CANADIAN MILITARY FAMILIES: SEPARATION RESILIENCE AND PEACETIME DEPLOYMENTS

CANADIAN MILITARY FAMILIES: SEPARATION RESILIENCE AND PEACETIME DEPLOYMENTS

By

IRENE DIERYCK, B.A., B.S.W., R.S.W.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Social Work

McMaster University

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE

MASTER OR SOCIAL WORK (2003)   McMaster University

(Social Work)   Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Canadian Military Families: Separation Resilience and
                         Peacetime Deployments

AUTHOR: Irene Dieryck
                         B.A., B.S.W., R.S.W. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Susan M. Watt, DSW

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 156

ABSTRACT

Military families face a unique lifestyle that brings with it a series of stressors not experienced by the general civilian population. These include frequent moves, adjusting to the military subculture, and family separations. Family separations are especially stressful, as military spouses and parents are deployed for peacetime missions and training. However, the resilience and strengths-based literature has shown that most families are able to successfully cope with adversity. Further, structural changes to the military and family environment can increase family resilience. This is the crux of 'Occupational Social Work' in the military wherein lies the responsibility to balance the needs of the individual, families, or other groups, with the needs of the military. In addition, policy development that is informed by research needs to form a significant part of 'Occupational Social Work' practice. This thesis is an exploratory work to further Occupational Social Work knowledge and practice and to stimulate further research on the effects of deployments on military families. This study also examines how Canadian military families cope with the deployment of their spouses by utilizing the Deployment Resilience Scale created by Major Adrian Van Breda on the South African Defence Force and by engaging in personal interviews in an attempt to explore family resilience in the Canadian military, and the usefulness of the Deployment Resilience Scale as a predictive tool. Findings show that, overall, Canadian military families have an average level of resilience. The area of lowest resilience appeared in family 'financial preparation' and military 'family-oriented management'. Military social workers need to be alert to potential difficulties with military deployments on the individual, family, and organizational levels. Historically military families relied on each other, friends and neighbours for support, usually only in dire circumstances. Currently, it appears that military families rely more on military formal and informal services, however, dissatisfaction with the gaps in service, and the military system of service delivery may be a indication that families are moving away from the 'rugged individual' ethos. It appears that military families acknowledge the mutually interdependent relationship between families and the military as an employer. Military occupational social workers need to encourage a healthy balance between employer and employees by using an ecological, strengths-based resiliency model of practice, and by developing appropriate assessment tools to track progress and identify areas of both health and concern.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Canadian Military Families: Separation Resilience and Peacetime Deployments

**"A comprehensive family focus characterizes military
Social Work practice."
Harris (1993; pp 280)**

1.   Introduction

The events of the past decade have ushered in a new era for Canadian

military families. Previous to this, military families were of secondary concern, if

at all, to the military organizations of many first world nations. In the 1990's,

events such as the Somalia Affair (Winslow, 1998), the 'friendly fire' bombing in

Afghanistan killing four Canadian soldiers (Cheney, 2002), and the

outspokenness of Romeo Dallaire, a retired Canadian Forces Officer afflicted

with Post Traumatic Stress as a result of his experiences on the battlegrounds of

foreign countries (Abbott, 2000), have all sparked new interest in Canadian

military families. Although Canadian literature remains scarce, the Department of

National Defence is currently engaging in research on Canadian military families

and the effects of deployment (Jamieson, 2003). The USA has also strongly

expressed interest in their military families by frequently implementing programs

for military families and by engaging in continuous research in this area (Bell et

al., 1996). In addition, the South African Defence Force has also developed an

interest in military families with a substantial contribution of research on military

families by Major Adrian Van Breda, Head Researcher for the South African

Defence Force. Interestingly, Great Britain has remained silent about their

military families. This is quite interesting given the fact that occupational social

work has its roots in the United Kingdom (Mor Barak and Bargal, 2000) and that British military psychiatry has been in existence since 1904 (Greenberg et al., 2002).

Military families need to possess high priority status in the military community since their impact on military readiness and effectiveness is prodigious. The uniqueness of the military lifestyle and its incumbent stressors on military families warrants individual, local, and national concern, as well as a place in the political arena. As the following will show, the work/family interface has had a long history of mutual tension and only in very recent times has this tension been addressed, albeit inconsistently, by the private sector, governments, and researchers.

1.1   The Work/Family Interface in a Military Context

The Industrial Revolution marked the beginning of a social phenomenon whereby families were increasingly separated from their places of work. Domestic life and employment for wages have been split, supporting the long-standing belief that work and families operate in two different spheres (Kamerman, 1979; Popoff et al., 1986; Holder and Anderson, 1989; Akabas, 1990; and MacDermid and Targ, 1995; Barnett, 1996). In addition, North American culture has long supported the notion of the 'rugged individual' (Walsh, 1998) that also applies to families and other entities trying to survive in a highly competitive, capitalist system.   One organization that has traditionally been closed to the families of its employees, and thrives on the 'rugged individual'

2

ethos, is the military. This ethos comes into direct conflict with recent findings that military families, especially spouses of military members, have a prodigious impact on combat readiness, effectiveness, and retention (Jensen et al., 1986; Kirkland and Katz, 1989; Amen et al., 1988; Rosen, et al., 1989; Knox and Price, 1995; and Finn, 1987). In addition, from the perspective of the soldier, Bartone and Adler's (1999) study revealed that there is a higher level of unit cohesion if a soldier believes his family is being well taken care of while he is on deployment. This raises the issue of the Canadian Forces' (CF) investment in families and for the purposes of this thesis, family separation resilience in the context of military deployments for peacetime missions. More specifically, based on Van Breda's (1999) research on family resilience and routine separations, can Van Breda's Deployment Resilience Scale, for peacetime, unaccompanied deployments, be a useful tool, adjusted for the Canadian military context, to expose areas of individual, family and organizational functioning that require attention and possible intervention? And how can military occupational social workers use this information to further facilitate the balance between individual, family and organizational needs and to inform family policy and social work practice within the CF?

1.2 The Military and Military Families

It has only been since Hill's (1949) classic study on families with returning military husbands/fathers that military planners in North America have begun to look at the influence of families on military personnel (in Rienerth, 1978;

McCubbin et al., 1976) and the mutual impact between these families and the military itself. Since some militaries have moved to an 'all volunteer' force (USA see Hunter, 1982; Canada see Department of National Defence, 2002; South Africa see Van Breda, 1999) many military personnel have chosen to have life partners and create their own families (Hunter, 1977; Hiew, 1992; Segal and Segal, 1993) rendering militarism as primarily a 'single man's occupation' a thing of the past. Traditionally, the military has upheld the 'survival of the fittest' framework that requires personnel and their families to adapt to their environment, especially their workplace (Segal, 1986). For civilians, Employee Assistance Programs (EAP) were instituted to assist families and individuals with adaptation to the work environment and productivity, effectively locating any problems within the individual and/or their family (Googins and Davidson, 1993). Much of the past and current research with military personnel focuses on individual traits rather than a 'person in environment' framework. For example, David and Orton (1981) state that the key variable in 'military family' health is the emotional stability of the mother (the left behind spouse). Britt, et al. (2001) focus on individual personality traits and the ability to derive meaning and benefit from military-induced stressful experiences. Thus, the focus remains on individuals to adapt to the organization.

The military 'takes care of its own' (Hunter, 1982) by having its own version of EAP programs specifically designed for military personnel called Member Assistance Programs (MAP's) (Government of Canada, 2002).

4

However, military and civilian families are still expected to adapt to the workplace and only recently, since the mass insurgence of women into the workforce, has the workplace even begun to look at ways to adapt to the needs of families (Hunter, 1978aa). For example, Kelley et al. (1994) discuss the dramatic rise in female military personnel, which necessitated the study of the effects of military deployments on female personnel and their children.

1.3   Family Readiness and Military Deployments

From this discussion of military personnel and their families adapting to the military lifestyle, comes the question of family readiness defined by Burke and Moskos (1996) as "a family's ability to positively adapt to and/or effectively deal with the stressors associated with military duties and a military lifestyle" (pp 1). The military lifestyle for most CF members requires routine separations and reunions, which can exact a heavy toll on the left-behind spouse (Hunter, et al., 1981) and other family members. Montalvo (1976) discussed how the workplace influences family, identity, and decisions, and since military families are part of the military subculture, work and personnel are not as sharply segregated as in civilian life. It is acknowledged here that there are other occupations that require family adults to leave home on a regular basis. Some of these are business executives, salespeople, politicians, and those in transportation. However, most militaries around the world have engaged in specific research to understand the needs of the military family, thus, information is more readily available for this population (Riggs, 1990).

1.4   Personal Interest in this Research

As a new Lieutenant, hired to provide social work services in the CF, it is of great interest to me how families survive and even thrive under the pressures of military life. Some of these pressures include frequent relocation, unaccompanied and accompanied deployments, and fitting in with the military subculture, especially if residing on a military base. Given Canada's commitment to peacekeeping around the world and to their heavy investment in trained personnel, many CF personnel are deployed for extended periods of time, 3-6 months or longer, for training and other peacetime missions. As a future occupational social worker with the Canadian military, it is incumbent upon me to attempt a full understanding of the interface between military families and the CF in order to facilitate a mutually beneficial relationship based on 'best practice' policies and interventions.

1.5   Purpose of this Research

The purpose of this research is to understand, in the context of the Canadian military, what resiliency factors are present in military families, who endure unaccompanied peacetime deployments of the adult partner (typically it is the male) and exploring the potential of the Deployment Resilience Scale as a predictive social work tool. In addition, given the findings of this research, implications for occupational social work in the military context will be brought to the fore in an attempt to increase understanding of the relationship between Canadian military families and the Canadian Forces. It is noted here that the

6

military is comprised of various occupations that renders it difficult to compare all CF personnel as though they were a single occupational group (Truscott and Flemming, 1986), however, the military lifestyle, regardless of military occupation, impacts all military families.

1.6   Plan of this Thesis

Using Van Breda's research (1997, 1997a, 1999) on family resilience in the South African Navy, this thesis will add to Occupational Social Work's understanding of military families and separation resilience in the Canadian context. It will also explore the possibility of utilizing Van Breda's Deployment Resilience Scale to track the effects of deployment on families over time, and to better understand their strengths and needs. Section Two will provide the assumptions made and the philosophical underpinnings of this study as well as a literature review grounding this research in resilience theory, which incorporates developmental, ecosystemic, and strengths-based theory. Occupational social work theory is also included.   In addition, further contextualization of this work is discussed in terms of military deployments, military families and deployment issues, as well as military social work in both the Canadian and US contexts given the cultural parallels between the two countries. Further, since the USA has generated the greatest amount of literature on military families and deployment issues, this material will be used extensively where Canadian literature is unavailable. Material from South Africa will also be used given the

similarity in military cultures and family deployment issues. Finally, both general and specific questions are raised as a result of the literature review.

Section Three will outline and discuss the 'mixed methods' framework; Van Breda's (1999) self-administered questionnaire (Deployment Resilience Scale) to gather quantitative data; and a semi-structured interview to gather qualitative data. The sample used and how the data was processed will also be described. Section Four will present the results of the data and provide a data analysis. Section Five will present a discussion of the findings in the context of the Canadian military, and the theoretical frameworks used, provide a critical analysis of this research, and discuss the implications for occupational social work practice within the CF as well as policy implications. Finally, Section Six will present the final conclusions in summary form. Appendices are also added, including a Glossary of Terms, to facilitate the reader's understanding.

2.   Literature Review

Serious study concerning the military family began after World War Two (WWII) when returning veterans and their families came to the attention of the mental health community. Hill, in 1949, published his classic study about family reintegration issues with returning prisoners of war (POW's) (McCubbin and Dahl, 1976; McCubbin et al., 1976; Rienerth, 1978) as a result of his realization that returning veterans and their families would experience family disruption upon reunion and the mental health community needed to be prepared (McCubbin et al., 1976). After WWII when the US Armed Forces shifted to an all volunteer force (AVF) (Hunter, 1982) and the Canadian Forces expanded its military to a larger AVF, military personnel were not as segregated from civilian society as in the past when militarism was primarily a single man's occupation (Segal and Harris, 1993; Knox and Price, 1995), and when one's person was entirely co-opted by his employer. Militaries had to come to terms with the fact that families were now an integral part of the military system and had considerable influence on military readiness and effectiveness (Kirkland and Katz, 1989; Finn, 1987), retention of qualified personnel (Dingle Associates, 1980; Amen et al., 1988), and soldier health and performance (Segal and Segal, 1993). This review examines past and current research about military families from WWII to the present. In addition, each section of the review discusses a unique aspect of this research to provide several lenses with which to view the military family.

Section 2.3 discusses assumptions to keep this project manageable, and also the philosophical underpinnings to provide a wider perspective. Section 2.4 discusses theoretical frameworks, derived mainly from the social work literature, to provide the general frameworks with which to view military families. Section 2.5 provides information about the Canadian military in order for the reader to be able to situate the military family. Section 2.6 describes the area of deployment and the processes involved that impact the military family. Section 2.7 discusses military families in the context of the previous sections. Section 2.8 briefly discusses social work in the military, and Section 2.9 contrasts the CF with the South African Defence Force to highlight some similarities and differences between them. Since there is no cross-cultural component to this research, similarities between Canada, South Africa, the USA, and other first world nations must be considered as this study is done within this context. Last, Section 2.10 outlines the research questions that arose from this literature review.

2.1   Introduction to the Literature Review

Since Hill's (1949) study, research has focused on the impact on military wives who experienced husband absence for both peacetime and other significantly dangerous deployments (Milgram and Bar, 1993). Much of the research on military families, both Regular and Reserve force has been produced by the USA. This is not surprising given their large and very active military both nationally and internationally (Stafford and Grady, 2003). Conversely, the Canadian Forces has been far less prominent since WWII making deployments

of military personnel primarily a function of training and/or peacekeeping, and high risk peacekeeping missions (DND/CF: Backgrounder: CF Joint Operations Group, 2000). One factor that is common in most militaries today is, the majority of military personnel is now partnered and have their own families (Hiew, 1992; Stafford and Grady, 2003). Hunter (1982) and Bowen et al. (1992) documented the typical military family that consists of the military man married to a civilian wife, usually with children. Further, much research also exists about the effects of deployment on 'left behind' children, and the effects of the 'left behind' wife on the children (Hunter and Hickman, 1981a). Although the more traditional heterosexual step-family and nuclear family is slowly decreasing in number, the majority of military families continue to be made up of this constellation (Hiew, 1992; and Bowen et al., 1992). In the CF, 66% of Regular Force members are married, and 40% of Reserve Force members are married (NDHQ Group, 2003). Reserve forces have fewer married personnel because of the younger age groups employed, many of whom are secondary and post-secondary school students.

2.2   Purpose of this Review

The purpose of this review is to provide both an historical timeline of the progression of research literature on the military family and to effectively situate this study in its historical context. In addition, to provide a greater depth of understanding, the social context of the experiences of the military family since WWII needs to be illuminated in order to better understand the complex

relationship between the military family and the military organization that can provide both family hardship and alleviation, often times simultaneously (Nichols, 1980; and Department of the Air Force, 1980). A third purpose of this review is to highlight the theoretical bases that have previously and recently informed policy and practice, in the mental health and social work contexts, concerning military families.

2.3   Assumptions and Perspective

In the interest of producing a manageable study some assumptions are necessary. From the readings about family resilience, and military culture in general in Canada, the USA, and South Africa, conversations with Canadian military personnel, and my own military experiences, there are identifiable common denominators. First, all three cultures continue to be grounded in traditional European ideology. An example of this is the still prevalent 'protestant work ethic' as described by Max Weber in his book "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" published in 1905 (Weber, 1958). Second, each nation's military culture continues to be fairly grounded in this ethic because of its continuous focus on 'readiness.' And third, the distinction between military and civilian persists, however, it is more pronounced in the Regular force than in the Reserve force (Knox and Price, 1999). Additional exploration of this issue by Finn (1987), found that research results on Canadian military families paralleled those of the United States. Van Breda (1997a, 1999) also grounds his research in literature mainly from the United States, and a handful of other first world nations,

including Canada. Last, it should be noted that both Canadian and South African militaries engage in peacetime deployments almost exclusively.

2.3.1   Assumptions

The primary assumption underlying this research is that families are resilient and that in an appropriate social environment, i.e. supportive, nurturing, and conducive to raising children without unnecessary hardships, most families can survive and even thrive. This is also true for military families, who have already shown that their divorce rates are more stable and lower than the national rates (Walker, 1994). It is also assumed that military families use hardship to strengthen family bonds and create relationship patterns that accommodate both the family and the military organization. These assumptions are congruent with the literature.

Traditionally, people, whether singular or in groups, have been viewed through the lenses of psychopathology.   In the military this was evident in Lagrones' 1978 article, 'The military family syndrome' which has since been revisited by Morrison (1981), Fernandez-Pol (1988), and Jensen et al. (1991) who found military families comparable to civilian families in levels of psychopathology. This study follows the example of other researchers (Antonovsky, 1998; McCubbin et al., 1998; and Saleebey, 1997) who have viewed people through the lenses of salutogenesis, a term coined by Antonovsky (in McCubbin et al., 1998) meaning viewing people from a health perspective to counter balance the long tradition of 'dis-easing' people by creating skewed and

inaccurate perceptions of both individuals and groups. The third assumption is that practice and policy, in both social work and the mental health field in general, designed to assist people through their difficulties, is ill informed by models based mainly on human pathology. To correct this imbalance salutogenic, strengths and resilience models of human functioning needs to dominate both research and practice in the human services arena in order to facilitate change in social and organizational policy that have traditionally been antagonistic towards individuals and families. Fourth, the assumption is made that the Canadian military has traditionally viewed its personnel through the same lens as their American counterparts. That is, through the lens of pathology, especially if the CF employee and/or his family were experiencing difficulty adjusting to the military lifestyle and its demands. Only recently have militaries begun the process of making organizational changes to accommodate people rather than continuing the dehumanizing process of molding people to fit the organization.

Fifth, the Canadian and American militaries differ in some respects (Enloe, 1997); however, this research is done within the context of the overall mission of the AVF's in all first world nations, which is 'combat readiness and effectiveness.' Further, since the Canadian and American militaries work closely together (Gaffen, 1995; CFAO 20-45), it is assumed that the general military culture of both nations is similar enough to apply many American findings on military families to Canadian military families. In addition, since this research is based on a study from the South African Defence Force, it is also assumed that Canadian

and South African military families are also similar enough, in the context of the militaries overall mission with an AVF, to warrant the application of the family resilience literature to Canadian military families. In addition, this research is intended to contribute to social work understanding without the cross-cultural analysis that would have added an important, but not necessarily vital, piece of understanding; however, that is beyond the scope of this thesis.

2.3.2 Philosophical Underpinnings

The philosophy underlying this research is congruent with the strengths and resilience based perspective on people and their families. Historically, in many cultures, especially those of European origin, humans have been seen as adapting to their environment. Darwin's theories on the 'survival of the fittest' exacerbated the notion of the requirement for adaptation to survive and prove superiority in order to control as many resources as possible, including other humans. These notions continue to underlie modern day organizations, for example Employee Assistance Programs designed to assist people in adapting to their places of work. Those unable or refusing to adapt were pathologized and no alternate social structures existed to allow these people to genuinely express their own unique strengths and resilience abilities.

In summation, humans do need to adapt to their environment in so far as survival requires it, however, the desire to prove superiority and control resources at the expense of others needs to be transformed from its destructive competitiveness to a model based on 'person in environment' cooperation. This

model is open to organizational and social change, which includes all people, and is, based predominately on human health and designing social structures that focus first and foremost on human needs rather than organizational needs.

2.4 Relevant Theoretical Frameworks

In keeping with the philosophical tenets stated above, the theoretical frameworks used in this study are strengths and resilience based. Further, ecosystemic theory is used to understand individuals, families, and groups within the context of the many environments with which they interact. Developmental theory is used to provide the time dimension as various events effect people in various ways at various times (Walsh, 1998). Last, occupational social work literature is incorporated to highlight the linkages between the realms of the individual, the family, the work place, and the greater environment. Further, this study is an attempt to add understanding to the practice of occupational social work in the context of the Canadian military.

2.4.1 Defining Military Families

For the purposes of this research, the family unit will be understood as any group of people, with or without children, that serves to meet particular human needs. These needs are; physical sustainment, developmental needs, love and acceptance, and having the family function as a support unit to enable participation in the larger society (Adams in Akabas, 1990). Walsh (1998) discusses the "postmodern family" as being diverse in terms of its structure and culture. The postmodern family can be any mixture of people, including pets that

meet some or all of the needs stated above. Conway-Turner and Cherrin, (1998) define family as, "a group of persons who consider themselves a stable unit and are related to one another by blood, marriage, adoption, or a consensual decision to live together and who provide acknowledged emotional and financial support for members" (pp 48). They go on to describe a wide variety of complex family forms including homosexual, interracial, inter-religious, and intergenerational, as did Hunter (1982) when discussing the changing military family. McCubbin et al. (1997) also discusses the reality of diverse family forms in their studies of resilient families.

However, Canadian military demographics affirm the "modern" family structure. This family structure consists mainly of married or common-law couples, consisting of the traditional family structure with men occupying the primary role as "bread-winner in the family" (Rodman Aronson and Schaler Buchholz, 2001: pp 109), single parent families, and single people who are identified with their family of origin for 'next of kin' purposes. As of August 2002, there were 60,000 full-time and 21,500 Reservist employees in the Canadian Forces (Department of National Defence, 2002a). Approximately 60 to 70% of military personnel are married or common-law and of those, approximately 7 to 9% have both partners in the military. Further, the military is comprised as follows; 13% women (Decima Research, 2000), 5 to 6% visible minorities, 95 to 96% are white and range from lower to upper-middle class, and approximately 35% are French speaking and 65% are English speaking (Canadian Forces,

2002). A note about Common Law relationships in the Canadian military is warranted here. In Canada, Common Law relationships have been recognized as marital relationships since 1966 (Pinch and Fournier, 1977). In addition, these relationships are provided for under the Queen's Regulations and Orders (QR&O's 1.075) and the Canadian Forces Administrative Orders (CFAO 19-41); however, the regulations specify that these relationships must be between those of the opposite sex to be recognized.

As a new Lieutenant in the Canadian Army it is already glaringly apparent that family units comprised of mixtures other than heterosexual, intra-racial, and single parents are scarcely tolerated. If same sex couples and other diverse family structures exist then they are well hidden. Although some military policies are structured to reflect diversity, for example, allowing CF members to name beneficiaries of their choosing on insurance forms, the military culture is clearly of a modernist bent. Woelfel and Savell (1978) documented the trend in the USA military of the increasing numbers of military personnel entering into heterosexual marriages (57.2%). In the CF, 66% of Regular Forces and 40% of Reserve Forces are in heterosexual marriages (NDHQ Group, 2003). In South Africa 48.3% of military personnel are in heterosexual marriages, and 92.3% of men report being in a stable relationship (Van Breda, 2004). In addition, Williams (1978) documented the increase in dual career families in the military as well as single parent families and the concerns they cause for military planners.

Discussions with military personnel over the course of the last two years indicate that these families are also a current issue for the Canadian Forces.

2.4.2 Human Resilience

Human resilience is grounded in several theoretical frameworks that each adds a unique perspective to viewing people primarily with a salutogenic lens as stated above. These frameworks include individual and family resilience theory, the strengths-based perspective in social work theory (including hope theory), and occupational social work theory, all within the context of developmental and ecosystemic frameworks.

