

**Ethical Dilemmas:  
A Survey of Canadian Forces Officers\***

Major Curt Hillier  
Assistant Professor

Military Leadership and  
Applied Psychology Department

Royal Roads Military College  
Victoria, British Columbia

Paper presented at the  
Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics  
Washington, DC, USA

30 January 1992

The views expressed in this paper are  
those of the author and do not  
necessarily represent the position  
and/or policy of the Canadian Forces  
or any of its agencies.

# Ethical Dilemmas: A Survey of Canadian Forces Officers\*

## Introduction

In their final year of studies at Royal Roads Military College, Cadets undertake a course of study in professional and ethical issues. Preparation of instruction materials for this course revealed little contemporary information regarding the ethical experiences of Canadian Forces officers. Most references originate from decades old Canadian experiences, or from the experiences of allied militaries.

To provide students with realistic examples of contemporary ethical dilemmas, a survey of Canadian Forces officers was undertaken early in 1991. The research questions which this survey addressed are as follows:

- a. How common is the experience of ethical dilemmas among Canadian Forces officers?
- b. How do Canadian Forces officers determine whether an issue is an ethical issue?
- c. How do Canadian Forces officers resolve ethical issues and what are the critical factors in arriving at a solution?
- d. What are some of the dilemmas experienced by officers?
- e. What is the extent of educational instruction or training in ethics of those responding to the survey?
- f. Are there any differences among the responses to the above questions across demographic variables such as age, rank, or military occupation?

Many other areas of interest might have been probed, however it was decided to keep the survey as brief as practical in order to encourage participation. Furthermore, the goals of Psychology (the author's discipline) and other sciences are to describe, explain, predict, and control. The data from this exploratory research provide a basic description of the phenomena under investigation, while the author joins the reader in the task of explaining the data.

---

\* The author acknowledges with thanks the contribution of the following associates in fostering the development of this research: Capt A.T. MacIntyre, Col M. Caines, OCdts D. O'Keefe and R. Porter, Dr. R.C. St John, and Dr. A.T. Malcolm.

---

Method

Executive authority for the survey was obtained from the operational commanders of each branch of the Canadian Forces. Maritime Command, with overall responsibility for operations related to Operation Friction and Desert Storm, specified that personnel in those operational theatres were not to be surveyed.

When the survey was undertaken, in December 1989, the strength of the Canadian Forces officer corp was:

- a. General Officers - 135
- b. Senior Officers - 5,135
- c. Junior Officers - 10,585

The Directorate of Personnel Information System (DPIS) drew a random sample of 1000 Canadian Forces officers stratified according to the following criteria:

- a. General Officers - 30
- b. Senior Officers - 320
- c. Junior Officers - 650

This stratified sample maintained the proportions of currently serving junior and senior officers. General Officers were over-sampled for two reasons:

- a. to protect the identity of respondents, and
- b. it was believed they might make a significant contribution due to their extensive experience.

To assure anonymity of participants, all research materials were forwarded to National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ) where DPIS applied mailing labels and forwarded the surveys to the randomly selected participants. When the surveys were returned to Royal Roads Military College (RRMC) they were removed from their mailing envelopes by an officer who was not involved in the research. In this way, the author remained blind to the identity or even the location of participants. These procedures were explained to potential participants in the survey package. The survey and accompanying material are attached as Annex A.

The demographic information and response options were numerically coded and entered into an SPSS-PC data file. Responses to the research questions were read independently by at

least two investigators who came to an agreement as to how the responses should be categorized for computer entry. For example, responses to Question 4 "What factors did you take into consideration in arriving at your solution to this dilemma?", originally resulted in a list exceeding 40 factors, which was eventually collapsed to 7 factors.

### Results and Discussion

This section is structured to present and interpret the data in answering the research questions presented in the introduction to this paper.

Of the 1000 potential participants, 441 returned their surveys to RRMC for a return rate of 44.1%. Participants were given three general response categories on the survey:

- a. I am unable to recall a work-related ethical dilemma.
- b. I am able to recall a work-related ethical dilemma but do not wish to participate in this research.
- c. I am able to recall a work-related ethical dilemma and my answers to the research questions are enclosed.

