

Canadian  
Forces  
College

Collège  
des  
Forces  
Canadiennes



## GENDER BIAS IN CANADIAN MILITARY MERIT-BASED HONOURS AND AWARDS

Major A. Ushko

**JCSP 37 DL**

**Master of Defence Studies**

**Disclaimer**

Opinions expressed remain those of the author and do not represent Department of National Defence or Canadian Forces policy. This paper may not be used without written permission.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2014, 2015.

**PCEMI 37 AD**

**Maîtrise en études de la défense**

**Avertissement**

Les opinions exprimées n'engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent aucunement des politiques du Ministère de la Défense nationale ou des Forces canadiennes. Ce papier ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation écrite.

© Sa Majesté la Reine du Chef du Canada, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2015, 2015.

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES  
JCSP 37 DL – PCEMI 37 AD

MASTER OF DEFENCE STUDIES – MAÎTRISE EN ÉTUDES DE LA DÉFENSE

**GENDER BIAS IN CANADIAN MILITARY MERIT-BASED HONOURS AND  
AWARDS**

By Major A. Ushko

August 2014

*“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.”*

Word Count: 9235

*“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.”*

Compte de mots : 9235

For my parents, with all my thanks for a lifetime of love and support.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are a great many people whose help and advice enabled me to complete this paper. The contributions of the following people were invaluable to me: Dr. Alan Okros (CFC), Lieutenant Colonel (Retired) Chantal Fraser, Major Carl Gauthier (DHH), Major Yvonne Parsons (CMP), and Captain Heather Macquarrie (DHRD). I particularly thank Dr. Karen D. Davis (DGMPRA) for the significant assistance and encouragement that she gave me despite the lack of any prior acquaintance. I must also thank my patient and thorough editors/proofreaders, Lieutenant Commander Sheyla Dussault, Marie Cotter, Major Sasha Paul, Lieutenant (Navy) Beth Lei and Chief Warrant Officer James Devine. As well, Major Jean Trainor provided assistance in the use of Microsoft Excel which was indispensable.

Unfortunately, while I was not able to obtain all the data required to examine the Command Commendations in greater depth, I do thank Chief Petty Officer First Class Mike Dionne of the Royal Canadian Navy Staff and Master Warrant Officer Yves Roy of the Royal Canadian Air Force Staff for consolidating and providing their command records. That data provided valuable perspective even if I was not able to directly reference it.

While many people and sources were consulted in the production of this document, the conclusions and interpretations, right or wrong, are solely my own.

## **ABSTRACT**

Granting honours and awards is a lasting way that the Canadian Armed Forces recognizes courage, valour, exemplary performance, achievements and exceptional dedication to service. Each year hundreds of service members are recognized for their significant accomplishments, exemplary leadership and tireless commitment but these awards appear to be bias against service women. This preliminary study reviewed the Order of Military Merit, Meritorious Service Cross and Medal, Queens' Diamond Jubilee Medal, Chief of Defence Staff and Command Commendations for the years 2008 - 2013. It was concluded that, based on DHRIM data, the women are disproportionately under-represented for the Meritorious Service Cross, Meritorious Service Medal, and the Chief of Defence Staff's Commendation.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	5
BACKGROUND	6
SELECTED CANADIAN HONOURS AND AWARDS	7
The Order of Military Merit	7
The Meritorious Service Cross	9
The Meritorious Service Medal	10
Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal	10
Chief of Defence Staff Commendation	13
Command Commendations	14
WHY GENDER BIAS IN RECOGNITION MATTERS	15
CONCLUSION	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY	23
APPENDIX	26

## **LIST OF TABLES (APPENDIX)**

Table 1 – Gender Distribution for Overall Order of Military Merit by Year	26
Table 2 – Percentage of Women in CAF by Year	26
Table 3 – Gender Distribution for Overall Order of Military Merit by Year	27
Table 4 – Percentage of Women In Each Rank by Year	27
Table 5 – Gender Distribution for Order of Military Merit (Officers) by Year	28
Table 6 – Gender Distribution for Order of Military Merit (Members) by Year	28
Table 7 – Gender Distribution for Order of Military Merit (Officers) by Rank and Year	29
Table 8 – Awards of Meritorious Service Cross by Year	29
Table 9 – Rank Distribution for Meritorious Service Cross by Year	30
Table 10 – Gender Distribution for Meritorious Service Medal by Year	30
Table 11 – Rank Distribution for Meritorious Service Medal by Year	31
Table 12 – Gender Distribution for Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal (QDJM)	32
Table 13 – Rank and Gender Distribution for QDJM	33
Table 14 – Percentage of Women in CAF vs Percentage of Women Receiving QDJM at Each Rank Level	34
Table 15 – Gender Distribution for CDS Commendations by Year	34
Table 16 – Rank and Gender Distribution for CDS Commendations	35
Table 17 – Gender Distribution for Command Commendations by Year	36
Table 18 – Rank and Gender Distribution for Command Commendations	37

## INTRODUCTION

*Deep and solid minds are improved and brightened by marks of distinction which serve, as a brisk gale, to drive them forward in the pursuit of glory.*<sup>1</sup>

- Plutarch, *Life of Caius Marcius Coriolanus*

While modern civilian society has evolved a number of ways to recognize exceptional performance and achievements, honours and awards remain an integral mechanism of the Canadian military culture for rewarding exemplary service. There are many organizations, particularly in the civilian world, that recognize achievements with tangible benefits such as monetary bonuses. Military honours and awards, however, are generally prominently displayed upon the uniform, honours in the form of decorations, medals<sup>2</sup>, and lesser awards such as badges. It is often said that military members wear their résumé on their chests. This is increasingly evident in the last decade following the dramatic increase in operational tempo that began with the conflict in the Balkans. In the early 90s, it was common, indeed normal, for a Canadian military member to be wearing only the Canadian Forces Decoration (CD), the long-service decoration awarded for twelve years of unblemished service. Today, it is the service member with only a CD who is remarkable in a military group, particularly in the Canadian Army.

While many medals are awarded for objective criteria, such as the CD, and campaign medals, awarded for participation in an operation, there are honours and awards that are granted based on individual merit. Although the criteria for nomination for honours and awards based on merit are designed to be as specific as possible, they are, by nature, subjective. Given the importance that the military ascribes to this form of recognition, it is not surprising that there is

---

<sup>1</sup> From Plutarch's "Life of Caius Marcius Coriolanus" quoted in Sir Arnold Wilson, *Gallantry: Its Public Recognition and Reward in Peace and War, At Home and Abroad* (Oxford, 1939), vi. Quoted in T.Robert Fowler. *Courage Rewarded: The Valour of Canadian Soldiers Under Fire 1900 to 2007*. (Victoria: Trafford Publishing, 2009). p. 305.

