

## Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

## Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES  
CSC 27 / CCEM 27

EXERCISE/EXERCICE NEW HORIZONS

TITLE/TITRE

**A Solution to Careerism in the Canadian Forces**

By /par Maj Darwin Gould

19 April 2001

*This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.*

*La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.*

## NEW HORIZONS

### A Solution to Careerism in the Canadian Forces

By Major Darwin J. Gould

*“If I were to be asked to list the primary negative influence in the officer corps today, I would unhesitatingly nominate ‘careerism’ as being at the root of the problem of ethical shortfalls. In its essence, careerism can be described as the subscription by an officer to that school of thought described by Gabriel as the ‘entrepreneurial model.’ Such an officer believes he has a ‘job’ to perform within a corporate bureaucracy, that the true measure of success is how far and how fast he can climb to what he perceives as the ladder of success. His credo is risk avoidance and promotion of self, his loyalty is entirely personal, his ethics situational.... If he manages to maneuver himself into a command position, he uses his subordinates to advance his career with concomitantly little understanding or appreciation of his role as a leader, teacher and example to his junior officers.... The tragedy of the careerist is that he is self-replicating, for he drives off many of the very type of officer needed in the military services.”*

A citation from a marine Colonel <sup>9</sup>rDr. Joseph bei

be deduced that any perception that a leader is acting in self-interest at the expense of his subordinates could seriously degrade this essential trust. If this leader behaviour was sufficiently widespread in a military force it could lead to losing a war.

The CF Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) defines careerism as "...the self-serving advancement of one's own career at the expense of the service and/or subordinates."<sup>3</sup> This essay postulates that careerism, a potentially fatal contagious sociological disease for a military organization, is present and spreading in the CF and that a 360-degree performance appraisal system provides a solution to this problem.

If left unchecked careerism will spread unknowingly in a benign peacetime environment. History has proven that the effects of careerism will only come to light at the very critical moment a strong subordinate-leader relationship is needed most—when the certain death of a few will save the lives of many. The CF's top-down approach to performance evaluation makes it difficult, if not impossible, to detect careerism in its leaders. Not only is subordinate feedback into the supervisor's evaluation not sought, but any negative feedback given to higher authority is seen as disloyal and usurping the supervisor's authority. Peer and subordinate feedback used to supplement the rater's assessment of the performance of the CF's leaders would contribute significantly to reducing or eliminating, at least the perception, if not the reality, of careerism. "Only the led know for certain the leader's moral courage, consideration for others, and commitment to unit before self."<sup>4</sup>

This essay will be presented in two parts. The first part will argue that careerism exists in the CF and deduce what should be done to correct the problem. This will be accomplished by

---

<sup>3</sup> Department of National Defence. *Chief of Defence Staff Guidance to Commanding Officers*, 1999/2000, Book 1, [http://hr.dwan.dnd.ca/dret/PDP/CDS/B1\\_CDS/GUIDANCE\\_e.pdf](http://hr.dwan.dnd.ca/dret/PDP/CDS/B1_CDS/GUIDANCE_e.pdf), p 11.

<sup>4</sup>Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., *Military Leadership in to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Another "Bridge Too Far?"*, [http://lfcqhq.army.mil.ca/comd\\_temp/COS/COSWeb/leadersh.htm](http://lfcqhq.army.mil.ca/comd_temp/COS/COSWeb/leadersh.htm), p 10.

first showing that even a perception of careerism can have a disproportionate negative effect on military effectiveness. Then it will be shown that the external and internal environments in which our CF members come from and work in, are based on basic values commensurate with careerist behaviour. Testimony from various sources and surveys conducted on the quality of leadership in the CF will be used to provide documentary evidence that careerism exists in the CF and some deductions on what should be corrected will be discussed. The second part will suggest a solution to careerism in the CF by incorporating 360-degree feedback into a leader's performance evaluation reports (PER), the primary means by which a CF member advances in his career.