Of the 441 returns, 285 (64.6%) respondents indicated that they were unable to recall a work-related ethical dilemma. A further 76 (17.2%) respondents indicated that they could recall a work-related ethical dilemma, but chose not to participate in the research. Eighty (18.1%) respondents could recall a work-related ethical dilemma and provided responses to the research questions. Their descriptions of ethical dilemmas were condensed by the researcher to retain the essence of the situations described, while eliminating any possible identifiers of those involved. These condensed scenarios are presented at Annex B. These vignettes give a flavour of the types of dilemmas experienced by CF officers, and may be used as case studies by students and teachers of military ethics. These narratives are deliberately open-ended so that users may manipulate the circumstances to accommodate the pedagogical aim. Most are written in the second person to encourage the reader to adopt the role of the central player.

#### **How common is the experience of ethical dilemmas among Canadian Forces officers?**

Of the 80 officers who chose to provide answers to the research questions, 36 were Junior Officers, 34 were Senior Officers, and 5 were General Officers. Five respondents chose not to reveal their rank. Further demographic data are summarized in Table 1a.

Variable	Response Group							
	Total		Response 1		Response 2		Response 3	
	N (441)	%	N (282)	%	N (76)	%	N (80)	%
Rank								
Jr Officer	289	65.5	210	74.5	42	55.3	36	45.0
Sr Officer	126	28.6	62	22.0	30	39.5	34	42.5
Gen Officer	12	2.7	6	2.1	1	1.3	5	6.3
Unreported	14	3.2	4	1.4	3	3.9	5	6.3
Gender								
Female	26	5.9	17	6.0	7	9.2	2	2.5
Male	363	82.3	236	83.7	61	80.3	65	81.3
Unreported	52	11.8	29	10.3	8	10.5	13	16.3
Age								
17-25	8	1.8	7	2.5	0	0.0	1	1.3
26-30	25	5.7	19	6.7	4	5.3	2	2.5
31-35	55	12.5	36	12.8	12	15.8	7	8.8
36-40	69	15.6	47	16.7	11	14.5	11	13.8
41-45	108	24.5	62	22.0	22	28.9	24	30.0
46-50	98	22.2	69	24.5	13	17.1	16	20.0
51-55	65	14.7	37	13.1	12	15.8	15	18.8
Unreported	13	2.9	5	1.8	2	2.6	4	5.0
Military Occupation								
Air Ops	118	26.8	89	31.6	12	15.8	17	21.3
Land Ops	53	12.0	26	9.2	13	17.1	14	17.5
Sea Ops	57	12.9	33	11.7	7	9.2	17	21.3
Engineer	63	14.3	40	14.2	15	19.7	8	10.0
Adm/Log	73	16.6	53	18.8	10	13.2	10	12.5
Other	58	13.2	32	11.3	15	19.7	10	12.5
Unreported	19	4.3	9	3.2	4	5.3	4	5.0
Education								
High School	188	42.6	131	46.5	32	42.1	24	30.0
Bachelor's	176	39.9	116	41.1	31	40.8	29	36.3
Master's	40	9.1	15	5.3	5	6.6	20	25.0
Doctorate	3	0.7	2	0.7	1	1.3	0	0.0
Unreported	34	7.7	18	6.4	7	9.2	7	8.8

Notes: Response 1 - Unable to recall ethical dilemma.  
Response 2 - Able to recall, unwilling to participate.  
Response 3 - Able to recall, and answers to research questions provided.  
% - Percentage of total in each response group.

Table 1a. Demographic profile of respondents and number choosing each response option.

By collapsing the 'Response 2' and 'Response 3' columns in Table 1a, the number of respondents who could recall an ethical dilemma can be derived. These figures are displayed in Table 1b. Thirty-five percent of respondents indicated that they could recall an ethical dilemma related to their military careers. This percentage did not vary by gender, nor by a distinction between operational and non-operational classifications. The recall rate increased with age and education: 21% for the 17-30 age group, 33% for age 30-40, and 38% for the 40-55 age group. Holders of graduate degrees reported at a rate of 60% while those with high school and Baccalaureate degrees reported at a rate of 32%. Both rank and education were significant correlates of recall of ethical dilemmas ( $r = .25$  and  $.19$  respectively,  $p < .001$ ).

