



ENABLING CHANGE: MILITARY CULTURE CHANGE BUY-IN

Major Jeremie Angrignon-Dompierre

JCSP 49

Exercise Solo Flight

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.

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2023.

PCEMI n° 49

Exercice Solo Flight

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 le Roi du chef du Canada, représenté par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2023.

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE - COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES

JCSP 49 - PCEMI n° 49
2022 - 2023

Exercise Solo Flight – Exercice Solo Flight

ENABLING CHANGE: MILITARY CULTURE CHANGE BUY-IN

Major Jeremie Angrignon-Dompierre

“This paper was written by a candidate 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. »

ENABLING CHANGE: MILITARY CULTURE CHANGE BUY-IN

INTRODUCTION

Organizational change is a necessary part of the success of any military organization. It is essential for any military service to keep up with the changing times and be able to adjust to the ever-evolving social landscape. However, it is not always easy to implement change, as it requires the cooperation of all members—especially those affected by the change. To ensure that military members are on board with the change, it is important to get their “buy-in” or agreement to support the change. To what extent does the level of CAF member’s change acceptance level pose a risk to CAF culture change effectiveness and to what extent is the CAF ready to optimize culture change readiness?

Cultural change can fail in a military context for a variety of reasons. One of the main reasons is resistance from both the leadership and the subordinates. Members of the military are often resistant to change because of their commitment to tradition and the belief that their current system works well. Additionally, military leadership may be hesitant to implement change because of the risk associated with making major changes in an organization that is responsible for national security and defense. Furthermore, military culture is often highly hierarchical and rigid, making it difficult for change to take root and become accepted. Finally, the lack of resources and expertise to implement and sustain change initiatives can lead to failure. In this essay, resistance to change will be defined as the phenomenon that manifests itself as the active and passive actions of individuals and teams within an organization that prevent the necessary on-the-job behavioral changes required to achieve the organizational outcomes that an organizational change is intended to achieve¹.

Change management cannot be done on the fly. It must be controlled, carefully planned and, above all, motivating. Urgency or lack of time are often invoked to impose changes. Yet, wanting to cut corners by skipping steps in its management only postpones the challenge of appropriation². Moreover, most change projects are now too complex to be managed exclusively by top management or to rest on the shoulders of one person, however charismatic they may be. Committees and group thinking must be called upon. It is important to include representatives of the various units or services affected. Likewise, people who know the content of the change and others who know how to manage its implementation should be part of it. Their mandate is essentially one of strategic advice to ensure the success of the change³. As stated by Albrow and Ivey : “It appears that the more genuine appreciation for the complexity of cultural learning and understanding, indeed, a more educated understanding of the meaning of culture, rests among those who are not in power and able to enable the process”⁴.

In exploring culture change acceptance theories, this essay will try to show that the lack of buy-in in implementing culture change needs to be addressed by CAF leaders and will demonstrate that different strategic institutional measures can be taken to combat these challenges and to enhance CAF culture change buy-in effectiveness. This essay will demonstrate that enhancing resilience, establishing conditions, fostering relationships with actors and supporting members are triggers for buy-in enhancement.

¹ Bovey and Hede, ‘Resistance to Organizational Change the Role of Cognitive and Affective Processes’, 2001.

² Hill, ‘Military Innovation and Military Culture’.

³ Albrow and Ivey, ‘Changing Culture with Culture at the US Naval Academy’.

⁴ Albrow and Ivey.

UNDERSTANDING BUY-IN: RESISTANCE TO CHANGE IN THE MILITARY

The commitment to tradition and belief that the current system is effective is one of the primary reasons for the failure of cultural change in a military context. The military is an organization that is steeped in tradition and has been in existence for centuries, and many of the higher-ranking military personnel are committed to preserving that tradition. This commitment to tradition often leads to a belief that the current system is effective, and any attempts to make changes to the system are seen as unnecessary and potentially detrimental. One may be unconsciously reflecting the value of military linear communication, hierarchy, and chain of command leadership in this belief. This could lead to the creation of a command atmosphere that is artificially sustained from the top⁵. Additionally, the potential for fear and opposition to substantial alterations in military forces that has duties concerning national security can be overwhelming. Most leaders and supervisors appear to view culture as something outside of themselves, and merely grasp its concept on a superficial level, not recognizing that they, too, are cultural entities⁶.