### **The Devastating Effects of Careerism**

Leadership is at the essence of military effectiveness. It is one of those intangibles that enable a numerically smaller unit to defeat a larger one. It can be said, therefore, that leadership is key to winning a war and the ultimate role of a military organization is to win a war.

History tells us that sending men and woman to their deaths is often necessary to win wars. Then it behoves the military to know, without a doubt, why soldiers follow orders to the extent that it may mean their certain death. The answer lies within the leader-follower relationship.

Leadership is defined as influencing people to willingly act the way the leader wants them to. True leadership is not about command or obedience, it is to "be welcomed and wanted by the led."<sup>5</sup> For soldiers to expect to, and to be expected to, routinely obey their superiors

---

<sup>5</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel Dr. Bernd Horn, *Wrestling with an Enigma: Executive Leadership*, paper from "Contemporary Issues in Officership: A Canadian Perspective", (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 2000), pp 124-126.

(especially in life threatening scenarios), they must identify with their leaders and they and the unit must satisfy the soldier's physical, emotional, security and social needs. A Vietnam veteran non-commissioned officer, who was awarded the Medal of Honor, the Silver star, two Bronze stars, an Air Medal and six Purple Hearts, summarizes and reinforces the point as follows:

“If you want a soldier's respect and loyalty, especially in a combat environment, you must demonstrate... a genuine concern for his safety and well-being. The concern must be real, because a young soldier can spot a faker a mile away. If your concern for him is genuine – and he knows it – then you can rest assured that he will follow you into the jaws of death”<sup>6</sup>

This implies that any perception, on the part of the follower, that a leader's direction is motivated by his personal self-interest, will undoubtedly lead to the follower's motivation to not sacrifice his interests to follow his direction.

So, it can be seen, that in a peacetime environment, where the physiological and psychological needs of followers may be met through pay, benefits, and quality-of-life initiatives, following orders requires very little sacrifice from the follower and is less dependent on the quality of the leadership of the leader. Thus the symptoms of careerism are difficult to detect and have a lesser consequence in accomplishing the mission. However, when the ultimate sacrifice comes into play, careerism can have devastating effect in the most crucial of situations. It is for this reason that any degree of careerism must be detected and eliminated for a military force to be effective. This is also the reason the military must be held to a much higher degree of selflessness than society. “ They (CF) are expected to reflect society, but at the same time, to adhere to a standard of behaviour above and beyond.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Major R.M. Landers, *Psychological Aspects of Authority and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*, from the “Proceedings of the Conference on Ethics in Canadian Defence”, (Ottawa: DND, 1997), p111.

<sup>7</sup> Ian Cameron, *Military Malaise of Our Times*, Vanguard Vol 2 No. 5, p3.

So far we have discussed the potential effects careerism can have on the ability of a military force to win a war. It has been shown that careerism has a disproportionate negative effect on military effectiveness. The discussion will now be directed towards answering the question: Does careerism exist in the CF? The basic premise is that it does and the following will hopefully persuade even the most cynical of readers that at least a perception of it exists which is sufficient to consider it a major problem.

### **Fertile Ground**

There are a number of factors that contribute to the proliferation of careerist behaviour in the CF and each will be discussed in turn. It is germane to the discussion that the environment in which leaders in the CF function provides one that makes it difficult for the ethical leader to succeed, encourages careerist behaviour and even rewards careerism unknowingly.

“Human beings appear to be largely, if not totally, a product of social environment.”<sup>8</sup> North American assumptions about economic life, according to Gabriel are that “greed of each equates to the good of all.”<sup>9</sup> The posit is that the pursuit of economic self-interest will all combine with market forces to provide the common good for all. Gabriel goes on to state that at the base of the American political system is the pursuit of individual self-interest which constitutes the *raison d’être* of the political order. He posits that government exists to control the tendency of individuals to press their own interests to everyone else’s detriment. So, at the basis of government, there exists the assumption that all individuals are motivated by self-interest. Gabriel finds this to be true not only at the political but at the social and economic levels as well.

---

<sup>8</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor: A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier*, (Connecticut, USA: Greenwood Press, 1982), p 15.