<sup>2</sup> Orders are societies of merit which recognize outstanding achievement and exceptional service over time while decorations recognize single event or a specific period of time. Medals recognize participation in military campaigns or operations, service under exceptional circumstances, and also long and loyal service (i.e. Queen's Jubilee medals). Source: [www.gg.ca](http://www.gg.ca), Guide for the Wearing of Orders, Decorations, and Medals (PDF)



widespread discussion of possible biases associated with nominating and choosing recipients. Anecdotally, the author has observed that many individuals believe rank, classification, unit assignment or gender (to name the most commonly cited areas of concern) are key influencers on nominations. Without looking at the awards in a broader perspective, it is impossible to say whether these common beliefs have any merit. Given the range of biases that could be explored, only one area of potential bias, gender, was examined in this paper.

It is therefore, the purpose of this paper to show that that gender affects the likelihood of a Canadian military member receiving a merit-based honour or award.

In order to limit the scope of this paper, only the following honours and awards will be examined for the years 2008-2013:

- The Order of Military Merit
- The Meritorious Service Cross and Medal (decoration)
- Recent Commemorative Medal (Queen's Diamond Jubilee) (medal)
- Chief of Defence Staff Commendation
- Command Commendations

The awards for valour and bravery, including the Victoria Cross, Star of Military Valour, the Medal of Military Valour, the Cross of Valour, the Star of Courage, the Medal of Bravery and Mentions in Dispatches, were not considered for this paper. The former three honours are very much recognition for exceptional feats in combat or combat-like situations in the presence of an enemy and therefore are largely the domain of the combat arms which are still overwhelmingly male-dominated classifications. Whereas the latter honours recognize people who endangered their own lives to protect or save others and are by definition, granted in very small numbers. A Mention in Dispatches, while significant, is awarded for valiant conduct, devotion to duty or

other distinguished service in combat or near-combat conditions. These honours mark such exceptional circumstances that looking for trends would be difficult, particularly in the limited years that were examined for this paper. To properly examine these awards, it would be better to start from 1989, the year that women were admitted into the combat arms, and observe if women have made any progress in this area of recognition as their representation in this challenging sphere has incrementally grown.

As the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) are a relatively small military compared to many others, and as such, do not award official forms of recognition in large numbers. The small sample size makes statistical analysis problematic if one is looking for strong correlations and statistical significance. This paper, however, examines the potential for general trends than may indicate a requirement for further investigation. The source of the statistics for this study was generated by the Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management (DHRIM). In order to avoid possible privacy issues, individuals' names were not included in the report. The lack of specific names, however, made it impossible to reconcile significant differences between the statistics provided by the database and the annual reports generated by the Directorate of History and Heritage (DHH). In particular, the number of awards granted per year varies significantly between the two different reports. This could be because DHH catalogues awards based on the date of the award being officially announced, but DHRIM (though HRMS) usually catalogues awards based on the date of receipt. The overall numbers for the last six years seem to have some correlation, but there is evidently significant discrepancies in the years those honours and awards are recorded. It is therefore not useful to look for trends over the years examined, as this fault appears to affect all the awards studied for this paper. A higher degree of accuracy of

the data would allow a more detailed analysis, which would have likely revealed more specific observations. The quality of the data limited the study to general trends.

On the recommendation of the Honours and Awards subject matter experts from the individual commands that were consulted at the outset of this project, it was decided that the data from 2008 onward would be used. At this time, a more detailed analysis of the commands' commendations was intended and it was generally agreed that the record keeping for honours and awards had begun to be significantly more consistent at that point in time. Unfortunately, only the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force were able to share their commendation data, and even then, they had not recorded the gender of the recipients. As such, it was not possible to determine if there are differences in the gender distribution of command commendations between the different commands. The tables that were generated from the DHRIM data are included in the appendix to this paper.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

When the CAF was forced to admit women into the combat arms in 1989, it did so with a palpable lack of enthusiasm. The failure to even remotely approach the targets required by the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal as the due date loomed spawned a flurry of examination into the whys of the dismal uptake of women into this traditionally masculine world.<sup>3</sup> In recent years however, there has been less pressure on gender issues. Consultation with noted experts on Canadian gender issues indicated that while statistics on Employment Equity and Diversity are actively being monitored, there are certain gaps in current research.

Outside of the mandatory EE [Employment Equity] monitoring of key employment processes, it is difficult to find recent analysis regarding gender bias in the CAF. The formal employment processes, including promotion, are monitored in compliance with the Employment Equity Act.<sup>4</sup>

This view is further supported by a recent study by scientists Coulthard and Tanner (Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis), *A Gap Analysis of Employment Equity and Diversity Research in the Canadian Forces*, that concluded that while there has been research into various issues relating to women in the Canadian military there are gaps in the available research. One research gap that they particularly noted was recognition of women's contributions. Thus, while there may be a variety recent available research on a number of women's issues, the topic of gender bias in the area of recognition, and more specifically, the distribution of honours and awards, is currently lacking. Another recent study, *Diversity and Employment Equity in the Canadian Armed Forces: Results of the 2011 Your-Say Survey Focus Section on Diversity Climate*, by Zhigang Wang however noted that women do experience more

---

<sup>3</sup> Karen Davis. *Negotiating Gender In The Canadian Forces, 1970-1999*. (PhD Thesis, Royal Military College of Canada, 2013).

<sup>4</sup> Karen Davis, Ph.D, email with author, 13 August 2014.

job discrimination than men, this study did not indicate the forms of discrimination that the women encountered.

This paper, in examining one measurable area of possible gender discrimination, is one small step in addressing the noted lack of research into issues of recognition for women in uniform. Further, more detailed studies with stronger data would be useful to fully address this gap in research.

## **BACKGROUND**

As early as the first century AD, the Roman military began to recognize that emblematic awards served even more powerfully to motivate soldiers than shares of the plunder.<sup>5</sup> After the fall of Rome, military honours of this type largely disappeared until the reign of Edward III, with his creation of the Order of the "Fraternity of St. George called the Garter". Early chivalric orders were restricted to the nobility but were not limited to warriors and had significant political overtones. While orders and medals evolved over time, it was not until Queen Victoria established the Distinguished Conduct Medal in 1854 that there was official recognition available for the non-commissioned ranks. This honour was followed two years later by the establishment of the Victoria Cross, which was created to provide similar recognition to the French Legion of Honour<sup>6</sup>, honouring extraordinary acts of valour. As Canada evolved as a nation and fought through two World Wars with Britain, it continued to use the British system of honours and awards, and it was not until 1966 when the Order of Canada was founded that Canadians had a home-grown honour, albeit one headed by the Queen.<sup>7</sup> And still it was not until 1972 that "Canada established an entirely Canadian honours system including orders, decorations, and

---

<sup>5</sup> T. Robert Fowler. *Courage Rewarded: The Valour of Canadian Soldiers Under Fire 1900 to 2007*. Victoria: Trafford Publishing, 2009, p.305.

