningful research.

---

4 Ibid., p. 45.
Autoethnography, a method where the researcher is at once both a subject of inquiry and a research instrument, is not a prominent research approach. There have been only a few scholars which have breached their ‘comfortable perimeters’ and utilized their experiences to study the military in this fashion. This approach does have limitations and has been subject to much scrutiny. Perhaps the most notable researcher in this regard is John Hockey, “the ex-British-army infantryman turned sociologist, [who] has written about his subjectivity during an ethnographic study of the British infantry”. Drawing from one author’s experience as a member of the CF, the authors will demonstrate the usefulness and value of this approach. However, before autoethnography can be discussed, there needs to be a discussion of ‘ethnography’ and ‘insider anthropology’.

Ethnography

Ethnographers work with words, ideas, and theories to turn life into text. ‘Ethno’ (people) and ‘graph’ (writing) combine to give an understanding of social life in the form of text. Most anthropologists, in Vered Amit’s estimation, “would likely invoke ethnographic fieldwork as the quintessential hallmark of social and cultural anthropology”. Historically, the term ‘fieldwork’ has implied an expectation of “travel away from the researcher’s ordinary place of residence and work or ‘home’” to study the ‘exotic’. Ethnographic research is an awkward undertaking that Hastrup described
as symbolical violence. Qualitative social scientists study people: they “explore’ them, ask questions, observe, photograph, make recordings, take notes, and pry into the details of their daily lives” in ways of which they themselves are unaware. The most intimate details of life become the focus of inquiry. Ethnographers do not frequently utilize terms such as ‘hypothesis’ and ‘variables’, but rather concern themselves with a more grounded, or inductive, approach. Ethnography is about finding and reporting upon the intricacies of life, as the study participants recognize them.

Post-modern ethnographers emphasize a need for reflexivity in ethnographic research because, in the eyes of study participants, “the ethnographer is never... no one”. Reflexivity requires considering the act of research in social contexts, including the identity and biography of the researcher and the setting of the subject, and the impact these factors have on the value of the work the researcher produces. Researchers bring their own emotional baggage and life histories into the field of research and their mere presence can have profound implications on the research they conduct. Paul Higate and Ailsa Cameron argue that the individual characteristics that impact on research include: research design application, choice of topic, selection of methodology, the ways in which researchers elicited data, and the overall nature of the findings. Contemporary qualitative researchers will not likely neglect reflexivity. Yet, the concept is largely absent in studies of military organisations, and, in an age of post-modern academia, this is somewhat puzzling.

The authors of this text violate the fieldwork requirement of travelling away from ‘home’ to explore the ‘exotic.’ One studies contemporary health systems, while the other two study military organisations, one as a current member of the CF while the other as a former member. In this paper, they focus on the experiences of Mr. MacIsaac, currently serving in the CF Primary Reserve. As a member of the CF and as someone who wishes to study this group, MacIsaac is an ‘insider anthropologist,’ someone who

—— ——— ———
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practices “anthropology from within”. Traditional ethnography featured a researcher who was an outsider and who sought to have an objective perspective toward the culture in question. Insider anthropology stresses the value of expert social knowledge possessed by an insider. Insiders are more sensitive to “bounding elements that are structurally and physically close to them”. In addition, they are already a member of the group and this can expedite fieldwork because the researcher already has established rapport, has social connections, and knows the language. A later section will consider how writers of insider anthropology are highly reflexive, and, thus, are faced with the challenge of balancing the competing demands of ethics and methodological validity.

Autoethnography

Autoethnography involves examining culture through the self, or the individual who is a member of the culture. A study of one person can be an autoethnography, even if the author is different from the subject. The inclusion of the prefix ‘auto’ implies that it is the ability to represent or speak for culture through the ‘self.’ Autoethnography is like an autobiography; authors draw on their own experiences and stories as primary data. However, autoethnography differs from autobiography in that autoethnographers contextualize their stories and experiences in the broader social world. Autoethnographers communicate emotional truth through stories and narrative description; they “show readers ways they are similar to and different from others in the world” and act as windows for human experiences. Readers of autoethnography

21 Kirke, p. 5.
need to question the ways they can relate to the accounts, how the accounts resonate with their personal knowledge, and what they teach them about their social world. In this sense then, autoethnography is a bridge between the traditional ‘scientific’ ethnographic method and fictional stories.