2.4.2.1 Individual Resilience

Walsh (1998, pp 4) defines resilience as "the capacity to rebound from adversity strengthened and more resourceful. It is an active process of endurance, self-righting, and growth in response to crisis and challenge." Much has been written about individual resiliency in the past two decades; however, most of this research has focused on children of parents who were mentally ill or who emerged from clinically dysfunctional families (Walsh, 1998). Further, research studies linked children's vulnerability factors to protective factors outside of the child as well, such as families, and other social systems that can support the child through various hardships (Walsh, 1998). Researchers such as Greene, 2002; Greene and Conrad, 2002; Greene and Livingston, 2002, have studied human resiliency as a universal concept, as well as resiliency specific to children and adults. Others, such as Lewis, 2002; Carter, 1999; and Garmezy,

1993 (in Greene, 2002), have studied human resilience in children or adults belonging to a specific population.

Individual resilience has been characterized by a number of traits. Bernard (in Greene, 2002) enumerates some of these in children: ability to form relationships, problem-solve, plan and hope, and develop a sense of identity. Thus, knowing the various protective and risk factors will guide social work practice is designing services (Greene, 2002). Greene (2002) states that "Social workers will need to understand how people positively respond to adverse situations and how to use this knowledge to foster client strengths, adaptation, healing, and self-efficacy" (pp 2), which lies congruent with social work's commitment to mobilize and strengthen people in their struggles to overcome adversity. Last, McCubbin (1988) states that "family strengths are facilitated by personal strengths" (pp 9) thus; knowledge of individual resiliency is one important factor in the study of family resiliency.

2.4.2.2   Family Resilience

McCubbin & McCubbin (1988) define family resilience as "...characteristics, dimensions, and properties of families which help families to be resistant to disruption in the face of change and adaptive in the face of crisis situations." McCubbin et al. (1997) also add the constructs of family 'elasticity' which is the family's ability to maintain its usual functioning after crisis, and family 'buoyancy' which is the family's ability to change its usual patterns of functioning in order to adapt to new circumstances. Further, DeHaan, et al. (2002) views

family resilience as a "process-oriented construct" as does Palmer (1999) who

focuses on the process of resilience, and Walsh (1998) who asserts that family

processes are key to understanding and assisting families as opposed to family

form, which is not a useful focal point. In addition, Burr (1973) and McCubbin et

al. (1970, in Black, 1993) assert that there are two resources that help families

adapt to stress. These are; *integration*, which is defined as, "the strength of a

family's common interest, affection, cohesion, and unity; and *adaptability*, which

is defined as the "family's ability to be flexible in discussion and decision making"

(pp 274). He states that adaptability is the more important of these two

resources.

Walsh (1998) details keys to family resilience, which she grounds in

ecosystemic and developmental theory. These keys are: "Family belief systems;

making meaning of adversity, positive outlook, transcendence and spirituality:

Organizational patterns; flexibility, connectedness, and social and economic

resources: Communication processes; clarity, open emotional expression and

collaborative problem solving" (pp 24). Further, Kirby and Fraser (1997) in their

study of individual resilience, cite three conceptualizations of resilience:

"overcoming the odds," "sustained competence under stress," and "recovery from

trauma" to emphasize that resilience is not equated with invulnerability (pp 14). In

addition, Fraser (1997) states that the concept of resiliency is evolving because

of its complexity and the myriad of factors involved. Greene (2002) in her study

of resilient children also cites an extensive array of resiliency factors under the

broad headings of internal factors, spiritual factors, social skills, and social supports. She continues with outlining the correlates to family resilience, which is generally congruent with Walsh's (1998) keys to family resilience. This speaks to the inextricable link between individual and family resilience factors as family resilience constructs are drawn from individual resiliency research (Hawley and DeHaan, 1996).

Early and GlenMaye (2000) discuss resilient children under the headings, social competence, autonomy, and sense of purpose and future in the broader context of the strengths based perspective in social work. Silberberg (2001) cites Stinnett and DeFrain's Family Strengths Model and the six universal qualities they identify as resiliency factors: "commitment to the family; appreciation and affection for each other; positive communication patterns; enjoyable time together; a sense of spiritual well-being and connection; and the ability to successfully manage stress and crisis." Saleebey (1997) states that the notion of resiliency underpins the strengths based approach to social work practice, which honours "the innate wisdom of the human spirit, and the inherent capacity for transformation of even the most humbled and abused" (pp 3). Antonovsky (in McCubbin et al., 1998) affirms this and also asserts that his SOC (sense of coherence) model is based on salutogenesis rather than pathogenesis and is highly complex when applied to collectives since "groups are both the cause and solution to problems" (pp 17). All of this demonstrates the complexity of identifying both risk and protective factors especially when viewing resiliency

through the lens of the strength based and SOC practice models. Walsh (1996) points out that to understand resiliency in a changing world one must "look for coherence among complexity" (pp 277).

2.4.3 The Life Model and Ecosystemic Social Work Theory

Germain and Gitterman (1980) delineate the 'life model of social work theory' as viewing humans in terms of their interactions with the greater environment. They state that both human needs and difficulties originate in these interactions and are thus congruent with the "social purpose" of social work in the context of the ecological perspective (pp 1-2). Further, Unger and Powell (1991) state that the ecological perspective is essential to developing family supportive environmental linkages, which is also congruent with social work practice and policy efforts.

2.4.3.1 General Principles and its Application to Families

Waller (2001) emphasizes the importance of the relationship between individuals and the social systems with which they interact. This interactional process of adaptation and accommodation is continuous which implies that resilience is "multidimensional and multidetermined" (pp 294). She adds that both family and individual resilience need to be viewed from an ecosystemic perspective to avoid blaming the victim. This perspective prompts social work investigators to identify the conditions under which anyone would rebound making the focus of intervention the reduction of adverse relationships (Benard, 1991 and Garmezy, 1994 in Waller, 2001). Further, Bronfenbrenner (in Meyers et

al., 2002) suggests that an important emphasis in ecological theory is individual

assessment of personal situations as a crucial determinant of behaviour. The

ecological perspective is similarly described and endorsed by Walsh (1998,

1996, 1982), Meyers et al. (2002), Fraser (1997), Greene (2002), Epstein et al.

(1983), Walton (2001), Anderson (1982), Gilgun (1996), and Berry (1997), to

name only a few.

2.4.4 The Developmental Perspective

McCubbin & McCubbin (1988) discuss family resilience in relation to

normative changes. They assert that each developmental period emphasizes a

unique mix of resiliency factors since individuals value different things at different

times. Their study of military families showed that, "families without children

emphasize status, income, "individual skills and abilities," spousal understanding

and caring, the value of leadership, and "a sense of community and community

support." Families with young and school age children emphasize, "...the

importance of community services and religious programs supported by the

military member's sense of fit in the military way of life." Families with

adolescents and young adults emphasize status and income, "the military

members' sense of fitting into the military lifestyle, family support and caring, the

sense of family bonds of unity, and support from the community." Finally, the

empty nest families emphasize "individual coping skills complemented by bonds

of family unity and a sense of community and strong leadership" (pp 252). In

addition, Kirby and Fraser (1997), Greene (2002), Barton (2002), and Walsh

(1998) also emphasize the importance of viewing families and individuals in terms of developmental processes. McCubbin and Lavee (1986) also found that each stage in the family life cycle has specific strengths, thus requiring a different set of supports at each stage. In sum, Walsh (1982) states that normality is a process that needs to be viewed over the life cycle under the lens of the ecosystemic perspective because "families are a transactional system operating over time" (pp 25).

2.4.5 Strengths Based Social Work Practice

Saleebey (1997), an avid proponent of strengths-based practice in social work, discusses strengths-based practice in terms of its versatility, encouragement of collaboration with clients, and its overall approach which honours human wisdom, spirit, and the innate ability to be transformed regardless of the level of abuse suffered. Although Saleebey (1997) acknowledges that his model is still in progress, he is explicit about what strengths-based practice is not; it is not a model whereby people can be automatically pathologized. Some of the principles that Saleebey includes in his perspective are,

> Every individual, group, family and community has strengths; trauma and abuse, illness and struggle may be injurious but they may also be sources of challenge and opportunity; assume that you do not know the upper limits of the capacity to grow and change and take individual, group, and community aspirations seriously; we best serve clients by collaborating with them; and, every environment is full of resources.

> Saleebey, 1997 (pp 12-15)

Strengths-based practice has also been recognized in the field of psychology by Snyder (1993, 2000) in the form of 'Hope Theory'. Snyder (2000) defines hope as "...the sum of perceived capabilities to produce routes to desired goals, along with the perceived motivation to use those routes" (pp 2). Snyder and Rodriguez-Hanley (2000) discuss 'Hope Theory' as a model for working with clients whereby a counsellor works to identify or instill hope in clients to reverse the process towards hopelessness (hope → rage → despair → apathy) (pp 41). In addition, they add that the difference between high and low-hope people is that high-hope people have the skills needed to find "alternative paths to their original goals" (pp 40).

Although this model is somewhat paralleled to a strengths-based model, it has the potential to be used as a medical model locating the problem within the individual while ignoring the individual's social context. However, the concept of hope is an important adjunct to strengths-based practice given that it can be acquired, even in the worst of circumstances, as a construct that sustains and motivates people to continue positive growth. Overall, the concept of resilience "epitomizes" and "operationalizes" the strengths-based perspective (Turner, 2001 pp 442).

2.4.6 Occupational Social Work Theory

Occupational social work is concerned with the relationship between employers and employees, however, there continues to be much ambivalence with regard to the role and loyalties of occupational social workers (OSW) since

the workplace is often viewed as hostile and antagonistic towards social work

ethics (Mor Barak and Bargal, 2000). More specifically, OSW is also concerned

with ameliorating the effects of work conditions on individuals, families, and

employers. Googins and Godfrey (1987 in Iversen, 1998) define OSW as "a field

of practice in which social workers attend to the human and social needs of the

work community by designing and executing appropriate interventions to insure

healthier individuals and environments" (pp 513). Segal (1986) makes the

important point in regard to the competition between the family and the military

for the military employee. She states, "the more the military services adapt to

family needs, the more committed will be both service members and their

families to the institution" (pp 35). According to Peck and Schroeder (1976) and

Lagrone (1978), the family is triangulated between the military and the military

member. Triangulation is used here to mean simply two entities that compete

with each other for the energies and cooperation of a third. According to Segal

(1986) it is generally the family and the military that compete for the employed

member. Akabas (1990) corroborates this by stating that the workplace is like

having another family member since family life is almost completely organized

around it. She also states that the workplace alone cannot solve the social

problem of family and workplace incompatibility. Since the family has a symbiotic

relationship not only with the workplace, but with society as well she states that,

"the real accomplishments must take place in the legislative arena" (pp 370).

Since military members are greatly restricted in their ability to engage in public

politics and legislative change (Harrison, 2002) they must depend on, and support, their non-military counterparts to deal with public policy leading to family friendly legislative change. This leaves military social workers to advocate for change within the military system. Lagrone (1978) states that military social workers will find it difficult to advocate for clients because they are subject to the same devices the military uses to obtain compliance. In contrast, Kirkland and Katz (1989) assert the importance of workplace and family collaboration since it is in the best interests of the Army (I assert the entire military) to have happy families in order to obtain high productivity because family life has a great impact on employee productivity. They go on to quote General J.A. Wickham (USA, 1983), who stated that, "Since we are in the readiness business, we are concerned...with [soldiers'] degree of commitment – their willingness to not only train, but also to deploy and, if necessary, to fight...The need for reciprocity of this commitment is the basis of the partnership between the Army and the Army Family." Jenson et al. (1986) corroborates the concept of family problems as negatively affecting the military members' duty and combat performance, increasing the risk of personnel going AWOL as well as creating staff retention difficulties.

Akabas (1990) states that the workplace does not only provide a family income, but it has the potential to provide other benefits as well. These benefits include respite from family care giving, and self-actualization. This assumes that if work strengthens individuals it strengthens families. In contrast, Walsh (1998)

28

asserts that the family system became isolated from extended family and other sources of support, as well as having lost the flexibility and diversity required to adapt to various conditions. This also creates greater need for balancing work and family responsibilities; potentially maximizing what is recognized as the 'spillover' effect meaning that the boundaries between work and family become 'fluid' (Eckenrode and Gore, 1990; Pleck, 1995; and Popoff et al., 1986). This effect is especially pronounced in the military.   This leaves us with the ambivalence associated with the workplace since it can simultaneously be a source of satisfaction and the bane of human existence.

In the military, occupational social work primarily takes on the form of micro-practice. The inherent message in this practice is the belief in the 'rugged family.' Walsh (1998) states that, "The modern nuclear family household, fitting the resurgent ethos of the rugged individual, was designed to be self-reliant within the borders of its white picket fence" (pp 28). All of this assumes that it is the responsibility of the family to adapt to workplace demands and conditions which perpetuates the concept of 'survival of the fittest.' The "military community sets the norms and expectations for coping" (Hunter and Hickman (1981b), and since it embraces the 'rugged individual' ethos, the military family is expected to be as 'rugged' as the soldier.

Spellman's (1976) study revealed that "considerable anxiety," especially among lower ranking personnel, and their partners don't often use military based help resources (pp 198). This appears to speak to the military dependency,

especially in the lower ranks, on the 'rugged individual' ethos. Interestingly, a Canadian Forces Health and Lifestyle Information Survey (Decima Research, 2000) revealed that full-time CF members are less likely to report excellent health, and score higher on the mental distress scale than the general Canadian population while reporting fewer visits to health care professionals. Having recognized this, it is incumbent upon all occupational social workers, especially those in the military, to work towards creating mutual compatibility between families and their places of employment. In addition, social work's roots in assisting families put the social work profession in a superior helping position given social works' view of individuals in terms of their greater environment and its "social vision based on justice rather than charity" (Weick and Saleebey, 1995: pp. 141-142).

2.5   The Canadian Military

The Canadian Military has a mission and a structure similar to other first world militaries. First, its mission is "to defend Canada and Canadian interests and values while contributing to international peace and security" (Department of National Defence, 2002 pp 7). Based on the British/European model it has a very distinct hierarchy, a chain of command, and a certain level of segregation from civilian society.

Historically, the military/civilian dichotomy was very distinct. Since 1993, however, with many civilians filling what were formerly military occupations (mostly administrative and scientific research), and the recent partnership

between the Department of National Defence (DND, civilian) and the Canadian

Forces (CF, military) all under National Defence Headquarters as the *Defence*

Team (Department of National Defence, 2002), total segregation is no longer a

feature of Canadian military life. Segregation does occur, however, in several

facets of the military. The most common of these is the 'combat arms' and those

involved in combat readiness, which is best developed in a 'total institution'

environment (Harrison, 2002). This will be discussed further in the next section.

2.5.1 Canadian Military Culture

Daley (1999) frames the military in terms of a unique ethnic identity that

patterns human activity in both overt and covert ways. He defines ethnicity in

terms of strong commonalties in "heritage, customs, and values unique to a

group of people" (pp 291). The Department of National Defence (2002) defines

the Defence Teams' culture as, "the combination of the behaviours and attitudes

that exist within our organization," acknowledging that the 'Defence Team'

concept is intended to strike a balance between separateness and togetherness

with DND and CF personnel (pp 6). This seems a lofty goal considering that the

> Defence Team will generate, employ and sustain high-quality,
> combat-capable, inter-operable and rapidly deployable task-tailored
> forces. We will exploit leading-edge doctrine and technologies to
> accomplish our domestic and international roles in the battle space
> of the 21st century and be recognized, both at home and abroad, as
> an innovative, relevant, knowledge-based institution.
> Department of National Defence, 2002 (pp 8)

Daley (1999) suggests that the military ethnic identity revolves around not

upsetting the status quo (striving for sameness) in order to gain equality within

the ranks. Harrison (2002) adds that the "ability to assert control" is a significant aspect of military life because this is what combat readiness is based upon (pp 14). Further, she states that the military is also based upon Goffman's concept of a *total institution* defined as "a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life" (Goffman, 1961 in Harrison, 2002 pp 14). This is congruent with Winslow's (1998) observations that the Canadian military continues to perpetuate itself as a war ready force as is has been reluctant to espouse peacekeeping as a priority in its defence policies. Sion (2001) adds that militaries continue to mirror the dominance of masculinity as she recently observed with the Dutch military and their sexist treatment of female personnel.

Winslow (1998) goes on to state that since Canada's permanent military force continues to be a culture characterized by its "primary purpose – war" the highly valued small unit cohesion, especially necessary to land warfare, can be detrimental to the CF as a whole since this exaggerated cohesion and loyalty to the unit has already proven to be unnecessarily deadly (see Winslow, 1997, *The Canadian Airborne in Somalia: A Socio-cultural Inquiry*) (pp 345). This cohesion also pitted unit against unit as each was striving to be superior. This is not surprising given that North American culture is based on the notion of the 'rugged individual' (Walsh, 1998) whether that individual is alone or part of an individual entity competing with other entities.

32

The socialization of CF personnel begins during basic training where they are stripped of their former selves and remolded into battle ready troops (Harrison and Laliberte, 1994, Harrison, 2002; Winslow, 1998). This is crucial not only to the CF but also to the individual. As a civilian, being ostracized from a group means that one can join another, however, in the military, there are no other groups to join (Peck, 1983 in Winslow, 1998). All of this brings to the fore the inherent contradictions of military life. Balancing individualism with group cohesion, humanitarianism (peacekeeping) with training for war, authoritarianism with democracy, and the civilianization with the militarization of DND and CF staff, continues to pose a formidable challenge for the Canadian military. Perhaps the 'Total Force Experiment' (DND/CF: The Total Force Experiment, 2003) of increasing Reserve Forces, especially in the combat arms, will facilitate a healthier integration of civilian and military cultures.

As part of the military culture, families, as well as the individual soldiers, are also expected to be loyal to the military (Knox and Price, 1995; and Burnam et al., 1992). Along with this, is the unwritten prohibition against seeking assistance of any type since "the man with the right stuff does not require assistance of any kind to cope with the stressors of military life" (Knox and Price, 1995; pp 482). Only in very recent history have military planners had to deal with the power of the military family since it has been recognized that the soldiers' family contributes substantially to retention, career choices, and overall readiness of the member (Knox and Price, 1995). Families are now part of the military

culture in a completely new way as a result of sociocultural changes in the larger society as well as militaries' move to an all-volunteer force consisting of mostly married personnel. Further, with militaries, primarily the USA (Knox and Price, 1999) and Canada (DND/CF: The Total Force Experiment, 2003) engaging in 'Total Force' policy, meaning heavy reliance of Reserve Forces, families with predominantly civilian identities may prove to be as powerful, or more powerful, an influence over the military member as the military itself.

2.5.2 Structure of the Canadian Military

The military structure is highly complex and changes depending on the type of operation(s) with which it is involved. In times of national and international emergencies, emergency commands are put into place, which look quite different from non-emergency structures (Department of National Defence, 2002). For the purposes of this study, since the Canadian military is mainly involved in peacekeeping operations, the non-emergency structure is outlined. In addition, the Land Force structure is outlined since the Naval Command and Air Force Command structures are similar. (See Appendix C).

2.5.3 Cultural Make-up of the Canadian Forces

Under the Official Languages Act, Canada is officially a bilingual country consisting of both Francophones and Anglophones. Rules and definitions around these 'Official Languages' are covered in the CFAO's 2-15. The Regular Canadian Force is comprised of approximately 44,500 Anglophones and 16,700 Francophones. The Reserve Canadian Force is comprised of approximately

72,000 Anglophones and 19,500 Francophones. This translates to 73% of the Regular Force being Anglophone and 27% being Francophone. In the Reserve Force, 79% of personnel are Anglophones and 21% are Francophones (NDHQ Group, 2003). It must be noted that Aboriginal peoples and other cultural minorities must identify their preferred language as either French or English meaning that they have been absorbed into the figures stated above.

2.5.4 Limitations Imposed by the Military on Personnel and Their Families

Military members are subject to the same laws and statutes as their civilian counterparts with some notable exceptions. All Canadians are subject to the Canadian Constitution including the Canadian Human Rights Act (Department of National Defence, 2002). Department of National Defence employees are subject to the Public Service Employment Act and military members are subject to the Queen's Regulations and Orders (QR&O's), Defence Administration Orders and Directives (DAOD's), and the Canadian Forces Administrative Orders (CFAO's), which are designed to amplify the QR&O's (Department of National Defence, 2002). In addition, the military as a whole is subject to the National Defence Act, and international treaties such as The Geneva Convention Act, the Charter of the United Nations, and the regulations under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization agreement to name a few (Department of National Defence, 2002).

Harrison (2002) states that the controlling nature of the military demands that CF employees have fewer rights than their civilian counterparts. "They are

not permitted to form unions, there is no mechanism for their collective dissent, and they are prohibited from circulating petitions complaining of unjust working conditions" (pp 15). In addition, CF members are subject to "unlimited liability" meaning that they must perform duties anytime they are called upon to do so by their superiors, whereas civilians are protected from this by various labour laws (Department of National Defence, 2002 pp 7). Thus, broad policies and laws, as well as the specific policies and laws directly affecting CF personnel, affect military families.

2.5.5   The Military as Extended Family

Many researchers have documented the phenomenon of the military as an 'extended family' to its members (Winslow, 1998), and ostensibly, his or her family (Ridenour, 1984; Finn, 1987) as well as the critical importance of military support to these families, i.e. similar supports that would have been offered by extended family (Hunter, 1982; Finn, 1987; Burke and Moskos, 1996; Jenson et al., 1986; Amen et al., 1988; Kirkland and Katz, 1989; Hiew, 1992; and Pincus et al., 2000). However, because of the ambivalent relationship between the military organization and the families of personnel, military families seek out informal supports before seeking those offered by the military (Hunter, 1982; Montalvo, 1976). Given the utilization rate of 0.9% of the CF Member Assistance Program, where 60.4% of this usage is by personnel with family and/or marital difficulties (Canadian Forces Member Assistance Program, 1999-2000), it is obvious that this is true. This speaks to the belief in the notions of the 'rugged individual' and

being made of 'the right stuff' continue to permeate military culture rendering the vital link between the military and the military family a dubious one since families are also expected to cope and not become problematic enough to interfere with combat readiness (Harrison and Laliberte, 1994; Harrison 2002). Winslow (1998) states that, in the CF Regiments, the "concept of family is strong and it is reinforced daily" and warns of the dangers of over exaggerated identification with the unit (pp 350). This is, in part, to win over the loyalty of the member as his own family competes for the same loyalty (Segal, 1986). Hunter (1982) discusses the tradition of militaries that 'take care of their own', which has created the cultural taboo against seeking assistance outside of the military. While this may be beneficial to the member to some degree, it leaves military families in a very precarious situation -- seeking services from the same organization with which they are competing. Much work needs to be done to understand and balance the relationship between the military and the families that it profoundly affects.

2.6 Deployment

Deployment in the military context means the sending of personnel to locations to perform their military duties, generally for prolonged periods of time far away from their families. These are called unaccompanied deployments as personnel are sent without their families. Given the nature of the military, work-related family separation is routine (Hiew, 1992; Blount, et al., 1992). The three most common types of deployments are war, peacekeeping, and training. In the CF, there is a fourth type called 'observation' (see Glossary). In addition, there

37

are unit deployments where several hundred personnel are deployed at once, and there are individual deployments that can last up to one year in the CF, however, most deployments in the CF are six months to one year in duration (Jamieson, 2003). According to the DND/CF: Current Operations (2003), "On any given day, about 8,000 CF members – one third of our deployable force – are engaged in or returning from an overseas mission. Since 1947, the "CF has completed 72 international operations" not including current operations and domestic operations (pp 1).