Approximately one third of respondents indicated that they could recall an ethical dilemma related to their careers as officers. This figure is much lower than expected based on the researcher's personal experience. Moreover, many of the respondents indicated that they had no difficulty recalling an ethical dilemma, rather, the difficulty was in choosing which of their various such experiences they should report. Conversely, several respondents asserted that a "good officer" would not

Variable	Total Grp	Response Group 2&3	
	N	N	%
Rank			
Jr Officer	289	78	26.9
Sr Officer	126	64	50.8
Gen Officer	12	6	50.0
Unreported	14	8	57.1
Gender			
Female	26	9	34.6
Male	363	126	34.7
Unreported	52	21	40.4
Age			
17-25	8	1	12.5
26-30	25	6	24.0
31-35	55	19	34.5
36-40	69	22	31.9
41-45	108	46	42.6
46-50	98	29	29.6
51-55	65	27	41.6
Unreported	13	6	46.2
Military Occupation			
Air Ops	118	29	24.6
Land Ops	53	27	50.9
Sea Ops	57	24	42.1
Engineer	63	23	36.5
Adm/Log	73	20	27.4
Other	58	25	43.1
Unreported	19	8	42.1
Education			
High School	188	56	29.8
Bachelor's	176	60	34.1
Master's	40	25	62.5
Doctorate	3	1	33.3
Unreported	34	14	41.2

Note: Total Grp N = total number of respondents.  
 Response Grp 2&3 N = number of respondents who could recall an ethical dilemma.

**Table 1b. Recall of ethical dilemma.**

allow ethical dilemmas to arise. Several respondents criticized the survey for not defining an ethical dilemma. A definition of ethical dilemma was not provided because the researcher stands by the assumption that potential ethical dilemmas arise for all officers at some point in their careers. It is therefore assumed that an officer who cannot recall an ethical dilemma is an officer who does not know how to recognize one.

It seems inconceivable to the researcher that one could serve as an officer for any significant period of time without experiencing an ethical dilemma. The significant correlation of recall of dilemmas with rank and education leads one to hypothesize that those who are less experienced and less educated may have difficulty recognizing ethical dilemmas. But this hypothesis does not adequately account for the fact that half of the Senior Officers and Generals responding to this survey could not recall any ethical dilemmas related to their military careers. Future research should examine the frequency with which officers experience ethical dilemmas. It is suspected that such quantification would demonstrate that once one is made aware of how to identify and deal with ethical issues, then their occurrence is seen as a normal challenge of officership.

#### **How do Canadian Forces officers determine whether an issue is an ethical issue?**

The most popular response was conflicting values, followed by obligations, legality, consequences, gut feel, and other reasons. The original situations described by respondents were analyzed by the researcher to determine why they were ethical dilemmas. This analysis produced results which differed from those provided by respondents in both the factors and their order. A comparison of the factors in response to Question #2 and the experimenter's categorization of responses to Question #1 is provided in Tables 2a and 2b.

Table 3 provides a correlation matrix of respondents' perceptions of the basis of ethical dilemmas with the researcher's analysis of the described dilemmas. This table reveals the high multicollinearity of the variables under examination. For example, Obligation (OBL2) is significantly correlated with Loyalty (LOY1), Values (VAL1), Integrity (INT1), Legality (LEG1), and Harassment (HAR1). It is unclear if this represents a relationship between different variables or if one or more of these variables is actually a subset of one or more of the other variables. Further research should seek to provide operational definitions for each of the variables under consideration so that surplus meaning might be eliminated from the common usage of the words identifying the variables.

Question #2 Response	N	%
Value Conflict	35	43.8
Consequences	11	13.8
Legality	16	20.0
Obligations	30	37.5
Gut Feel	3	3.8
Other	2	2.5

Table 2a.

Question #1 Categorization	N	%
Value Conflict	27	33.8
Consequences	4	5.0
Legality	27	33.8
Loyalty	29	36.3
Integrity	20	25.0
Harassment	1	1.3

Table 2b.

Note: percentage figures do not total 100 because individual cases may have included more than one variable in defining an ethical dilemma.

Comparison of respondents' perception of basis of ethical dilemmas with researcher's analysis of the described dilemmas.