<sup>9</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor...* p33.

These self-interest values are also supported with a philosophical view known as ethical egoism. “Good is defined subjectively as that which promotes the individual’s self-interest as he sees fit; evil is seen as that which does not advance the individual’s subjectively defined self-interest.”<sup>10</sup> This view serves to reinforce and legitimize the self-interest-oriented society that sees no tension between individual interests and community interests since the latter cannot exist apart from the former.

Evidence of this malaise in the Canadian context is at least hinted at by Mr. Ian Cameron, the executive director of the Conference of Defence Associations Institute (CDAI). In speaking of the massive lay-offs in corporate America, he states: “... it wasn’t through far-sighted careful management, selfless dedicated leadership and genuine loyalty and concern for the greater good of society.”<sup>11</sup> Mr. Cameron confirms that if there is a crisis in the CF’s leadership it is because of this malaise that is gripping society as a whole.

It is from this society that the CF draws its future leaders and it is against these values that existing CF members measure their behaviour. To counterbalance these influences the CF has developed an ethics programme and published some ethical statements that includes “faithfulness to subordinates” but these efforts are still mostly descriptive devices instead of prescriptive and proscriptive rules requiring observance. Until these devices are developed and enforced it will be impossible to develop a sense of community obligation for the military profession where death on the battlefield in defence of community interests works strongly against perceived notions of self-interests.

The end of the Cold War amongst other factors has led to a reduction in the perception of a serious military threat to Canada. This has led to pressures to redirect resources away from the

---

<sup>10</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor...* p17.

<sup>11</sup> Ian Cameron, *Military Malaise of Our Times*, Vanguard Vol 2 No. 5, p3



military without reducing task levels. This phenomenon combined with the unproven theory that the private sector is more efficient than government, pressured the CF to open its gates and allow the private sector to compete for services traditionally done internally. So, over the last ten years or so, one of the primary missions of the CF has been to match or exceed the efficiencies of the private sector, under the threat of replacing entire sectors of support by contractors. Our military members are now being placed on the same ethical footing as the self-serving, profit oriented, private firms. The message seems to be: The bottom line is cost reduction and the intrinsic values of loyalty and selflessness provided by a military workforce is of little value. Gabriel supports this thesis by stating: “ The adoption of business ethics within the military environment portends disaster, for in a free enterprise democratic system, business ‘ethics’ are dictated largely by cost-effectiveness which, in turn, is directed solely to the maximization of profits. ... the pursuit of self-interest at the level of the individual is the highest value.”<sup>12</sup> It seems the military can be regarded like any other occupation that does not require a special calling or what Gans calls a “vocation”<sup>13</sup>.

Another force that tends to weaken the ethical resolve of selflessness is that the idea of service in the CF has disappeared and the occupational model has taken over. Gabriel writing of the US experience states that the Vietnam era produced a transformation of the military away from a “special profession to merely another occupation... no one should be surprised to find multi-tiered executives, nay officers, behaving much the same as self-interested executives in the business community.”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor...* p 62.

<sup>13</sup> Major Arthur E. Gans, *Vocation or Job: A Warrior's Place in a Rights-Driven Society*, from “Canadian Defence Quarterly” Volume 24, No. 2, December 1994.

<sup>14</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor...* p 68.

In the CF our military members are paid on a scale based on the pay scales of the Federal Public Service. On many bases the military work side by side with civilian counterparts and many trades do the same thing. The tendency therefore is to substitute a sense of military professionalism for the idea that the military service is no different from any other occupation.<sup>15</sup>

There is also a tendency to adopt a bureaucratic form of organization. Colonel Sean Henry (Retired), a senior defence analyst of the CDAI has this to say about bureaucracy in the CF: “Bureaucratic habits and procedures hide the problems and lead to indecision, bloated rank structure, and careerism.”<sup>16</sup> Gabriel agrees that bureaucratic tendencies are “inevitable”<sup>17</sup> as the view to the execution of responsibilities is pushed towards those of businesses. He warns us of the danger that the bureaucrat’s ultimate goal is to follow orders irregardless of the ethical and moral consequences and to minimize career risks. Colonel Henry’s article “ENDGAME: A Recovery Strategy For Canadian Defence” states that a bureaucratic ethic does in fact exist in the CF since the creation of the combined civilian and military National Defence Headquarters in the mid-1960s. These bureaucratic pressures create an environment that exert careerist forces with little in the way of an equal counter-balancing force of “tough guidance on ethos, ethics and personal values”<sup>18</sup>.