<sup>6</sup> Fowler, pp. 308-314.

medals unique to Canada."<sup>8</sup> While Canadian military members can and do receive honours and awards from outside the organization, these are the exceptions to the rule (and not discussed in this paper).

### SELECTED CANADIAN HONOURS AND AWARDS

The following section will outline the general trends for each of the honours and awards being examined by looking at the general representation of women across the board and then looking at the general distribution in terms of ranks.

#### The Order of Military Merit

Admittance to the Order of Military Merit is one of the most prestigious honours available within the Canadian military honour and its motto is OFFICIUM ANTE COMMODOUM (service before self)<sup>9</sup>. This honour is usually granted to recognize outstanding career achievements. "There are three levels of membership in the Order of Military Merit: Member, Officer, and Commander, the latter being the highest. The number of appointments made annually is the equivalent of 0.1% of the total strength of the CF in the preceding year. Of that number, 6% will be Commanders, 30% will be Officers and 64% will be members."<sup>10</sup>

Overall, for the years 2008-2013, the percentage of women who were appointed to the Order of Military Merit, was 10.5% or 57 of 542 (Table 1).

The overall percentages of women in the Canadian military for those years varied from a low of 16.71% (2012) and a high of 17.29% (2010) (Table 2). Without taking rank into consideration,

---

<sup>7</sup> Christopher McCreery. *The Beginner's Guide to Canadian Honours*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2008, pp. 29-30.

<sup>8</sup> Christopher McCreery. *The Canadian Forces' Decoration*. Ottawa: National Defence Directorate of History and Heritage, 2010.

<sup>9</sup> Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005. p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005. p. 5

women appear to be generally under-represented within the Order. When considering rank, for example, for Commanders of the Order, one may say that women are actually over-represented in that group. It is however, unwise to draw any conclusions as one woman in 20 (5%) (Table 3) received that honour in the years 2011-2013 and Commanders of this Order are general/flag officers, a rank level that consisted of 2.8 - 4.7% women (table 4) for that same period. Given the relatively low numbers of general/flag officers in general, the percentage of women will change significantly with small changes in numbers. One individual cannot be deemed indicative of a trend.

Looking at the other two levels of this Order, over the time period examined, of the Officers, 8.8% (10 of 113) were women, while 11.2% of the Members were women (46 of 408). (Tables 5 and 6).

Looking at the Member level, where the numbers are higher and trends will be more apparent, it is interesting to note that women continue to be statistically underrepresented amongst the officers, with 9.0% of the Members of the Order of Military Merit Majors being women (3 of 33) and 6.8% of the Members of the Order of Military Merit Captains were women. (Table 7) These numbers are low when one considers that for this time period, the percentage of females at the Major rank ranged from 10.2-15.9% and 20.7- 24% at the Captain rank. On the other hand, women are slightly over-represented at the Chief Warrant Officer and Master Warrant Officer ranks with 8.8 and 10.2% respectively when the percentages of women at those ranks were 4.2-5.4% for Chief Warrant Officers and 6.3-8.5% for Master Warrant Officers. Women were significantly over-represented at the Warrant Officer and Sergeant ranks

with 31.6% (12 of 38) and 25% (2 of 6) respectively as women comprised from 10.2-11.7% of WOs and 13.3-15.9% of Sergeants.

### **The Meritorious Service Cross**

The Meritorious Service Cross (military division) “recognizes a military deed or activity that has been performed in an outstandingly professional manner, according to a rare high standard that brings considerable benefit or great honour to the CF.”<sup>11</sup> The Meritorious Service Cross is a very significant honour that only a small number receive. It is interesting to note while the DHRIM database shows 57 Meritorious Service Crosses being bestowed upon military members since 2008, mostly to Regular Force members (Table 8), none were received by a woman.

Statistically, even though the ranks that generally receive this honour are weighted towards the more senior ranks (Table 9), at least one or two female recipients would be expected.

---

<sup>11</sup> Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005. p. 21.



### **Meritorious Service Medal**

The Meritorious Service Medal (military division) is similar but lesser in weight and prestige when compared to the Meritorious Service Cross. It "...recognizes a military deed or activity that has been performed in a highly professional manner or of a very high standard that brings benefit or honour to the CF."<sup>12</sup> This award is granted in significantly higher numbers than the Cross (Table 8), and as such does have female representation, 19 of 359 or 7.3%, significantly lower than the percentage of women (approximately 17%, see Table 2), within the Canadian military as a whole.

When one looks at the spread of the Meritorious Service Medal across the ranks, senior personnel such as Majors and above, Chief Warrant Officers and Master Warrant Officers (Table 11) receive the bulk of the medals. The rank with the highest percentage of females in this group is Major rank with 4 female recipients among 56 or 7.1% (Table 9). As noted before, the overall percentage of women at this rank in this time period ranged around 14%.<sup>13</sup> As such, women are clearly statistically under-represented in this group.

### **Recent Commemorative Medal (Queen's Diamond Jubilee)**

In order to celebrate the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Queen Elizabeth's reign, 60 000 medals were made and 11 000 of these were allocated to the Canadian military to be awarded through a merit-based process that would be akin to that followed for the Order of Military Merit.<sup>14</sup> Unlike the selection process for the Order of Military Merit, the nominating commands were directed to meet allocation criteria based on the most recent statistical data for the Canadian Forces,

---

<sup>12</sup> Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005.

p. 21.

<sup>13</sup> 2014 Chief Military Personnel Annual Employment Equity Report.

<sup>14</sup> A.M Levesque. Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal – Selection. NDHQ: file 5401-406 (DH&R 4), 15 December 2011.

distributing the medals by rank, component (Regular Force or Reserve), and certain specific groups (for example, Cadet staff or Canadian Rangers). To use one nominating Command as an example, the Vice Chief of Defence Staff Group was directed to allocate 1624 medals:

- 545 for Private/Ordinary Seaman
- 166 for Warrant Officer/Petty Officer 1<sup>st</sup> Class- Chief Warrant Officer/Chief Petty Officer 1<sup>st</sup> Class
- 169 for Officer Cadet – Captain/Lieutenant(N)
- 234 for Major/Lieutenant Commander-Colonel/Captain(Navy)
- Maximum one medal for an honorary appointment
- 6 for General/Flag Officers

Of these medals, there had to be a minimum of 112 Reservists, and a minimum of 171 women. A further 504 were set aside for cadet staff.