Variable	LOY1	VAL1	INT1	CON1	LEG1	HAR1
VAL2	.1716**	.4298**	.3363**	.1103	.2267**	-.0140
CON2	.2561**	.0078	.1355*	.0953	.2242**	-.0083
LEG2	.0370	.0953	.0604	-.0228	.5846**	-.0092
OBL2	.5050**	.2553**	.2925**	.0460	.2190**	.1765**
GUT2	.0813	-.0220	-.0199	.2284**	.0893	-.0039
OTH2	.0813	-.0220	-.0199	-.0097	.2006**	-.0039

Note: The "1" appended to the variable name designates it as the researcher's categorization of the dilemma and corresponds to the variables in Table 2b. Similarly, the "2" appended to the variable name designates it as the respondent's view of why a situation is defined as an ethical dilemma, and corresponds to the variables in Table 2a.

Key: VAL Conflicting Values CON Consequences  
 LEG Legality OBL Obligations  
 GUT Gut Feel OTH Other  
 LOY Loyalty INT Integrity  
 HAR Harassment  
 \* = p<.01  
 \*\* = p<.001

Table 3. Correlation matrix of respondents' perception of basis of ethical dilemmas with researcher's analysis of the described dilemmas.



At Royal Roads Military College, students learn that an issue involves ethics if values are in conflict. Almost half (44%) of the respondents to this survey indicated that a case of conflicting values identified an issue as being ethical in nature. The remainder presented a more limited view, relying on factors such as consequences, legality, obligations, or gut feel. Gut feel is a particularly inappropriate way of identifying ethical issues because it does not include the application of rational thought in analysis. Such personal relativism in assessing ethical dilemmas would be chaotic at an institutional level because each case might be disposed of at the whim of the individual without reference to precedent or consultation.

Consequences, legality, and obligations may or may not include conflicting values. The danger of adopting a single specific factor in evaluating ethical situations is that clearly unethical behaviour may be seen by some as acceptable. Using consequences as a guide may lead to a purely utilitarian approach in which the ends justify the means, whatever those means might be.

While it is most appropriate that officers have a healthy respect for law, there are situations in which behaviour that does not violate a law may still violate ethical principles. A reliance on the law to define ethical issues reflects ignorance of the difference between legality and morality. Furthermore, it can be argued that in specific cases breaking the law may be the most ethical course of action.

Obligations usually include duty and/or loyalty. To the extent that duty and loyalty to various others may be in conflict, this factor is clearly a subset of conflicting values. The danger in taking a narrow view of ethical dilemmas is that if a situation meets a set of narrow criteria (such as legality) then the individual may deal with a potential ethical issue as if no ethical considerations are required. The fact that more than half of the respondents have a limited view of defining ethical dilemmas may be indicative of the need for more education and/or training in this area.

**What are some of the ethical dilemmas experienced by Canadian Forces officers?**

Other than United Nations peace-keeping duties and the Gulf War, Canadian Forces have not been involved in a major armed conflict since the Korean War. Because members serving in the Gulf War theatre were precluded from inclusion in this survey, it is not surprising that the ethical dilemmas described by respondents reflect situations in the context of a peace-time force.

The ethical dilemmas described at Annex B could be interpreted by some as examples of moral decay among officers of the Canadian Forces. Such a conclusion is inappropriate. Contemporary media coverage of the ethical dilemmas confronting most professions reinforce the view that the military is in many ways a representative subset of the society which it is designed to serve and protect.

However the military is distinct from the mainstream of society because of its mandated legitimate use of force and the unlimited liability of its members. This mandate sets up two special requirements for the military related to dealing with ethical dilemmas. First, there appears to be an expectation on the part of society that members of the military profession, as guardians of society's values, will be exemplary in their behaviour. Secondly, in preparation for the exercise of this mandate, it is essential that military professionals be trained and educated in identifying and resolving ethical dilemmas in both peace and war.

The lack of examples of ethical dilemmas experienced by Canadian Forces officers in the context of armed conflict requires that we must continue to refer back to events of 40 to 50 years past. The alternative, appealing to the experience of officers in allied militaries, may be somewhat beneficial in providing an understanding of some of the challenges in the context of modern technology and politics. But in spite of shared values, Canada is a distinct society in comparison to its allies. For this reason, the types of ethical dilemmas described in this study provide only a limited resource for educating and training our officers in dealing with ethical issues. Further research is required to examine these issues in the context of armed conflict.