The discussion so far has revolved around the forces external to the CF. There are also forces within the CF system that contribute to promoting careerist behaviour.

The Personal Evaluation Report (PER) system is the primary method of evaluating performance of individuals. It is a systematic, regularly scheduled process that affects all

---

<sup>15</sup> Major Arthur E. Gans, *Vocation or Job: A Warrior’s Place in a Rights-Driven Society*, from “Canadian Defence Quarterly” Volume 24, No. 2, December 1994.

<sup>16</sup> Sean Henry, *ENDGAME: A Recovery Strategy For Canadian Defence*, Vanguard, Vol 2 No. 5, p 4.

<sup>17</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor...* p 99.

<sup>18</sup> Sean Henry, *ENDGAME: A Recovery Strategy For Canadian Defence...* p4.

personnel. Based on certain criteria, it provides for both the reward and punishment of personnel performance through praise and criticism and through its direct impact on promotion and posting decisions. It is one of the most important formal systems which shapes the behaviour in the CF's workplace.

Every military member knows that a less-than-perfect evaluation may well mean the difference between a successful and unsuccessful career. As a consequence members take few risks (zero-defects mentality), try to keep the lid on existing problems, and avoid confronting problems directly. Thus some commanders often keep everything in order, at least publicly, long enough to receive a good PER and then move on to another posting. Lieutenant-Colonel Doctor Bernd Horn supports this premise: "In the Canadian Forces today...the prevailing culture is one of political correctness, risk aversion and zero tolerance of mistakes."<sup>19</sup> Gabriel provides the connection to careerism " ... there is the drive for success which tends to manifest itself especially within officers who have been corrupted by the values of...careerism."<sup>20</sup>

The foregoing has provided considerable reason to presume that the environment members of the CF operate in and originate from provides fertile ground for careerism to flourish. It has been shown that there is motive, opportunity and influence for careerism. If it can be shown that there are indeed careerists at all levels in the military then either self-interest-at-the-expense-of-others is not observed or is ignored because members advance in rank despite this ethic.

The following section will provide evidence that there is, in fact, careerism at all levels in the CF and it is flourishing.

---

<sup>19</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel Dr. Bernd Horn, *Wrestling with an Enigma: Executive Leadership*, paper from "Contemporary Issues in Officership: A Canadian Perspective"... p 132.

<sup>20</sup> Richard R. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor*... p 12.

## Evidence of Careerism in the CF and What Should be Corrected

It seems that the preponderance of documentation alleging that careerism is a major leadership problem in the CF has been produced soon after the Canadian Airborne Regiment's Somalia debacle. Some may say that the Somalia Commission of Inquiry sparked a feeding frenzy on the CF's leadership by frustrated retired senior officers and has influenced the CF soldier's poor opinion of the quality of leadership they receive. It is this writer's contention that the Somalia Inquiry was simply the first public leaking of an "unspoken truth" that allowed others to finally speak their minds without being labelled a traitor. After all, there were a lot more credible people other than vengeful frustrated retired members of the CF that have come forward admitting that careerism exists in the CF.

The Somalia Inquiry had this to say about careerism in the CF as it relates to the career management system:

"The precepts of careerism seem to have become entrenched in the attitudes of many members of the CF. This is particularly noteworthy in the upper echelons, where some senior officers have tended to hitch their stars to selected superiors, cultivated their performance to the personal standards of their bosses, and rationalized their actions—and sometimes their sense of values, particularly loyalty—on the basis of their understanding of their bosses' imperatives."