Autoethnography is usually a first-person account and it can take many numerous storytelling forms, including poetry, short stories, personal essays, journals, fiction, novels, fragmented and layered writing, photographic essays, and social science prose. In addition to a plurality of forms, it incorporates three genres:

“(1) ‘native anthropology,’ in which people who were formally the subjects of ethnography become the authors of studies of their own group; (2) ‘ethnobiography,’ personal narratives written by members of ethnic minority groups; and (3) ‘autobiographical ethnography,’ in which anthropologists interject personal experience into ethnographic writing”.

Regardless of form and genre, autoethnography is about evocative stories that “elucidate the unspoken analytical givens, concepts and techniques” of a study and which helps the reader examine how members of the society in question endow their experience with meaning.

Autoethnography as Method

Anthropologists are not the only academics who produce autoethnographic accounts, and it is rare for authors to use only an autoethnographic style in their writing. Both ‘insiders’ at ‘home’, members of the group being studied, and ‘outsider’ researchers across several disciplines, use the technique. Anthropologists use
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autoethnographic approaches in ethnographic accounts as a means of strengthening their findings. It is customary for authors to insert reflexive self-narratives, field stories or discussions of a particular emotion they have never felt before, during, or after fieldwork, to enhance the substance of their text. Their use of this method often positions the ethnography into an ambiguous category: is it “fiction” or “factual depiction”? The resulting ambiguity can be problematic for researchers trying to fit their study within the comfortable perimeters of institutional expectations.

The insider has privilege to background knowledge and an in-depth understanding of the cultural milieu that escapes even the most objective participant-observer. For the insider anthropologists, rather than a form of potential bias, personal experience is a heuristic tool useful in analyzing theoretical standpoints. Personal life history is a source of research questions and insights. Without contextualizing personal narratives in broader social framework, the authors’ work remains an autobiographical account – a pronouncement that ‘this story happened to me’.

A Vignette

A personal story from one author’s experiences while serving in the CF will serve to highlight how autoethnography can work.

Several years ago, two reserve Master Corporals had summer employment working as instructors. The course they were involved with was roughly half over and there was a good deal of after-hours freedom for both staff and students to participate in the local economy. One evening, the two Master Corporals walked by the patio of a pub where they recognized four of their students engaged in an animated conversation over food and drink. The students recognized the instructors, and each party acknowledged the other. The students invited the instructors to sit down for a drink. Following the CF policy of fraternization, the instructors joined the
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students but made it clear that they would not be spending the entire evening in their company. The students purchased the instructors alcoholic beverages and, for the better part of an hour, the six men conversed until the instructors completed their drinks and left the patio.

An outsider analyst could find a host of anthropological theoretical arguments and insights to support or challenge with this vignette. Issues of social structure, hierarchy and power; the giving of gifts and reciprocity; transaction theory; and topics regarding gender, ritual, and symbolism could be addressed. On the surface, however, the story lacks some information that the outsider could not account for and that quantitative assessment could not reveal. The insider anthropologist can draw on tacit knowledge in order to derive a more comprehensive interpretation of the situation.

In this account, two of the students were underaged and the attitude and performance of two in the training course had marked them as ‘bad apples’. Underage infractions, like the consumption of alcohol, normally results in discharge from the course. However, while the six men do not discuss these facts before or during the encounter, after the interaction the instructors acknowledged the implicit change in relationship and power. That is, the instructors gained an advantage over the students and subsequently ‘owned their asses’ and no further incidents regarding attitude, misconduct, or code of service discipline infractions surfaced for the remainder of the course. Caught in the act, the students had nothing to lose so they invited their instructors to join them for a drink. The instructors ‘gained the upper hand’ in the interaction but it came at the risk of jeopardising their own positions. The instructors stood to gain social power but they took the chance, as the students did, that their direct supervisor, someone with the same sort of insider knowledge, would not pass during this period.