**How do Canadian Forces officers resolve ethical issues and what are the critical factors in arriving at a solution?**

Participants were asked which factors they considered in resolving the ethical dilemmas which they had reported, and were asked to rate those factors in order of importance. Most respondents did not rate the importance of the factors that they considered, therefore analysis of the importance of factors was not possible. Half of the respondents identified Military Values as a factor in resolving dilemmas. Other factors included Consequences, Personal Values, Law/Regulations, Canadian Values, Integrity, and other factors. These data are summarized in Table 4.

Factor*	N	%
Military Values	40	50.0
Consequences	33	41.3
Personal Values	27	33.6
Law/Regulations	20	25.0
Canadian Values	17	21.3
Integrity	14	17.5
Other	7	8.8

\* The original 44 factors cited by respondents were collapsed into the seven categories in this table. The compilation of factors is as follows:

<u>Mil Values</u>	<u>Cdn Values</u>	<u>Pers Values</u>	<u>Other</u>
Loyalty	Justice	Communication	Social Pressure
Can-Do	Safety	Confidentiality	Abuse of Power
Conduct	Individual	Proper Behaviour	
Morale	Dignity	Maturity	
Duty			
Trust			

**Table 4. Factors considered in resolving ethical dilemmas.**

Respondents were asked how they resolved the ethical dilemmas which they had described. The most popular response indicated that 22.5% eventually followed guidance provided by law, rules, and/or policy. Some (15.1%) chose to break the rules, refuse orders, or confront superiors, while others (13.8%) referred the situation up the chain of command or to a specialist professional. Almost 20% of reported dilemmas were unresolved and several cases were still in progress. Other methods of resolution included personal intervention, compromise of values and use of judgement, and transfer or resignation. These methods of resolution are presented in Table 5.

Almost 60% of the ethical dilemmas described by respondents were resolved in ways that can be defined as acceptable to the military. These methods included reliance on; rules and policy, the chain of command and other professionals, and personal judgement and intervention. Twenty percent of the dilemmas remained unresolved. A further 20% involved transfer or resignation, breaking the rules, refusal of orders, or confrontation of superiors. There is cause for concern in the fact that 40% of the ethical dilemmas remained unresolved or were resolved in ways that potentially undermine good order and discipline in the military. This concern increases when one

How Dilemma was Resolved	N	%
Followed rules/policy	18	22.5
Broke rules	5	6.3
Refused orders	5	6.3
Confronted superiors	2	2.5
Refer to chain of command	5	6.3
Referred to professional	6	7.5
Transferred/Resigned	4	5.0
Personal intervention	9	11.3
Compromised/Used judgement	6	7.5
In progress	2	2.5
Not resolved	14	17.5
Other	2	2.5

**Table 5. Respondents' methods of resolving ethical dilemmas.**

recognizes that the issues under consideration were somewhat mundane in comparison to the life and death situations likely to be encountered in combat.

The problem of unresolved dilemmas or inappropriately resolved dilemmas might be addressed at least partially through education and training. First, leaders may display less propensity to behave inappropriately if they are given an opportunity in the classroom to examine issues which they are likely to face as part of their line responsibilities. Moreover, the knowledge that subordinates are well versed in identifying and dealing with ethical issues might provide some incentive for leaders to monitor their own behaviour more closely. Second, subordinates would benefit from instruction in how to pursue legitimate avenues of dissent when faced with orders which are at odds with military rules and values.

Although the methods of resolving ethical dilemmas may not be supportive of good order and discipline in a minority of cases, it is encouraging that when integrity is included as a military value, fully two thirds of respondents rated military

values as important in their resolution of dilemmas. It is difficult to conclude from the current data if this consideration of military values is a direct consequence of our military socialization and professional development programs. The fact that one third of respondents did not include military values as a consideration again emphasizes the need for more education and training in this area.

**What is the extent of educational instruction or training in ethics of those responding to the survey?**

Reported sources of education and training in ethics for respondents included university/professional courses, military training, church and family, and experience. These sources are broken down and quantified in Table 6. Level of education was, not surprisingly, significantly correlated with university and professional training in ethics ( $r = .25$  and  $.19$  respectively,  $p < .001$ ). Rank was significantly correlated with Staff College, religion, family, and experience as sources of education and training in ethics ( $r = .14, .16, .16,$  and  $.13$  respectively,  $p < .01$ ).