And

"... careerism also contributed to a performance appraisal system that was overly reluctant to criticize and to record instances of shortcomings. ... careerism inspired the cover-up... of serious negligent, and even criminal, misconduct."<sup>21</sup>

These were conclusions based on a number of factual observations of the manner the CF manages the careers of officers in particular. The entire chapter on Personnel Selection and

---

<sup>21</sup> Department of National Defence, *Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry*, Chapter 20, Vol. 2, "Personnel Selection and Screening", [http://din.dwan.dnd.ca/din\\_locl/report/somalia/dnd/vol2/v2c20ae.htm](http://din.dwan.dnd.ca/din_locl/report/somalia/dnd/vol2/v2c20ae.htm).

Screening describes how career management and advancement is accomplished not only with disregard of the led but at their expense. It shows that leaders need not concern themselves with the welfare of their unit or subordinates to advance in the CF.

Some of the CF's retired senior officers agree with these conclusions. Colonel Michel Drapeau, retired after 34 years service with the CF comments:

“Over the years, the value structure of the CF officer corps has changed from one of self-sacrifice to one of self-interest... On the whole, the CF officer—particularly in its senior ranks—is far more adept at mastering the imperatives of the system that provides promotions and career security than learning and executing the imperatives of leadership.”<sup>22</sup>

Colonel John Roderick (retired), an armoured regimental commander in the eighties, who denies that there is a leadership problem in the CF, expresses some doubt: “If he (the young person who joins the army today) develops into one who sees ‘self’ before ‘unit’ then that is because that is what he perceives is expected of him.”<sup>23</sup>

These officers represent both ends of the spectrum of thought about leadership in the CF. There are many other prominent CF generals who attest to the problem. Major-General C. Milner (retired) agrees that “Officers tend to consider themselves before their subordinates.”<sup>24</sup> Lieutenant- General J.K. Dangerfield (retired) admits there is a problem but blames politicians and a lack of national objectives.<sup>25</sup> Major-General George S. Kells (retired) believes the solution to the leadership crisis is to concentrate on “the welfare of our subordinates”<sup>26</sup>. General Maurice

---

<sup>22</sup> Colonel (Retd) Michel Drapeau, *Leadership crisis in the Canadian Officer Corps*, *Esprit de Corps*, Volume 4, Issue 6, Nov 1994, p 5.

<sup>23</sup> Colonel (Retd) John E. N. Roderick, *In Defence of Today's Junior Officer and his NCOs – They are only Executing the Plan of those Who Went Before*, *Armour Bulletin*, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996, p 38.

<sup>24</sup> Major-General Milner (Retd), *Ethics and Leadership - An Officer's Code*, *Armour Bulletin*, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996, p 20.

<sup>25</sup> Lieutenant-General (Retd) J.K. Dangerfield, *Canadian Army Ethics 1996: A Possum's Viewpoint*, *Armour Bulletin*, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996, p 17.

<sup>26</sup> Major-General (Retd) G. Kells, *Ethics and Leadership*, *Armour Bulletin*, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996, p 25.

Baril, the present CDS, declared, when he was Commander Land Forces Command, that the CF leadership is wanting because of a lack of responsible leadership and moral and ethical values.

“...the army has a significant leadership deficiency... trust between the leader and the soldier is what distinguishes outstanding units from ineffective ones ”<sup>27</sup>

The final piece of evidence that conclusively shows that there is at least a perception of careerism in the CF is provided in a number of surveys of what our soldiers perceive. There is evidence that Canadian soldiers do not see their leaders as effective. A 1995 Department of National Defence (DND) survey of attitudes of military and civilian employees within DND revealed dissatisfaction towards leadership. Survey respondents believed that leaders were too concerned about “building their empires” and “following their personal agenda”, and that DND was too bureaucratic<sup>28</sup>. A follow-up survey in 1998 concluded:

“They (military and civilian employees) do not see their supervisor as someone who is willing to take a strong stand or personal risk on behalf of the best interests of the workplace but rather someone who is more concerned with advancing his career through pleasing superiors”<sup>29</sup>

The survey also indicated that only about 30% of respondents believe that there have been improvements since 1995.