Advantages, Limitations, and Critique

Autoethnography has faced critical assessment and there are limitations to this approach. The most prominent critiques of the approach focus on the degree of objectivity and the question of factual validity of an insider perspective.34 While, ease of
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cultural access and the benefit of alternative insights provide a rationale for using autoethnographic accounts, the approach triggers certain issues concerning ethical conduct of research and participant relationships. The vignette in this paper does not belong to one person; six people share ownership of the event, and anonymity dilutes the significance that time, place, and other associated cultural specifics give to the context.

Access to the Field

The greater the insider knowledge and cultural capital a researcher possesses, the less time and effort it will take to gain access to the field setting. The ‘anthropologist from within’ is, by definition, a member of the culture under examination and sits at the opposite end of the insider-outsider continuum to the ‘pure outsider’.35 Insiders, according to O’ Reilly, “blend in more, gain more rapport, participate more easily, have more linguistic competence with which to ask more subtle questions on more complex issues, and are better at reading non-verbal communications”.36 In addition, they may already possess a pre-existing network of contacts37 and can be more efficient at conducting research because they do not need to invest as much time and energy trying to fit in or acclimate as does an outsider.38

Insiders of a group may not foresee culturally valued concepts as problematic. For instance, Val Colic-Peisker found, in her study of Croatians in Australia, that she was well received based upon the credibility associated with her level of education that is culturally valued by Croatian migrants. She writes: “My higher education detracted from my ‘insider’s status’” and, therefore, access became more fluid as she was seen as non-threatening.39 In contrast, while working among the American military, Higate failed to consider that his business cards included the title ‘Dr.’ before he distributed

35 Kirke, p. 10.
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them to prospective participants prior to interview. His respondents categorised him as an outsider on the basis of his academic status. Although he has previously served in the British Royal Air Force (RAF), senior officers emphasised rank disparity and classified him as an outsider based on his military background as well.

**Insider / Outsider**

Proponents of insider anthropology can argue that they are better situated to conduct research than outsiders but they continue to battle the belief that they are “too close, too involved, and lacking detachment”. Being an insider means not having to experience the ‘culture shock’ that many anthropologists credit for aiding their social understanding. To the critics, insider anthropologists are “too familiar with the setting for the unfamiliar and exotic to arouse curiosity” and this deficiency limits the scope of what they can potentially report upon. In a similar vein, Jaffe reminds us that “native ethnographers and writers are no less subject than outside anthropologists to representational politics and dilemmas”. The nature of the researcher’s pre-existing relationships, and whether they can provide sound, representative information of the larger social world, are matters of inquiry and concern for the insider anthropologist. They are also matters of debate and contention for critics. Outsider anthropologists tend to face different ethical challenges when it comes to the relationships they have with respondents and the impact of the relationships on the representativeness and soundness of information.

One response to the criticism that insider anthropology is too close to the culture in question is that the insider anthropologist’s perspective is more representative than the outsider’s perspective. As Reed-Danahay has argued, “The native voice is privileged as more ‘authentic’ than that of outsider” and is more legitimate than the
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Insider ethnographic accounts offer interpretations that are more faithful to cultural idioms or, as O’Reilly argues, insiders offer more detailed and complex descriptions and interpretations while outsider created accounts tend to be more broadly generalized or stereotyped. Defendants of insider ethnographers argue that community members may see outsiders as “less trustworthy, less discerning, lacking commitment to the group, or having no political axe to grind”.