Source of Education or Training	Total Grp		#3 Group*	
	N	%	N	%
University	19	4.3	15	18.8
Professional	9	2.0	6	7.5
Staff School	9	2.0	7	8.8
Staff College	9	2.0	6	7.5
Church/Religion	10	2.3	8	10.0
Family	9	2.0	9	11.3
Leadership Trg	22	5.0	18	22.5
Experience	21	4.8	19	23.8

\* Note: % for Total Grp is based on all respondents, N=441  
 % for #3 Group is based on respondents who provided descriptions of ethical dilemmas, N=80.

**Table 6. Sources of education and training in ethics.**

The greatest source of education and training in ethics identified by respondents was experience. While experience is a  
 .../13

great teacher, it is often the case that one must first err and subsequently correct that error to benefit from experience. Such pragmatic learning is both desirable and inevitable. But learning from our mistakes should be secondary to learning from the mistakes of others through education and training.

Less than one quarter of respondents indicated that they had received education or training in ethics through military leadership training. Considering the importance of ethics in the military, 100% of officers ought to be able to say that ethics was integral to their training as leaders. This is not to say that ethics is not currently a topic in Canadian Forces leadership training; it is covered more or less extensively in many programs aimed at training officers. However, the coverage may be such that some individuals do not recall this topic in their training: it may not be salient for them due to a lack of emphasis in some programs.

While family, church, universities, and professional schools are other sources of ethical development, it is unlikely that these institutions can prepare an officer for the specific application of ethics required in the military profession. Because military officers are called upon to use violence in executing their duties, the military is obligated to ensure that those officers are equipped with the knowledge and reasoning skills necessary to arrive at decisions which serve the best interests of society.

### Conclusion

Although the results of the current research are preliminary, they have some utility for classroom use. The descriptions of ethical dilemmas provide students with actual, rather than hypothetical scenarios to which they can apply various theories and models of dilemma resolution. Trainees sometimes labour under the misconception that as they advance in service and rank, the resolution of many types of challenges will become easier. The demographic information from this study will show them that even our most senior officers, in terms of both age and rank, continue to be confronted with ethical dilemmas. Also, the range of problems should demonstrate clearly that ethical challenges are common even though some officers appear to have difficulty recognizing them. Perhaps most important; students must realize that unresolved or inappropriately resolved ethical problems can potentially undermine cohesion, trust, good order, and discipline.

In conclusion, it appears that ethics and ethical issues are not perceived to be of great significance or concern to a majority of Canadian Forces officers based on the return rate and

responses to this survey. It is highly unlikely that this result was obtained due to the fact that the ethical climate of the Canadian Forces is pristine in comparison to other professions and institutions. More likely is the view that too many of our officers are blissfully ignorant in terms of both recognizing and resolving ethical dilemmas. The data clearly indicate a serious shortcoming on the part of the Canadian Forces in training and educating officers in the area of ethics.

In sponsoring this research the Canadian Forces has taken an important first step, but further research is required on at least two fronts before action can be taken to address this problem. First, officers with combat and near-combat experience should be surveyed to determine the types of ethical issues they wrestled with while serving in harm's way. Second, a survey of training and educational institutions should be undertaken to ascertain the type and scope of preparation provided to officers for dealing with ethical issues. The results of this required research could then be used to incorporate ethics education and training into the military socialization and professional development programs so that all officers will possess a common foundation on which to build their own strategies for dealing with ethical issues.

**Annex A**

**The Survey Package**





National Defence

Défense nationale

National Defence Headquarters  
Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0K2

Quartier général de la Défense nationale  
Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0K2

5570-1 (DPED)

5570-1 (DFPP)

24 November 1990

le 28 novembre 1990

Participant

Participant

ETHICS RESEARCH PROJECT

PROJET DE RECHERCHE  
CONCERNANT L'ÉTHIQUE

Reference: RRM C Survey  
(enclosed)

Référence: Exposé de RRM C  
(ci-inclus)

1. The subject of ethics has grown in importance, not only in the military but, in the civil sector as well. As professional military officers, the subject has daily implications. Therefore, it is a subject on which we should all have spent considerable thought and for which we should have developed our own opinions and standards.

1. La question d'éthique a grandi en importance, non seulement dans le milieu militaire, mais aussi dans le secteur civil. En tant qu'officiers militaires professionnels, c'est un sujet qui nous concerne de près dans ses implications journalières. Donc, c'est un sujet auquel nous aurions dû développer nos propres opinions et nos propres principes.