2.6.1 Stages of Deployment

In studying military families and deployments, researchers have identified a distinct process that families experience called the 'cycle' or 'stages' of deployment (McCubbin and Dahl, 1976; Lagrone, 1978; Finn, 1987; Amen et al., 1988; Kelley, 1994b; Kelley et al., 1994; Van Breda, 1995, 1997, 1999; and Pincus et al., 2000). These stages are: the pre-deployment phase, the deployment phase, and the post-deployment phase. Blount et al. (1992) term these stages, 'predeployment,' 'survival,' and 'reunion.' Bermudes (1973, 1977) likens the stages of deployment to the grief cycle in order to depathologize families who showed difficulties in dealing with the absence of the father/husband. In addition, Logan (1987 in Van Breda, 1997) asserts that the stages of deployment can be broken down into seven stages, which he calls "The Emotional Cycles of Separation" (See Appendix A) that begins with the anticipation of loss and ends with the stabilization period of reintegration (pp

156). Similarly, Pincus et al. (2000) have delineated five stages in their "Emotional Cycle of Deployment." These stages are: pre-deployment, deployment, sustainment, re-deployment, and post-deployment (pp 1). For the purposes of this thesis, the stages will be termed, 'predeployment,' 'deployment,' and 'post deployment.'

Based on the research conducted by Nice (1983), the progression of "depressive affect" experienced over the course of the deployment cycle by the remaining spouse is generally experienced in a linear fashion, and each stage is experienced differently by each wife/mother depending on various factors (pp 343). Nice (1983) also asserts that age of the female partner is the best predictor of "depressive affect" not necessarily because of experience with deployments, but because of increased maturation as one becomes older. Further, he states that demographics are also important since his USA study had revealed that young, non-whites, who have experienced fewer deployments than their older, white counterparts with more separation experience, are more likely to experience "depressive affect" (pp 341). The research pertaining to the effects on children will be discussed in section 2.7 of this study.

2.6.2 Types of Deployment

This section will discuss the various types of deployments that engage many military personnel around the world. These are wartime deployments, peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peace-enforcing deployments, domestic operations, training missions, and other deployments that are generally classified

as secret. In Canada, there are three major types of peacekeeping deployments that last six months or more including: major unit deployments where six to eight hundred personnel are deployed as a unit; individual deployment as part of a United Nations contingent; and individual deployment as a United Nations Military Observer (Jamieson, 2003). In addition, deployments are either 'accompanied' or voluntary (with family) or 'unaccompanied' or involuntary (without family) (Segal and Harris, 1993).

In the CF, generally deployments of six months to one year in duration are 'unaccompanied' and those of one year or more in duration are 'accompanied' (CFAO 20-6, Annex A). In the United States military, many deployments are unaccompanied owing to their highly active forces in many volatile areas around the world in both peacekeeping and wartime operations. In South Africa, the Navy has acquired much research attention because of frequent deployments (Van Breda, 1999). There has been a pervasive realization in the military world that families are still the most basic institution (Kaslow, 1984), and with feminist influence, have become a force to be aligned with rather than opposed. As a result, militaries have responded with policy changes that restrict the length of unaccompanied tours and allow personnel to return home in the event of a family emergency (see CFAO 20-6).

2.6.2.1 Peacetime and Wartime Deployments

Researchers such as Hill (1949, in Reinerth, 1978), McCubbin and Dahl (1976), Hunter (1982), Kelley (1994b), Milgram and Bar (1993) and Seplin (1952 in Jenson et al., 1986) have studied the effects of wartime deployments on families. These studies originating in the USA [with the exception of Milgram and Bar (1993) who studied Israeli families] are the result of the USA's active military presence around the world in wartime, peacetime, and training activities (Westhuis, 1999).

In South Africa, the bulk of deployments are peacetime deployments (Van Breda, 1997). In Canada, the Canadian Forces have completed twenty-five international operations from 1948 to 1989, however, since 1989 CF personnel have been deployed sixty-five times, which is considered "high personnel tempo" (DND/CF Backgrounder: May 15, 2003; pp 1). Since the Korean War in the 1950's, the last war in which Canada fought, the CF has been engaged primarily in peacekeeping and training missions (Jamieson, 2003) as well as many domestic operations (DND/CF, 2002).

2.6.2.2. Peacetime and Training Missions

Militaries around the world must engage in training exercises. The type of training will depend on the country's socio-philosophical stance on militarism. Normally training begins upon enrolment since a combat ready force must have its troops prepared as early on as possible (Harrison, 2002) and so that military indoctrination can begin early to acclimatize personnel, especially younger

41

members, to the military culture. Militaries have no interest in forfeiting public confidence by employing unskilled, individualistic people who would be unable to perform the most basic of military skills (e.g. using military equipment) in the event of an emergency. In addition, a combat ready force is based upon a strict code of discipline supported by a rigid chain of command that enforces teamwork with praise and other rewards for conformity and superior skill.

Training missions can last anywhere from a few days to several months. For example, French language training for all officers is seven months in duration (author's own experience). Also, as stated above, peacekeeping missions can take several forms and vary in duration (see CFAO 20-6). Suffice it to say that type of training will vary greatly depending on element and occupation; however, those involved in the direct combat occupations will have experienced more unaccompanied deployments than those in the support services (Doyle, 2003).

2.6.2.3   Long-term and Short-term Deployments

Length and frequency of deployments vary by occupation and military objective. In the United States, typical deployments last three months or longer (Decker, 1978 in Van Breda, 1997). In Canada, typical unaccompanied deployments last from six months to one year (Jamieson, 2003; CFAO 20-6). Generally, anything over this becomes a posting and is typically an accompanied situation. In South Africa, Naval deployments are more frequent than in North America, however, they are of shorter duration, lasting anywhere from one to twelve weeks (Van Breda, 1997). In addition, Van Breda (1997) states that some

naval deployments occur in an unpredictable manner creating more stress than longer deployments that allow families time to prepare and adjust. He has also found that frequency and duration of deployments have little effect on families' progression through the emotional cycle of separation and that the "routine absence" of the husband/father is stressful to the majority of families.

2.6.3   Frequency of Deployments

In South Africa, Naval deployments are frequent but comparatively short, however, many sailors are away from their families for several months of the year (Van Breda, 1997). In Canada, the personnel tempo is very high and deployments are several months to one year in duration, also leaving families to experience extended absence from the husband/father. However, personnel are not to be deployed again for one year after return and usually three years must be served in Canada between unaccompanied deployments (CFAO 20-50, Section 2). The situation is much the same in the USA given their high level of personnel tempo, not only in peacekeeping missions, but also in the fighting of wars. However, short, frequent deployments can be as stressful to families as extended deployments, which make the Canadian, South African, and American militaries very similar in their experiences with military families and deployment issues (Mitchell, 1995).

2.6.4   Regular Force and Reserve Force Deployments

Canada has adopted the 'Total Force' model, which means a heavy reliance upon Reserve Forces (Department of National Defence, 2003). Reservists are part-time military, have fewer training hours than Regular Force members, and sustain civilian employment, except when deployed on military service. Further, for reservists, deployments are always voluntary in the Supplementary Reserves. However, in the Primary Reserves, deployments are voluntary except in the case of a national emergency (Department of National Defence, 2002) Reservists are considered complementary –adding breadth to Regular Forces, and supplementary – adding depth to Regular Forces (Department of National Defence, 2003). See Appendix J for an example of Reservist Pre-Deployment Screening procedure. Regular force screening forms were not available; however, it is similar to the Reservist procedure.

The USA has also embarked on the 'Total Force Experiment' relying heavily on Reserve Forces in all elements to complement regular force, active duty personnel both nationally and internationally (Knox and Price, 1999). In South Africa, because of the frequency of naval deployments most personnel are Regular Force; however there is an increasing interest in the use of Reserve forces (Van Breda, 2003).

2.6.5   Military Rank and Deployments

The CF has approximately 47,000 non-commissioned members and 13,500 commissioned officers. The Reserve units have approximately 58,000

non-commissioned members, and 30,000 commissioned officers. How many of each are deployed depends on the nature of the operation and its requirements, however, taken on a percentage basis, approximately 75% of those deployed are non-commissioned members ranking from Private to Chief Warrant Officer, and the remainder are officers (See Appendix B) or civilian personnel authorized to deploy (Department of National Defence, 2002). Given similar hierarchical structuring in the USA (Spellman, 1976) and the South African militaries, these percentages also approximate the deployment constellation of these militaries. (Van Breda, 2003).

2.6.6   Military Deployments: A Retrospective View

Historically, the Canadian military has not had a specific 'rule book' covering deployments in general (Jamieson, 2003). Since each deployment is unique, rules are drawn up for each particular mission. However, there are regulations about the deployment of personnel covered in the CFAO 20-50 Section 2 and CFAO 20-6 that includes length and frequency of deployments, and retention beyond the period of engagement. One requirement of deployment is pre-deployment screening of personnel, which is engaged in by each Commanding Officer and Platoon Commander (Finn, 1987). In addition, the Deployment Assistance Group (DAG), consisting of Chaplains and Social Workers, screen those embarking upon individual deployments. Generally, the DAG does not screen troops involved in 'Unit Deployments' (Jamieson, 2003).

In the past Chaplains performed mental and social health screening, but in more recent times both Social Workers and Chaplains perform this type of screening, with the inclusion of spousal input, to ensure individual and unit effectiveness. Generally, Medical Officers, Chaplains and/or Social Workers screen those with obvious known domestic, administrative, or disciplinary difficulties, while physicians screen for medical difficulties. If an employee's difficulties are deemed severe enough to interfere with unit readiness the employee will not likely be deployed (Deployment Screening Readiness Form, See Appendix J). Similarly, in the South African Defence Force, all members are screened prior to deployment (Van Breda, 2003) unlike the United States military that has no consistent pre-deployment screening (Burnam et al., 1992).

2.6.7 Demographics of Deployed Personnel

Much of the demographics have already been presented, however, age of deployed personnel is of great importance since those who are young are likely to have young families and spouses who are inexperienced in military life. A small portion of the military family literature discusses the special needs of the young military family (Kelley, 1994b; Hunter, 1982; Nice, 1983; Segal and Harris, 1993; Rosen et al., 1989a; and Knox and Price, 1995). Based on the Canadian data given previously, most of those deployed are from the lower ranks and are thus likely to be younger and have young families that require special consideration. This is also true for the USA (Coolbaugh and Rosenthal, 1992 in Segal and Harris, 1993) and South African militaries (Van Breda, 2003).

46

2.7   Military Families

After WWII, literature pertaining to military families and husband/father absence was focused on men as POW captives or MIA and the effects this had on their families with a gradual shift towards including the effects of peacetime deployments. Researchers concerned with wartime and other hazardous deployments discuss the element of the unknown, whether the soldier will return home or not, and the effects on families (Hill, 1949 in Reinerth, 1978; McCubbin and Dahl, 1976; Hunter, 1982; and Milgram and Bar, 1993). Other researchers have focused on peacetime deployments given that they comprise the bulk of deployments in a modern permanent military force (Segal and Segal, 1993). In Canada, all deployments are peacetime deployments, although some may be hazardous (Department of National Defence; 2002). In South Africa, the majority of deployments are "non-combatant" (Van Breda, 1997a: pp 154). Last, it is well known that the US military participates in both peacetime and wartime deployments (Gravino et al., 1993). For the purposes of this study the focus is on peacetime deployments, including training, in the context of military families.

2.7.1   Military Families and Deployment Issues

Much of the military family literature has focused on the left behind wife/mother and the effects on the children. First, the effect of the various stages of deployment on the remaining spouse has a common theme: all phases of deployment are stressful; however, with the proper resources these stressors can be effectively managed. Segal and Harris (1993) have documented their

47

findings about Army families stating that the largest factor affecting family adaptation to military life is the spouses' perception of the military's support for the family. They also state that the largest factor affecting unit readiness is the soldier's perception of the level of support given to soldiers and their families by unit leaders. Since militaries are primarily focused on combat readiness, family adaptation must be a concomitant concern as it directly affects military effectiveness and personnel retention rates (Segal and Harris, 1993; Hunter, 1982; Woelfel and Savell, 1978; Burke and Moskos, 1996; Kirkland and Katz, 1989; Knox and Price, 1995; Jenson et al., 1986; Grace and Steiner, 1978; and Rosen et al., 1989).

A review of the literature reveals that historically military wives and children who demonstrated any coping difficulties were pathologized and sometimes labeled unsupportive, or in the USA - unpatriotic (Wertsch, 1991) - by the military community. Early research focused on the military wife as the major influence on her soldier/husband thereby also targeting her as a threat to military effectiveness. With the wife identified as the "family regulator," (Riggs, 1990 pp 150) she has been the selected aim for study (Beckman et al., 1979; Nice, 1983) as well as the family itself (Hill, 1949 in Reinerth, 1978; Dickerson and Arthur, 1965; Decker, 1978; Jenson et al., 1986; Farley and Werkman, 1986; Amen et al., 1988; Black, 1993; Kelley, 1994b; and Knox and Price, 1995).

McCubbin and McCubbin (1986) primarily focused on the military family as a target for change when they stated, "family competencies and strengths,

48

particularly marital communication, complemented by social support" appeared to buffer the difficulties associated with deployment separation (pp 73).   More recent research looks to both the family and the military organization equally as targets for study and change (Van Breda, 1997, 1999; Hunter, 1978aa, 1982; Nice, 1978; Van Vranken and Benson, 1978; Lagrone, 1978; Keith and Whitaker, 1984; Martin, 1984; Kirkland and Katz, 1989; and Rosen et al., 1989).

The effects of the deployment cycle on military wives have been well documented. Research has focused on clinical samples of military wives and subsequently depression and its associated symptoms, severe stress, anxiety and other pathologizing labels that were used to identify her inability to cope and be the "good military wife" (Beckman et al., 1979; Nice, 1983; Montalvo, 1976; Bey and Lange in McCubbin et al., 1976). In addition, military mothers' parenting abilities were also studied (Dahl, McCubbin, and Lester in Decker, 1978) and programs were recommended and/or implemented to correct parenting behaviour and to increase social support (Hiew, 1992; Black, 1993; and Amen et al., 1988).

In earlier research, the effects of father absence on children was studied, however, as is the case with military wives, clinical samples were used to study these effects (Dickerson and Arthur, 1965; and Pearlman, 1970, Cretekos, 1971, and Bey and Lange, 1974 in Lagrone, 1978). More recent research focused on non-clinical samples (Applewhite, 1995) and found that children from military families generally responded the same to maternal and paternal separation

(Applewhite, 1995; Applewhite and Mays, 1996). Children at various stages in the life cycle will be affected in different ways. Amen et al. (1988) have charted the effects of father absence on children at various stages of the life cycle and the deployment cycle (See Appendix A). They divide children into the 'preschool,' 'latency,' and 'adolescent' stages and link child behaviour to parental feelings and behaviour, thereby implicating mothers as the primary cause of children's' responses since the father is away for most of the deployment cycle.

Other research focuses on children's anxiety, fear, sadness, and anger and state that children suffer from heightened emotional and behavioural problems if the mother is having difficulties coping with separation (Hunter and Plag, 1973 and McCubbin and Dahl, 1976 in Black, 1993). Further, Hunter (1981 in Black, 1993) asserts that children cope best when mother expresses a 'positive attitude' towards separation, is satisfied with the marriage before separation, and when she has the internal coping ability to effectively manage through the separation.

Other studies such as Kelley's (1994a) research suggest, "...patterns of family interaction (i.e., cohesiveness, and organization) and child behaviour, rather than maternal behaviour per se, may be most affected by work-related separation" (pp 108). She goes on to state that all routine separations diminish families to some degree and that type of deployment (peacetime vs. wartime) effects families differently. This needs to be taken into account when interpreting family behaviour. For instance, Amen et al. (1988) states that the reunion period

50

is the most difficult time for families; however, Kelley (1994a) asserts that under routine deployment conditions, the pre-deployment phase is the most difficult for children and that these difficulties are temporary. Because of the complexity of the inter-relationships between families, systems, and their own internal idiosyncrasies, including developmental uniqueness, all research needs to be interpreted with caution.

2.7.2 Military Families in the Context of Resilience: Ecosystemic and Developmental Frameworks

Historically, the military was not a family friendly employer. Only in recent history have so many military personnel obtained life partners, which necessitated serious study of the relationship between the military and military families, and the impact they have upon one another (Woelfel and Savell, 1978). Greene (2002) adds that resiliency studies at the macro level addresses this impact in terms of identifying debilitating stress factors. This mutual impact necessitates the need for an ecosystemic perspective that emphasizes the importance of assessing the fit between people and their environment. In addition, the developmental perspective is necessary to understand the importance of developmental stages as a major factor in assessing coping ability.

Van Breda (1999) organizes family resilience around eight dimensions specifically geared for the military family attempting to cope with routine separations. They are: "emotional continuity"; "positive perspectives on separations" and the employer; "support systems" external to the family including the employer; "financial preparation" before separation; a "partner aware family

51

structure" which keeps the absent partner symbolically present; "resilient children;" a "flexible marriage" that can accommodate significant and routine changes; and a "family oriented management of the workforce" (pp 598-600). He states that a flexible marriage is the most important of these eight dimensions for the military family.

2.7.3 A Feminist Perspective

An issue of concern is that families are primarily viewed as the woman's domain, especially families with children and/or other dependents. This puts an enormous amount of pressure on the female spouse during deployment cycles (Hunter and Pope, 1981; Bartone et al., 1993; Harrison and Laliberte, 1994) and on the military member to keep his family in line (Harrison and Laliberte, 1994). From a feminist perspective this social reliance on women to maintain families, even while working outside the home, needs to be corrected to comply with the social agenda for equality. In addition, this agenda for equality needs to be sought after even more diligently by the military because of its current and historical roots in patriarchal structures of power and control. Further, Batterson and Dobrofsky (1977) found that it is more difficult to recruit military wives into the women's movement because of "isolated socialization," however, as women become more educated they are more likely to define their own roles and status (pp 683).

Historically, women had to be independent to survive since it was mainly men that left home for work (Riggs, 1990). Rienerth (1978) also recognized that

in military families, it is the woman that is required to do most of the adjusting, however, these female centered families are not matriarchal because the family must restructure out of "necessity" rather than "choice" (pp 170). This may suggest a number of things, however, it strongly points to the contradiction women face around the necessity of being strong, and also the price she must pay if this strength is named and claimed (Enloe, 1997; Harrison and Laliberte, 1994). Last, Hunter and Pope (1981) identified the 'role conflict' experienced by military wives who are expected to oscillate between independence and dependence depending on the circumstances.

Riggs (1990) states that in the "typical military family, the major responsibility for normalizing the family's physical, social and emotional behaviour frequently becomes the responsibility of the wife" (pp 151). She goes on to state that the most important psychological resource for these women is an androgynous gender role that develops independence and self-efficacy. Herein lies one great dilemma for female partners. When a woman develops this androgynous identity she is usually a threat to her male partner and sometimes to other males in her life. However, if she does not develop an androgynous orientation, she is in danger of being accused of failing the family if problems occur. A study by Meyers et al. (2002) affirms the social construction of family survival being dependent on women. They used an ecological framework to study family functioning factors and emphasized that "mothers' personal maturity is not only an important correlate of family functioning, but it also may serve as a

pervasive organizational heuristic that caseworkers use to evaluate mothers and families" (pp 269).

It is believed here that this focus on women as having the greatest impact on, and responsibility for, the family perpetuates the contradictions in women's lives (e.g. dependence vs. independence, weak vs. strong) and the myth that men have minimal or no responsibility for family functioning. Therefore, the study of family resiliency factors must incorporate a feminist analysis in order to create policies based more on egalitarian constructs than on social constructions that support male cultural biases. Woman blaming and victim blaming are destructive to the family as a whole and demands a pathogenic deficit based approach rather than a salutogenic strengths-based approach. Last, Googins (1991) states that "as long as work/family issues are defined as women's issues, there is little hope for resolving even the most superficial conflicts" thus, new partnerships are required to reduce work and family conflict (pp 294).

2.8   Social Work in the Military

> Military social work is practiced in an institution whose mission, as statutorily defined, is to maintain the peace and, if necessary, to wage war successfully ... Any discussion of military social work must, therefore, take into consideration: the organization and mission of the Department of [National] Defence, the characteristics of the military community, the history of military social work in that community, and the practice implications of its theoretical underpinnings in occupational social work.
>
> McNelis (1987)

In the Canadian Forces, Social Work Services are covered under CFAO 56-

15, which states,

> The aim of the social work program is to contribute to
> the achievement of a high level of morale, efficiency,
> and mental health in the CF through the provision of a
> professional social work service to military members.
> As part of the Canadian Forces Medical Service
> (CFMS) it provides a resource that complements
> established social services generally available to the
> civilian community and is in direct support of military
> operational effectiveness.

In addition, it states that Social Work Officers (SWO's) must have

qualifications that are "recognized by the Canadian Association of Social

Workers, and who subscribe to the code of ethics of that Association." SWO's

are qualified to treat psychosocial problems, and as dependents have a

significant influence on the effectiveness of personnel, they are also entitled to

social work services. Last, SWO's are viewed as an important resource for

military families as well as other officers and NCM's who are experiencing

difficulties as a direct result of occupational stress.

The Canadian military also provides professional civilian social workers

hired on contract by the Department of National Defence. These social workers

are independent of the military chain of command and can work full-time or part-

time depending on the needs of the particular military community. Civilian social

workers must possess professional qualifications, with the minimum of a B.S.W.

degree, and must also subscribe to a professional code of ethics (Doyle, 2003).

The above can be generalized to the USA and South African Social Work Officers who have similar responsibilities. The emphasis still lies on the support of military operational effectiveness with a predominant concern for military families. (Van Breda, 1997; Hunter, 1978aa).

2.8.1   The Military Family and the Strengths Based Approach

Early and GlenMaye (2000) found that the strengths perspective in social work with families is in its infancy. In addition, they encourage further analysis of the strengths perspective in the context of families in order to improve understanding and application. The strengths approach draws on resilience theory and utilizes its basic tenet – humans possess the capacity to grow and change (Early and GlenMaye, 2000; Saleebey, 1997; McQuaide and Ehrenreich, 1997; and Kaplan and Girard, 1994).

The central concepts upon which the strengths perspective rests are as follows: people who seek assistance are more than their problems; each individual possesses characteristics, roles, and experiences that comprise their identity; people are understood in terms of their strengths through the examination of their abilities, resources, desires, and knowledge which are used to achieve the person's goals; people have the knowledge to define their situation and possible solutions; people have knowledge of how they managed prior to seeking assistance, thus their resourcefulness is reinforced; the person's authority in ascribing meaning to their situation is respected; how people have struggled against external oppression must be validated and built upon; and,

people are resilient meaning they can survive and even thrive in spite of risk factors (Early and GlenMaye, 2000; Saleebey, 1997). Early and GlenMaye (2000) have extended these concepts to the family milieu stating that families possess many of the same qualities as individuals, thus, they also have the capacity to change. Last, McCubbin et al. (1996) states that to understand family resilience one must understand the strengths and health based approach to working with families.

2.8.2 The Role of Social Workers in the Military

The role of the social worker under the strengths based model is one of collaborator. The social worker and client take action together on goals that were "collaboratively decided" to not only improve family life, but also to demonstrate the family's abilities in self preservation (Dunst et al., in Early and GlenMaye, 2000). The strengths based approach does not ignore problems; they are downplayed to a minor role in order to apply strengths based concepts consistently (Saleebey, 1997). In the case of military families, Keith and Whitaker (1984) state that "The military family does not come to the clinic to learn how to become a civilian family, but rather it needs help to live inside the military system" (pp 147). Since the military has also recognized that it must accommodate families as much as possible, the crux of occupational social work in the military focuses on the mutual adaptation of the two systems from a strengths perspective.

2.8.3 Dilemma's Facing Military Social Workers

Military social workers, unlike their civilian counterparts, are directly within the military chain of command and are also subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as other military personnel. The benefits of this lie in the fact that military social workers have a first hand understanding of the military system and can engage in 'empathy training' by engaging in exercises with the troops to better understand their occupational situations. This is a privilege not afforded civilian social workers. Conversely, military social workers "...are subject to the same devices the system uses to enforce compliance in other system members, thus they might be in a rather rigid bind if they view themselves as advocates for the family" (Lagrone, 1978). Lagrone goes on to state that the "therapist" continues to advocate on behalf of the military as a result of internal pressure from the system.