Any changes to the military can have a significant impact on the nation's security, and any potential risks must be taken into consideration. This can lead to resistance from the leadership and subordinate as they may be unwilling to take the risks associated with making major changes in an organization with national security responsibility. As mentioned by Oren : "An epistemology which presumes that scholarship, culture and security constitute separate realm may not be equal to the task of interpreting a world in which, scholarship, culture and security mutually constitute a single nexus"⁷.

Understanding Buy-In: Challenges of Implementing Cultural Change

The rigid hierarchical structure of military culture is a significant challenge for any attempt to make changes to the organization. The military is a highly structured organization, and any changes must be carefully considered and planned, as any missteps can have serious consequences. Brigadier Nigel-Aylwin implies that the Army has difficulty changing its culture to one fostering innovation due to a hierarchically oriented command ethos, which encourages centralization and conversely discourages low-level initiative or innovation even when senior commanders have stressed the need for them⁸. This rigid hierarchical structure and linear promotion systems also make it difficult to implement long-term change initiatives, as the higher-ranking officers may be unwilling to accept any changes to the system because of a lack of recognition and exposure. Additionally, the subordinates may be resistant to any attempts to make changes, as they may be more comfortable with the current system and any changes may be seen as an encroachment on their power and authority. Due to the current system of officer promotion and development, those in senior positions typically have the specific attributes that the organization seeks in its leaders, and have served in the roles that are esteemed in the prevailing culture. Their careers are generally modeled on the accepted standards of noble battle, delegation of authority, or the amount of uniformity. If the answer to conquering opposition to progress is for senior leaders to negate or disregard the tactical culture and values upon which their careers were built, the organization is likely to be unsatisfied. This is the paradox of innovation leadership: while senior military personnel are best placed to create an atmosphere, which allows the organization to explore and validate new methods of action,

⁵ Albro and Ivey.

⁶ Albro and Ivey.

⁷ OREN, 'Is Culture Independent of National Security?: How America's National Security Concerns Shaped 'Political Culture' Research'.

⁸ Carpenter and ARMY WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS PA, 'Army Organizational Culture of Innovation: A Strategic Imperative for Transformation'.

they are not suited to the tasks of identification, demonstration, and persuasion which are integral to innovation leadership⁹.

There may be a perception that those in higher ranks are not necessarily the best mentors, as they may be too distant to establish meaningful relationships with those they are mentoring. For progress to be made toward a supportive working environment that promotes diversity in the CAF, Senior Management must continue to work towards the cultural change that is subscribed to. This can be challenging since many women in senior positions have been indoctrinated in traditionally masculine culture, and are therefore not always well-suited to assume a mentorship role¹⁰. Nonetheless, certain women and men in uniform can act as role models, mentors, and allies to help women in the military further their careers. Judge Marie Deschamps has noted that without available and competent mentors, women in the armed forces risk missing out on opportunities to reach leadership roles¹¹. The lack of resources and expertise to implement and sustain change initiatives is a major challenge for cultural change in a military context. The military is typically a large organization with a large budget, and any change initiatives must be carefully planned and implemented in order to be successful. Additionally, the lack of resources and expertise can make it difficult for the military to implement and sustain change initiatives, as the personnel may not have the necessary skills or knowledge to effectively implement the changes.

UNDERSTANDING BUY-IN: THE BASIS FOR MILITARY CULTURE CHANGE SUCCESS

The success of a change greatly depends on the adoption of new behaviors and ways of doing things by employees. This primarily involves their mobilization. Its counterpart is found in the leadership of leaders and managers who, beyond their authority, arouse the desire to follow them. Echoes of mobilization can also be found in an organizational culture that is concerned with people, where employees' contribution to success is recognized¹². In addition, it is closely linked to the quality of communication. In the context of a change, mobilization results from careful and sensitive management of the transition where the gradual adoption of new ways of doing things is encouraged and employees can participate and contribute to enriching the change¹³. One of the CAF leadership principal is directly tied to communication skills which are to keep the staff informed of the mission, changes in the situation, and what is generally going on.