Commemorative medals are a great opportunity, on the occasion of a happy anniversary, to recognize on a more generous scale those Canadians who make a difference in the country, their community or their field of activity. The CAF have traditionally been major participants in those medal programs. Over time a variety of selection methods have been used to award these medals to CAF members. While an automatic criteria was used for The Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal in 2002<sup>15</sup>, the CAF returned to a merit-based selection for the Diamond Jubilee Medal in 2012. This process is not only more in tune with the national criteria for these medals but also ensures the most deserving CAF members are recognized. The parameters provided also ensure the CAF list of recipients is a good representation of the CAF demography. In 2012, the CAF received its largest allocation in a commemorative medal program, with 11,000 medals awarded to deserving military personnel of all ranks, branches and regions, meaning that nearly 10% of the CAF's strength was recognized on this occasion.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Despite the use of automatic criteria in 2002, the chain of command still had the final say in whether a nominee became a recipient, based on conduct. This was to prevent a automatically selected member with a long conduct sheet from receiving the medal.

<sup>16</sup> Major Carl Gauthier, Acting Director Honours and Recognition, email with author, 10 July 2014.

When one looks at the end results of the distribution of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal, of the recipients, 1737 of 9357 (Table 12) 18.6% were women, slightly higher than the percentage of women in the CF overall. The distribution by rank is also interesting. Table 13 shows that women are clearly well-represented at all rank levels. When you compare the percentages of women (Table 12), receiving the medal by rank against the overall CF percentages of women at that rank, it can be observed that except for the ranks Officer Cadet/Naval Cadet-Captain/Lieutenant(Navy), women received this medal at higher rates than would be statistically predicted. It must be remembered that while the commands were direct to submit a minimum number of female nominations, maximum numbers were not specified. At the ranks of 2Lt/A/Slt-Lt/Slt, very junior officers, the significant difference in the expected percentage and the actual is not readily explicable and may indicate an area for vigilance when commemorative medals are dispersed in the future.

Of the honours and awards examined for this paper, this is the sole one that had strict controls and central oversight with the intent of ensuring appropriate distribution across rank and gender.

### **Chief of Defence Staff Commendation**

The Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) awards his commendation to “...recognize deeds or activities beyond the demand of normal duty.”<sup>17</sup> Those awarded this commendation receive a gold bar pin with three maple leaves which is worn on the pocket of DEU shirts or tunic pockets.

Of the honours and awards examined, the CDS Commendation shows the most significant statistical departure from the expected number of female recipients. Overall, only 71 of 921 or 7.7% of the recipients were female in the years examined (Table 15). As the percentage of women in the Canadian military hovered around 17% (Table 2), this is a significant difference. When looking at the distribution by rank (Table 16), the percentage of women who received the award was consistently lower than the actual representation of women at that rank, with the sole exception of the Master Corporal/Master Seaman rank. For that one rank, the women received 16.5% of the awards where the overall representation of women was 16.2 - 16.7%. The greatest disparity from that which would be statistically expected was at the Captain/Lieutenant (Navy) and Sergeant/Petty Officer 1<sup>st</sup> Class ranks. The awards at those ranks, which comprised almost 20% of the total awards, were granted to 3 female Captains/Lieutenants(Navy), or 3.4% of those given at that rank. Referring back to table 4, roughly 23% of Captains/Lieutenants(Navy) were female. At the Sergeant/Petty Officer 2<sup>nd</sup> class rank, while 6 of the 90 (6.7%) recipients were female, the percentage of women was actually between 15.0 – 15.9. When explained in personnel terms, for the 179 awards given at those rank levels, statistically one would expect that 35 would have gone to women, as opposed to the 9 that were actually granted.

### **Command Commendations**

---

<sup>17</sup> Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005. p. 41.

Command Commendations are awarded by the respective commanders "...to recognize a contribution affecting or reflecting well on the command."<sup>18</sup> Those awarded this commendation receive a silver bar pin with three maple leaves which is worn on the pockets of DEU shirts and tunics. Unlike all the other honours and awards considered for this paper, the command commendations are not subject to oversight from the strategic level. As such one would expect that they would be more likely to statistically show bias. The reality however, is the opposite. One sees in Table 17 that 245 of the 1336 awards went to women or 18.3%, a figure slightly above the actual rate of females in the military at any point in the period examined.

Looking at how the awards were distributed by rank (Table 18), women were generally over-represented for Captains/Lieutenant(Navy) and above for officers, and for Master-Corporals/Master Seamen and above for the non-commissioned ranks.

A breakdown of how the environmental commands distributed the awards would have perhaps provided interesting data, the records merely show whether an individual has received a command commendation, not which command granted it. While the environmental commands were asked if they could provide their data, only the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force were able to make it available in time, and even then, their records did not include gender and had not captured consistent data over the years.

### **WHY GENDER BIAS IN RECOGNITION MATTERS**

While morale and motivation are difficult concepts to quantify, the Canadian military, at its best, is populated by people who are motivated by the higher needs in Maslow's hierarchy (such as self-esteem) as described by Makin, Cooper, and Cox as a Theory Y situation as opposed to Theory X, which theorizes that people are inherently lazy and must be controlled to

---

<sup>18</sup> Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005. p. 41.

get results.<sup>19</sup> In general, military personnel want to contribute to group success but additional incentives should also add to enthusiasm. Recognition, such as honours and awards, should theoretically improve motivation. Indeed, other studies have shown statistically significant correlations between reward and recognition programs and work satisfaction and motivation in civilian companies<sup>20</sup> and that recognition programs positively contribute to employees' innovation and their application of new ideas and change<sup>21</sup>. It is likely that these conclusions would also likely apply to a military population.

One factor that would decrease the effectiveness of a recognition program such as military honours and awards, is the perception of unfairness or bias. Recommendations for honours and awards, like personnel evaluations, are by necessity, subjective and influenced by human biases. There are some typical biases, such as Halo bias, where "the rater who is subject to the halo bias assigns rating on the basis of a general impression of the ratee."<sup>22</sup> In other words, people who have a history as high performers, unless they compromise their reputations, will tend to continue to be rated highly. On the other hand, many individuals are simply more skilled at influencing other people. Those that are skilled at ingratiating themselves with superiors do generally achieve higher assessments<sup>23</sup> and are therefore, more likely to be rewarded by their superiors either at performance evaluation time or through the nomination for awards. The common bias that is of particular interest for the purposes of this paper is the

---

<sup>19</sup> Peter J. Makin, Cary L. Cooper, and Charles J. Cox. *Organizations and the Psychological Contract: Managing People at Work*. (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996), p.191.

<sup>20</sup> Renna Ali and M. Shakil Ahmed. "The Impact of Reward and Recognition Programs on Employee's Motivation and Satisfaction: An Empirical Study." *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 5 No. 4 June 2009, pp. 270-279.

<sup>21</sup> Jeroen P.J. de Jong, and Deanne N. Den Hartog. "How Leaders Influence Employees' Innovative Behavior." *European Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 10 No. 1, 2007, pp. 41-64.

<sup>22</sup> Cascio, Wayne F. *Applied Psychology in Human Resource Management – Fifth Edition*. Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc, 1978, p. 65.