In the CF, military social workers are officers in the chain of command. However, as social workers, the chain of command may be bypassed under certain circumstances (Doyle, 2003). Given the SWO's mandate to directly support military operational effectiveness, these circumstances may not arise too often. However, as Kurzman and Akabas (1981) point out, it is of great importance to understand how the host setting defines the function of social work practice. For example, the civilian social worker working within the military system is less likely to "triangulate the family against the military" whereas military social workers may become so absorbed by the military system that

assistance to clients becomes fraught with obstacles (Keith and Whitaker, 1984). In order to facilitate the mutual adaptation process, the military social worker must tread carefully between the system and the military family while adhering to a basic social work tenet: respect client self-determination (Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers, 2000).

2.8.4 Current Social Work Interventions With Families During Peacetime Deployments

Currently, both civilian and military social workers utilize extensively the 'Brief Solution Focused' model of counseling and 'Cognitive Behavioural Therapy' (Doyle, 2003). In addition, Canadian Forces civilian and military social workers do not identify themselves as 'occupational social workers.' Rather, in the Canadian Forces, Social Workers are generally identified with 'Industrial Social Work' and they rely predominantly on Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy (Doyle, 2003).

2.9 Canadian and South African Comparison

The scarcity of Canadian literature on military families is the result of heavy reliance on US research literature (Jamieson, 2003). In addition, before the 1990's there was also a scarcity of research literature from the South African military and their current studies continue to rely on US research literature as well (Van Breda, 1997, 1999). This makes detailed comparisons between the Canadian and South African militaries difficult. Nevertheless, since they are both based upon the same European military system and have similar social cultures, comparisons are made within this context.

2.9.1   General Comparability Between Canada, South Africa and the USA

Both the Canadian and the South African militaries require deployments from its personnel. The type, frequency, and duration of these deployments depend on military occupation with those in combat arms and some support occupations deploying most frequently (Doyle, 2003; Van Breda, 2003). Further, those in the enlisted ranks are also more likely to experience deployment since they are far greater in number than the officer ranks and have less power to circumvent the deployment process. Generally, the Canadian and South African militaries have the same origins, rank structure (Van Breda, 2003), hierarchy, chain of command, and military ethos. Based on the review of the literature it strongly appears that the USA military is also culturally, ideologically, structurally, and operationally similar to both the Canadian and South African militaries.

2.10   Questions Arising from the Literature Review

This section will focus on some of the pertinent questions that resulted from this literature review. The list of questions is not exhaustive; however, the hope is to stimulate thought in areas related to occupational social work with military families. It is hoped that further research will be undertaken to allow for a more comprehensive understanding of military families and their relationship to the various aspects of the military system.

2.10.1   General Questions

Many of the peacekeeping and observation deployments, and some military training exercises (e.g. live fire exercises) are classified as hazardous,

meaning there is a possibility of death albeit much lower than wartime deployments. This raises the question of whether or not there are any parallels between military family behaviour as described by Hill (1949, in Reinerth, 1978), McCubbin et al., (1976) and Hunter (1982) on military families with spouses deployed for war (MIA), or returning as a former Prisoner of War, and today's families who must also wonder if he will return home. In addition, how much information does the family require about the deployment in order to facilitate optimal coping responses? And, what does the military system need to do to assist families to manage optimally in the face of hazardous deployments for their spouses?

With the Total Force Experiment (Department of National Defence, 2003) it is important to understand what differences there are in the needs of the Regular Force member families and Reserve Force families. Knox and Price (1999) have shown that most of the literature about military families focuses on Regular Force member families. Given that Reservist's families are more grounded in civilian life than Regular Force member families, what do social workers need to do to best serve this population? In addition to the civilian influence on the military, what impact has the feminist movement had and what do social workers need to understand about this impact to best serve military families?

The majority of today's military families are predominately structured along the traditional model of 'husband, wife and children' (including blended families).

This limited definition of families creates a formidable barrier for non-traditional military families to receive military services. What do military social workers need to do to reach out to these families and create a place for them within the military system as equally deserving of services? Now that same sex marriages are legal in Canada, what policy changes can military and civilian social workers strive towards to ensure equal access to services for all military families? In addition, what theoretical bases currently inform social work policy and practice in the military that prevent the marginalized from accessing military services?

Last, research has shown that military families tend to use hardships to bond closer together. How are these families identified and what can we learn from them in terms of resilience and occupational social work theory? Further, how can the military foster individual resilience in a way that enhances family resilience? Even though the 'rugged individual' is deemed resilient within the larger culture, and especially within the military culture, how could this ethos be reworked to reflect a strong mutual relationship between self and environment?

2.10.2   Specific Research Questions for the Purposes of this Thesis

Van Breda (1997a, 1999) has studied extensively the needs of the military family in the context of peacetime deployments. This thesis is based on Van Breda's research on resiliency and military families using similar theoretical frameworks outlined in the previous sections.   His research outlines eight resiliency dimensions (see section 2.7.2) that can be applied to most first world nation military families who endure peacetime deployments. Since he has

developed a 'Deployment Resilience Scale' (DR Scale) based on the eight resiliency dimensions, it is of importance to the author to attempt an exploration of the usefulness of the DR Scale in the Canadian context. More specifically, is the DR Scale a useful tool to help assess the deployment or 'separation' resilience of Canadian military families and if so, what predictive value does it hold and how can it be used to guide policy and practice interventions?

2.10.3   Dual Deployments

One area of interest to military planners is the dual military couple. These couples pose specific difficulties for a variety of reasons. First, many of these couples want to be posted to the same base regardless occupation. Second, one or the other of the couple will likely "remuster" into a similar military occupation as their spouse so they can be posted together. This has the potential of causing staffing problems for the military. Third, when there are children involved and both parents are deployed at the same time, childcare issues become a military concern. Since these couples are still in the great minority, and little research has been conducted in regard to their special needs and circumstances, these couples will not be included in this research study.

3. Methodology

3.1   Introduction

This research study is based on a mixed methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative data gathered at a single point in time from research participants. Mixed methods research is a recent addition to the recognized research methods in the social sciences. Authors such as Campbell and Fiske (1959 in Creswell, 2003), Jick (1979 in Creswell, 2003), Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998 in Creswell, 2003), Dzurec and Abraham (1993), and House (1994) have asserted mixed methods research from various perspectives. The definition of mixed methods research used here is taken from Creswell:

> A mixed methods approach is one in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds (e.g. consequence oriented, problem-centered, and pluralistic). It employs strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems. The data collection also involves gathering both numeric information (e.g., on instruments) as well as text information (e.g. on interviews) so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information.

> Creswell (2003 pp19-20)

In addition, Creswell (2003) states that the quantitative portion of the research allows for some generalization of the results to a population, in this case, to all military families as defined by this study. Second, he states that the qualitative portion allows for the collection of detailed perspectives supplied by

each individual research participant. In this study both the qualitative and quantitative portions of this study are anchored to the same research question to make the mixed methods approach most viable. Further, the 'convenience sample' method used in this study will accommodate limited generalizations to the military family population. This static group design is based on participant recall of deployment experiences rather than current experiences; however, it remains an exploratory study into the use of Van Breda's Deployment Resilience Scale in the Canadian military.

3.2   Rationale for Mixed Methods Research

This study is designed to be an exploratory piece based on Van Breda's (1999) research on 'separation resilience' in military families who experience military deployments, the simultaneous implementation of both qualitative and quantitative methods are used here to add information that may otherwise go undiscovered. Mullen and Iverson (1986 in Swanson and Chapman, 1994) state, "Quantitative methods have developed largely to confirm or verify theory, whereas qualitative methods have been developed to discover theory" (pp 75). This approach allows for both possibilities as the research participants share their perceptions of their experiences with the Canadian Forces. Without this, the Canadian context would remain buried as would the potential for further theory development reflecting the Canadian deployment experience. In addition, Van Breda's 'Deployment Resilience Scale' (DR Scale) is not culturally sensitive (Van Breda, 2003). Thus, the semi-structured interview is designed to inject

specifically Canadian data, as well as data from those participants who served with the other two elements - land and air. This is to counter-balance the emergent deficits in the DR Scale (designed specifically for the South African Navy) when applied to Canadian military families. Although the DR Scale is designed for military families, there are two factors that make the South African Naval families somewhat different from the Canadian military families - frequency and length of deployments. The naval families experienced more sporadic and frequent deployments (Van Breda, 1997). However, regardless of these factors, researchers have found that military deployments are similarly stressful to families (Pincus et al., 2000; Van Breda, 1997; Knox and Price, 1995; Kelley et al., 1994; Kelley, 1994b; Milgram and Bar, 1993; Black, 1993; Hiew, 1992; Eastman et al., 1990; Rosen et al, 1989; Amen et al., 1988; Farley and Werkman, 1986; Jenson et al., 1986; Martin, 1984; Nice, 1983; Beckman et al., 1979; Snyder, 1978; Lagrone, 1978; Bermudes, 1973, 1977; and Hunter, 1982). Further, type of deployment, such as peacetime, hazardous duty, training, and war, may also influence family stress in various ways. For the purposes of this study, peacetime deployments, including hazardous duty and training missions, are being studied which is congruent with Van Breda's (1997, 1999) research.

Finally, Creswell (2003) asserts that researchers using the mixed methods approach often give priority to either the qualitative or quantitative portions of their study. Further, he states that researchers also have latitude in deciding at what stage in the research the data will be integrated. For this study, the

qualitative data will be given slightly more weight than the quantitative data in order to bring forth as much of the Canadian context as possible and data integration will occur at the interpretation phase of the study. One final note is that the Heimler Scale of Social Functioning, and the McMaster Family Assessment Scale that were used in the original Van Breda study will not be used in this study as these two scales were used to evaluate families in the context of the 'Deployment Separation Seminar,' which is a social work intervention not used in this study (Van Breda, 1999).

3.3   Operational Definitions

The definitions furnished below are used to provide as much congruency with Van Breda's (1999) study as possible and also account for Canadian military families. It is generally understood that most militaries have a rigid hierarchical structure; most personnel are living in conjugal, heterosexual relationships, with or without children; and that most military families experience routine separations from the male adult. The definitions below are based on these constructs.

3.3.1   Families and Military Families

The term 'family' has never been as controversial as in recent times. Family forms are growing more diverse and today's families often do not endorse the need for a stay-at-home full-time parent (Conway, 2001). This leaves the family unit to serve as purveyors of "love, renewal, meaning, identity, confirmation, support, recognition, and a sense of belonging" (Conway, 2001 pp 39). For the purposes of this thesis, the family unit will be understood as any

group of people, with or without children, that serves to meet particular human needs. These needs are; physical sustainment, developmental needs, love and acceptance, and having the family function as a support unit to enable participation in the larger society (Adams in Akabas, 1990). Canadian military demographics affirm the "modern" family structure. This family structure consists mainly of married or common-law couples, single parent families, and single people who are identified with their family of origin for 'next of kin' purposes. One important notation is that the Canadian military has included Common Law relationships, between heterosexual couples, in their definition of marriage since 1966 (Pinch and Fournier, 1977). Further, South Africa's military only recognized 'legal marriage' relationships at the time Van Breda's DR Scale was tested in 1997 (Van Breda, 2003). Thus, for this thesis, military families are defined as those heterosexual couples that are married or living common-law, with or without children, and whose spouse has been deployed for peacetime missions.

3.3.2 Family Resilience

Walsh (1998) defines resilience as "the capacity to rebound from adversity strengthened and more resourceful. It is an active process of endurance, self-righting, and growth in response to crisis and challenge" (pp 4). McCubbin & McCubbin (1988) define family resilience as "...characteristics, dimensions, and properties of families which help families to be resistant to disruption in the face of change and adaptive in the face of crisis situations" (pp 247). Military family resilience will be discussed in the next section.

3.3.2.1   Van Breda's Eight Separation Resilience Dimensions

Van Breda organizes family resilience around eight dimensions specifically geared for the military family attempting to cope with routine separations. They are:

1. Emotional continuity defined as families having a reasonably stable emotional life over the cycle of a separation (pp 598);
2. Positive perspectives on separations defined as the family's positive attitude towards separations and the employing organization (pp 598);
3. The presence of support systems (via family, naval, community and religious) for the family and employee (pp 598);
4. Financial preparation defined as the family having adequate financial resources during separations (pp 599);
5. Partner-aware family structure defined as the family having a "partner-aware family structure (pp 599);
6. Resilient children defined as the family actively developing the separation resilience of their children (pp 599);
7. Flexible marriage defined as a secure marriage in which partners are flexible in the allocation of gender roles and responsibilities (pp 599); and,
8. Family-oriented management of the workforce and of separations (pp 600).

(Van Breda, 1999)

He states that a flexible marriage is the most important of these eight dimensions for the military family. These definitions will be used in this thesis.

3.3.3 The Deployment Cycle

Many researchers have investigated the cycle of deployment and its effect on families (Hill, 1949 in Reinerth, 1978; Pincus et al., 2000; Logan, 1987 in Van

Breda, 1997; Amen et al., 1988; Beckman et al., 1979; and Kelley, 1994a, 1994b). Although these identified stages range from three to seven in number, for the purposes of this thesis, the three most commonly identified stages will be used. First is the pre-deployment stage, which begins when the family becomes cognizant of the husband/father's impending deployment. Second is the deployments stage when the husband/father is actually separated from his family for the duration of the deployment. And, third is the post-deployment stage when the husband/father returns and the family must readjust to his return. The utilization of these three constructs is congruent with Van Breda's research (Van Breda, 1997).

3.3.4 Military Deployments

'Unaccompanied deployment' in the military is a term used to refer to military personnel who must leave their families for extended periods of time to perform their military duties. There are several types of military deployments that have been identified in the literature. This study focuses on peacetime deployments that entail peacekeeping and training missions, which may or may not be hazardous (an example of hazardous training would be soldiers engaging in 'live fire' exercises). Peacekeeping missions are generally overseas and are in conjunction with the United Nations. Training missions can take place anywhere in the world. In addition, in the Canadian military, there are also 'Observation' missions where personnel are deployed individually to observe and gather

intelligence (Jamieson, 2003). These deployments can last from six months to one year (CFAO 20-50).

3.3.5 Family Stress

Stress here is defined very broadly to encompass all family responses to deployment of an adult intimate partner. Since stress theory is the counterpart of resilience theory (McCubbin, et al. 1996) family stress is defined as an event or situation that creates a need for active family adjustment whether of not the family, or certain individual members, perceive the event or situation as normative or crisis inducing.

3.4 Sample Recruitment

The data for this study was originally to be collected in Southern Ontario from one major urban center, Hamilton, and two suburban centers that border it, Stoney Creek and Burlington. Each area has its own Royal Canadian Legion composed of former military members, their spouses, and associate members that have various relationships with current and former military personnel. Each Legion has its own business executives and are structured to provide community support through numerous fundraising activities and to provide a social milieu for Legion members (Royal Canadian Legion Press Release, 2002).

Each of the three Legions agreed to allow advertising of this research study within their Branch facility in order to recruit participants. A poster was displayed at each Branch explaining the purpose and data collection method. The poster also invited potential participants to call and leave their name and telephone

number for a return telephone-screening interview to determine if the caller met the criteria for this study. Unfortunately, all of the respondents, except one, did not meet the study criteria. The alternate method of data collection chosen was a 'convenience sample', which began with making one contact in Trenton, Ontario where many former military personnel reside. The researcher was referred from person to person until twelve people were interviewed. In total, thirteen people were interviewed, only one residing in Hamilton. The researcher contacted each person to conduct telephone screening, and if the person was deemed to be appropriate, a time was arranged to meet in a private setting to ensure confidentiality. Since Legion facilities in each area are very large, many private rooms were available for interviewing and administering the questionnaire. However, each person was allowed to choose the area most comfortable for them. Only one interview took place at the Hamilton Legion, all others were conducted in the participants' homes at their request.

Further, upon meeting, each participant was given a letter of information (Appendix E) detailing the study and giving permission to withdraw from the study at any time and to omit any questions they found were too uncomfortable to answer. If this stage was successfully completed with the participant, they were given a letter of consent (Appendix F) to sign acknowledging their full understanding of the process and their willingness to participate. The questionnaire was administered first, followed immediately by the interview due to time constraints. It is assumed here that this data collection time frame will not

adversely affect the data interpretation, and as stated earlier, it is hypothesized that the final results will emerge enriched.

The selection criteria for each male participant is as follows: be a former member of the Canadian military; be fluent in English; have experienced at least one peacetime deployment of three months or longer; have been in a heterosexual conjugal relationship, with or without children, during the time(s) of deployment; and be willing to share his family's experiences with deployment. The selection criteria for the females was as follows: be a spouse or former spouse of a Canadian military member; have experienced the peacetime deployment(s) of their spouse for three months or longer; have been in a heterosexual conjugal relationship with their spouse at the time of deployment(s); and be willing to share their family's experiences with deployment. The target sample numbers were twelve males and twelve females for this study. However, because of the difficulty in obtaining participants, only thirteen persons had completed the DR Scale and participated in the semi-structured interview. One male whose female spouse was deployed for six months was included in the study as his experiences were almost identical to those of the female spouses left behind and paralleled the literature.

3.4.1   Data Collection Instruments

The instruments used in this study were designed to complement one another with the intent of providing data that has been enriched enough to capture the experiences of military families, in general, and also the unique

experiences of Canadian military families. The Deployment Resilience Scale is a quantitative data collection instrument and was designed by Major Adrian Van Breda of the South African Naval Defence Force (1997) for naval military families. The semi-structured interview was designed for qualitative data collection and to provide a Canadian context for military deployments and its effect on military families.

3.4.1.a Quantitative Data Collection: The Deployment Resilience Scale

The quantitative data collected in this study was acquired with Van Breda's 'Deployment Resilience Scale' (See Appendix H). This battery of one hundred and thirty questions has been designed to measure the eight family separation resilience dimensions described earlier. The scale used, to allow for coding of the data, has four options starting with 'Strongly Agree' (SA) to 'Agree' (A) to Disagree' (D) to 'Strongly Disagree' (SD). The SA option is given a numerical value of one and the SD option is given the numerical value of four, with the A option at two and the D option given the value of three. Thus, the lower the overall score, the more resilient the family (Van Breda, 1997). Further, each item on the scale belongs to one of the eight dimensions and is grouped accordingly (See Appendix I for the 'Scoring of the Deployment Resilience Scale and Reliability Data'). For the 'family support' dimension, there are four sub-dimensions that are averaged to reach a numerical value for 'total family support.' Last, Van Breda used six of these dimensions to reach an average score for 'family separation resilience.' They are; emotional continuity, support

systems, financial preparation, partner-aware family structure, flexible marriage, and the employer's family-oriented management of the workforce. The same scoring procedure will be used for this thesis.

3.4.1.b The Semi-Structured Interview

The semi-structured interview was designed to collect sociodemographic and experiential information about the participants in order to ensure a realistic comparison with South African military families (See Appendix G). It is also to expose similarities and differences between the Canadian and the South African 'military deployment' experience. Further, the supplementary details brought forth in these interviews will reveal additional variables that may encourage further research into the needs of the military family and how to balance these needs with those of the military organization. The foci of this instrument are: descriptive data collection and the use and availability of supports for military families.

3.4.2 Procedure

After the screening of individual participants, as described above, each person was given the DR Scale, a writing instrument, a private room,. and up to one hour to complete the scale. After this step was completed, the researcher checked with each participant to ensure willingness to also participate in the semi-structured interview portion of this study. If the participant indicated that they wished to continue, the private room was used to conduct the interview. Each participant was aware that the interview was being digitally recorded and each had the option, as explicitly stated in the 'letter of information,' to have the

digital recorder paused or shut off at any time. In addition, each participant had the option of ending either portion of the study, the questionnaire or the interview, at any time without consequences. Participants were specifically asked to base all their responses on their last extended deployment with the Canadian Forces. Those participants who completed both portions of the study were advised that the interviewer would be in constant possession of their data, the researcher would transcribe the interview data, and that a brief summary report of the data would be available to them upon request. Twelve out of thirteen participants requested a copy of this summary report.

3.5 Data Management

The data collected with the Deployment Resilience Scale was scored using the formulae in Appendix I, and analyzed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v.10) computer software. The qualitative data collected with the 'Semi-Structured Interview Schedule' was coded to provide numerical expression of the information given by the participants. Each interview was documented on the 'Semi-Structured Interview Schedule' as well as digitally recorded and transcribed by the researcher to ensure integrity of the data. The SPSS v.10 software was also used to analyze the qualitative data. Each piece of sociodemographic information was used to provide the Canadian context, and the deployment experience information collected was used in conjunction with the information collected with the Deployment Resilience Scale.

For the DR Scale item-total statistics were used meaning that the items for each dimension were processed to determine the following: the DR Scale means for each of two groups; those deployed and those not deployed (left behind spouses), and the group means for each dimension, however, the last dimension, 'employer management' is separated from the others because it does not measure family resilience itself, only employer contribution to family resiliency (Van Breda, 2003). In addition, a total resilience score was calculated for the sample. These resilience scores were then compared with the qualitative data. Performing the data entry and corresponding statistical analyses three times ensured control of data entry errors. This repetition was possible because of the small sample size.

Last, as noted earlier, this study is not designed for cross-cultural investigation. In e-mail correspondence with Mr. Van Breda (2003) he acknowledged that the Deployment Resilience Scale was not culturally sensitive and significant problems with reliability and validity surfaced when the scale was used for any cross-cultural exploration.

4.   Data Analysis and Findings

4.1   Introduction

This research study seeks to gain further understanding of military families by exploring military family resiliency factors that assist families in coping with unaccompanied deployments. Based on the findings, this study examines the implications for occupational social work in the CF in order to increase understanding about Canadian military family resiliency factors, the DR Scale as a predictive tool and the implications this has for family policy and social work practice in the military. Using Van Breda's (1997) Deployment Resilience Scale, a pre-test was conducted with a sample of five former Canadian military male personnel who experienced extended separation(s) from their wives and children, and 8 civilian spouses who had experienced deployment separations as the 'left behind' spouse. All extended separations, of three months or more were for peacekeeping missions (including hazardous duty), support services, or training. Note that although the typical length of deployment is six months, this study included separations of three months or more as these types of deployments are also common in the CF (Jamieson, 2003) and are also treated as extended deployments (Doyle, 2003). The number of deployments shorter than three months was included to provide further context for deployment patterns in the CF.

4.2   Sample Characteristics

The demographic information presented was collected during the semi-structured interview portion of the meetings with participants. Of the five males who participated in this research, 40% experienced peacekeeping deployments, 40% experienced training deployments, and 20% were deployed to provide support services. Of the eight military spouses who participated in this research, 50% experienced partner deployment for peacekeeping, and 50% experienced partner deployment for training missions. Also, all of the participants were serving with the Air Force except for one who was in the Army at the time of his deployment. In addition, all participants were legally married, served with the Regular Forces, and the deployments cover the time frame from 1975 to 2003. It is interesting to note that 85% of all participants experienced from one to sixty short-term deployments in their military careers or as a spouse. The remainder of the information is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1   Summary of Total Sample Demographics   **N = 13**

	Deployed (5 males)	Non-Deployed (7 females, 1 male)
Age range at the time of deployment(s)	35-39	26-48
Cultural affiliation	60% Anglo 20% French 20% Other	87.5% Anglo 12.5% Other
Males: Average number of years Retired from service	9.4 years	
Spouses: Average number of years (former) Partner retired from the military		4.4 years (5 spouses not retired)
Average number of short term deployments experienced	23.2	15.75
Average number of long term deployments	1.8	1.4
Rank at the time of deployment(s)	NCM	NCM (One is an Officer's wife)
Level of education	< HS to College	<HS to University
Average number of dependents at the time of deployment(s)	1.5	1

Since all of the participants were recruited from Southern Ontario, it is not surprising that the dominant cultural affiliation is English Canadian as Ontario is predominantly an English province. This demographic information reflects the sample population at the time the participants were experiencing military

deployments, and the data specifically targets the last experienced long term deployment.