Employees affected experience the change with emotions related to the unknown, uncertainty, instability, loss of control in their work, and feeling of inability or incompetence. Its legitimacy is therefore an important condition for them to accept the direction given. As well, institutional theory puts forth the idea that maintaining legitimacy is of utmost importance for any social order to survive. This means that an institution could be expending a lot of energy to protect its legitimacy, even if it means sacrificing its functional goals¹⁴. However, it is necessary to avoid trying to mobilize the staff by arousing unrealistic expectations or making promises that cannot be kept. If this gives, in the very short term, the impetus to launch, the disappointment that follows is all the more demobilizing as staff feels they have been "manipulated".

⁹ Hill, 'Military Innovation and Military Culture'.

¹⁰ Waruszynski, 'Women Serving in the Canadian Armed Forces: Strengthening Military Capabilities and Operational Effectiveness'.

¹¹ Waruszynski.

¹² Locke, 'The Change Handbook: The Definitive Resource on Today's Best Methods for Engaging Whole Systems'.

¹³ Bousquet et al., 'Resilience and Development: Mobilizing for Transformation'.

¹⁴ Ouellet, 'LA TRANSFORMATION DES FORCES CANADIENNES : La Quête de l'insaisissable Efficacité'.

To adhere means that employees are in a subjective state of receptivity and openness. Therefore, they understand the need and relevance of the change. They recognize its legitimacy. Transparency, communication, and consideration are factors that facilitate staff membership and past experiences greatly affect the mindset in which it develops. If the members have had painful experiences in the past, one must go back and show how the present change distinguishes itself by its dynamics and how it will be managed¹⁵. Without receptivity and openness, the result is likely to be counterproductive like during the implementation of the 1960 CAF unification project and the implementation of the defense policy in the 70's. This proves once again that the defense policy of the 1970s, which provided measures that shook the power of each of the armed services, such as the merging of military and civilian personnel, disrupted the traditional structure of the forces as much as the unification of the services had done in the 1960s. This strategy has once again provoked the resistance of the military and has contributed to the fact that the directives are not perceived as legitimate within the institution¹⁶.

Employee participation is a potentially mobilizing component that also greatly contributes to making the change process management transparent. However, it cannot be forced. Not all employees necessarily want to get involved, but voluntary participants often have a contagious effect within their work group¹⁷. If support from the majority is to be gained, it should not be expected that everyone will adhere to it. Moreover, resorting to "formal" participation, only allowing to intervene on insignificant details or not considering what is raised, has devastating effects on personnel mobilization. Participation has several aspects that must be predetermined¹⁸. Who participates? On what basis? At what level? What is its scope? What is its character? It is necessary in particular to answer the following questions: will all members or only a few representatives participate? Will this participation be advisory or for approval purposes? What dimensions of change will be included? What phases of the change process will its scope cover? Will the character of this participation be formal or informal? The first essential step is to establish a mutual comprehension of military culture and its implications for the Army. This should be followed by a series of dialogues with those most involved - our officers, NCOs, and soldiers - as only they can assure that the senior leadership grasps the views of those who lead soldiers and serve every day¹⁹.