<sup>23</sup> Ferris, Gerald R., and Wayne A. Hocharter, Cesar Douglas, Fred r. Blass, Robert W. Kolokinsky and Darren C. Treadway. "Social Influence Processes in Organizations and Human Resources Systems." In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management – Volume 21*. Editors Gerald R. Ferris and Joseph J. Martocchio. (Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd 2002), p. 82.

gender bias. Many do not believe or discount the possibility that gender bias still exists in the Canadian Armed Forces. Brigadier-General (Retired) Sheila Hellstrom, CD noted in the foreword to the publication *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces* that "...gender integration has been considered, by many, to be complete since the end of the 10-year period spanning 1989-1999, when, as a result of the 1989 Canadian Human Rights Tribunal direction, The Canadian Forces was closely monitored in its activities related to the employment of women."<sup>24</sup> A number of recent studies have concluded that bias (prejudice) against women is generally rooted in the clash between the traditional stereotypes of men and women and established views on what qualities are required to lead and succeed. "The gender stereotypes that contribute to biased evaluations in leadership are the pervasive and resilient gender stereotypes maintaining that women take care and men take charge".<sup>25</sup> "That is, women are associated with communal characteristics that highlight a concern for others, whereas men are viewed as possessing agentic characteristics that emphasize confidence, self-reliance, and dominance."<sup>26</sup> Other studies have found that "...women in higher positions should also anticipate pro-male biases in hiring and evaluation decisions."<sup>27</sup> As such, while women have made gains in opportunities and participation in military life, it is reasonable to expect that bias against them also exists in the military, particularly given its traditional values and generally male-centric culture, and will likely do so for the foreseeable future.

While there is a very strong likelihood that bias against women exists in one form or another within the Canadian military, the question being examined by this paper is whether this

---

<sup>24</sup> Department of National Defence. Canadian Defence Academy. *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*. Kingston: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2009, p.iii.

<sup>25</sup> Crystal L Hoyt and Jeni L. Burnette. "Gender Bias in Leader Evaluations: Merging Implicit Theories and Role Congruity Perspectives." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2013 39: 1306, p.1307.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>27</sup> Victor S. Maas, and Raquel Torres-Gonzalez. "Subjective Performance Evaluation and Gender Discrimination." *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol 101, 2011, p.668.

bias is extended to the selection of recipients of merit-based honours and awards. While statistically some of the honours and awards show fewer than expected female recipients, mere examination of the numbers, one cannot provide an explanation for the difference. While bias is one possible explanation, some may argue that women as a group are less likely to achieve the levels of performance required to earn that recognition. However, if that should be the case, it would suggest that maximizing men in the Canadian Armed Forces would maximize performance overall. Yet even if one could accept this very politically incorrect premise as true, this suggests recruitment goals that would be contrary to the Canadian government's aims for diversity in the Armed Forces, "...committed to increasing diversity by creating a workforce that is reflective of the Canadian labour market, and seek to retain their current, valued employees by fostering an inclusive work environment. CAF and DND will need to take appropriate measures to keep pace with the growing diversification of the Canadian population."<sup>28</sup> If women cannot succeed in significant numbers, they are unlikely to ever be retained in sufficient numbers to enable the Canadian military to reflect the greater Canadian society. This circles back to the question of whether women as a group are capable of the same level of performance of men in a military context. It is fundamentally is a question of whether there are gender-based differences in performance levels, if there are gender-based biases in the assessments of performance, or if other variables, such as differences in the opportunities and challenges offered based on gender, are limiting the recognition of women.

The examination of the particular honours and awards for this particular period in time was instructive. Examination of the three levels of the Order of Military Merit did not show clear evidence that gender bias was likely an issue, whereas the Meritorious Service Cross was

---

<sup>28</sup> Department of National Defence - Reports on Plans and Priorities 2013-14. <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about-reports-pubs-report-plan-priorities/2013-other-work-environment.page>. Accessed 16 July 2014.



awarded exclusively to males. While the Meritorious Service Cross was awarded in very small numbers in that period (57) and mostly to very senior personnel, even taking the relatively low numbers of women in senior ranks (Colonel/ Captain(Navy) and above and Chief Warrant Officers/Chief Petty Officers 1<sup>st</sup> Class), statistically one would expect it to be awarded to one or two women. While this may be an anomaly of the particular period of time, it may also be indicative of a trend. The Meritorious Service Medal, which was granted in significantly higher numbers than the Cross, clearly showed lower numbers of women recipients that would be expected.

The Chief of Defence Staff Commendations and the Command Commendations provided interesting results in that while the author expected that the Chief of Defence Staff Commendation would be more reflective of the gender makeup of the Canadian military than the Command Commendations whereas the opposite proved true. The Chief of Defence Staff Commendation demonstrated a significantly lower representation by women while the Command Commendations show much stronger representation by women. As the Command Commendations are decided at a lower level and gender statistics are not maintained by the Command authorities, it was expected that the results would be more skewed towards males than was demonstrated.

The Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal provides a contrasting view of gender representation. Due to the directed levels of representation for women, it is not surprising that women generally showed the expected levels of representation. In fact, women actually received slightly more awards than would be statistically expected. The most interesting anomaly of this award was the fact that for the Lieutenant/Sub-Lieutenant and 2<sup>nd</sup> Lieutenant/Acting Sub-Lieutenant ranks, women were significantly under-represented. Without more data on normal

employment of officers at this rank, it is difficult to form a hypothesis, but closer scrutiny of submissions at this level may be useful in the future.

## CONCLUSION

This paper looked at the following honours and awards that were bestowed in the years 2008-2013 according to the Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management: The Order of Military Merit, The Meritorious Service Cross and Medal, a recent Commemorative Medal (Queen's Diamond Jubilee), the Chief of Defence Staff Commendation and Command Commendations.

While the representation of women for the Order of Military Merit, the Queen's Jubilee Medal, and Command commendations did not support the perception of bias against women, the representation of women for the Meritorious Service Cross, Medal, and the Chief of Defence Staff's Commendation did have female representation that was significantly lower than should be expected. These results indicate that bias may be an issue in either the nominations for or the selection of recipients for these honours and awards. It appears that, in general, the more prestigious awards have the more disproportionate the under-representation of women. It must of course be noted again that the data has shown enough unreliability that these conclusions can only be used to highlight areas of concern rather than unequivocal truths.

The examination of these honours and awards does indicate that for certain aspects of recognition, women are disproportionately under-represented. It must be remembered that women in the Canadian military have made significant gains in acceptance and equality in the last decade, and that women have now successfully commanded ships, flying squadrons, and combat troops but studies have shown that women still believe that they suffer more discrimination than men. One study suggested that prejudice against women will diminish as "...effective past performance by a female is viewed as repeatable."<sup>29</sup> In other words, as women

---

<sup>29</sup> Tara L'Heureux-Barrett and Janet L. Barnes-Farrell. "Overcoming Gender Bias in Reward Allocation: The Role of Expectations of Future Performance" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol 15 2001, p. 138.

continue to succeed in the Canadian military, acceptance and recognition will become easier over time. As women become more integrated and more visible within the military however, bias is becoming more subtle.