4.3   Deployment Resilience Scale: Data Presentation

The DR Scale measures responses to military deployments along eight dimensions. These dimensions are: emotional continuity, positive perspectives on separations, support systems, financial preparation, "partner-aware" family structure, resilient children, flexible marriage, and family oriented management. The deployment resilience questionnaires that were completed by the participants were scored as they were scored for the South African military participants (See Appendix H). The DR Scale uses a Likert type response system (Van Breda, 1999) with a scale of one to four answer options. A score of '1' for each dimension shows more overall resiliency and a score of '4' for each dimension shows lower overall resiliency. Last, the scores for the spouses (non-deployed) were calculated separately from the scores for the males (deployed) to examine any differences, and those with children and those without children were scored as such to ensure accuracy of the data. All scores were then added together to calculate the total overall average of resiliency scores for the entire sample population.

Table 2:   **Resiliency Scores by Deployed and Non-Deployed Spouses**

N=13

Dimension	Deployed	Non-Deployed Spouses	Total
Emotional Continuity	2.0250	2.1015	2.0653
Positive Perspectives on Separation	2.2000	1.8875	2.0438
Support Systems	1.9408	1.8477	1.8942
Financial Preparation	3.0154	2.9817	2.9985
Partner-aware family Structure	2.4267	2.1167	2.2717
Resilient Children	1.2500	1.1633	1.2066
Flexible Marriage	1.7900	1.6313	1.7106
Family Oriented Management	*3.2250*	*2.7969*	*3.1019*
Total Average (Those with children)	**2.1053**	**1.9640**	**2.0346**
Total Average (Those without children)	**2.1734**	**1.8514**	**2.0124**
Total Average			**2.0235**

* This score is analyzed separately as it is not a direct measure of family resiliency.

The data indicates that those deployed scored lower on overall resiliency factors except for the 'emotional continuity' dimension where they scored slightly higher. Overall, however, the data is tightly clustered. Interestingly, the largest

gap between those deployed and the non-deployed spouses lies in the 'positive perceptions of deployment' where the non-deployed spouses showed stronger resiliency, and the 'family oriented management' dimension where those deployed showed the least resiliency. The total averages seem to indicate that Canadian military families of the past, and recent past show average resiliency along all dimensions except 'financial preparation' that showed lower resiliency and 'resilient children' which showed high resiliency.

Last, 'family oriented management' has the lowest resiliency score. This is congruent with the participant responses to the efforts on the part of the military in supporting families and individuals. In earlier deployments many felt the military did all they could, however, in more recent deployments, people are more skeptical about military support.

4.4   The Deployment Resilience Scale and Data Reliability

Van Breda's study (1997) tested the reliability of his DR Scale. The reliability scores were calculated for each 'family separation resilience' dimension. Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure internal reliability for each of the eight subscales. Each subscale has an alpha score of over .80, which falls near to the acceptable range of .85 to .94 (Van Breda, 1997).

4.5   The Semi-Structured Interview: Data Presentation

This data revealed that those deployed used personnel briefings, occasionally the Commanding Officer, and friends as supports during the pre-deployment, and deployment phases. Post-deployment supports were not

provided; only self and extended family were cited as supports during this phase. The non-deployed spouses mainly cited friends and military information sessions for spouses during the pre-deployment phase. For the deployment phase they cited spouses' military co-workers and friends, however one person used a civilian family service as the military did not offer family respite programs, and others cited the Military Family Resource Centers for childcare and family activities. During the post-deployment phase, no supports other than 'family' and the 'Commanding Officer' were cited. The data also showed that 46% of the participants found information through their spouses and military and civilian friends, 15% did not know what supports were available, and the remainder received information from the military. On average, the supports that were listed as most helpful were family, friends, and informal military assistance, for example, calling the deployed spouses unit for assistance.

Participants were also asked to express the worst and best part of pre-deployment, deployment, and post-deployment. The responses, on average, reflected worry about the family while away and fear for one's own safety for the deployed group, and being alone, fear for spouses safety, and not knowing when he would be returning, for the non-deployed group. The responses for best experience reflected travel and exposure to other cultures for the deployed group, and gaining independence and reunion for the non-deployed group. In addition, the participants added information about their personal feelings during each phase and what they thought their children had experienced during each of

the deployment phases. The resiliency scores showed strong parental perception of child resilience. All parents stated that their daughters coped well, except for one who returned to her normal level of functioning when 'dad' arrived home, and 50% of the sons coped well. The remainder of the sons had some difficulty, however, were able to continue to function adequately in spite of the deployment.

Participants also shared the type and frequency of communication with their family members during the deployment phase. The data indicates that during the 1970's and 80's there was reliance on weekly letters but by the 1990's, there were various modes of communication available (e-mail, telephone, letters etc...) and communication was almost daily. Further, 92% of participants indicated that this was enough to keep them feeling like a family. Last, in the 1970's and 80's most participants felt that the military did do enough to ease family stress around deployment. However, in the 1990's until present, even though communication and services seem to have greatly improved, 50% stated they thought the military was doing everything it could to assist families, and 50% stated they thought that military supports were inadequate.'

4.6   Participants Perception of Deployment in Canada Since the 1970's

Table 3   Sample Representation by Decade   N=13

Decade	Deployed	Non-Deployed
1970's	3	3
1980's	1	0
1990's	1	3
2000 +	0	2

This study covers a time frame that has seen many changes. The most significant of these for military families is the formal recognition by the military to support military families with the institutionalization on Military Family Resource Centers in 1991 (Department of National Defence: CFPSA – Military Family Services, 2002) amongst other policy changes. The data from those participants who experienced deployment in the 1970's and 80's indicates that military families relied heavily on friends, family, neighbours, and themselves during the pre-deployment and deployment phases. In the 1990's and beyond, families relied more heavily on military services, both formal and informal (military friends, co-workers, and wives clubs) as well as on family and friends. The deployment phase indicated the heaviest reliance on family and friend supports. The post-deployment phase had no formal support offered by the military and only two persons indicated that the Commanding Officer was a resource to the family in an emergency. Thus, it appears that the post-deployment phase is an area of great concern as it had no substantial family supports, and as one soldier stated,

"Not even a proper homecoming; it was like we never even left." One further note is that in the 1970's and 80's the overriding concern for both deployed and non-deployed spouses was being alone and lack of military support for the family. In the 1990's to present, the overriding concern is for the deployed spouse's safety. In addition, best experiences were 'travel and adventure' for those deployed. For those left-behind, best experiences went from 'gaining independence' in the 1970'and 80's to 'reunion' in the 1990's (except for the one male non-deployed spouse who stated that his best experience was getting closer to his sons). This speaks to the global climate of increased military conflict and the increase in hazardous deployments of first world militaries. One very interesting revelation is that twelve of the thirteen participants stated that through their deployment experiences, they continued to feel like they were 'a family' in spite of the perception that the military is less family supportive today than in the past, and that participants overall personal feelings about military deployments went from 'positive' in the early years to 'negative' in recent years. Finally, positive perceptions around military supports waned greatly from the 1990's to the present. This will be discussed further in Section 5.

4.7   Resiliency Scores and Use of Support Resources

The resiliency scores for supports are listed in Table 3 as follows:

Table 4   Resiliency Scores in the Four Areas of Support by Deployed and Non-Deployed

Support Dimension	Deployed	Non-Deployed	Grand Total
Family Support	2.1714	1.8929	
Military Support	2.1250	1.8750	
Community Support	2.0666	2.0694	
Religious Support	1.4000	1.5536	
Total Support Averages	**1.9408**	**1.8477**	**1.8943**

These resiliency scores indicate average resilience (0 = perfectly resilient and 4 = no resiliency) except for religious support that takes on a stronger value than the other support scores. This is interesting given that military padres were not cited as sources of support, and only two participants made explicit their church involvement. It is also interesting to note that community support has a stronger resiliency score than military support which scores stronger than family support. These inconsistencies will be discussed in Section 5.

4.8   Summary

The data from the DR Scale and the Semi-structured interview is generally inconsistent but have some general themes and points worthy of further exploration. Overall, the group has an average resiliency score except in the area of financial preparation where it indicates lower family resilience. Those without children had a slightly higher resiliency score than those with children, and in the

support dimension 'religious support' scored the highest. Last, 'family oriented management' had the lowest resiliency score (although this is not a measure of family resilience itself, but employer contribution to it) which is highly congruent with participant responses about military support. Participants indicated that overall, their experience with military services was negative, especially from the 1990's to the present.

5   Discussion: Introduction

Although the data is not from a sample representative of the Canadian Forces, it serves its purpose by pointing to some indicators that would alert a military occupational social worker to begin the process of assessment. This process can range from deciding to remain alert to the situation to a full-scale plan of action that will create mutually beneficial change. For example, one issue that sounds a warning is the lack of military support during the 'reintegration' phase of deployment. This phase has been cited in the literature as the most difficult for many families, however, this area appears to be highly neglected and thus worthy of social work assessment.

More specifically, the data is intended to assist in formulating a direction for social work action in the context of the military and military families who experience deployment. The research question is based on obtaining a small amount of data from former military members and military spouses as to their experiences with deployment in the Canadian Forces. Thus, how can the DR Scale assist in gaining a better understanding of resiliency factors among Canadian military families, how can the DR Scale be used as a predictive tool in order to allow more proactive work, and how can military occupational social workers use this information to influence military family policies and social work practice in the military context?

5.1 Strengths and Limitations of This Study

This study provides a beginning into the understanding of family resiliency in the context of peacetime deployments. Collectively, the strengths outlined carry the justification for further exploration of the issues presented here. First, this research uses a mixed methodology approach that enriches the data. Without the qualitative information, much of the Canadian context will have remained undiscovered. This qualitative data was also intended to complement the DR Scale data to assist in developing this scale or a similar scale specifically for Canadian military families that can then serve as a predictive tool. Second, the DR Scale is also used to complement the qualitative data and to learn more about resilience factors in Canadian military families. Further, this scale has shown both acceptable levels of validity and reliability when used with the military population of the South African Navy. When resiliency factors can be identified, services and policies can be directed towards fostering these factors and nurturing those factors that are weaker whether they are on the individual, family, organizational, or relationship levels.

Third, the matching of resilience scores with interview data can serve as a tool for identifying inconsistencies that can aid in development of assessment tools and alert social workers to area's requiring further exploration for policy and practice purposes. Fourth, this study is based on many years of research and theory construction and thus offers solid grounding for further research. In addition, a body of research that comes from countries possessing more

similarities than differences serves as a framework for this research, as well as influencing interpretation of findings. Fifth, integrity of data was preserved by digitally recording interviews and transcribing each to ensure no data was lost thus as much context as possible was retained. Sixth, the use of the SPSS v.10 program was used to simplify the data without losing vital pieces pertinent to this study and to highlight areas for further exploration. Last, five of the spouses interviewed had spouses who are currently in the military thus the researcher was given relatively current information to further contextualize deployment experiences. For instance, one spouse who experienced a recent deployment stated that she was given extensive information through briefings for spouses, and military information packages and newsletters. This at least acknowledges that the CF is cognizant of the importance of military families and their influence on military readiness.

The primary limitation of this study lies with the convenience sampling. This sample consists of all regular force, married, mature adults in age, predominantly English, and all Air Force, save one, at the time of their last deployments. Although the spouses are overrepresented by 24%, this sample has indicated some areas that should alert an occupational social worker, even though any areas for intervention may be unique to this group, and their relationship with the military. It is acknowledged here that since the 'military spouse' group, and those with the characteristics mentioned above, are overrepresented, and that the data obtained from the military spouse group is

somewhat richer than that for the 'former employee' group, all interpretations of the data are made with caution.

Second, the sample portion that was deployed represented only 38% of the total sample and none were deployed from 2000 on, thus they were not represented in that decade's analysis. Third, the age range for those deployed was tightly clustered (35-39 years) thus there was no representation of younger or older men. The spouse group had a wider age range (26-48 years), however, no very young, newly weds or parents were represented. Fourth, of those deployed all were NCM's and of the 'spouse group' all were married to NCM's, except for one spouse who was the wife of a Captain. Thus no real representation of the Officer ranks is present. Fifth, 61% of the sample experienced six month deployments, 23% experienced three to five month deployments, one person experienced a 10 month deployment, and one a 12 month deployment, thus the data will be skewed towards 6 month deployments. Sixth, even though data was collected about short term and frequent deployments, there was no direct measurement of how these deployments affect the family and how they influence family coping with long term deployments. The interplay between long and short-term deployments and military families would be a vital area of interest for military social workers, but is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Seventh, although a cultural component would be vital to a comprehensive study of this topic, it is not included here since it was surmised by the researcher

that the sample population would be predominantly white, Anglo-Saxon closely

paralleling the South African Naval population in 1997 (Van Breda, 2003). The

scale was partially chosen because it did not include a cultural component, which

is also beyond the scope of this thesis. Eighth, given the high resilience scores

for religious support, resilient children and the fact that twelve of thirteen

participants stated they still felt like a family despite their deployment

circumstances, it is possible that this sample represents only fairly resilient

families and perhaps fairly resilient individuals as well. Ninth, this study relied on

participant's memories of past deployments. Some of these deployments took

place over twenty-five years ago, thus it is acknowledged that "respondent

inaccuracy" as identified by Woodside and Wilson (2002) is a factor, thus again,

all results must be interpreted with caution.

Last, the data for this study was collected from individuals. This summons

the legitimate debate about the usefulness of making inferences about the family

based on the responses of individual family members, as well as excluding

responses from the children. However, any group data must be collected from

individuals on some level, but for the purposes of this thesis, the findings will be

used as a warning device rather than a description of all Canadian military

families.

5.2   Critical Analysis and Implications for Occupational Social Work in the Canadian Forces

Findings of this study will be discussed in the context of the outline given

above of the sample characteristics and the strengths and limitations of this

study. However, two items need to be noted. First, the category of family income has been deleted from the qualitative statistical analysis, as it is too difficult to compare salaries adjusted for inflation over the years represented in this study; however it remains as part of this analysis as finances are generally a significant family issue. It is interesting to note that participants indicated family income as a stressor, yet none indicated either implicitly or explicitly that military pay was an insufficient family income. This is interesting given that the family resilience score for the sample on the 'financial preparation' subscale indicated low resiliency in this area. There is no way to explain this from the data, however, it may be an area of concern for the military social worker who may want to explore this issue further, especially if families are incurring greater expenses as a result of deployments. Van Breda (1999a) and Van Breda and Potgieter (2002) also cited financial difficulties as 'significant' for military families experiencing deployment because of the cost of having to support two households. Perhaps families require some financial relief if these extra financial expenses are incurred. Perhaps some families don't plan for the unforeseen, and would like some assistance with money management. There could be many and varied reasons for this inconsistency, including data collection method since the researcher did not directly question the area of finances beyond 'family income at the time of the last deployment'.

Second, the variable 'family oriented management' or 'employer support for families' has the lowest family resilience scores. This variable is analyzed

separately since it is a measure of its contribution to family resilience and not family resilience itself as expressed by the originator of the DR Scale (Van Breda, 2003). This finding is congruent with participant responses as to whether the military is supporting families in a way that is helpful and meaningful. What is interesting to note is that in the 1970's and 80's when there appeared to be much less support for military families, the majority of participants stated that their overall experience with deployments were positive and that the military did everything it could at the time to support families. In the 1990's to 2003, it appears that the military is recognizing the influence of the military family and is providing more services and supports to families who are experiencing unaccompanied deployment(s). However, the majority of participants stated that their overall experience with deployment was negative even though reliance on military formal and informal services had increased and daily communication with a spouse during deployment was now possible. Further, the majority of participants from the 1990's to the present, indicated that they felt the military was not doing everything it could to ease the stress of deployment on families. For example, two mothers complained of the aggressiveness of the media upon departure or homecoming of the soldiers and that military officials do nothing to stop this. The mothers complained that the media distresses the children and adds stress to an already stressful situation. Also, the wife of the officer stated that when her husband was to be deployed she was given no information and was not made aware of any military or civilian services for herself or for any

difficulties with her stepchildren. The system was negligent in terms of its administrative tardiness in ensuring that she was put on the mailing list for deployment information. She was greatly distressed at this as she could have been someone in a position to be in great need of assistance, especially since they were newly posted to Trenton.

It is plausible to surmise that the years prior to 1990 retained within them the 'rugged individual' ethos within a 'survival of the fittest' framework. This is most notable with the spousal participants as the predominant response was in terms of having little choice but to be resourceful and to understand that the military existed to peace keep and fight wars, not to take care of families. After all, the military required families to be strong (implying women spouses left behind) and support their men along with national interests. The military was able to use women's time and energy by having them involved in volunteer work to support their men and one another, thereby, supporting military interests (Harrison and Laliberte, 1994). This unpaid labour greatly hindered women from advancing their own career and educational interests. Conversely, after 1990, the data indicate that spouses are no longer adopting the 'survival of the fittest' and 'rugged individual' frameworks, but instead are demanding military support and offering critical feedback in order to continue the pressure for more and appropriate services. It seems that this new generation of military spouses and parents are holding the military accountable for its demands on its employees

and their families, as well as recognizing their own power and influence on military retention and readiness.

The 'rugged individual' ethos may also be reflected in the patterns of support system use and availability. In the 1970's and 80's military families predominantly relied on friends, military co-workers, and neighbours in all phases of the deployment cycle. Another common response from participants of this time frame was that services weren't needed. Those deployed received preparation training and had their supervisors to turn to while those left behind had to demonstrate their resourcefulness. They seemed to have only wives networks, and the rear party which many military wives have criticized as ineffective (Harrison, 2002). By the 1990's there were military supports added through the Military Family Resource Centers (Department of National Defence: CFPSA-Military Family Services, 2002). The data indicate that families are more reliant upon formal and informal military services (for example, childcare and family social activities) but they are not willing to be fully satisfied, perhaps also suggesting a departure from the 'rugged individual' ethos. This is important to note since families appear to have no military sponsored support in the post deployment phase. Although participants stated that they probably did not need post deployment services, they understood how others might be in dire need of them because of their own struggles with reintegration.

The heaviest reliance on supports comes during the deployment phase, however, during the 1970's and 80's friends, neighbours and sometimes families

were the main supports used. Extended family support was usually unavailable, as military families are not often residing near their families of origin because of frequent military relocations. Since the 1990's the data indicates a heavier reliance on military services as well as an expressed satisfaction with their availability during the pre-deployment and deployment phase, however; post deployment services appear either unavailable or hidden from the general military community. One important note is that military families often rely on military services as they may be too new to a community to know about civilian services or they are at an isolated location where services are minimal. Overall, support usage lies predominantly with self, friends and neighbours suggesting perhaps a still uneasy relationship between the military and military families and perhaps a lack of communication on the part of the military about the availability of services. This highlights the finding that the majority of participants discovered services through their spouse, friends, military co-workers, and occasionally the Commanding Officer indicating that services are frequently discovered by chance rather than by a systematic effort on the part of the military. This should be an area of concern for the military social worker who is interested in the appropriate dissemination of information.

One final note originates with a participant who stated that she found the wives network unhelpful because she "didn't want to hear women bitching all the time." This is an area that the military social worker should track to evaluate the helpfulness of services that were put into place during the early years of the

99

military's concern with families. Although military families may be impressed that services are available, the services should reflect the needs of the current military family. A further finding of note is the shift from "worry about left being alone to manage the family" to concern about the deployed spouse's safety and the anxiety expressed around not knowing the spouse's return date. For those left behind, best experiences of deployment shifted from the gaining of independence to reunion with the spouse. This speaks to the changes in the global climate, which is requiring more hazardous peacekeeping duties from all peacekeeping nations creating a shift in focus from self and children to spousal safety. The effect of this type of deployment on military families needs to be studied further to generate appropriate services for those experiencing the potential loss of a spouse in a military context.

Military social workers need to assess power imbalances between the military and military families in order to create and maintain the healthiest possible balance between the needs of the employees and employer. Instruments such as the DR Scale may be a quick and relatively simple tool to aid with these assessments and engage workers in proactive work rather than the predominant reactive mode of practice. Once the scale is adjusted specifically for Canadian military families an accompanying interview may not be necessary to capture the ongoing needs and difficulties within the military community around deployment issues. Further, this mode of social work practice accommodates the strengths and resilience based approaches to social work

with families since an ecological framework is used where all pertinent systems and relationships are assessed to allow policy decisions to rest on a fuller understanding of situations. This de-focuses the family as the object of change and more fairly distributes responsibility while simultaneously assessing the strengths of the systems involved in order to provide a balanced perspective. Yuen and Pardeck, (1999) state that social work practice has always been dominated by the disease model thus social workers need to adopt a family health model and view families within the context of their environment. In addition, it is believed here that a strengths based approach lubricates the change process by accentuating the positive, creating more amicable relationships, and by possessing the potential to expedite matters of importance.

A final point about family based social work in the military is the parallel between the 'rugged individual' ethos and the concepts of resiliency and 'strengths based' practice. In a highly competitive society an individual deemed resilient may also be categorized as someone who succeeds in spite of the odds against them. However, in social work the mark of a resilient person is someone who succeeds on their own terms often because of the odds against them (Walsh, 1998). This difference in definition is of great importance to the military social worker who must be clear about defining employee and organizational needs and their current context. The crucial point here is that the concept of the 'rugged individual' must not be confused with the 'resilient individual' to avoid reliance upon the 'survival of the fittest' framework and to understand that

resiliency does not mean a person without personal problems. The concept of the 'rugged individual' implies complete self-reliance despite environment, whereas the 'resilient individual' implies a healthy integration with the environment to ensure health for both individual and community. Resiliency then is the ability to draw from the community as well as help sustain it, whereas 'rugged individualism' implies drawing only from the self while denying the mutual dependency between an individual and their environment. In military social work it is important to draw these distinctions in order to avoid regressing into earlier notions about individual and family functioning in the 'survival of the fittest' framework.

The research literature indicates that fearfulness of utilizing community resources increases as rank decreases. Programs designed to increase the level of information about help resources and to make their use more acceptable must, therefore, be primarily aimed at lower-ranking groups, although they must be sufficiently broad to include all strata of the community...Help giving must be structured in such a way that the client or potential client does not perceive the receipt of help as damaging to his or her official status in the organization. (Spellman, 1976; pp 205) This is especially important in male dominated organizations where 'survival of the fittest' sentiments continue to resonate. Therefore, in the military subculture extra efforts need to be made to create an atmosphere of acceptance for individual and social problems as a normal part of life rather that as a punishment for past wrongdoings or a reflection of personal

inadequacy. Iversen (1998), states that social work needs multilevel practice; micro, meso, and macro. Therefore not only individuals are implicated, but an entire organization can also be held accountable for its policies and actions. This is fairly new to military organizations and must be handled by those who have understanding of the military subculture.

In addition it must be noted that military social workers must work towards an 'all-inclusive family policy' that includes diverse family forms. "At the policy level, myths that define the ideal family have inhibited support and empowerment of diverse family structures" (Weick and Saleebey, 1995; pp 143). Occupational social workers must understand the reality of families and their forms and processes in order to advocate their interests within the military arena. This implies that occupational social workers must attempt to understand not only those social constructions that are apparent, but also explore those that are hidden from social view. This gives occupational social work an investigative and exploratory role as well as a reactive advocacy role.

Last, Turner (1997) states, "social workers still have a long way to go in strengthening the research base from which they practice..." and "social workers in Canada are going to see a great expansion in their interrelations with colleagues in other countries. We have much to learn from other countries, and we have much to contribute" (pp 46). This last point speaks to the need for social workers to unite on a global level to exchange ideas and research findings. Social workers can then more purposefully assist military families and the very

military organizations that have the potential to end global conflict and redistribute resources based on need rather than interests. On a micro level, social workers are responsible for "the effects of their interactions on clients, for examining their own biases and privileges, for confronting the limits of their own understandings, for making transparent and naming the ideas that influence their work, and for confronting injustices and oppression in the surrounding community. The postmodern clinician must be alert to dominant discourses and the stories of the marginalized, and must not only empower clients, but promote social justice" (Laird, 1995). This leaves the occupational social worker with many realms to contend with as well as the myriad of relations between them.