MILITARY RESILIENCE AS A FORCE ENABLER FOR CULTURE CHANGE

Building resilience can create a virtuous circle because it can help CAF members to cope with difficult situations such as culture change and build their capacity to tackle them. Resilience, when worked upon by military members, becomes a renewable health resource for military organizations. Resilience gives us the strength to face challenges, the courage to take risks, and the confidence to learn from our mistakes.²⁰ By working on resilience, military members can create a positive cycle of growth and self-improvement. It also encourages them to seek out new experiences and strengthen their physical, social, and emotional well-being. This helps them to build meaningful connections with their environment and the people around them, which can provide mutual support and understanding for tackling difficult situations. This cycle of resilience, connection, and growth can help military members become more successful in their careers by improving their coping skills and providing them with a supportive network. With resilience, members of the CAF can create a virtuous circle of strength and growth, allowing them to become more capable and better equipped to handle culture change and other difficult situations. Mileham argues that a clearly defined moral relationship is required to ensure that the "leader defines and

¹⁵ Locke, 'The Change Handbook: The Definitive Resource on Today's Best Methods for Engaging Whole Systems'.

¹⁶ Ouellet, 'LA TRANSFORMATION DES FORCES CANADIENNES : La Quête de l'insaisissable Efficacité'.

¹⁷ 'The Change Handbook; Group Methods for Shaping the Future'.

¹⁸ 'The Change Handbook; Group Methods for Shaping the Future'.

¹⁹ Capstick, 'DEFINING THE CULTURE: THE CANADIAN ARMY IN THE 21ST CENTURY'.

²⁰ Britt, Sinclair, and McFadden, 'Introduction: The Meaning and Importance of Military Resilience'.

personifies the moral responsibility for his own and others' actions and the consequences."²¹ He goes on to say that all leaders, from the corporal to the Commander-in-Chief, will need to develop a new sort of moral toughness and a better intellectual grasp of the issues than in the past because the information and knowledge revolution is increasing our reliance on virtual reality exponentially, "which can cause moral divergence from reality."²²

The CAF should foster and encourage diversity and inclusivity of women at all levels of the hierarchy, as they possess both physical and psychological abilities that are necessary to implement the CAF's culture transformation strategy. As stated by Nindl et al: "Specific to the demands of combat, women are better at making logical decisions under stressful conditions without the negative interactions caused by testosterone which increases the activity of brain areas associated with impulse control and distractibility".²³ We connect available actions to resilience by claiming that actors are more resilient if they have a greater diversity of actions available or, equivalently, a larger 'option space'.²⁴ Diversity is an intuitive surrogate for resilience: the more different things a system has, the better its capacity to respond to disturbances or change.²⁵

Women tend to be more emotionally expressive than men, which can help them to better manage their feelings. "Expressing emotions can be a helpful way to process difficult experiences and to make sense of them. It can also help women to build emotional resilience, as it allows them to understand their feelings and to develop coping strategies to handle them."²⁶ In terms of mental resilience, after controlling for reports of prior life stressors and sexual harassment during deployment, Vogt et al. reported "no gender differences in the association between several types of deployment stressors including combat exposure and PTSD. In fact, men are 5 times more likely to use alcohol as a coping mechanism, and become alcohol dependent or diagnosed with an antisocial personality disorder."²⁷ Many men find it difficult to express their emotions, leading to feelings of being overwhelmed and unable to handle difficult situations. While the capability of a soldier's performance is ultimately grounded at the cellular level, performance will be suboptimal if the soldier is unable to develop coping mechanisms to handle a changing operational environment.²⁸ Women are typically more compassionate and empathetic than men, enabling them to be more understanding and supportive of others. This can also help them to stay strong when faced with hardships, as they are able to recognize the difficulties of those around them. Furthermore, these qualities help women to build strong relationships, which is a key aspect of developing resilience.

ESTABLISH CONDITIONS FOR CULTURE CHANGE BUY-IN

The military chain of command has to create the institutional conditions that make military change possible, not in imposing it: innovation cannot be decreed. Brenneman asserts that "The key to

²¹ English, *Understanding Military Culture: A Canadian Perspective*.

²² English.

²³ Nindl et al., 'Perspectives on Resilience for Military Readiness and Preparedness: Report of an International Military Physiology Roundtable'.

²⁴ Bousquet et al., 'Resilience and Development: Mobilizing for Transformation'.

²⁵ Lade, Walker, and Haider, 'Resilience as Pathway Diversity: Linking Systems, Individual, and Temporal Perspectives on Resilience'.