2. Society has changed its values greatly during the last half century. Today's young officers face perhaps even greater challenges than those of us who have been around for a while. I am, therefore, encouraged by RRM C's initiative to conduct some research in this area and to add realistic and credible case studies to the course of duty for their officer cadets.

2. Au cours du dernier demi-siècle, les valeurs de la société ont beaucoup changé. Il est fort possible que les jeunes officiers d'aujourd'hui se heurtent à de plus grands défis que ceux d'entre nous qui sommes plus avertis. Donc, je suis encouragé par l'initiative démontrée par RRM C en faisant des recherches dans ce domaine et en ajoutant des études de cas réalistes et croyables aux cours d'études de leurs élèves-officiers.

3. Research of this type can only be of value if the participants take an interest and take the time to provide all of the information. I am personally satisfied that

3. Ce genre de recherche peut être valable seulement si les participants y portent intérêt et prennent le temps de fournir tous les renseignements demandés. Je suis

.../2

appropriate measures have been taken to protect you from identification and I strongly recommend that you seriously consider supporting this project. I would also encourage anyone who may wish to discuss a particular situation in greater detail, or to provide other examples, to contact Major Hillier at RRMC.

personnellement satisfait que toutes les mesures nécessaires ont été prises afin de préserver votre identité; ainsi, je vous recommande fortement de considérer, avec pondération, appuyer ce projet. Aussi, j'encourage toute personne qui peut vouloir, soit discuter d'une situation particulière en détail, ou fournir d'autres exemples, de se mettre en contact avec le major Hillier à RRMC.

Pour le Chef d'état-major de la Défense  
Le Chef - Perfectionnement du personnel  
Le Major-général G.S. Clements



G.S. Clements  
Major-General  
Chief Personnel Development  
for Chief of the Defence Staff

Enclosure: 1

Pièce jointe: 1

Royal Roads Military College  
Military Psychology Department  
FMO Victoria, BC  
VOS 1B0

Dear Fellow Officer,

I am currently instructing Military Professionalism and Ethics to fourth year cadets at RRMC. My review of the literature has revealed that most professions have documented the types of ethical dilemma faced by professionals within their ranks. While this is also true for the military in a very general sense, I was unable to locate a distinctly Canadian example of the ethical dilemma we face as officers.

I request that you assist in establishing the documentation of the ethical challenges we face as CF Officers by responding to the questions I have posed on the attached sheet. The information gained from this survey will be used to guide the structure of instruction in Ethics at RRMC and will be made available to other interested audiences.

Every precaution has been taken to preserve your anonymity should you decide to participate in this research. You have been randomly selected, along with 1000 other officers, by the DPIS computer to receive these materials. This sample includes 30 Generals, 320 Sr Officers, and 650 Jr Officers. The mailing was undertaken by DPersA, and I have no access to that mailing list. Neither I nor anybody else will be able to determine if you or any other participant chooses to respond. When the surveys are returned to Royal Roads they will be removed from their mailing envelopes before being passed to me so that identification of their point of mailing will remain unknown. To that end I encourage you to transmit no identifying information with your return when you send it to me in the enclosed addressed envelope.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this important research. Should you wish to discuss any aspect of this research, please contact me at CSN 255-4550 or 604-380-4550.



L.C. (Curt) Hillier  
Major

(français au verso)

1. Describe an ethical dilemma which you have experienced or are experiencing which is related to your work as a military officer. Please provide sufficient detail so that the situation can be fully understood, but avoid specifics which would allow anyone to identify you or other players. Your example need not be a life and death situation; many ethical dilemmas arise from mundane circumstances.
2. What is it about this situation that makes it an ethical dilemma? How do you normally determine whether an issue is an ethical issue?
3. How did you resolve the issue described above, or if it is still in progress, how do you think you will resolve it? What decision did you reach if any, and/or, what action did you take if any?
4. What factors did you take into consideration in arriving at your solution to this dilemma? Were some factors more important than others? Rate each of your factors on a seven point scale with 7 being most important and 1 being least important. Help me to understand your reasoning about this.
5. Have you ever received educational instruction or training in ethics? If yes, please describe.

**Thank you for your participation.**