5.3   Questions for Future Research

External differences between first world militaries appear to be minimal given that the South African, USA, and Canadian militaries employ social workers and other mental health professionals who provide support to military personnel and their families. The literature revealed that the South African and Canadian militaries base their MAP's (Member Assistance Programs) on the USA models of support to military personnel and their families. The salient questions arising from this are: How can researchers ensure equal study of those deployed and those left behind to develop a clearer understanding of family dynamics rather than, as Safilios-Rothchild (in Draper and Marcos, 1990) state, basing studies solely on the responses of wives which created researcher dependency on sole respondents. How can the children be included, in a safe

and ethical manner, in military family studies to be more congruent with the social work value of holistic study? What generalizations can be made from individual data to the military family population as a whole? In addition, Wexler and McGrath (1991) state that specific sub groups need to be identified based on factors such as age, level of education, ethnicity, actual lengths of separations, and number of separations experienced. This is a salient point given the complexities of the military, its families, and the greater social environment.

Future research needs to be very specific in order to design appropriate programs for each sub-population. Thus, how do these factors affect resource utilization, both military and civilian, and how do social workers ensure that these sub-groups are identified and resourced? Further, how does the postmodern family deal with unaccompanied deployments? It seems that on the macro level military families are very similar. However, on the micro level, military families may be as unique as their civilian counterparts in terms of their coping and resiliency patterns. Occupational social workers need to be cognizant of changing family forms and their support utilization patterns.

Family based social work research and practice require further development and integration in order to explain and predict family behaviour and move towards improved interventions (McCubbin and McCubbin, 1992). The following are questions that require further research which will inform family policy and practice and reflect the dynamic nature of families and their environments. Typically, social support has been discussed as a separate issue

in the social work literature, however, it is an integral part of family research and processes and raises the following questions: how can social support be defined for all military families? What types of social supports offer families assistance in stressful times? And if social supports act as a mediator of family stress, what types of stressors do these supports successfully mediate? (McCubbin and McCubbin, 1992). The occupational social worker must ask questions on all levels of human interaction.

5.4 Summary

The findings of this research primarily alert the occupational social worker to the necessity of holistic assessments of the individual, family and military organizational structures. Since deployments are generally stressful for all military families, a strengths based approach to family social work in the military is crucial to counter the predominant social and military ethos of the 'rugged individual.' Support availability and utilization in the military reflects the 'rugged individual' ideology, however, the data indicate that this may be changing as military families are holding the military organization more accountable for the effect of deployment on their families.

6 Conclusions

From the results of this study, the Deployment Resilience Scale is an instrument worthy of further exploration as a quick and effective assessment tool for military occupational social workers. For the purposes of this thesis the DR Scale has alerted the researcher to potential financial difficulties, lack of appropriate military support services, especially in the post deployment phase including support availability and utilization difficulties, and the possibility of insufficient information dissemination strategies on the part of the military. The semi-structured interview yielded information about the effects of deployment in an historical context and also a glimpse into the current context of the changing attitudes and expectations of current military families coping with deployment. The 'rugged individual' ethos appears to be waning greatly with the spouses of military personnel. Even if the military continues to embrace this ethos, the impact of the civilian community in the form of the DND, the Reserve units, civilian contract workers, and families of military personnel will serve to counterbalance this and highlight the mutual interdependence of people and social organizations. Thus, military occupational social work needs to embrace the ecological, strengths and resilience based approaches to counter military traditions steeped in the 'survival of the fittest' framework, patriarchy, and an inflexible hierarchy that has a very rigid chain of command. Occupational social workers must be prepared to operate on all levels of human interaction within an

ecological and human resiliency framework to highlight the human condition of

mutual interdependence and individual strength existing simultaneously.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AVF	All Volunteer Force - All military personnel have joined the Forces of their own volition
CF	Canadian Forces military branch of the Ministry of National Defence
CFAO	Canadian Forces Administrative Orders are designed to complement the Queen's Regulations and Orders.
Chain of Command	All first world militaries have a distinct hierarchy and rules about how many levels one can go up or down to communicate information. In Canada, generally speaking, the chain of command is realized in one level increments
	Part of the National Defence Act in Canada. All military personnel are subject to this piece of legislation.
Commanding Officer: (CO	A CO can be the commander of a base, wing, unit, squadron, or any other unit set up by the military.
Combat Arms	Those personnel employed to carry out the combat function of the military.
Commission	All military commissioned officers hold a commission endowing them with certain responsibilities not given to their non-commissioned colleagues.
DAOD	Defence Administrative Orders and Directives (Canadian) complements military laws.
DAG	Deployment Assistance Group. These employees, mainly military, screen potentially deployable personnel for any difficulties that may lead to premature repatriation.
Deployment	Accompanied deployments consist of the entire military family being posted to a location; unaccompanied deployment means working at a location outside of your posting without your family.
DND	Department of National Defence: Canadian Federal Government responsibility
DoD	Department of Defense: United States Federal Government responsibility
EAP	Employee Assistance Programs, generally for civilian employees and their families.
Element	Refers to Land (Army), Air (Air Force) and Sea (Navy).
MIA	Missing in Action: used to refer to those who disappeared in a war or peacekeeping situation.
MOC	Military Occupational Code: Each occupation within the military has a code name.

NCM	Non-commissioned member is a military employee that is not an officer meaning s/he does not hold a Queen's commission and thus is not subject to particular military responsibilities
Peacekeeping	There are many levels and types of peacekeeping in first world militaries thus refer to the military literature for each country. Peacekeeping can range from extremely hazardous to safe.
Q R & O's	Queen's Regulations and Orders (Canadian and British) – rules and regulations for Commonwealth militaries.
Regular Forces	Full-time military personnel
Reserve Forces	Part-time military personnel who hold civilian jobs or studies
Remuster	To move from one occupation to the other or from one element to the other
SADF	South African Defence Force: National Government responsibility
SANDF	South African Naval Defence Force: National Government responsibility
SWO	Social Work Officer: a commissioned military officer licensed to practice social work with military personnel and the organization.
SWO Unit	A group of military personnel made up to perform a certain military function.
United Nations Observer	The military personnel are deployed individually rather than in a unit and work with other UN troops to observe movement and gather intelligence.

APPENDIX A

Taken from: Logan (in Van Breda, 1997 pp.156)

Emotional Cycles of Separation

Stage	Title of Stage	Duration of Stage	Phase
PRE-SEPARATION PHASE			
1	Anticipation of loss	Two weeks prior to separation	Crying, irritability, depression, marital conflict
2	Detachment and withdrawal	Two days prior to separation	Withdrawal, sexual tension, despair, hopelessness
SEPARATION PHASE			
3	Emotional disorganization	First week of separation	Adjusting, worry, irritability, depression, aimlessness, numbness, anger, guilt, sleep disturbance
4	Recovery and stabilization	Middle of separation	New life is established, independent, anxious, depressed, illness
5	Anticipation of homecoming	One week prior to return	Excitement, joy, tension apprehension, nervousness
POST SEPARATION PHASE			
6	Renegotiation of marriage contract	First two days after return	Excitement, emotiona distance, sexual difficulties, conflict, los of independence and negotiation of roles
7	Reintegration and stabilization	Two weeks after return	Established roles and routine and marital closeness

111

APPENDIX B

Canadian Forces ranks

Commissioned officers	**Non-commissioned members**
Army and Air Force	**Army and Air Force**
General (Gen)	Chief Warrant Officer (CWO)
Lieutenant-General (LGen)	Master Warrant Officer (MWO)
Major-General (MGen)	Warrant Officer (WO)
Brigadier-General (BGen)	Sergeant (Sgt)
Colonel (Col)	Master Corporal (MCpl)
Lieutenant-Colonel (LCol)	Corporal (Cpl)
Major (Maj)	Private (Pte)
Captain (Capt)	Private (Recruit) (Pte (R))
Lieutenant (Lt)	
Second Lieutenant (2Lt)	
Officer Cadet (OCdt)	

Navy	**Navy**
Admiral (Adm)	Chief Petty Officer, 1st Class (CPO 1)
Vice-Admiral (VAdm)	Chief Petty Officer, 2nd Class (CPO 2)
Rear-Admiral (RAdm)	Petty Officer, 1st Class (PO 1)
Commodore (Cmdre)	Petty Officer, 2nd Class (PO 2)
Captain (N) (Capt(N))	Master Seaman (MS)
Commander (Cdr)	Leading Seaman (LS)
Lieutenant-Commander (LCdr)	Able Seaman (AB)
Lieutenant (N) (Lt(N))	Ordinary Seaman (OS)
Sub-Lieutenant (SLt)	
Acting Sub-Lieutenant (A/SLt)	
Naval Cadet (NCdt)	

112

APPENDIX   C

DND and Canadian Forces Military Structure

Prime Minister of Canada

Canadian Parliament

Minister of National Defence

Deputy Minister of National Defence	JAG	Chief of Defence Staff

Department of National Defence

Canadian Forces

Vice Chief of Defence Staff

Various Assistant Deputy Ministers

NDHQ

Chief of the Land Staff

Command Group	General Staff	Special Staff and Advisors

Assistant CLS	Command CWO	Dir. General Land Staff	Dir. General Land Reserve	Land Force Command Inspector	Medical Advisor

LS Secretariat

Chaplain Advisor

Fire Marshal Advisor

113

APPENDIX C (CONTINUED)

Director LF Readiness	Director Land Strategic Planning	Director Land Requirements	Dir. Of Land Comms. and Info.	Legal Advisor	Scientific Advisor

Director Land Personnel	Director Land Force Structure	Comptroller Land Force	Director Land Public Affairs	Army Cadet Advisor

Director Land	Director Army	Director Army Training

On LFDTS Strength. Liaison with DGLS through COS LFDTS

It is not necessary to understand the terms, only that there is a fairly large and complex hierarchy within the Canadian Forces, as in many First World militaries.

APPENDIX D

<u>**POSTER FOR RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS**</u>

ATTENTION

<u>**NEEDED: PARTICIPANTS TO TAKE PART IN RESEARCH ABOUT CANADIAN MILITARY FAMILIES**</u>

If you are a former male employee of the Canadian Military and if you have endured deployments of 4 months or longer for training or peacekeeping missions; or the female spouse, or former female spouse, of a former male Canadian military employee, and have endured an unaccompanied deployment(s) of your spouse for 4 months or longer for training or peacekeeping missions; and you are willing to share your family's experiences with deployment(s) in the past, your input is greatly needed.

This study is to increase understanding of how best to serve Canadian military families around deployment issues and to contribute to current social work research about the strengths of military families.

This research is being conducted by Irene Dieryck, currently an MSW student at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. In addition, this research is being supervised by Dr. M. Susan Watt, Professor at the School of Social Work, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.

If you are interested and would like more information, please call **525-9140 ext.23792** to arrange a return telephone call. If you are still interested an interview date and time will be set up at your convenience.

APPENDIX E   <u>**Letter of Information**</u>

*Researcher:*Irene Dieryck, R.S.W.   *Faculty Supervisor:* Dr. M. Susan Watt,
MSW Student   D.S.W., R.S.W.
McMaster School of Social Work   Professor
McMaster University,   McMaster School of
Hamilton, Ontario   Social Work
905-525-9140 ext. 23795   McMaster University
                                              Hamilton, Ontario
                                              905-525-9140 ext.
                                              23792

Dear Participant,

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research. The purpose of this study is to learn more about family strengths of Canadian military' families during unaccompanied deployment cycles. Much has been written about family strengths by other family and military researchers around the world. This study will be using research on South African naval families to investigate the possiblity of existing parallels between factors that contribute to the strengths of these families compared to Canadian military families. The goal is to create higher quality social work services to Canadian military families based on this research and to spur further study in this area.

You will be asked to fill out a questionnaire first which will take from 30 to 45 minutes to complete. Then you will be asked to engage in an interview with the researcher, which will take approximately 1/2 hour and will be taperecorded to ensure accuracy of the data. All questions will focus on your previous family experiences with deployment as well as some demographic information. You may omit any questions you find uncomfortable. A summary report of any findings will be provided to you upon your request. However, a copy of the final thesis will be available at the McMaster Uninversity School of Social Work.

All information collected will be held in the strictest of confidence and will only be viewed by the researcher, the faculty (thesis) advisor, and the thesis consultant if necessary for interpretation purposes. In addition, the data extracted from this research will be shared with Mr. Adrian Van Breda who is a Social Worker and researcher with the South African Navy. All information will be held until completion of the thesis and destroyed within one year after completion. No research participant will be identified in the thesis or any other document(s) resulting from this research. You are free to withdraw from this process at any time without any consequences. If you experience any discomfort or distress while engaging in this process, please tell the researcher and appropriate action will be taken. Again, full confidentiality is assured. In addition, you will be provided with an emergency telephone number for your area if you experience any discomfort or distress as a result of having participated in this research.

Please note that this research has been reviewed and accepted by the McMaster Research Ethics Board. If you have any questions or concerns please contact:

McMaster Reserch Ethics Board Secretariat
Telephone: 905-525-9140, ext. 23142
c/o Office of Research Services
E-mail: srebsec@mcmaster.ca

Sincerely,

Irene Dieryck, B.A., B.S.W., R.S.W.

APPENDIX F

LETTER OF CONSENT

I _____ have agreed to participate in this research, at

_____, Ontario on this _____day of _____, 2003.

I understand that I will be asked to complete a questionnaire and be asked to engage in an interview, which will be taperecorded, describing my past experiences with deployment issues in the Canadian military and its effects on my family. I understand that all information is kept strictly confidential and that I may request a report outlining any findings of this study from the researcher. I also understand that I may withdraw from this process at any time without consequence. Finally, I acknowledge, that I may inform the researcher at any time of any discomfort or distress that I experience as a result of my participation in this study, and appropriate action will be taken.

Signature of Participant:_____

Date:_____

Signature of Researcher: _____

Date:_____

Appendix G

Interview Schedule

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study of how military personnel and their families deal with deployments. I am going to ask you questions about each of the deployments that you have experienced but first would like to get some information about you at this time.

<u>Sociodemographic Information</u>

1. Respondent gender :   M   F

2. How would you identify your cultural affiliation: ,

    a. English Canadian

    b. French Canadian

    c. Other

       i. Specify _____

3. How long have you been retired from the military? _____ yrs.

4. Are/were you:

    a. the person deployed ____

    b. the partner of the deployed person ____

5. How many deployments have you experienced?

    a. Short term (5 mo or less) _____

    b. Long term (6 mo or more) _____

I am now going to ask you to describe each of these deployments starting with you first deployment and moving through to the last of your
deployment experiences.

Deployment information (please specify for each deployment):

Deploy #	When (year)	Length (months)	Purpose T/PK/O	Your age	Rank	Education level	Element/ Service Reg./Res	Marital status	No. of dependents	Family Income
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										

Supports: medical, documentation (eg. Newsletters), one-on-one assistance, family assistance, pay and benfits, group support, information sessions, seminars, religious, extended family, community, school, rear detachment party, Military Family Resource Centres, any   1-800 mission information lines, etc...

6. What supports were available to you during the pre-deployment phase?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

7. What supports were available to you during the deployment phase?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

8. What supports were available to you during the post-deployment phase?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

9. Were the supports different for different deployments?

    a. Yes
        i. If yes, how? _____
    b. No

10. How did you find out about available supports?

_____
_____

11. Which supports were most helpful to you and/or your family?

_____
_____

12. What was the worst aspect(s) and best aspect(s) of the deployment cycle (pre-deployment, deployment, post-deployment)? Explain?

_____
_____
_____
_____

13. Describe what it was like for you personally during the pre-deployment phase, deployment phase and post-deployment phase.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

14. What do you think your children experienced during each of the deployment phases?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

15. How much personal communication did you have with your family member(s)?

    a. Daily

    b. Weekly

    c. Monthly

    d. < Monthly

16. What type(s) of communication was/were available to you?
    a. Visits

    b. Telephone

    c. Email

    d. Letter

    e. Other

    f. None

17. Was this communication enough to keep you feeling like a family?
    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Explain

    _____
    _____
    _____

18. Do you think the military did everything they could to make this time easier for you and your family?
    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Explain

    _____
    _____
    _____

19. Thank you for your participation in this study,
    Would you like to receive a copy of the summary of the results?
    NO

    YES

    Send to: Email _____

    S-mail: _____

    _____

APPENDIX H

DEPLOYMENT RESILIENCE SCALE

This questionnaire is being developed by the social work department of the Institute for Maritime Medicine. Its purpose is to assess the couple's ability to *resist the stress of deployment.* All questions refer to you in the context of your marriage relationship.
Please answer the questions honestly in relation to your last deployment.

Each question is a statement. Read the statement and decide if it was true for you in your marriage at the time of your last deployment. Circle the response which best reflects your marriage:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

SA A D SD   1 We accept that it takes time for the husband to find his place in the family after a deployment.

SA A D SD   2 I am involved in activities in the community (eg. Sport, church, voluntary work).

SA A D SD   3 Even when we are separated physically, we still feel emotionally connected.

SA A D SD   4 Our marriage is in difficulty because of financial concerns.

SA A D SD   5 During a deployment our family manages to stick together until the husband gets back.

SA A D SD   6 Before the ship leaves we are informed approximately how long the deployment will be.

SA A D SD   7 We usually manage to resolve our disagreements before too long.

SA A D SD   8 I cannot trust my partner to be sexually faithful during a deployment.

SA A D SD   9 The wife in our family is involved in the ship's support group.

(If there is no support group, circle SD)

SA A D SD   10 I usually get on well with my partner's family.

SA A D SD   11 I cannot tell my partner when deployments are upsetting to me.

SA A D SD   12 I feel we are in control of our major debts.

SA A D SD   13 I am completely satisfied with our sexual relationship.

SA A D SD	14 When making decisions during a deployment, the wife in our family always considers what her husband would think.
SA A D SD	15 I can count on other couples from the ship for help with a personal or family problem.
SA A D SD	16 My partner and I disagree on how to practice our religious beliefs.
SA A D SD	17 If the Navy paid more, all our difficulties would disappear.
SA A D SD	18 During deployments the wife in our family seldom knows how things are going on the ship.

CONFIDENTIAL

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree

SA A D SD	19 I have absolute confidence in my partner's sexual faithfulness.
SA A D SD	20 The wife in this marriage has a useful contribution to make to her husband's career .
SA A D SD	21 Our religious beliefs are an important part of our marriage.
Yes No	22 The husband in our family spent *more* than half the previous 12 months at sea.
SA A D SD	23 My partner and I discuss our feelings about upcoming deployments.
SA A D SD	24 I wish my partner was more careful in spending money.
SA A D SD	25 The husband feels he has no significant role to play in our family.
SA A D SD	26 Sharing religious values helps our relationship grow.
SA A D SD	27 We seldom know where the ship is going before it sails.
SA A D SD	28 My marriage is a perfect success.
SA A D SD	29 My partner should be more involved in social activities.
SA A D SD	30 During a deployment we found that we can get on okay with our lives.
SA A D SD	31 We have difficulty controlling our use of credit cards and accounts
SA A D SD	32 After a deployment the husband feels shut out of our family.
SA A D SD	33 My partner and I feel closer because of our religious beliefs.

SA A D SD   34 I know who in the military organization to contact for help were I to have a problem (e.g. Pay, medical, death).

SA A D SD   35 On the whole, I am very satisfied with my marriage.

SA A D SD   36 I have some needs that are not being met by my marriage.

SA A D SD   37 The time after each deployment is like a honeymoon for us.

SA A D SD   38 I experience depression during deployments which is sometimes overwhelming.

SA A D SD   39 We have a written monthly budget.

SA A D SD   40 The shifting of responsibilities backwards and forwards over a series of deployments is difficult for us.

SA A D SD   41 I feel uncomfortable with my partner's relationship with his/her family.

SA A D SD   42 My spouse often complains that I do not understand him/her.

SA A D SD   43 The ship's support group is useless or non-existent.

SA A D SD   44 I am satisfied with our decisions about saving money.

SA A D SD   45 It is unnatural for marital partners to argue prior to a deployment.

CONFIDENTIAL

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree 152 SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree

SA A D SD   46 When the husband returns from a deployment he cannot find his place in the family again.

SA A D SD   47 When things go wrong during a deployment it is all the husband's fault.

SA A D SD   48 We avoid unit functions, sports and family days, etc.

SA A D SD   49 I sometimes wish I had never gotten into this relationship.

SA A D SD   50 My partner and I have different views on religion.

SA A D SD   51 Deployments do not affect my life significantly.

SA A D SD   52 Our family attends functions or socials at the unit.

SA A D SD   53 The loneliness I feel during deployments is unbearable.

SA A D SD   54 Although we could do with more money, we feel that we are coping financially.

SA A D SD   55 This family can only cope when the husband is home.

SA A D SD   56 Deployments tend to be erratic and unpredictable.

SA A D SD   57 My partner and I enjoy the same type of social activities.

SA A D SD   58 My partner meets my needs very well.

SA A D SD   59 We know that there is money available for emergencies during deployments.

SA A D SD   60 All of the problems in our marriage are caused by deployments.

Yes No   61 The husband in our family has spent *less* than nine years at sea in total.

SA A D SD   62 I only have fun when I'm with my partner.

SA A D SD   63 I have come to terms with the emotional stress I experience during deployments.

SA A D SD   64 Our family falls apart during deployments.

SA A D SD   65 When we have conflict it sometimes turns violent.

SA A D SD   66 Sometimes we don't handle the tension well after a deployment.

SA A D SD   67 The husband in our marriage likes his wife to be independent.

SA A D SD   68 We avoid any contact with naval people after work.

SA A D SD   69 I can't keep up with the emotional turbulence during deployments.

SA A D SD   70 I believe in my partner's ability to cope effectively during a deployment.

SA A D SD   71 After a deployment we always find some special way to draw the family together again.

SA A D SD   72 We cannot talk about money without arguing.

CONFIDENTIAL

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree

SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree

SA A D SD	73 In our family, the husband is in charge of the wife- '-"
SA A D SD	74 By the time the deployment starts my partner and I have separated emotionally.
SA A D SD	75 My partner is against my having friendships with naval couples.
SA A D SD	76 When my partner is not interested in sex just before or after a deployment I feel rejected.
SA A D SD	77 Family life remains the same regardless of whether the husband is deployed or not.
SA A D SD	78 Our families play a strongly positive role in our marriage.
SA A D SD	79 We still feel like a family despite the disruptions of deployments.
SA A D SD	80 Deployments are an unacceptable intrusion into the life of the family.
SA A D SD	81 We can talk honestly with each other about our feelings before and after a deployment
SA A D SD	82 Our relation with our families is sometimes an area of conflict in the marriage.
SA A D SD	83 Deployments seem to appear unexpectedly in our lives.
SA A D SD	84 I feel that deployments will eventually destroy my marriage.
SA A D SD	85 During deployments, provisions are made for contact between husbands and wives.
SA A D SD	86 I think my partner spends too much time with friends between deployments.
SA A D SD	87 We have trouble paying our bills.
SA A D SD	88 Our friendships with other naval families cause problems for us.
SA A D SD	89 Our debts are constantly troubling me.
SA A D SD	90 During a deployment we find ways to remember each other .
SA A D SD	91 We have naval friends.
SA A D SD	92 Deployments offer the opportunity for independence and self-expression.

SA A D SD   93 Sometimes our extended family does things which create tension in the marriage.

SA A D SD   94 We feel geographically isolated from the Naval community.