²⁶ Jordan, 'Women and Empathy: Implications for Psychological Development and Psychotherapy'.

²⁷ Nindl et al., 'Perspectives on Resilience for Military Readiness and Preparedness: Report of an International Military Physiology Roundtable'.

²⁸ Nindl et al.

getting results is not to tell people what to do. Instead, find ways to keep them focused on the right things, and for the most part, let them figure out how to achieve the goals.”²⁹

The effectiveness of implementation can be increased if the advantages of an incremental and continuous approach to implementation were recognized. This helps to avoid the risks of stop and go, long periods of stagnation and blockage, followed by short periods of disruption and innovation.³⁰ Furthermore, a more gradual and less fragmented approach has its drawbacks: it can be difficult to manage; spread out over too much time, it can lose its initial coherence; drifting in different directions, it can become opaque and difficult to decipher and steer; it may lack ambition at the outset and leave intact systemic logics that limit the substance of change.³¹ It can also move at the pace of the stakeholders involved and according to the possibilities and constraints of their particular context, and, under certain conditions, be an opportunity for individual and collective learning.

Starting with securing success is beneficial. For actors of institutional change implementation, pragmatic legitimacy is essential. For junior officers and NCOs, insofar as a policy calls for significant changes in their practices, pragmatic legitimacy, concerning the feasibility or practicality of a desired change, will be central and will influence their mobilization or resistance³². As mentioned by Chinn: “Leaders of successful defense transformations resist the urge to reorganize; they focus first on securing successes that can make a big difference to the momentum of a program. They specifically aim to achieve quick wins, often through targeted pilots, over the first three to six months. Many of these initial successes can then be turned into transformational change across the organization”³³.

RELATIONSHIP WITH ACTORS AS A FORCE ENABLER FOR CULTURE CHANGE

Employee engagement is essential for the successful implementation of a strategic change such as providing employees with opportunities to be involved in the change process, such as offering feedback and input. It would be wrong to consider actors operating in various practice contexts as mere executors tasked with faithfully implementing policies thought up and imposed from above according to traditional top-down approaches. In fact, they enjoy a relative autonomy that they seek to maintain and increase (depending on their interests, their understanding of the situation and their values), and exercise their professional judgment in various ways³⁴.

Involving the members in the decision-making process can enable the process. This can be done by creating a committee that includes members from all levels of the military organization. This committee should be given the responsibility of coming up with solutions to the problem and giving feedback on the proposed change. By involving the employees in the decision-making process, they will feel that their opinions are valued and taken into consideration, which will make them more likely to support the change. As stated by Col Capstick in the Canadian Army journal: The goal of a committee is to administer the Army's discussion on military culture in a formal manner. To do this, the committee will initiate conversations, host conferences, symposia, and focus groups to create a comprehensive plan of action. Additionally, this committee is responsible for providing advice on the priority of the policy

²⁹ Carpenter and ARMY WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS PA, ‘Army Organizational Culture of Innovation: A Strategic Imperative for Transformation’.

³⁰ Acemoglu, Egorov, and Sonin, ‘Institutional Change and Institutional Persistence’.

³¹ Acemoglu, Egorov, and Sonin.

³² Capstick, ‘DEFINING THE CULTURE: THE CANADIAN ARMY IN THE 21ST CENTURY’.

³³ Chinn, ‘Five Principles to Manage Change in the Military’.

³⁴ Nelson, ‘Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis’.

reviews discussed previously. This team should consist of current officers, NCOs, soldiers, and knowledgeable members of the academic and retired communities.³⁵

Duty with honor³⁶ also makes us understand that there is an important element that affects the relationship between officers and NCO. The roles and responsibilities of each one transform as the context of leadership shifts in response to the demands of social contexts and operations³⁷. Therefore, officers have to delegate a bit more of their authority to the NCOs and thus, potentially, share some of their authority and responsibility with them. As experienced during counterinsurgency operations conducted in Afghanistan in 2010, the command teams of the tactical group had agreed to "decentralize leadership and delegate it to the NCOs, in order to give them more flexibility and speed of action," so that they could carry out their missions. The decision-making role no longer exclusively belongs to the officer corps and the technical role is no longer exclusively in the hands of the NCOs which represents a shift in culture. Furthermore, this situation strengthens the identity of the NCOs as professionals who "apply this expertise competently and objectively in the course of their missions" within the profession of arms.