In general, I would argue that we have moved beyond what I call “psychometric” gender bias; that is, what can be measured “cleanly” through quantitative analysis. However, what is harder to get at and understand are the systemic, qualitative processes that undermine full inclusiveness and gender diversity.<sup>30</sup>

The interpretation of the results of the *Your Say* survey by Wang showed that women believe that they suffer discrimination at a significantly higher rate than men. While perception, even on a large scale, does not necessarily reflect reality, this brief examination of the distribution of certain forms of recognition indicates that leaders should be aware that gender bias does exist and guard against it. Quotas, however, are not the recommended approach as they tend to generate uneasiness in the promoted group and resentment outside it.

The efforts of the Canadian military to increase the overall percentage of women has been stymied by their higher attrition rates. While there are a number of reasons for the higher attrition of women, the perceptions of servicewomen that they are not protected from discrimination is surely a factor. In order to increase women's confidence in the institution, the leadership must continue to make efforts to combat discrimination and give the women of the Canadian Armed Forces confidence that their service is valued.

There are a number of areas of study in this area that bear further investigation. While women were statistically under represented for certain honours or awards, it would be interesting to know whether or not there is a correlation between classification and the likelihood of being selected. As well, there may be value in perhaps comparing years of active overseas operations against more peaceful periods. As the representation of women varies significantly between

---

<sup>30</sup> Karen Davis, email with author, 13 August 2014.

various classifications, it is possible that in some cases, the bias that limits female representation is actually a bias against certain trades. The bias may also vary significantly by military environment. Therefore examination of environmental awards and nominations for central awards would also prove interesting and compelling. While this paper did not examine the valour awards, a further examination of the limited inclusion of women into this group starting from the time of inclusion of women into the combat arms in 1989, through the Balkan conflict era and the Afghanistan years to today. While the numbers of women in the combat arms are very small, they "...had increased from well under 1 percent in 1989 to 4.2 percent of combat officers and 1.5 percent of combat non-commissioned troops by 2011."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Karen Davis. *Negotiating Gender In The Canadian Forces, 1970-1999*. (Doctoral Thesis, Royal Military College of Canada, 2013) p.240.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ali, Renna and M. Shakil Ahmed. "The Impact of Reward and Recognition Programs on Employee's Motivation and Satisfaction: An Empirical Study." *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 5 No. 4 June 2009, pp. 270-279.
- Cascio, Wayne F. *Applied Psychology in Human Resource Management – Fifth Edition*. Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc, 1978.
- Coulthard, Julie and Leesa Tanner. *A Gap Analysis of Employment Equity and Diversity Research in the Canadian Forces*. Technical Memorandum, DGMPRA TM 2009-009, July 2009. Chapter 7.
- Davis, Karen. *Negotiating Gender In The Canadian Forces, 1970-1999*. (PhD Thesis, Royal Military College of Canada, 2013.
- de Jong, Jeroen P.J. and Deanne N. Den Hartog. "How Leaders Influence Employees' Innovative Behavior." *European Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 10 No. 1, 2007.
- Department of National Defence. Canadian Defence Academy. *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*. Kingston: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2009.
- Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. *Canadian Honours and Awards bestowed upon members of the Canadian Forces*. A-AD-200-000/JD-001, 31 March 2005.
- Ferris, Gerald R., and Wayne A. Hocharter, Cesar Douglas, Fred r. Blass, Robert W. Kolokinsky and Darren C. Treadway. "Social Influence Processes in Organizational and Human Resources Systems." *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*

– *Volume 21*. Editors Gerald R. Ferris and Joseph J. Martocchio. Oxford: (Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd )

Fowler, T. Robert. *Courage Rewarded: The Valour of Canadian Soldiers Under Fire 1900 to 2007*. Victoria: Trafford Publishing, 2009.

Hoyt, Crystal L. and Jeni L. Burnette. “Gender Bias in Leader Evaluations: Merging Implicit Theories and Role Congruity Perspectives.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2013 39: 1306.

Levesque, A.M. *Queen’s Diamond Jubilee Medal – Selection*. NDHQ: file 5401-406 (DH&R 4), 15 December 2011.

L’Heureux-Barrett, Tara and Janet L. Barnes-Farrell. “Overcoming Gender Bias in Reward Allocation: The Role of Expectations of Future Performance” *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol 15 2001.

Makin, Peter J., Cary L. Cooper, and Charles J. Fox. *Organizations and the Psychological Contract: Managing People at Work*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Maas, Victor S. and Raquel Torres-Gonzalez. “Subjective Performance Evaluation and Gender Discrimination.” *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol 101, 2011.

McCreery, Christopher. *The Beginner's Guide to Canadian Honours*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2008.

McCreery, Christopher. *The Canadian Forces' Decoration*. Ottawa: National Defence Directorate of History and Heritage, 2010.

Wang, Zhigang. *Diversity and Employment Equity in the Canadian Armed Forces: Results of the 2011 Your-Say Survey Focus Section on Diversity Climate*. Defence Research and

Development Canada, Technical Report, DGMPRA

TR 2013-002, December 2013.



**APPENDIX - (TABLES)**

<b>Order of Military Merit</b>	<b>(Overall)</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
	<b>Females Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
<b>Year</b>							
2008	1	1	2	18	5	23	25
2009	3		3	31	7	38	41
2010	4	3	7	25	9	34	41
2011	5	3	8	40	9	49	57
2012	17	5	22	198	49	247	269
2013	11	4	15	81	13	94	109
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>542</b>

**Table 1 - Gender Distribution for Overall Order of Military Merit by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total #</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>%</b>
01-Apr-08	108856	90395	18461	16.96%
01-Apr-09	111556	92749	18807	16.86%
01-Apr-10	117424	97126	20298	17.29%
01-Apr-11	110989	92023	18966	17.09%
01-Apr-12	112989	94046	18877	16.71%
01-Apr-13	108948	90474	18474	16.96%

**Table 2 - Percentage of Women in CAF by Year**

Source: The 2014 Chief Military Personnel Annual Employment Equity Report

<b>Order of Military Merit - Commanders</b>					
	<b>Females</b>	<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Years</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>		
2011			2	2	2
2012	1	1	10	10	11
2013			7	7	7
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>

**Table 3 - Gender Distribution for Overall Order of Military Merit by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Range of Percentages of Women at Each Rank 2008-2014<sup>32</sup></b>
Generals	2.1 - 4.2%
Col/Capt(N)	3.9 – 5.1%
LCol/Cdr	7.1 – 9.1%
Maj/LCdr	13.0 – 15.9%
Capt/Lt(N)	22.7 – 25.0%
Lt/SLt	33.3 – 36.6%
2lt/A/SLt	25.7 – 29.5%
OCdt/NCdt	27.4 – 31.2%
CWO/CPO1	4.4 – 5.2%
MWO/CPO2	7.5 – 8.5%
WO/PO1	10.2 – 11.7%
Sgt/PO2	15.0 – 15.9%
MCpl/MS	16.2 – 16.7%
Cpl/LS	15.1 – 16.5%
Pte/OS	13.9 – 14.8%