SA A D SD   95 Our family life is dominated by deployments.

SA A D SD   96 The Navy should do more to support families.

SA A D SD   97 There are times when my partner cannot be trusted.

SA A D SD   98 I have enough friends I can rely on.

CONFIDENTIAL

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree 154 SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree

SA A D SD   99 Religion is an important part of my life.

SA A D SD   100 During deployments I find it hard to sleep properly.

SA A D SD   101 We argue about our family responsibilities.

SA A D SD   102 I find I keep a very positive mood during deployments.

SA A D SD   103 Our marriage is growing despite the disruption of deployments.

SA A D SD   104 I feel lonely.

SA A D SD   105 Our extended families help make deployments progress more smoothly.

SA A D SD   106 A very unpleasant mood descends on me during deployments.

SA A D SD   107 My faith helps me get through deployments.

Yes No   108 We have attended a seminar or discussion group run by a social worker on deployments.

SA A D SD   109 I occasionally forget about my spouse when we are separated.

SA A D SD   110 I have at least one friend I could tell anything to.

SA A D SD   111 I stay calm and relaxed during deployments.

SA A D SD   112 I believe the Navy is interested in the well-being of families.

SA A D SD   113 My partner is not interested in my feelings.

SA A D SD   114 My partner is completely happy with my relationship with my extended family.

SA A D SD   115 Even when I am with my friends I feel alone.

SA A D SD   116 I get exceptionally irritable around the time of deployments.

SA A D SD   131 I try to be positive about deployments.

SA A D SD   132 I am worried about our debt.

SA A D SD   133 We often end up arguing when talking about money.

SA A D SD   134 On the positive side, deployments offer variety and space in our relationship.

Complete the following section only if you has children living with you at the time of your last deployment.

SA A D SD   117 There is something wrong with a child who gets a bit out of control at the beginning of deployment.

SA A D SD   118 My partner or I speak to our children about how they feel prior to a deployment.

SA A D SD   119 The children are encouraged to write letters to Dad during deployments.

SA A D SD   120 The father is irrelevant in the lives of our children.

SA A D SD   121 During deployments mothers should spend all of their time looking after the children.

SA A D SD   122 As far as possible, the children's rules and routines are maintained during deployments.

SA A D SD   123 We manage to adjust our family life around the   deployments.

SA A D SD   124 Dad makes an effort to stay in touch with each child during a deployment.

SA A D SD   125 We accept that our child may feel upset about an upcoming deployment.

SA A D SD   126 We expect the eldest boy to be the "man of the house" during deployments.

SA A D SD   127 Our children know that they can get whatever they want from Mum while Dad is away.

SA A D SD   128 We agree on the disciplining of our children.

SA A D SD   129 The children feel Dad is an important part of their lives.

SA A D SD   130 Discipline of the children is a problem during deployments.

Thank you for taking the time to complete these questionnaires.

APPENDIX I

Scoring of the Deployment Resilience Scale

Score by taking a constant (first number) and adding or subtracting indicated items from the constant, then dividing by number of items in that subscale. (Items with a minus sign in front are effectively reverse scored and the average of all items in that subscale is then calculated). Scores can range from 1 to 4, with lower scores indicating more resilient families.

Dimension 1: **Emotional Continuity** = (45 + var1–11+23+30-38-45-53+63-66-69+74-100+102-106+111-116) / 16

Dimension 2: **Perception of Deployment** = (20 + var20+37+51-60-80-84+92-95+103+131) / 10

Dimension 3: **Support = (Family Support + Military Support + Community**

Support + Religious/God Support) / 4

Family Support = (15 + var10-41+78-82-93+105+114) / 7
Military Support = (25 + var15-48+52-68-75-88+91-94) / 8
Community Support = (25 + var2-29+57-62-86+98-104+110-115) / 9
Religious/God Support = (10 – var16+21+26+33-50+99-107) / 7

Dimension 4: **Finances** = (30 – var4+12+24+31+39+44+54+59-72-87-89+132+133) / 13

Dimension 5: **Partner Aware Family Structure** = (45 + var3+5+14-25-32-40-46-55+64+71+79+90-95-101-109) / 15

Dimension 6: **Children** = (20 – var121+122+123+124+125-126-127+128+129-130-117+118+119-120) / 14

Dimension 7: **Marriage** = (50 + var7-8+13+19+35-42-47-49+58-65+67+70-73-76-84+81-97+103-113+134) / 20

Dimension 8: **Family Oriented Management** = * (25 +var6+9-18-27-56-83+85+112) / 8
*Variables 22 and 61 are binomial and are analyzed separately.
Total Resilience Score is based on Dimensions 1 to 7 for those with children at the time of deployment, thus:
Total Resilience Score = (Dimensions 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7) / 7
For those without children at the time of deployment, Dimension 6 was removed.
Total Resilience Score = (Dimensions 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 7) / 6

Employer Management is analyzed separately as Van Breda (2003) states that this is the military "unit's contribution to family resilience and not a measure of family resilience itself."

APPENDIX J

Appendix 1
To Annex K
To Chapter 12   **PROTECTED B WHEN COMPLETED**

DEPLOYMENT READINESS SCREENING FORM

SN: _____ RANK: _____ NAME: _____

INIT: _____

MISSION: _____ HOME UNIT: _____

DATE OF DEPLOYMENT: _____

SCHEDULED END DATE OF DEPLOYMENT: _____

| CATEGORY | REQUIREMENT | READY | | REMARKS |
		Date	Authority's Signature	
Unit of Origin	Supervisor certifies there appears to be no obvious known domestic, administrative or disciplinary reasons to preclude a posting outside Canada.			
	This section completed only if person is an augmentee who is going on collective training with deploying unit. CO confirms initial screening, and no career activity will interfere with training or deployment			
Medical	Meets minimum medical category for MOC without geographical restrictions.			CRB(M) decision may permit deployment
	Medical Officer's Assessment			Review of medical file and medical category
	Social Work Officer's / Chaplain's Assessment that there are no obvious social, domestic or psychological concerns which would preclude the member's deployment			
	United Nations Form MS-2. Completed and signed by medical officer.			For UNMOs only Annex N to Chap 12 of DCDS Direction to Commanders of Deployed Operations or avail from J1 Coord (613 992 2170)

132

	Immunization			CF core immunization programme – current Mission area specific requirements
Dental	Fit for deployment			Dental records to include current panographic
Personal Clothing and Equipment	CF Supply Scale (CFS) Specific to the mission			All designated items to be taken by deploying personnel
Pay	Advance			
	Allotments			
	Copy of Pay Guide to URS			Pay Office to grant "Alt PON" to mission URS
	Class C Contract Initiated			
Records	Will updated (if reqr)			
	Power of Attorney			
	SISIP updated (if reqr)			
Prerequisite Training Parent Unit	Wpn Handling			Chapter 4 - DCDS Direction to Commanders of Deployed Operations B-GL-318-006/PT-004 "Shoot to Live" Vol 6
	NBCD			Chapter 4 - DCDS Direction to Commanders of Deployed Operations B-GL-316-001/AG-000 CF Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Vol II NDHQ Instr DCDS 2/89 NBC and Chemical Defence Training 28 Feb 89
	First Aid			Current St John's Ambulance Standard First Aid CFAO 9-5
	Physical Fitness			Passed the CF EXPRES test or LFC IBTS CFAO 50-1
	Driving			Hold valid current DND 404 Demonstrate proficiency in operating a standard transmission, 4x4 vehicle
Travel	Travel arrangements to an area of operations.			UN Msn – made by UN NY. Contact CFSU(O), NDHQ if not received within 7 days of deployment (613) 996 2468 Non UN – Indiv's parent unit UNDOF – Parent unit to make travel arrangements to APOE (usually CFB Trenton) and book Svc Fl Tel Aviv. Contact for Svc Air - (613) 996 0249
	Baggage. Commercial airlines advised of 'excess baggage'.			

	Shipment of F&E			DCBA 23564 032000Z May 95
	Shipment of PMV			OR&O Vol4, Appx 4.3 and CFAO 205-5
Postal Docs (hand carry)	Mission Postal Address			
	International Certificate of Vaccination			
	Temporary CF 2034 with Med Form			
	CF 2033 (Record of Med Examination)			
	Photocopy of Dental Records			
	Passport(s) and Visa(e)			Contact DTM 3-2-2 (613) 997 7625
	CAFIS 20 ID Card – valid for at least 12 months			
	CF 281 Geneva Convention ID Card – for Med Personnel			
	CF 767 Credential Card – Mil Police			
	ID Disc			
	Personal file (temp)			
	DND 404 Driver/op permit			
	DND 416			
	Valid civilian driver's licence			
	ID Card Photos – 6 head & shoulder photos			ID size
Unit Deploying / Unit of origin	Commanding officer certifies that following a perusal of the member's documents, there appears to be no known reason why the member should not proceed on a posting outside Canada		I declare mbr fit for deployment	This certification should be conducted last by CO of deploying unit when member part of collective training or otherwise CO of unit of origin.

134

Post Deployment		Date	Authority's Signature	
Medical	Medical Examination			NLT 30 days of the member's return from disembarkation leave
	Tuberculin (PPD) Testing			All individuals are required to have a post-deployment PPD testing after returning from duty provided the last test was negative. It is recommended that the routine post-deployment PPD test be done six weeks after return from overseas duty.
Post-Deployment Stress Briefing	The briefing should cover such issues as potential medical/psychological concerns, medical coverage, environmental concerns and family reintegration			Normally take place in the area of operations, about 2-4 weeks prior to the individual's redeployment. Should this not be possible due to exceptional circumstances, the commanding officer of the member's receiving unit is responsible to ensure that this briefing takes place as soon as possible after the member's arrival at the home unit.
	Post Deployment Follow-up. These interviews are to be conducted by health care professionals. This is to determine if physical, emotional or psychosocial problems exist, that require ongoing treatment or follow-up counselling or monitoring.			The commanding officer may elect to have post-deployment follow-up interviews for all members of the unit returning from deployment if the nature of the mission so dictates.
Home Unit	CO confirms he/she is satisfied that the member has completed all post deployment follow up			

SUITABILITY SCREENING

1. Amplifying direction on each part of the screening process is provided in Appendices 1 – 7 of this Annex. Guidance is provided below on screening of Reserve Force members and procedures to enhance the screening process.

2.   **Screening   Of   Reserve   Force   Personnel**

a.   For Reserve Force members being considered for a deployment
outside of Canada, the parent unit is responsible for conducting a Unit Administrative Review and Suitability Screening. At a minimum, all items on the Deployment Readiness Checklist (Annex C) identified by Note 1 must be completed, and a Class C contract must be signed before the member can be authorized to proceed to pre-deployment training or PSTC.

b.   Based on an assessment of the screening results, the parent unit Commanding Officer will either recommend, or not recommend at Serial 7.a., Part 2 of the Deployment Readiness Checklist (Annex C) the Reserve Force member to attend pre-deployment training with the deploying unit or PSTC. If the member is not recommended, he/she will not be considered further for that particular operation.

c.   Medical/Dental/Social Work Officer's Endorsement

   (1)   Reserve Force units must be proactive in encouraging Reserve
   Force members to maintain a high standard of medical and dental health. One of the options available to meet this end is the Reserve Force Dental Plan. Any financial costs incurred to achieve the required level of dental fitness, except costs for the screening examination and X-rays, will be the responsibility of the member. At the request of the CBG, based on availability of resources and the number of Reserve Force personnel being screened for an operational tour, a nationally funded Technical Assistance Visit may deploy to assist with Medical, Dental, and Social Work Officer/Chaplain/PSO screening.

   (2)   Appendices 3, and 5 of this annex contain additional guidance on the completion of the Social Work Officer/Chaplain/PSO, Medical Officer and Dental Officer portions of the screening process.

d.   Documentation. The following documentation must be sent from the member's CBG to the mounting unit to the appropriate Op URS:

   (1)   CF 478 Personnel Records Envelope;

   (2)   CF 464 Leave Jacket;

   (3)   CF 892 Record of Clothing and Equipment;

   (4)   CF 459 Conduct Sheet;

(5) CF 2034 Medical File (including latest CF 2033 and CF 2016;

(6)   CF 562A Dental File (if available);

(7)   CF 743 UER;

(8)   DND 416/404s (if applicable);

(9)   CF 796 Reserve Record of Service (copy);

(10)   Last Will and Testament;

(11)   CF 497 Supplementary Death Benefits;

(12)   Copy of SISIP application;

(13)   CF 742 Personnel Emergency Notification form;

(14)   CF 1007 Statement of Reserve Force Service (complete and verified);

(15)   Deployment Readiness Checklist;

(16)   copy of Class C Nomination message;

(17)   ADM(PER) 2/93 Class C Terms of Service;

(18)   copy of Birth Certificate;

(19)   passport or passport application form (hand carried by member)*;

(20)   current corrective lens prescription;

(21)   CAFIB 20 ID Card (carried by member);

(22)   International Certificate of Vaccination (hand carried by member);

(23)   CF 899 Route Letter (hand carried by Class B personnel only);

(24)   CF 99 Travel Claim (hand carried);

(25)   copy of marriage certificate or proof of common-law relationship;

(26)   NDI 50 MP Credentials (MPs only); and

(27)   Family Care Plan Declaration.

*   Note: Members possessing valid Blue passports are to bring them. Personnel not in possession of a valid passport are not to acquire one. This will be done in bulk, at the deploying unit, while members undergo Pre-Deployment training.

e.   Changes to Circumstances. As with Regular Force personnel, Reserve Force members are required to report to their chain of command any changes in their personal circumstances that could negatively impact on their participation on the operational tour.

3.   Procedures to Enhance the Screening Process

a.   **The unit chain of command is ultimately responsible for the final decision of whether or not a member deploys based on the best information at hand. The following procedures, to be employed by LFWA units, represent methods to enhance the screening process:**

(1)   in recognizing the chain of command as a critical screening step, units are to utilize the screening questionnaire for the Troop/Platoon/Section Commander interviews during the screening process (Appendix 2, Annex B) and attach it to the screening form;

(2)   the Commanding Officer is to produce and distribute a letter to spouses or parents to advise them of the upcoming mission, provide unit points of contacts, and encourage them to participate in the screening process, if applicable (an example of letter is located at the end of this paragraph);

(3)   Units are to conduct a briefing for members and their families on such subjects as:

(a)   description of mission area;

(b)   benefits and allowances, HLTA/LTA and compassionate travel entitlements;

(c)   pay procedures;

(d)   rear party and MFRC resources available to the family while the member is deployed;

(e)   legal considerations – wills, powers of attorney, SDB; and

(f)   SISIP coverage;

(4)   units must adopt a friendly and informative approach to illustrate to non-service spouses the numerous benefits of participating fully in the screening process, keeping spouses as part of the process vice subject to the process;

(5)   units should provide, gender, language, location and professional officer alternatives for screening interviews with a view to promoting maximum participation by and comfort for families;

(6)   units are to ensure non-service spouses/families are aware of interview content ahead of scheduled interview to promote maximum familiarity with interview content and to reduce fear of the unknown;

(7)   units must promote a positive atmosphere during interview and briefing periods by coordinating the provision of free childcare and refreshments with the local Military Family Resource Centre; and

(8)   units should provide alternatives to the personal interview such as a telephone interview, visit to the home, workplace or neutral location.

SAMPLE LETTER TO SPOUSES/PARENTS

The following is an example of a letter the unit Commanding Officer should consider sending to family members of deploying members:

From: Commanding Officer, Unit Address

To: (name of **family member**) of Members Deploying on (**name of operation**):

The purpose of this letter is to explain to you the events that will unfold over the next few months in preparation for your (**spouse's/son or daughter's**) possible participation on an operation in (**name of country**), and to invite you to participate in this process.

As you have probably heard by now (**name of unit**) has received a Warning Order to deploy to (**name of country**) from (**date**) to (**date**). Although not yet certain, there exists the possibility that your (**spouse/son or daughter**) may be deploying on this mission with (**name of unit**). There are a number of activities which will occur in preparation for this tour. The unit will likely deploy to (**location**) for (**number of days**) in (**month**) to conduct pre-deployment training. Other training activities include (**describe what, where, and when**).

Another critical activity will be the requirement for your (**spouse/son or daughter**) to screen for deployment. Screening will take place during the period (**date**) to (**date**), and I encourage your participation in this vital component of the deployment. Your (**spouse/son or daughter**) is likely quite enthusiastic about the upcoming deployment, but I can appreciate the impact that this deployment might have on your family.

The aims of the screening process are two-fold. Firstly, the process is designed to determine your (**spouse's/son or daughter's**) suitability for deployment. Secondly, and equally important, the process contains an educational aspect of what can be offered for assistance to members and their families. Understanding that, while I do not wish to impose upon the privacy of your family's personal lives, it is essential that I am made aware of any concerns that you may have about your (**spouse's/son or daughter's**) participation on the mission, so that I can make an informed decision on whether or not (**he or she**) should deploy. You will have an opportunity to voice these concerns during a voluntary interview with a Social Work Officer. This is the preferred method but, should you be unable to attend this interview, there are other methods that you can request to enable your valuable input to be obtained. These can include a telephone interview with a Social Work Officer, an interview with a Military Chaplain, or an interview with the Base Personnel Selection Officer. All of these services are available in either official language and can be provided at your own residence or at a neutral location should your circumstances not allow you to visit these individuals on the Base.

As I stated above, your participation in the screening process is important for several reasons. The process is designed to be educational for both you and the deploying unit. We can provide you with information and assistance to help you cope with your (**spouse's/son or daughter's**)

absence. There are many agencies and facilities available to offer support to the families of deployed members and you can learn how to access these during your screening interview. Concurrently, with your input we can tailor our organization to best provide assistance to you.

The unit will also be conducting a family event on (**date/time**) at (**location**). Coffee and refreshments will be available as well as a child-care professional should you wish to bring along children. At the family event, a number of experts will speak on such issues as legal considerations, benefits and allowances, rear party services and the Military Family Resource Centre. The Family Night has been organized for your benefit and I hope that you will be able to attend.

Should you have any questions concerning the deployment, you may ask them at the family event, or contact (**name and position**), at (**phone number**). Thank you for your time, I hope to see you at the unit's Family Night.

Yours truly,

Selected Bibliography

Abbott, R. (2000). "From shell shock to post-traumatic stress disorder: What are we asking of our Armed Forces personnel?" Retrieved July 14, 2003, from http://www.cda-cdai.ca/symposia/2000/abbott.htm.

Akabas, S.H. (1990). "Reconciling the demands of work with the needs of families," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 71(1): 366-371.

Amen, D.G., Jellen, L., Merves, E., Lee, R.E. (1988). "Minimizing the impact of deployment separation on military children: stages, current preventive efforts, and system recommendations," *Military Medicine*, 153 (9): 441-446.

Anderson, C. (1982). "The community connection: the impact of social networks on family and individual functioning," In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal family processes (425-445)*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Antonovsky, A. (1998). "The sense of coherence: an historical and future perspective," In McCubbin et al. (Eds.), *Stress, coping, and health in families: sense of coherence and resiliency* (pp.3-20). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Applewhite, L.W., Mays, R.A. (1996). "Parent-child separation: A comparison of maternally and paternally separated children in military families," *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 13(1): 23-39.

Applewhite, L. (1995). "The relationship between children's experience with extended parental separation and psychosocial functioning," *Dissertation: The Catholic University of America*. Washington D.C.

Barnett, R.C. (1996). *Toward a review and reconceptualization of the work/family literature: work in progress.* Cambridge, MA: Radcliff College.

Barton, W.H. (2002). "Methodological square pegs and theoretical black holes," In Greene, R.R. (Ed.), *Resiliency: an integrated approach to practice, policy, and research.* Washington DC: NASW Press.

Bartone, J.V., Harris, J.J., Segal, D.R., and Segal, M.W. (1993). "Paratroopers' wives," In D.R. Segal and M.W. Segal (Eds.), *Peacekeepers and their wives: American participation in the multinational force and observers* (pp. 129-139). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Bartone, P.T., Adler, A.B. (1999). "Cohesion over time in a peacekeeping medical task force," *Military Psychology*, 11(1): 85-107.

Batterson, C.T. and Dobrofsky, L. (1977). "The military wife and feminism," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 2: 675-683.

Beckman, K., Marsella, A.J., Finney, F., (1979). "Depression in the wives of nuclear submarine personnel," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 136 (4B): 524-526.

Bell, D.B., Teitelbaum, J.M., Schumm, W.R. (1996). "Keeping the home fires burning: Family Support Issues," *Military Review*, 76 (2): 80-84.

Bermudes, R.W. (1973). "A ministry to the repeatedly grief-stricken," *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 27: 218-228.

Bermudes, R.W. (1977). "Separation: Its effects and adaptations," *The Chaplain*, 34(1): 18-34.

Berry, M., (1997). *The family at risk: issues and trends in family preservation services.* South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Black, W.G. Jr. (1993). "Military-induced family separation: A stress reduction intervention," *Social Work*, 38 (3): 273-280.

Blount, B.W., Curry, A., Lubin, G.I. (1992). "Family separations in the military," *Military Medicine*, 157(2): 76-80.

Bowen, G.L., Orthner, D.K., Zimmerman, L.I., and Meehan, T. (1992). *Family Patterns and Adaptation in the U.S. Army.* (Technical Report #966) Alexandria, VA: United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioural Social Sciences.

Britt, T.W., Adler, A., Bartone, P.T. (2001). "Deriving benefits from stressful events: The role of engagement in meaningful work and hardiness," *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1): 53-63.

Burke, S.C., Moskos, C.C. (1996). "Family readiness: Applying what we know and highlighting what we need to know," *Military Family Issues: The Research Digest.* 1(1): 1-4.

Burnam, M.A., Meredith, L.S., Sherbourne, C.D., Valdez, R.B., and Vernez, G. (1992). *Army families and soldier readiness.* Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation.

Canadian Forces (2002). *Military Briefing: Professional Development, Harassment Issues.* ASU St. Jean, Quebec, Fall, 2002.

Canadian Forces Member Assistance Program (1999-2000). *Utilization Report: 01 April 00 to 31 Mar 01.* Retrieved April 29, 2003 from, <u>http://Statistics 2000-2001 – Member Assistance Program – Health Services.htm</u>.

Canadian Human Rights Act (R.S., 1985, c. H-6, 4th Supp.)

CFAO (January 2002). CD-ROM for *DCE 001: Introduction to Defence Management: Course Notes (Version 1.0).* Kingston, Ontario: Royal Military College.

Cheney, P., "Fighter pilot's town sends condolences: Springfield, Ill. is heartbroken" about death of soldiers, guardsman's mother says," *Globe and Mail,* 27 April, 2002 pNA.

Conway-Turner, K., Cherrin, S. (1998). *Women, families, and feminist politics: a global exploration.* New York: Harrington Park Press.

Conway, J.F. (2001). *The Canadian Family in Crisis (4th Ed.),* Toronto: James Lorimer and Company Ltd., Publishers.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd Ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Daley, J.G. (1999). 'Understanding the military as an ethnic identity," In J.G. Daley (Ed.), *Social work practice in the military* (pp.291-303). New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.

David, J.R., Orton, J. (1981). "Parent absence in the military family," *Medical Bulletin of the US Army, Europe,* 38(12): 4-8.

Decima Research (2000). *Comparison of Regular and Reserve Force Responses in the HLIS 2000.* Department of National Defense: Ottawa, Canada.

Decker, K.B. (1978). "Coping with sea duty: problems encountered and resources utilized during periods of family separation," In Hunter, E.J. and Nice, D.S. (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.113-129). New York: Praeger Publishers.

De Haan, L., Hawley, D.R., Deal, J.E. (2002). "Operationalizing family resilience: a methodological strategy," *The American Journal of Family Therapy,* 30: 275-291.

Department of National Defence, (May 18, 2000). DND/CF: *Backgrounder: Canadian Forces Joint Operations Group.* Retrieved June 18, 2003, from http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/Newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=110.