Moreover, the unpredictable nature of operations calls for increased reliance on junior officers and NCOs autonomy as a leader. Junior officers and NCOs are being delegated increased responsibilities in various operations where their actions have tactical and operational implications. Not only must they adapt physically, but they must also adapt philosophically to changes occurring in the operational and strategic environment in order to take logical actions despite an unpredictable situation. This represents a paradigm, a culture change³⁸. Indeed, NCOs must now depart from their traditional role which was to rely solely on the authority of the officers' corps and resort to their own authority and own decision-making. This concerns the way MRs, as leaders, manage to communicate with members of the organization and influence group adherence to culture change. But the difficulty of adapting to the culture does not rest on the shoulders of young officers who are just starting to understand the institutional culture. The issue is reforming the view and groupthink of mid-to senior-level officers in the military. Usually, these higher-ranking officers are deeply rooted in the existing military culture, where creativity is not rewarded, but instead, a narrow-minded emphasis on tasks, conditions, and standards is. The current military culture emphasizes mastery of basic skills and achieving immediate objectives more than fresh ideas.³⁹ The challenge here is for strategic leaders to understand the requirement of this shift in institutional culture, explain what the new culture should be, and mentor organizational leaders while leading by example through their actions.

To get employee buy-in during an institutional change is to clearly communicate the rationale for the change. It is important to explain the objectives and the expected outcomes of the change. It is also important to explain how it will benefit the organization and the employees. When the employees understand the reasons behind the change, they are more likely to accept it and be willing to cooperate.⁴⁰ Even though participation can be problematic it remains that the implementation will be all the more successful if its main artisans have had the opportunity to discuss its moral, cognitive and practical foundations throughout the life of the policy, and have had the opportunity to participate in the management or resolution of the tensions inherent in any educational policy.⁴¹ A collaborative approach to policy making, from their manufacture to their implementation and evaluation by the stakeholders, and

³⁵ Capstick, 'DEFINING THE CULTURE: THE CANADIAN ARMY IN THE 21ST CENTURY'.

³⁶ *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*.

³⁷ *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*.

³⁸ Britt, Sinclair, and McFadden, 'Introduction: The Meaning and Importance of Military Resilience'.

³⁹ Carpenter and ARMY WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS PA, 'Army Organizational Culture of Innovation: A Strategic Imperative for Transformation'.

⁴⁰ Carpenter and ARMY WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS PA.

⁴¹ Albrow and Ivey, 'Changing Culture with Culture at the US Naval Academy'.

first and foremost by all ranking members of the military, is a key ingredient for successful change management. This ensures a greater likely adherence, or at least minimizes the risks of resistance, rejection or dilution of the policy. We would in fact be well advised not to consider any discussion of one aspect or another of a policy as a manifestation of "corporatist" or even irrational resistance.⁴² It would be more appropriate to take into account the experiential knowledge of the actors and, within learning communities, to confront them with the expert knowledge derived from serious and convergent research.

SUPPORT TO MEMBERS DURING CULTURE CHANGE

Establishing support systems can help ensure that the change is implemented successfully. This includes providing training, resources, and feedback mechanisms to help employees understand and embrace the change. It's important to monitor progress throughout the implementation process to ensure that the change is successful. This includes regularly assessing the impact of the change and adjusting as needed.

Providing training and support to the employees enables change buy-in. Change can be difficult and it is important for the employees to understand how the change will affect their work. It is important to provide the employees with the necessary training to help them understand the new procedures and processes. It is also important to provide support to the employees during the change process.⁴³ This can be done by providing clear direction, answering questions, and ensuring that the employees have the resources they need to succeed. One way to modify these perceptions is to create mentor-mentee links. In Waruszynski et al.'s (2018) study, women expressed the desire and highlighted the need for mentorship programs in the armed forces, but lamented the lack of available women to take on this role.⁴⁴ Thus, while mentorship tends to promote the well-being of women in the workplace, the lack of women in high-level positions in the armed forces who can serve as mentors is a cause for concern.