Based on the environment, facts and credible testimony presented, it can be concluded that careerism is being practiced in the CF, or that there is at least a perception of it being present. The environment encourages it, and the root of the problem is that career advancement

---

<sup>27</sup> Department of National Defence, *Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry*, Chapter 15, Vol. 2, “Leadership”, [http://din.dwan.dnd.ca/din\\_locl/report/somalia/dnd/vol2/v2c15e.htm](http://din.dwan.dnd.ca/din_locl/report/somalia/dnd/vol2/v2c15e.htm).

<sup>28</sup> Department of National Defence, *Military and Civilian Employee Feedback Survey*, (The Philips Group/ The Wyatt Company, 1995), p4.

<sup>29</sup> Department of National Defence, *D2000 Survey*, [http://vcds04nt.dndhq.dnd.ca/dgsp/dsc/archives/survey/result\\_e.asp](http://vcds04nt.dndhq.dnd.ca/dgsp/dsc/archives/survey/result_e.asp).

can and is accomplished solely by feeding the self-interests of superiors in a bureaucratic work environment and at the expense of subordinate's needs and welfare.

There is little incentive for the careerist to concern himself with the problems and welfare of subordinates because this has not been the major criteria for success and advancement in the CF. Dr. Horn comments:

“... leadership has always been results-oriented, not process-orientated. The military interpretation is basically centred on the premise that to be a successful military commander is to be a great leader... The fact that the results may have been achieved in spite of a poor leader is often ignored.”<sup>30</sup>

The remainder of this essay will discuss 360-degree feedback as a solution to careerism in the CF. It has the potential to change a careerist's behaviour almost immediately. But, by itself, 360-degree feedback will not change the basic values of CF members who have been immersed in a society based on the achievement of success by the pursuit of self-interests at the expense of all else.

### 360-Degree Feedback: A Solution to Careerism

“Only the led know for certain the leader's moral courage, consideration for others, and commitment to unit before self.”<sup>31</sup>

Throughout history, people have provided feedback to others about their performance in the workplace. While feedback is not new, certain aspects have changed over time, such as the purpose, source, and manner in which it is provided. Traditionally a top-down or boss to employee approach has been the norm but it was realized that it provided only a one-dimensional

---

<sup>30</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel Dr. Bernd Horn, *Wrestling with an Enigma: Executive Leadership*, paper from “Contemporary Issues in Officership: A Canadian Perspective”, p 124.

<sup>31</sup> Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., *Military Leadership in to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Another “Bridge Too Far?”*, [http://lfcqhq.army.mil.ca/comd\\_temp/COS/COSWeb/leadersh.htm](http://lfcqhq.army.mil.ca/comd_temp/COS/COSWeb/leadersh.htm), p 10.

perspective. Researchers revealed that unit performance may influence a boss' feedback more than actual observations of the employees behaviour. Finally the previous discussion has revealed how a CF member need only please his boss to succeed. In addition the boss may not have the soldier's best interest as a priority or is unaware if his supervisors are meeting the needs of their people. "... setting the example of subordinating self to mission, demonstrating moral courage, are unreliably observed by seniors even though they require just that information for their evaluation of subordinates."<sup>32</sup>

The need for accurate, fair, performance measurement has increased exponentially as most organizations face increasingly flatter structures, greater internal changes, and more external competitive pressures. Research has shown that 360-degree performance appraisals is a solution. Rather than have a single person play judge, a 360-degree appraisal acts more like a jury: the people who actually deal with the person each day create a pool of information and perspectives on which a supervisor may act. This group of individuals may include supervisors, top management, subordinates and co-workers, hence the term "360-degree". Unlike with supervisors, leaders cannot hide as easily in 360-degree appraisals because peers and subordinates know their behaviours best. In an article by Kirksey it was stated that:

"(360-degree appraisals) makes the employee much more accountable to his customers because these people now have feedback into the employee's performance rating. Employees who previously might have concentrated a great deal on impressing managers now have a powerful motivation to focus on working well with all individuals with whom they interact."<sup>33</sup>

The use of 360-degree feedback is becoming increasingly widespread. "In the U.S., more than 90 percent of Fortune 1000 companies use some form of multi-source assessment system

---

<sup>32</sup> Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., *Military Leadership in to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Another "Bridge Too Far"*, p 10.