**Table 4 - Percentage of Women In Each Rank by Year**

Source: The 2014 Chief Military Personnel Annual Employment Equity Report

## **Order of Military (OMM)**

<sup>32</sup> Data on the numbers and percentages of women is taken from the 2014 CMP Annual Employment Equity Report

<b>Merit- Officers</b>							
	<b>Females</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Years</b>	<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
2008	1		1	4	1	5	6
2009				5		5	5
2010	1		1	4	1	5	6
2011		2	2	9	3	12	14
2012	3	2	5	45	9	54	59
2013	1		1	20	2	22	23
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>113</b>

**Table 5 - Gender Distribution for Order of Military Merit (Officers) by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Order of Military Merit - Members (MMM)</b>							
	<b>Females</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
2008		1	1	14	4	18	19
2009	3		3	26	6	32	35
2010	3	3	6	21	8	29	35
2011	5	1	6	29	6	35	41
2012	14	2	16	143	40	183	199
2013	10	4	14	54	11	65	79
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>408</b>

**Table 6 - Gender Distribution for Order of Military Merit (Members) by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

Members of the Order of Military Merit																									
Row Labels	LCol/Cdr Total		Maj/LCdr Total		Capt/LT(N) Total		CWO/CPO1 Total		MWO/CPO2 Total		WO/PO1 Total		Sgt/PO2 Total		Grand Total										
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M												
2008			6		6	4		4	5		1	1	2		2				19						
2009	1		1	4	4	8		8	3	10		6	6		3				35						
2010			1		1	10		11	1	10		2	7		9	2	1		35						
2011	1		1	4	4	3		3	2	15		2	11		13	2	1		41						
2012	1		1	3	9	12	2	28	5	81		3	47		50	2	12	14	1	5	6	199			
2013			6		6	1	2	3	3	25		3	24		28	3	24	27	6	7	13	1	1	2	79
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>146</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>96</b>		<b>107</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>408</b>			

**Table 7 - Gender Distribution for Order of Military Merit (Officers) by Rank and Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

Meritorious Service Cross (only received by males)	Overall Males		Overall Males	
	Reg F	Res F		
2008	13	2	15	15
2009	9	1	10	10
2010	3		3	3
2011	10		10	10
2012	4		4	4
2013	14		14	14
2014	1		1	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>57</b>

**Table 8 - Awards of Meritorious Service Cross by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Meritorious Service Cross</b>								
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
LGen/VAdm			1	2		4		7
MGen/RAdm		1			2	2		5
BGen/Cmdre	3	2		2		1		8
Col/Capt(N)	4	2		1	1	3		11
LCol/Cdr	3	2		1		1		7
Maj/LCdr				1		1		2
Capt/Lt(N)	1				1	1	1	4
CWO/CPO1	2	1		2				5
MWO/CPO2	2	1	1			1		5
WO/PO1			1	1				2
Sgt/PO2		1						1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>57</b>

**Table 9 - Rank Distribution for Meritorious Service Cross by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Meritorious Service Medal</b>							
<b>Years</b>	<b>Females</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
	<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
2008	1		1	29	3	32	33
2009				31	2	33	33
2010	3	1	4	19	3	22	26
2011	2		2	42	3	45	47
2012	3	2	5	71	7	78	83
2013	5		5	87	10	97	102
2014	2		2	30	3	33	35
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>359</b>

**Table 10 - Gender Distribution for Meritorious Service Medal by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

Meritorious Service Medal								Grand Total
Rank	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	
<b>LGen/VAdm</b>						<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
Males						1		1
<b>MGen/RAdm</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>			<b>5</b>
Males	1		1	2	1			5
<b>BGen/Cmdre</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>16</b>
Males		3	2		3	8		16
<b>Col/Capt(N)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>62</b>
Females				2			1	3
Males	2	5	4	3	15	19	11	59
<b>LCol/Cdr</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Females</b>			<b>1</b>			<b>3</b>		<b>4</b>
Males	9	5	6	11	18	16	3	68
<b>Maj/LCdr</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Females</b>			<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>4</b>
Males		2	3	11	11	20	5	52
<b>Capt/Lt(N)</b>	<b>5</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Females</b>					<b>1</b>			<b>1</b>
Males	5			3	7	6	4	25
<b>Lt/SLt</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Females</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2Lt/A/SLt</b>					<b>1</b>			<b>1</b>
Males					1			1
<b>OCdt/NCdt</b>	<b>1</b>						<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Males	1						1	2
<b>CWO/CPO1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Females</b>						<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
Males	3	5	1	5	4	8	4	30
<b>MWO/CPO2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>
Males	2	6	1	3	8	5	2	27
<b>WO/PO1</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Females</b>			<b>1</b>					<b>1</b>
Males	2		1	4	5	7	2	21
<b>Sgt/PO2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>
Males	4	4		2	3	2	1	16
<b>MCpl/MS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>13</b>
<b>Females</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>					<b>2</b>
Males	2	2	2	1	1	3		11
<b>Cpl/LS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>Females</b>					<b>2</b>			<b>2</b>
Males	1	1	1		1	2		6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>359</b>

**Table 11 - Rank Distribution for Meritorious Service Medal by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal</b>							
	<b>Females</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Years</b>	<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
2010				1		1	1
2012	621	296	917	2935	1063	3998	4915
2013	593	227	820	2770	833	3603	4423
2014				16	2	18	18
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1214</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>1737</b>	<b>5722</b>	<b>1898</b>	<b>7620</b>	<b>9357</b>