It is important to recognize and reward employees for their hard work and dedication to the change process. This can be done through incentives, bonuses, or positive reinforcement. Rewarding employees for their efforts will help to motivate them and encourage them to continue to support the change. The military needs to equip its leaders with the necessary skills and mechanisms to foster transformation and reward creative ideas. To ensure junior officers are comfortable in this new atmosphere, they must be confident in the knowledge that their senior officers are providing them with strong guidance, as well as backing their decisions⁴⁵. By providing mentorship and offering useful feedback on both successes and failures, senior officers will create a safe space for junior officers to take calculated risks⁴⁶. It is important to track the progress of the change and make sure that it is moving in the right direction. If adjustments are needed, it is important to make them quickly and effectively. By following these steps, organizations can ensure that employees are on board with the change and are willing to support it.⁴⁷ Getting employee buy-in is essential for successful organizational change and can help to ensure that the change is implemented successfully.

⁴² Capstick, 'DEFINING THE CULTURE: THE CANADIAN ARMY IN THE 21ST CENTURY'.

⁴³ den Hartog, Boselie, and Paauwe, 'Performance Management: A Model and Research Agenda'.

⁴⁴ Waruszynski, 'Women Serving in the Canadian Armed Forces: Strengthening Military Capabilities and Operational Effectiveness'.

⁴⁵ Whelan-Berry and Somerville, 'Linking Change Drivers and the Organizational Change Process: A Review and Synthesis'.

⁴⁶ Carpenter and ARMY WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS PA, 'Army Organizational Culture of Innovation: A Strategic Imperative for Transformation'.

⁴⁷ Whelan-Berry and Somerville, 'Linking Change Drivers and the Organizational Change Process: A Review and Synthesis'.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is clear that, in exploring culture change acceptance, this essay has shown that the lack of buy-in in implementing culture change needs to be addressed by CAF leaders and that different strategic institutional measures can be taken to combat this challenge by enhancing CAF culture change buy-in effectiveness

The failure of cultural change in a military context can be attributed to a number of factors, including resistance from the leadership and the subordinates, a lack of resources and expertise to implement and sustain change initiatives, and the rigid hierarchical structure of military culture. The commitment to tradition and belief that the current system is effective is one of the primary reasons for resistance from the leadership and subordinates, while the risk of making major changes in an organization with national security responsibility can lead to the additional resistance. Additionally, the rigid hierarchical structure of military culture and the lack of resources and expertise to implement and sustain change initiatives can lead to the failure of cultural change initiatives in a military context.

While the barriers to change may sometimes be the result of issues such as legal or regulatory, or economic or financial limitations, the literature clearly shows that the most common and significant barrier to organizational change can be attributed to human behavior. This recognition that individual-level behavior is fundamental to any organizational change effort has resulted in a great deal of attention being given to the phenomenon of resistance to change⁴⁸. Many have concluded that managing resistance to change is perhaps the most important aspect of the change process⁴⁹.

Given the challenges of implementing cultural change in a military context, it is clear that resources and expertise are needed in order to successfully implement and sustain change initiatives. The military must be willing to invest in the necessary resources and expertise in order to ensure that any change initiatives are successful. Additionally, the leadership and subordinates must be open to change and willing to accept and embrace the new initiatives in order for them to be successful. Without resources, expertise, and a commitment to change, any attempt at cultural change in a military context is likely to fail.

⁴⁸ Piderit, 'Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes toward an Organizational Change'.