Department of National Defence, (August 6, 2002a). *Backgrounder: The Department of National Defence and The Canadian Forces.* Retrieved March 17, 2003, from, http://65.54.244.250/cgi-bin/getmsg/DND-CFBackgrounderTheDepartmentofNationalDefenceandtheCanadianForces...

Department of National Defence: CFPSA-Military Family Services (2002). *CFPSA-Military Family Services.* Retrieved August 15, 2003, from, http://www.dnd.ca/hr/cfpsa/dmfs/Engraph/home_e.asp.

Department of National Defence, (January 2002). *DCE 001: Introduction to Defence Management: Course Notes (Version 1.0).* Kingston, Ontario: Royal Military College.

Department of National Defence, (2003). *The Total Force Experiment.* Retrieved June 18, 2003, from http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/reports/Fraser/english/totalforce_e.htm

Department of the Air Force (1980). *Air Force conference on families: held at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, September 24-26.*

Dickerson, W.J., Arthur, R.J. (1965). "Navy families in distress," *Military Magazine,* 130: 894-898.

Dingle Associates, (1980). *The Navy leader's family manual.* Washington D.C.: Dingle Associates.

DND/CF, (2002). *About DND/CF: Making a Difference at home and abroad.* Retrieved June 18, 2003, from, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/about/abroad_e.asp

DND/CF, (May 15, 2003). *DND/CF: Backgrounder: Modernizing the CFSA: Realities and Rigours of Military Service.* Retrieved June 18, 2003, from, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/Newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=1079

DND/CF: Current Operations, (2003). *DND/CF: Operations: Current Operations.* Retrieved June 18, 2003, from, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/operations/current_ops_e.asp

Doyle, G. (2003). [Major] (Canadian Forces, Ottawa). Interview by author, telephone, August 11, 2003.

Dzurec, L.C., Abraham, I.L. (1993). "The nature of inquiry: Linking quantitative and qualitative research," *Advances in Nursing Science*, 16: 73-79.

Early, T.J., GlenMaye, L.F. (2000). "Valuing families: social work practice with families from a strengths perspective," *Social Work*, 45:118-130.

Eastman, E., Archer, R.P., Ball, J.D. (1990). "Psychosocial and life stress characteristics of navy families: Family environment scale and life experiences scale findings," *Military Psychology*, 2(2): 113-127.

Eckenrode, J., Gore, S. (1990). "Stress and coping at the boundary of work and family," In J. Eckenrode and S. Gore (Eds.), *Stress between work and family* (pp.1-11). New York: Plenum Press.

Enloe, C. (1997). "Wives," In L. Weinstein and C.C. White (Eds.), *Wives and warriors: Women and the military in the United States and Canada* (pp. 1-5). Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Epstein, N.B., Bishop, D.S., Baldwin, L.M. (1983). "The McMaster family assessment device," *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 9(2): 171-180.

Farley, G.K., Werkman, S. (1986). "Overseas fathers: Vulnerabilities and treatment strategies," In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role* (pp. 277-292). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Fernandez-Pol, B. (1988). "Does the military family syndrome exist?" *Military Medicine*, 153 (8): 418-420.

Finn, J.E. (1987). *Separation and the military family*. Toronto: Canadian Forces Command and Staff College.

Fraser, M.W. (1997). "The ecology of childhood: A multi-systems perspective," In Fraser, M.W. (Ed.), *Risk and resilience in childhood: an ecological perspective,* (pp. 1-9). Washington D.C.: NASW Press.

Gaffen, F. (1995). *Cross-Border warriors: Canadians in American forces, Americans in Canadian Forces: From the civil war to the gulf.* Toronto: Dundern Press.

Germain, C.B., Gitterman, A. (1980). *The life model of social work practice.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Gilgun, J.F. (1996). "Human development and adversity in ecological perspective, Part 1: A conceptual framework," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 77(7): 395-402.

Googins, B. (1991). *Work/Family conflicts: private lives---public responses.* Westport, CT: Auburn House.

Googins, B. and Davidson, B.N. (1993). "The organization as client: Broadening the concept of Employee Assistance Programs," *Social Work*, 38 (4): 477-484.

Government of Canada (Received, 2002 at ASU St. Jean, QC). *Your Member Assistance Program*, Ottawa: Department of National Defence/Canadian Forces.

Grace, G.L., Steiner, M.B. (1978). "Wives' attitudes and the retention of navy enlisted personnel," In Hunter, E.J. and Nice, D.S. (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.43-55). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Gravino, K., Segal, D.R., Segal, M.W., and Waldman, R.J. (1993). "The evolution of peacekeeping as a military mission," In D.R. Segal and M.W. Segal (Eds.), *Peacekeepers and their wives: American participation in the multinational force and observers* (pp. 1-14). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Greenberg, N., Temple, M., Neal, L., Palmer, I. (2002). "Military psychiatry: A unique national resource," *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 26: 227-229.

Greene, R.R. (2002)."Human behaviour theory: a resilience orientation," In R.R. Greene (Ed.), *Resiliency: an integrated approach to practice, policy, and research* (pp.1-27). Washington DC: NASW Press.

Greene, R.R., Conrad, A.P. (2002). "Basic assumptions and terms." In R.R. Greene (Ed.). *Resiliency: An integrated approach to practice, policy, and research* (pp. 29-62). Washington DC: NASW Press.

Greene, R.R., Livingstone, N.C. (2002). "A social contract," In R.R. Greene (Ed.) *Resiliency: An integrated approach to practice, policy, and research* (pp 63-94). Washington DC: NASW Press.

Harris, J.J. (1993). "Military social work as occupational practice," In P.A. Kurzman and S.H. Akabas (Eds.), *Work and well-being: the occupational social work advantage* (pp. 276-290). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Harrison, D., Laliberte, L. (1994). *No life like it: Military wives in Canada.* Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publisher.

Harrison, D., (2002). *The first casualty: Violence against women in Canadian military communities.* Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publisher.

Hawley, D.R., DeHaan, L. (1996). "Toward a definition of family resilience: Integrating life span and family perspectives," *Family Process,* 35 (September): 283-298.

Hiew, C.C. (1992). "Separated by their work: Families with fathers living apart," *Environment and Behaviour,* 24 (2): 206-225.

Holder, D.P., Anderson, C.M. (1989). "Women, work, and the family," In McGoldrick, M. et al. (Eds.). *Women in families: A framework for family therapy* (pp. 358-380). New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

House, E.R. (1994). "Integrating the quantitative and qualitative," In C.S. Reichardt and S.F. Rallis (Eds.), *The Qualitative-Quantitative Debate: New Perspectives* (pp 13-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hunter, E.J. (1977). "Introduction," In E.J. Hunter (Ed.), *Changing families in a changing military system* (pp. v-vi). San Diego, CA: Family Studies Branch, Naval Health Research Center.

Hunter, E.J. (1978aa). "Epilogue: adapt or opt out," In Hunter, E.J. and Nice, D.S. (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.241-243). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Hunter, E.J., Gelb, M.B., Hickman, R.A. (1981). *Military wife adjustment: An independent dependent.* (Report No. TR-USIU-81-05-1981). San Diego, CA: US International University.

Hunter E.J., Pope, M.A. (1981). *Family roles in transition in a changing military.* (Report No. TR-USIU-81-02) San Diego, CA.: United States International University.

Hunter, E.J. and Hickman, R.A. (1981a). *As parents go, so go the children: The adjustment and development of military children.* Technical Report TR-USIU-81-01 (DTIC. No. A197347). San Diego, CA.: US International University.

Hunter E.J., Hickman, R.A. (1981b). *Family separation and reunion: A style of life in the military.* (Report No. TR-USIU-81-04). San Diego, CA.: United States International University.

Hunter, E.J. (1982). *Families under the flag. New York: Praeger Publishers.*

Iversen, R.R. (1998). "Occupational social work for the 21st century," *Social Work*, 43(6): 551-560.

Jamieson, J. (2003) [Lieutenant Colonel] (Canadian Forces, Ottawa), Interview by author, telephone, June 10, 2003.

Jensen, P.S., Lewis, R.L., Xenakis, S.N. (1986). "The military family in review: context, risk, and prevention," *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 25(2): 225-234.

Jensen, P.S., Xenakis, M.D., Wolf, P., Bain, M.W. (1991). "The military family syndrome revisited: By the numbers," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 179 (2): 102-107.

Kamerman, S.B. (1979). "Work and families in industrialized societies," *Signs*, 4(4): 632-650.

Kaplan, L., Girard, J. (1994). *Strengthening high-risk families: A handbook for practitioners*. New York: Lexington Books.

Kaslow, F.W. (1984). "Training and supervision of mental health professionals to understand and treat military families," In F. W. Kaslow and R. I. Ridenour (Eds.), *The military family: Dynamics and treatment* (pp 269-305). New York: The Guilford Press.

Keith, D.V. and Whitaker, C.A. (1984). "C'est la guerre: Military families and family therapy," In F.W. Kaslow and R.I. Ridenour (Eds.), *The military family: Dynamics and treatment* (pp. 147-166). New York: The Guilford Press.

Kelley, M.L., Herzog-Simmer, P.A., and Harris, M.A. (1994). "Effects of military-induced separation on the parenting stress and family functioning of deploying mothers," *Military Psychology*, 6 (2): 125-138.

Kelley, M.L. (1994a). "The effects of military-induced separation on family factors and child behavior," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 64(1): 103-111.

Kelley, M.L. (1994b). "Military-induced separation in relation to maternal adjustment and children's behaviors," *Military Psychology*, 6(3): 163-176.

Kirby, L.D., Fraser, M.W. (1997). "Risk and resilience in childhood," In M.W. Fraser (Ed.), *Risk and resilience in childhood: an ecological perspective* (pp.1-9). Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.

Kirkland, F.R., Katz, P. (1989). "Combat readiness and the army family," *Military Review*, Vol. LXIX (4): 63-74.

Knox, J., Price, D.H. (1995). "The changing American military family: Opportunities for social work," *Social Service Review*, September: 479-497.

Knox, J., Price, D.H. (1999). "Total force and the New American military family: Implications for social work practice," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 80(2): 128-136.

Kurzman, P.A., Akabas, S.H. (1981). "Industrial social work as a arena for practice," *Social Work: Journal of the National Association of Social Workers*, 26(1): 52-60.

Lagrone, D.M. (1978). "The military family syndrome," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 135(9): 1040-1043.

Laird, J. (1995). "Family-centered practice in the postmodern era," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, March: 150-162.

MacDermid, S.M., Targ, D.M. (1995). "A call for greater attention to the role of employers in developing, transforming, and implementing family policies," *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 16(1): 145-170.

Marcos, A.C., Draper, T.W. (1990). "Capturing family variables," In T. W. Draper and A.C. Marcos (Eds.), *Family variables: Conceptualization, measurement, and use* (pp 13-18). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Martin, J.A. (1984). "Life satisfaction for military wives," *Military Medicine*, 149(9): 512-514.

McCubbin, H.I., Dahl, B.B., and Hunter, E.J. (1976). "Research on the military family: A review," In H.I. McCubbin, B.B. Dahl, and E.J. Hunter (Eds.), *Families in the military system* (pp. 291-319). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

McCubbin, H.I., Dahl, B.B. (1976). "Prolonged family separation in the military: A longitudinal study," In H.I. McCubbin, B.B. Dahl, and E.J. Hunter (Eds.), *Families in the military system* (pp. 112-144). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

McCubbin, H.I., Lavee, Y. (1986). "Strengthening army families: A family life cycle perspective," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 9(3): 221-231.

McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M. (1986). "Resilient families, competencies, supports, and coping over the life cycle," In L. Sawyers, *Ghost ranch symposium on faith and families* (pp. 65-88). Philadelphia: The Geneva Press.

McCubbin, H.I. (1988). *Family stress, coping and health project.* Edina, MN: University of Wisconsin.

McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M.A. (1988). "Typologies of resilient families: emerging roles of social class and ethnicity," *Family Relations,* 37 (July 1988): 247-254.

McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M.A. (1992). "Research utilization in social work practice of family treatment," In A.J. Grasso and I. Epstein (Eds.), *Research utilization in the social services: Innovations for practice and administration* (pp. 149-192). NY: Haworth Press.

McCubbin, H.I., Thompson, A.I., McCubbin, M.A. (1996). *Family assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Publishers.

McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M.A., Thompson, A.I., Han, S., Allen, C.T. (1997). *Families under stress: what makes them resilient.* Retrieved 03/06/2003 from http://www.cyfernet.extension.umn.edu/research/resilient.html.

McCubbin, H.I., Thompson, E.A., Thompson, A.I., Elver, K.M., McCubbin, M.A. (1998). "Ethnicity, schema, and coherence: Appraisal processes for families in crisis," In McCubbin et al., (Eds.), *Sense of coherence and resiliency: Stress, coping, and health* (pp. 41-67). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

McNelis, P.J. (1987). "Military social work," In *Encyclopedia of Social Work, 18th Edition* (pp.154-160). Silver Springs, MD: National Association of Social Workers, Inc.

McQuaide, S., Ehrenreich, J.H. (1997). "Assessing Client Strengths," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services,* 78(2): 201-210.

Meyers, S.A., Varkey, S., Aguirre, A.M. (2002). "Ecological Correlates of Family Functioning," *The American Journal of Family Therapy,* 30: 257-273.

Milgram, N. A., Bar, K. (1993). "Stress on wives due to husbands' hazardous duty or absence," *Military Psychology,* 5(1): 21-39.

Mitchell, M.H. (1995). *"Military families: Are they unique?"* In NDHQ – MFRC Program Evaluation (2900 – 94 (CRS)) (pp. 105-111). Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters.

Montalvo, F.F. (1976). "Family separation in the army: A study of the problems encountered and the care taking resources used by career army families undergoing military separation," In H. I. McCubbin, B.B. Dahl, and E.J. Hunter (Eds.), *Families in the military system* (pp. 147-173). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mor Barak, M.E., Bargal, D. (2000). "Human services in the context of work: Evolving and innovative roles for occupational social work," In M.E. Mor Barak, and D. Bargal (Eds.), *Social Services in the Workplace: Repositioning Occupational Social Work in the New Millennium* (pp. 1-11). New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.

Morrison, J. (1981). "Rethinking the military family syndrome," *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 138 (3): 354-357.

National Defence Act (R.S., c. N-4, s.1)

NDHQ Group (February 28, 2003). *Effective Strength and Total Strength Reports.* Retrieved April 10, 2003 from, http://65.54.244.250/cgi-bin/getmsg/D0088r01_e.htm

Nice, S.D. (1978). "The androgynous wife and the military child," In E.J. Hunter and S.D. Nice (Eds.), *Children of military families: A part yet apart* (pp. 25-37). San Diego: Military Family Research Conference (Code 452).

Nice, S.D. (1983). "The course of depressive affect in navy wives during family separation," *Military Medicine,* 148(April): 341-343.

Nichols, R.S. (1978) "The military family/military organization interface: A discussion," In E.J. Hunter, and T. Shaylor. *The military and the military family.* (pp 62-75). (DTIC No. AD-A080943) Washington DC: The Adjutant General Center.

Official Languages Act (R.S., 1985, c.31)

Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers Code of Ethics (2000). *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers: Standards of Practice Handbook (1st Ed.),* Toronto: Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers

Palmer, N. (1999). "Fostering resilience in children," *Social Thought,* 19(2): 69-87.

Peck, D., Schroeder, D. (1976). "Psychotherapy with the father-absent military father," *Journal of Marriage and Family Counselling,* 2 (January): 23-30.

Pinch, F.C., Fournier, B.A. (Eds.) (1977). *Proceedings of the regional social work conference on the Canadian family,* (April) Canadian Forces Base Trenton, ON.: Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.

Pincus, S.H., House, R., Christenson, J., Adler, L.E. (2000). *The emotional cycle of deployment: A military family perspective.* Retrieved 05/23/2003 from http://www.hooah4health.com/pageprinter.asp?f=/environment/deployment/

Pleck, J.H. (1995). "Work roles, family roles, and well-being: Current conceptual perspectives," In G.L. Bowen and J.F. Pittman (Eds.) *The work and family interface: Toward a contextual effects perspective* (pp. 17-22). Minneapolis: National Council on Family Relations.

Popoff, T., Truscott, S., Hysert, R. (1986). *"Military family study: An overview of life/work stress and its relationship to health and organizational morale," (ORAE Project No. PR 351),* Ottawa: Department of National Defence.

Public Service Employment Act (R.S., 1985, c. P. 33)

QR&O (January 2002). CD-ROM for *DCE 001: Introduction to Defence Management: Course Notes (Version 1.0).* Kingston, Ontario: Royal Military College.

Ridenour, R.I. (1984). "The military, service families, and the therapist," In F.W. Kaslow and R.I. Ridenour (Eds.). *The military family: Dynamics and treatment* (pp 1-17). New York: The Guilford Press.

Rienerth, J.G. (1978). "Separation and female centeredness in the military family," In E.J. Hunter and D.S. Nice (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.169-184). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Riggs, B.A. "Routine work related absence: the effects of family," *Marriage and Family Review,* 15: 147-160.

Rodman Aronson, K.M., Schaler Buchholz, E. (2001). "The post-feminist era: still striving for equality in relationships," *The American Journal of Family Therapy,* 29: 109-124.

Rosen, L.N., Moghadam, L.Z., Vaitkus, M.A. (1989). "The military family's influence on soldiers' personal morale: A path analytic model," *Military Psychology,* 1(4): 201-213.

Rosen, L.N., Carpenter, C.J., Moghadam, L.Z. (1989a). "Impact of military life stress on the quality of life of military wives," *Military Medicine,* 154(3): 116-120.

Saleebey, D., (1997). "Introduction: power in the people," In D. Saleebey (Ed.), *The strengths perspective in social work practice* (3-19). New York: Longman Publishers USA.

Segal, M.W. (1986). "The military and the family as greedy institutions," *Armed Forces and Society,* 13(1): 9-38.

Segal, M.W., Harris, J.J. (1993). *"What we know about army families,"* Special Report 21. Alexandria, Virginia: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Segal, D.R., Segal, S.W. (1993) "Research on soldiers of the Sinai multinational force and observers," In D.R. Segal and S.W. Segal (Eds.), *Peacekeepers and their wives: American participation in the multinational force and observers* (pp. 56-80). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Silberberg, S. (2001). "Searching for family resilience," *Family Matters,* 58 (autumn 2001): 52-57.

Sion, L. (2001). ""The weakest link": women in two Dutch peacekeeping units," *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military:* 5-11.

Snyder, A.I. (1978). "Periodic marital separation and physical illness," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 48(4): 637-643.

Snyder, C.R. (1993). "Hope for the journey," In A.P. Turnbull, S.K. Behr, D.L. Murphy, J.G. Marquis, and M.J. Blue-Banning (Eds.), *Cognitive coping, families and disability* (pp. 271-285). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Snyder, C.R. (2000). *Handbook of Hope,* San Diego, CA: ACADEMIC PRESS.

Snyder, C.R., Rodriguez-Hanley, A. (2000). "The demise of hope: On losing positive thinking," In C.R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of Hope* (pp. 39-54). San Diego, CA.: ACADEMIC PRESS.

Spellman, S. (1976). "Utilization of problem-solving resources among military families," In H.I. McCubbin, B.B. Dahl, and E.J. Hunter (Eds.), *Families in the military system* (pp.174-206). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stafford, E.M., Grady, B.A. (2003). "Military family support," *Pediatric Annals*, 32 (2): 110-115.

Swanson, J.M., Chapman, L. (1994). "Inside the black box: Theoretical and methodological issues in conducting evaluation research using a qualitative approach," In J.M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 67-93). Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Truscott, S., Flemming, S. (1986). *Occupational stress among married and single parent Canadian forces personnel,* (ORAE Project PR 375) Ottawa: Department of National Defence.

The Geneva Convention Act (R.S., 1985 c. G.3)

The Royal Canadian Legion: Ontario Command, (2002). *Press Release,* Received January, 2003, Stoney Creek Legion, Stoney Creek, Ontario: The Royal Canadian Legion.

Turner, F.J. (1997). "Canada," In D. Elliot, N.S. Mayadas, and T.D. Watts (Eds.), *International Handbook on Social Work Theory and Practice* (pp. 29-45). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Turner, S.G. (2001). "Resilience and social work practice: Three case studies," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services,* 82(5): 441-448.

Unger, D.G., Powell, D.R. (1990). "Families as nurturing systems: An introduction," *Prevention in Human Services* (9): 1-17.

Van Breda, A.D. (1995). "Cycles of deployment," Vlootnuus/Navy News, May: 10.

Van Breda, A.D. (1997). "The development of the deployment resilience seminar" (MSW thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa, 1997)

Van Breda, A.D. (1997a). "Experience of routine husband absences in the South African navy," *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk* 33(2): 154-164.

Van Breda, A.D. (1999). "Developing resilience to routine separations: an occupational social work intervention," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services,* 80(6): 597-605.

Van Breda, A.D. (1999a). "Improving deployment resilience: Guidelines for families," *Salut*, 6 (1): 1-2.

Van Breda, A.D., Potgieter, H. (2002). "Social concerns for peace support operations," *Paper presented and the 34th International Congress on Military Medicine*, Sun City, South Africa, September 15-20.

Van Breda, A.D. (2003) [Major] (South African Defence Force). Electronic Mail correspondence to the author, September 25, 2003.

Van Breda, A.D. (2004). "Multicultural scale development in social work," Doctoral Thesis in progress: Rand Afrikaans University, South Africa.

Van Vranken, E.W., D.M. Benson (1978). "Family awareness and perceived helpfulness of community supports," In E.J. Hunter, and D.S. Nice (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.209-221). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Walker, P. (1994). "The army cares: But does anyone believe it?" *Army Times*, (19) September: 12-17.

Waller, M.A. (2001). "Resilience in ecosystemic context: evolution of the concept," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71(3): 290-297.

Walsh, F. (1998). *Strengthening family resilience*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Walsh, F. (1996). "The concept of family resilience: crisis and challenge," *Family Process*, 35 (3), 261-281.

Walsh, F. (1982). "Conceptualizations of normal family functioning," In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal family processes* (3-42). New York: The Guilford Press.

Walton, E. (2001). "A conceptual framework for family-centered services," In E. Walton et al. (Eds.), *Balancing family-centered services and child well being: exploring issues in policy, theory, and research* (pp.69-92). New York: Columbia University Press.

Weber, Max (1958). *The protestant work ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Wertsch, M. (1991). *Military brats: Legacies of childhood inside the fortress*. New York: Harmony Books.

Westhuis, D.J. (1999). "Working with military families during deployments," In J.G. Daley (Ed.) *Social Work Practice in the Military* (pp.275-290). New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.

Weick, A., Saleebey, D. (1995). "Supporting family strengths: Orienting policy and practice toward the 21st century," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services,* March: 141-162.

Wexler, H.K., McGrath, E. (1991). "Family member stress reactions to military involvement separation," *Psychotherapy*, 28 (3): 515-519.

Williams, J.W. (1978). "Dual-Career military families," In Hunter, E.J. and Nice, D.S. (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.103-110). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Winslow, D. (1998). "Misplaced loyalties: The role of military culture in the breakdown of discipline in peace operations," *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,* 35(3): 345-355.

Woodside, A.G., Wilson, E.J. (2002). "Respondent inaccuracy," *Journal of Advertising Research,* 42 (5): 7-24.

Woelfel, J.C., Savell, J.M. (1978) "Marital Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, and Retention in the Army," In E.J. Hunter and D.S. Nice (Eds.), *Military families* (pp.17-31). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Yuen, F.K.O., Pardeck, J.T. (1999). "A family health approach to social work practice," In J.T. Pardeck and F.K.O. Yuen (Eds.), *Family health: A holistic approach to social work practice* (pp. 1-16). Westport: Auburn House.