*Friendships and Participants*

Participant observers face the prospect that their identity and role as a stranger will clash with the role they have developed in friendships with participants. This potential clash can be particularly problematic for insiders because they risk “transforming friends and family into informants”. Dyck makes the case that he has “been unwilling to use personal relationships surreptitiously for professional purposes”. Despite their preferences, fieldworkers often find themselves thrust into unexpected situations that blur the boundaries between personal and professional lives. Adding to the complexity of the issue, is the fact that, even when researchers believe they are not exploiting personal connections to further professional interests, respondents, and prospective respondents, might interpret their actions differently, and that this difference can have a negative impact on both their personal and professional lives.

O’Reilly found that participants he knew thought that they were not suitable candidates for study and constantly directed him to talk to others who they considered had experiences “more valuable than what they themselves had to offer”. Similarly, while studying the American Forces, Jaffe discovered how difficult it was to “systematically ask basic, ‘outsider’ questions of a large... sample of the military.
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population without compromising the legitimacy of my insider status”.54 In his study of the British military, John Hockey did not advertise his insider status and was able to ‘play dumb’ and ask the sorts of questions that Jaffe could not ask.55 However, because of his prior background, Hockey became emotionally frustrated by some of the events and situations he witnessed where he could not, for the sake of maintaining his outsider identity, voice his concerns.56

Autobiographical narratives call into question the ownership of stories. Just because one individual tells a personal story does not mean the event or situation does not also belong to other people. Ethnographers must work at preserving the anonymity and identities of their respondents but how far should these efforts go? At what point does an account lose focus, or even validity, if it cannot include the vibrant details that characterize and, hence, identify the people involved? Personal relationships can be damaged if the ethnographer reveals too much information, or misinformation from the vantage of participants.

Composing Ethnographic Works

Bochner and Ellis argue that language “cannot be a neutral means of communicating what exists in the world”.57 Ethnographers rework their participants’ reports and, sometimes, the reworking is far different from the original report. Authoritative voice and authenticity are topics for all social scientists to consider while writing their texts. The identity of the author and the author’s reasons for writing are important points to consider in the evaluation of “all ethnographic and autobiographical writing”.58 The need for reflexivity in the evaluation of field work is a long standing tradition in anthropology. A classic example of how anthropologists have grappled with their choice of rhetoric and authorial voice is Horace Miner’s “Body Ritual among the Nacirema,” a creative depiction of everyday American (Nacirema) life

55 Hockey.
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in the voice of an outsider social scientist viewing a strange and exotic culture. Min
adopts an emotive style that opens the reader’s mind to the anthropological strangeness
of American life, and to the inherent problems with accepting research at face value.
Through anthropological rhetoric, the outside anthropologist imposes a worldview on
his study population that depicts people as overly superstitious and harbouring exotic,
ritual, practices. Contemporary autoethnography holds a similar perspective, and
advocates an insider anthropology that is more ‘authentic’ than ‘straight’
ethnography.

Like literature and other fictitious accounts, scholarly writing can enlarge our
sense of human community. Regardless of authorial style, the linguistic competence of
the researcher is perhaps the ultimate requirement for successful ethnography.
Language fluency ensures consistency and accuracy in reporting that would otherwise
be fatal for interpretive potential.

The CF Reserves as a Research Site

Social science research on the Canadian Forces Primary Reserves is in its infancy;
most social science research on reserve forces has been conducted on either the United
States Army or the Israeli forces. Willett’s classic work on the army reserves is out of
date and, with only a few exceptions, there have been no attempts to update his
ethnography of the militia or to complement it with studies of the navy and air
reserves. This lacuna is particularly disturbing as the Regular Forces of Canada are
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coming to rely more and more on the Reserves to meet the staffing requirements of Canada’s overseas and domestic operations. Currently, reserve members fill at least 20% of regular overseas deployments, and are being called upon to contribute in significant numbers for the 2010 Olympics, which will stretch an already over-committed Regular Force.\(^{65}\) Reservists are dying and being wounded in Afghanistan as they fill roles that were unforeseen when Willett was writing *A Heritage at Risk.*\(^ {66}\) How reservists respond to their new roles is only one area of research that has been sadly neglected. The Primary Reserves represents a subject of research that needs the attention of the social sciences.