⁴⁹ Bovey and Hede, 'Resistance to Organizational Change the Role of Cognitive and Affective Processes', 2001.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acemoglu, Daron, Georgy Egorov, and Konstantin Sonin. 'Institutional Change and Institutional Persistence'. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*. St. Louis: Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis, 2020.
- Albro, R., and B. Ivey. 'Changing Culture with Culture at the US Naval Academy'. In *Cultural Awareness in the Military*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2014.
- Bousquet, Francois, Aurélie Botta, Luca Alinovi, Olivier Barreteau, Deborah Bossio, Katrina Brown, Patrick Caron, et al. 'Resilience and Development: Mobilizing for Transformation'. *Ecology and Society* 21, no. 3 (2016): 40.
- Bovey, Wayne H., and Andy Hede. 'Resistance to Organizational Change the Role of Cognitive and Affective Processes'. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 22, no. 8 (2001): 372–82.
- 'Resistance to Organizational Change the Role of Cognitive and Affective Processes'. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 22, no. 8 (2001): 372–82.
- Britt, Thomas W., Robert R. Sinclair, and Anna C. McFadden. 'Introduction: The Meaning and Importance of Military Resilience'. In *Building Psychological Resilience in Military Personnel: Theory and Practice*, edited by Thomas W. Britt and Robert R. Sinclair, 3–17. Washington;US;DC; American Psychological Association, 2013.
- Capstick, Col. 'Defining the Culture: The Canadian Army in the 21st Century', 9 Jun 16, <http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo4/no1/doc/v4n1-p47-53-eng.pdf>
- Carpenter, Martin T. 'Army Organizational Culture of Innovation: A Strategic Imperative for Transformation', March 2006. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA449358.pdf>
- Chinn, David. 'Five Principles to Manage Change in the Military', n.d.
- Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*, n.d.
- English, Allan D. *Understanding Military Culture: A Canadian Perspective*. Book, Whole. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.
- Hartog, Deanne N. den, Paul Boselie, and Jaap Paauwe. 'Performance Management: A Model and Research Agenda'. *Applied Psychology* 53, no. 4 (2004): 556–69.
- Hill, Andrew. 'Military Innovation and Military Culture'. *Parameters (Carlisle, Pa.)* 45, no. 1 (2015): 85–85.
- Jordan, Judith. 'Women and Empathy: Implications for Psychological Development and Psychotherapy', n.d.
- Lade, Steven J., Brian H. Walker, and L. Jamila Haider. 'Resilience as Pathway Diversity: Linking Systems, Individual, and Temporal Perspectives on Resilience'. *Ecology and Society* 25, no. 3 (2020): 19.
- Locke, Lisa. 'The Change Handbook: The Definitive Resource on Today's Best Methods for Engaging Whole Systems'. *Group Facilitation*, no. 8 (2007): 38.

- Nelson, Richard R. 'Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis'. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management* 16, no. 1 (1997): 176–78.
- Nindl, Bradley C., Daniel C. Billing, Jace R. Drain, Meaghan E. Beckner, Julie Greeves, Herbert Groeller, Hilde K. Teien, et al. 'Perspectives on Resilience for Military Readiness and Preparedness: Report of an International Military Physiology Roundtable'. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport* 21, no. 11 (2018): 1116–24.
- OREN, IDO. 'Is Culture Independent of National Security?: How America's National Security Concerns Shaped 'Political Culture' Research'. *European Journal of International Relations* 6, no. 4 (2000): 543–73.
- Ouellet, Eric. 'LA TRANSFORMATION DES FORCES CANADIENNES : La Quête de l'insaisissable Efficacité', n.d.
- Piderit, Sandy Kristin. 'Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes toward an Organizational Change'. *The Academy of Management Review* 25, no. 4 (2000): 783–94.
- 'The Change Handbook; Group Methods for Shaping the Future'. *Reference and Research Book News* 15, no. 1 (2000).
- Waruszynski, Barbara. 'Women Serving in the Canadian Armed Forces: Strengthening Military Capabilities and Operational Effectiveness', n.d.
- Whelan-Berry, Karen S., and Karen A. Somerville. 'Linking Change Drivers and the Organizational Change Process: A Review and Synthesis'. *Journal of Change Management* 10, no. 2 (2010): 175–93.