**Table 12 - Gender Distribution for Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal</b>					
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>LGen/VAdm</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>
Males		2	1		3
<b>MGen/RAdm</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>9</b>
Females		1	1		2
Males		4	3		7
<b>BGen/Cmdre</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>32</b>
Females		1	1		2
Males		12	18		30
<b>Col/Capt(N)</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>95</b>		<b>144</b>
Females		5	2		7
Males		44	93		137
<b>LCol/Cdr</b>		<b>187</b>	<b>251</b>		<b>438</b>
Females		21	32		53
M		166	219		385
<b>Maj/LCdr</b>		<b>473</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>953</b>
Females		70	98		168
Males		403	380	2	785
<b>Capt/Lt(N)</b>		<b>478</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>881</b>
Females		105	109		214
Males		373	292	2	667
<b>Lt/SLt</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>66</b>
Females		6	8		14
Males		23	28	1	52
<b>2Lt/A/St</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>		<b>27</b>
Females		4			4
Males		10	13		23
<b>OCdt/NCdt</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>		<b>23</b>
Females		4	2		6
Males		5	12		17
<b>CWO/CPO1</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>318</b>
Females		8	13		21
Males		135	161	1	297
<b>MWO/CPO2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>748</b>
Females		38	46		84
Males	1	359	303	1	664
<b>WO/PO1</b>		<b>653</b>	<b>495</b>		<b>1148</b>
Females		84	82		166
Males		569	413		982
<b>Sgt/PO2</b>		<b>954</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1754</b>
Females		210	165		375
Males		744	629	6	1379
<b>MCpl/MS</b>		<b>856</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1557</b>
Females		210	135		345
Males		646	562	4	1212
<b>Cpl/LS</b>		<b>644</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1235</b>
Females		147	123		270
Males		497	467	1	965
<b>Pte/OS</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>21</b>
Females		3	3		6
Males		6	9		15
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4915</b>	<b>4423</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9357</b>

**Table 13 - Rank and Gender Distribution for Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103



<b>Rank</b>	<b>Overall % of Women in CF (1 Apr 11)</b>	<b>Medal Recipients % Women</b>
Generals	3.8	6.8
Col/Capt(N)	4.0	15.9
LCol/Cdr	8.4	12.1
Maj/LCdr	14	17.6
Capt/Lt(N)	25	24.3
Lt/SLt	36.1	21.2
2lt/A/SLt	29.5	14.8
OCdt/NCdt	27.6	26.0
CWO/CPO1	4.6	6.6
MWO/CPO2	7.8	11.2
WO/PO1	10.9	14.5
Sgt/PO2	15.4	21.4
MCpl/MS	16.4	22.2
Cpl/LS	15.7	21.9
Pte/OS	13.9	28.6

**Table 14 - Percentage of Women in CAF vs Percentage of Women Receiving QDJM at Each Rank Level**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>CDS Commendations</b>							
<b>Year</b>	<b>Females</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
	<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
2008	5		5	52	4	56	61
2009	2		2	34	4	38	40
2010	7		7	72	7	79	86
2011	6		6	56	10	66	72
2012	11	2	13	68	11	79	92
2013	26	7	33	396	48	444	477
2014	4	1	5	79	9	88	93
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>921</b>

**Table 15 - Gender Distribution for CDS Commendations by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

CDS Commendations								
Ranks	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Grand Total
<b>MGen/RAdm</b>						<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
Males						1		1
<b>BGen/Cmdre</b>	<b>1</b>					<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
Males	1					4	1	6
<b>Col/Capt(N)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>64</b>
Females		1		1				2
Males	3	2	8	4	2	39	4	62
<b>LCol/Cdr</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>162</b>
Females	1		1		1	4	1	8
Males	15	12	12	10	8	79	18	154
<b>Maj/LCdr</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>186</b>
Females	2	1	2	2	4	8	3	22
Males	7	3	19	12	19	88	16	164
<b>Capt/Lt(N)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>89</b>
Females			1			1	1	3
Males	5	1	10	14	7	40	9	86
<b>Lt/SLt</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>9</b>
Females						1		1
Males	2	1		1	1	3		8
<b>2Lt/A/SLt</b>					<b>1</b>			<b>1</b>
Males					1			1
<b>OCdt/NCdt</b>						<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Males						1	1	2
<b>CWO /CPO1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>34</b>
Females						1		1
Males	2	1	3	4	2	17	4	33
<b>MWO/CPO2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>52</b>
Females			1			1		2
Males	3	4	5	3	8	21	6	50
<b>WO/PO1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>95</b>
Females			2		2	4		8
Males	6	3	6	7	9	48	8	87
<b>Sgt/PO2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>90</b>
Females	1			1	1	3		6
Males	9	7	9	5	6	39	9	84
<b>MCpl/MS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>85</b>
Females				2	4	8		14
Males	1	2	6	4	11	37	10	71
<b>Cpl/LS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>45</b>
Females	1				1	2		4
Males	2	2	1	2	5	27	2	41
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>921</b>

Table 16 - Rank and Gender Distribution for CDS Commendations

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Command Commendations</b>							
<b>Years</b>	<b>Females</b>		<b>Females Total</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Males Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
	<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		<b>Reg F</b>	<b>Res F</b>		
2008	22	2	24	113	24	137	161
2009	46	10	56	146	16	162	218
2010	32	12	44	236	30	266	310
2011	57	10	67	238	33	271	338
2012	20	3	23	111	11	122	145
2013	17	11	28	93	13	106	134
2014	2	1	3	25	2	27	30
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>962</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>1091</b>	<b>1336</b>

**Table 17 - Gender Distribution for Command Commendations by Year**

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103

<b>Command Commendations</b>	<b>(All Commands)</b>							<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Rank/Gender</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	
<b>MGen/RAdm</b>				<b>1</b>				<b>1</b>
Males				1				1
<b>BGen/Cmdre</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>				<b>4</b>
Females			1					1
Males			2	1				3
<b>Col/Capt(N)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>
Females				1				1
Males	3	3	4	2	1		1	14
<b>LCol/Cdr</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>83</b>
Females	1		2	2	2	1		8
Males	10	8	19	19	8	8	3	75
<b>Maj/LCdr</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>247</b>
Females	6	4	6	12	5	2	1	36
Males	30	36	52	44	30	18	1	211
<b>Capt/Lt(N)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>173</b>
Females		8	6	14	2	6		36
Males	13	19	37	26	24	13	5	137
<b>Lt/SLt</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>			<b>2</b>		<b>7</b>
Females	1	1	1			1		4
Males		1	1			1		3
<b>2Lt/A/Slt</b>			<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>			<b>2</b>
Males			1		1			2
<b>OCdt/NCdt</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>11</b>
Females	1	1	1					3
Males		2	1	2	2	1		8
<b>CWO/CPO1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>41</b>
Females			1	2	1			4
Males	3	5	10	11	5	3		37
<b>MWO/CPO2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>87</b>
Females	1	2	3	3			1	10
Males	13	9	24	19	6	6		77
<b>WO/PO1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>151</b>
Females	3	7	5	7	2	6		30
Males	16	22	26	35	6	15	1	121
<b>Sgt/PO2</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>231</b>
Females	7	15	10	10	3	5		50
Males	29	35	32	46	15	19	5	181
<b>MCpl/MS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>169</b>
Females	3	13	7	8	4	2	1	38
Males	16	16	30	39	10	16	4	131
<b>Cpl/LS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>111</b>
Females	1	5	1	8	4	5		24
Males	4	6	27	25	13	6	6	87
<b>Pte/OS</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
Males				1	1		1	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1336</b>

Table 18 - Rank and Gender Distribution for Command Commendations

Source: Directorate of Human Resources and Information Management Report produced on 4 June 2014, Ticket 7103