<sup>33</sup> Jayart Kirksey, et al, *Companies Evaluate Employees from all Perspectives*, <http://www.quality.org/tqmbbs/tools-techs/360pa.txt>, p 2.



for at least developmental feedback.”<sup>34</sup> Many suggest that 360-degree feedback should not be used for performance evaluation purposes as it creates an environment of distrust and recriminations for poor assessments. However, other studies show that the recipients were not interested in feedback unless it “had teeth”<sup>35</sup>. If peer and subordinate feedback did not have an impact on rewards, it often was not used. It is beyond the scope of this paper to develop a proper 360-degree feedback appraisal programme for the CF. The aim here is to persuade the reader that the system is a viable means to change the perception and behaviour of careerism in the CF.

It is suggested, however, that a properly implemented 360-degree appraisal system incorporated into the CF PER system would, by the very nature of a careerist’s interests and behaviour, cause that person to immediately take measures to ensure that his subordinates and peers as well as his superiors are satisfied with the performance expected of him. This paper has shown that the military knows what essential qualities and values are required of a leader to win a war, that the problem is that there is at least a perception of leaders advancing their careers at the expense of subordinates and that the PER is the means of achieving this advancement. Therefore it follows that a means to incorporate subordinate feedback into the PER of the supervisor will alleviate the subordinate’s perception of careerism and prevent the advancement of careerists at the expense of peers, subordinates and unit.

## Conclusion

Leadership is key for a military organization to win wars and winning wars is its ultimate reason for being. Leadership involves a willingness to be led and a trust between a leader and his followers that is predicated on the perception, at least, on the part of the followers, that the

---

<sup>34</sup> Roland Nagel, *The 360-Degree Feedback Avalanche*, <http://www.ipma-hr.org/global/360au.html>, p 2.

leader has the needs, concerns, and welfare of his subordinates at the forefront of his decision-making. In peacetime the follower sacrifices little in following the leader but in wartime he may have to sacrifice his life to follow an order. It has been argued that even a small perception of careerism in this scenario can have a disproportionate negative effect on the chances that the follower will comply. Therefore even a small degree of careerism in a military context is too much.

The CF draws its members from a rights-driven society that believes self-interest equates to the good of all, which is supported by a philosophy of ethical egoism. As the CF integrates its workforce more closely with the private sector, it is influenced by bureaucratic values and considers its services as no more than a 9 to 5 job. All of these have been shown to promote careerism.

In addition to the environment that provides fertile ground for the careerist to thrive, it has been shown from reports, testimony, and surveys that, at least a perception of, careerism exists and is flourishing.

The means by which military members advance their careers is through the PER system. The CF's traditional top-down approach to performance evaluation not only contributes to the proliferation of careerism but the system cannot easily detect its presence. It has been argued that a 360-degree performance appraisal system is a solution. Only the led know the leader's commitment to unit before self and consideration for others. 360-degree feedback is a more accurate, fair, performance measurement that, arguably, will eliminate careerist behaviour immediately by forcing the careerist to consider the interest of his subordinates in order to advance in his career.

---

<sup>35</sup> Maury A. Peiperl, *Getting 360° Feedback Right*, Harvard Business Review, Volume 79, Number 1, January 2001, p 145.

Although 360-degree feedback will not change the basic values of the careerist it is suggested that a well-implemented feedback system will eliminate the behaviour while other means are developed to inculcate selfless values in the long term.