The flexible terms of service for members of the reserve and the training cycle of reserve units make it appealing part-time and temporary full-time employment for university students, who seem to be over-represented in the reserves at all ranks\(^{67}\). These “soldier/students” may well be considered a pool of potential auto-ethnographers with much to contribute to the scholarship on the Canadian Forces Reserves. In that regard, they represent a previously untapped resource, both for the CF and for social sciences. One of this paper’s authors, Derek MacIsaac, is part of this potentially untapped resource, and his current research into role conflict among members of the reserve will begin to fill the gap in our understanding of reserve military service in Canada. There is much more to be done in this area, however, and an autoethnographical approach to military and defence studies has the potential to provide insights into human relations and to enhance the understanding of the Canadian Forces as a whole.

**In Closing**


\(^{66}\) Willett, 1987.

\(^{67}\) This is an educated guess only: there has been so little research done on the CF Reserves that is impossible to obtain a demographic profile of the Reserves. As one indicator only, all three authors have had serving members of the Reserves in their university classes, and as stated above, Derek MacIsaac is currently serving.
Autoethnography, as an alternative form of qualitative social research, challenges the traditional views of scientific research that prides itself on ‘minimizing the self’. It does not fit into the category of orthodox scientific research. However, it has the ability to move past purely quantitative research that tends to focus upon broad organizational structures towards the more intricate dimensions of social life. The traditional scientific approach offers reassurances but, as Arthur Bochner suggests, these provide “the same kind of solace many people find within formalized religion. If we lose faith in [the] scientific method as a path to Truth beyond human subjectivity, then we have to rely on ourselves to decide what to believe”. For many researchers this proposition can be uncomfortable and threatening.

If research is to progress into dimensions not wholly focused on providing a detached voice of authority, social scientists need to “locate ourselves in our studies honestly and openly, in an admission that observations are filtered through our own experience”. Reflexive qualitative research has diverse applications, but following Higate and Cameron, perhaps its most promising trait is that it can motivate and help researchers of military fields to better “consider how they might... reflect on the challenges presented by particular research topics”. Autoethnography has the potential to “open ethnography to a wider audience, not just academics but all people who can benefit from thinking about their own lives in terms of other people’s experiences”, and here we include the Canadian Forces and studies of the military more generally.

Academic social sciences and military organisations are becoming increasingly accountable to the public. Research has greater responsibilities to better the lives of study participants and the general populace. If the knowledge and experiences researchers study emerge out of complex social processes, then exploring ways to better acknowledge and represent this dynamic holds “greater potential for both transparency
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and, ultimately, accountability in the research process".\textsuperscript{75} Ethnographic writing is well positioned to increase transparency and accountability because, in the words of Carolyn Ellis, qualitative research “breaches the received genre of realist writing that construes the author as a neutral, authoritative, and scientific voice”.\textsuperscript{76}

This article began by expressing frustration and discouragement created by the DND SSRRB application form. To reiterate: the board will make allowances for research that does not neatly fit into the standard perimeters that researchers commonly utilize in social science research. However, the fact that the form is restrictive toward qualitative research, and biased in favour of quantitative inquiry, suggests that alternative forms of social research are not yet “on the radar” of the DND. Qualitative research can be equally beneficial and important. If DND values alternative forms of research, then the military review board should take this into consideration and be explicit in their openness toward other forms of research.

\textsuperscript{75} Higate and Cameron, p. 220.
\textsuperscript{76} Bochner and Ellis, p. 19.
Annex A: SSRRB Submission Form for External Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSRRB RESEARCH REVIEW BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH QUALITY CONTROL AND COORDINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Researcher Submission Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of survey (English and French if available):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates of Data Collection (Start Date – End Date):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations of Data Collection (include all specific locations/bases):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Survey (i.e. questionnaire, focus group, interview, etc):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Type (i.e. Reg F, Res F, civilians, etc):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Date of Final Report:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL RESEARCHER’S INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business mailing address/Institutional Affiliation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Check appropriate status below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DND/CF Researcher**

If principal researcher is a student, provide the information below

**DND/CF Member**

Academic supervisor’s Name:
Academic Institution:

**University/College Faculty member**

Academic supervisor’s Telephone (including area-code):

**University/college student**

**Academic supervisor’s E-mail Address:**

**Consultant**

**Date Academic Advisor Approval form received:**

**DND/CF SPONSOR INFORMATION**

Name of DND/CF agency sponsoring this research:

Name of Sponsor’s contact: | Contact’s telephone number: | Contact’s e-mail address:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be completed by sponsor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State the benefit accruing to DND/CF by supporting this research. Relate to specific Defence Objectives/Change Initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHER’S INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert a short, one paragraph biography.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIDENTIALITY/PRIVACY CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert the survey’s directions/statement with respect to Privacy/Confidentiality of Responses in this box or add a new page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert instructions for completing the demographic section of the survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Insert demographic questions (including coding scheme) below or add pages. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT - DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and define Construct here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How is Construct 1 measured (check as appropriate):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Previously validated scale?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Specially created scale/items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Combination of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the construct contains items from a previously validated scale in whole or in part, provide complete citation information, state the population on which the scale was validated, and explain rationale for choice of that particular scale.

(1) Citation information
   - Authors/Year:
   - Title of Article:
   - Publication:
   - Volume and pages.

(2) Population on which scale was validated:

(3) Rationale for choosing this particular scale:

Instructions for completing scale items (Copy instructions for answering scale items to this table-row).

Rating scale (Copy the rating scale to this table-row)

Interpretation of scale (State meaning of high and low scale-scores in this table-row)

Scale items (enter one item per table-row and indicate with an “X” if item is “reverse-coded”, and whether it originates from a validated scale.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item (Add table-rows as required)</th>
<th>Reverse coded</th>
<th>From Validated Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### TESTING HYPOTHESES/RELATIONSHIPS

**Instructions:** In the appropriate spaces below:

a. Identify each of the hypotheses/relationships to be tested (use additional pages as necessary and number hypotheses appropriately).

b. Identify the independent and dependent variables to test each hypothesis/relationship

c. State how each hypothesis/relationship will be tested providing the indicated information.

(Add additional pages as necessary and number hypotheses appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis/relationship</th>
<th>Independent Variables (IVs)</th>
<th>Dependent Variables (DVs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IVs may be constructs or biographical variables

Note: DVs may be constructs or biographical variables

How will Hypothesis/Relationship 1 be tested? State statistic/method/technique and describe analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis/relationship</th>
<th>Independent Variables (IVs)</th>
<th>Dependent Variables (DVs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State hypothesis/relationship 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables (IVs)</th>
<th>Dependent Variables (DVs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: IVs may be constructs or biographical variables | Note: DVs may be constructs or biographical variables

How will Hypothesis/Relationship 2 be tested? State statistic/method/technique and describe analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION, SAMPLING, AND ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To whom will this survey be administered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what population will survey results be generalized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify proposed sample-size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State proposed sample characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will potential respondents be identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where will respondents complete the survey?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many respondents will complete the survey at a sitting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will respondents be selected?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State proposed start-date of survey | State proposed end-date of survey
--- | ---

How will surveys be delivered to respondents?

How will completed surveys be returned to the researcher?

How will completed surveys be stored?

**Principal Researchers Educational Background**

Please include a brief description of your educational background including relevant courses such as statistics (univariate/multivariate), test construction, etc.

---

**End of project administration**

Authorization to conduct any research within the Department of National Defence/the Canadian Forces is conditional on the principal researcher’s undertaking to forward electronic copies of the following to SSRRB on completion of the research:

1. any research reports/theses/dissertations emerging from the research;
2. complete copies of any data-sets created/employed in the process of the research; and
3. coding schemes/keys for all data-sets created/employed in the process of the research.
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