## Bibliography

Brenan, Dr. Joseph G., *Ambition and Careerism*, Vol XLIV, Number 1, Sequence 333, Naval War College Review, Winter 1991.

Cameron, Ian, *Military Malaise of Our Times*, Vanguard, Vol 2, No. 5.

Dangerfield, Lieutenant-General (retd) J.K., *Canadian Army Ethics 1996: A Possum's Viewpoint*, Armour Bulletin, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996.

Department of National Defence. *Out of the Sun: Aerospace Doctrine for the Canadian Forces*. (Winnipeg: Craig Kellman & Associates Ltd, 1997).

Department of National Defence. *Chief of Defence Staff Guidance to Commanding Officers*, 1999/2000, Book 1, [http://hr.dwan.dnd.ca/dret/PDP/CDS/B1\\_CDS/GUIDANCE\\_e.pdf](http://hr.dwan.dnd.ca/dret/PDP/CDS/B1_CDS/GUIDANCE_e.pdf).

Department of National Defence, *Military and Civilian Employee Feedback Survey*, (The Phillips Group/ The Wyatt Company, 1995)

Department of National Defence, *D2000 Survey*, [http://vcds04nt.dndhq.dnd.ca/dgsp/dsc/archives/survey/result\\_e.asp](http://vcds04nt.dndhq.dnd.ca/dgsp/dsc/archives/survey/result_e.asp).

Department of National Defence, *Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry*, Chapter 20, Vol. 2, "Personnel Selection and Screening", [http://din.dwan.dnd.ca/din\\_locl/report/somalia/dnd/vol2/v2c20ae.htm](http://din.dwan.dnd.ca/din_locl/report/somalia/dnd/vol2/v2c20ae.htm).

Drapeau, Colonel (retd) Michel, *Leadership crisis in the Canadian Officer Corps*, Esprit de Corps, Volume 4, Issue 6, Nov 1994.

Gabriel, Richard R., *To Serve With Honor: A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier*, (Connecticut, USA: Greenwood Press, 1982).

Gans, Major Arthur E., *Vocation or Job: A Warrior's Place in a Rights-Driven Society*, from "Canadian Defence Quarterly", Volume 24, No. 2, December 1994.

Henry, Sean, *ENDGAME: A Recovery Strategy For Canadian Defence*, Vanguard, Vol. 2 No. 5.

Horn, Lieutenant-Colonel Dr. Bernd, *Wrestling with an Enigma: Executive Leadership*, paper from "Contemporary Issues in Officership: A Canadian Perspective", (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 2000).

Kells, Major-General (retd) G., *Ethics and Leadership*, Armour Bulletin, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996.

Kirksey, Jayart, et al, *Companies Evaluate Employees from all Perspectives*, <http://www.quality.org/tqmbbs/tools-techs/360pa.txt>.

Koring, Paul, *Army Unfit for Battle, Boyle says*, The (Toronto) Globe and Mail, Feb 13, 1996.

Landers, Major R.M., *Psychological Aspects of Authority and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*, from the "Proceedings of the Conference on Ethics in Canadian Defence", (Ottawa: DND, 1997).

Milner, Major-General (ret'd), *Ethics and Leadership - An Officer's Code*, Armour Bulletin, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996.

Nagel, Roland, *The 360-Degree Feedback Avalanche*, <http://www.ipma-hr.org/global/360au.html>.

Peiperl, Maury A., *Getting 360° Feedback Right*, Harvard Business Review, Volume 79, Number 1, January 2001.

Roderick, Colonel (ret'd) John E. N., *In Defence of Today's Junior Officer and his NCOs – They are only Executing the Plan of those Who Went Before*, Armour Bulletin, Volume 29, No. 1, 1996.

Ulmer, Walter F., Jr., *Military Leadership in to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Another "Bridge Too Far?"*, [http://lfcqhq.army.mil.ca/comd\\_temp/COS/COSWeb/leadersh.htm](http://lfcqhq.army.mil.ca/comd_temp/COS/COSWeb/leadersh.htm).