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Dedication

Over the course of completing this research study I have unintentionally learned about why my views of the military are not necessarily shared by others. In that regard, researching the civil–military gap has broadened my perspective of how civilians view me as a soldier and how I, personally, view American society. This study is first and foremost dedicated to the men and women of the military. The statement inscribed in so many memorials—all gave some, some gave all—holds a deep sentiment in my life work. I do hope that this study attracts more young people into the military services. More importantly, I hope this study will broaden public understanding of civil–military relations in terms of U.S. Army JROTC.

This study would not have been possible without the extreme desire that my father, SFC (R) Ulises Miranda-Weynez, instilled in me for the U.S. Army. As a very young boy, my father would take me with him to field artillery firing lines and ammunition transfer points when we lived in Fort Sill-Lawton, Oklahoma. At the young age of twelve, I pulled the lanyard on the gun breach of a 105 Howitzer. On those same military field exercises, I fired the turret mounted 50 cal. machine gun and watched thousands of excess power charge bags, that were not used during the live fire artillery training, burn in shallow pits as billowing black clouds of smoke rose toward the sky. Always with the permission of his commanding officer, my father was able to let me do these things because he earned the respect of everyone. Even the post commander knew that my father was a different type of soldier. My father, a veteran of the war in Korea
and two tours in Vietnam, worked excessively hard for his superior officers. He is an old soldier in the truest sense of the definition. First drafted into the U.S. Army from his native island of Puerto Rico, he numbers among the type of soldier whom most citizens wonder if exist anymore. I hope that my son, T.J., will also feel the same extreme desire to continue to serve as an officer in the U.S. Army.

For interviewing assistance I am indebted to Mary Courtney. This research study would have been much more difficult without her help. When I taught high school chemistry, she guided me through the curriculum. When I needed to move my U.S. Army JROTC program to another high school, she was my biggest advocate. I hope that she takes as much pride in this research as I do. I hope that she will someday also reach her highest levels of academic lifetime achievement.

I am a product of the professors that have guided me. Dr. Guillermo Montes and Dr. Jeanette Silvers have treated me as their most important student. In higher education, ROTC is still not completely accepted on many high school and college campuses. Dr. Montes stood fast to ensure that I shared equal footing among other doctoral candidates. His support for my work is an example of his unwavering dedication to social justice and equal opportunity. Dr. Silvers believed in my work and grew in her appreciation of my abilities. We would attend committee meetings consistently for two years and we grew to learn about the civil–military gap and military JROTC research together. Part of me understands that I now have a burden to carry on and uphold the high standards I learned from my professors. I will not let them down and I will always be their best work.

For supporting me so many times through my U.S. Army career, I am lovingly grateful to my wife, Shari. She has been tolerant and exceptionally understanding of my
extreme desire to achieve at the highest levels in all endeavors. It is not easy to live, love, or be with me. My children are familiar with my extremes. But it is my wife who has held the family together for these 28 years of marriage. Ultimately, it is Shari, Courtney, Taylor, and T.J. who energize and motivate me to achieve. With them, it is ok to do everything. Without them, it is impossible to do anything.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how values and attitudes of high school administrators may affect unequal access to Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) in public schools. This study compares values, attitudes, demographic and philosophical information for schools representing urban, suburban, town and rural school districts in an attempt to understand how high school administrators’ life experiences with the military influence their support for the JROTC program. The first chapter of the dissertation presents the background and history of JROTC programs in the United States, and examines the current national distribution of JROTC in high schools throughout the country. It explores the interaction between military and civilian society and the “civil–military gap” as a measure of the differences in attitudes and values between these two groups. This chapter further explains the significance of the study, and the research questions addressed through the study.

Problem Statement

JROTC, as a national youth citizenship program, is not being offered equally to students throughout the country. The regulations governing the operation of the JROTC program (10 USC Sec. 2031) require fair and equitable distribution of JROTC units throughout the nation. However, examination of the data on distribution of Army JROTC units shows a clear inequality in geographic distribution of the program throughout the United States. Little research is available documenting the lack of equitable distribution, or investigating the reasons for this inequality.
Opposition to the military and JROTC in public high schools may be caused by misunderstandings between the military and civilian society. Misunderstandings can cause conflict between JROTC instructors and school administrators creating, to some extent, civil–military discord. This discord may be defined most accurately as a civil–military relationship gap. Identifying the underlying reasons for these gaps may help civil–military relations, unequal access to JROTC and national security.

**JROTC**

This section defines the JROTC program, describes the components of the instructional program and indicates when and how the program was founded. To understand the history of how and why the program was founded, the early history of military schools in the U.S. is traced with a focus on the philosophical split that led to creation of JROTC. Finally, the growth of the JROTC program through the 20th century is traced up to its current status.

JROTC is an elective citizenship program for high school students. It is a Federal program sponsored by the United States Armed Forces. JROTC’s mission is to motivate young people to become better citizens. Most of the service branches maintain their own JROTC units, including Army, Air Force, Navy and Marines. Retired military personnel instruct high school students in an elective program designed “to instill in students in United States secondary educational institutions the values of citizenship, service to the United States, and personal responsibility and a sense of accomplishment,” as set forth in Title 10 U.S. Code 2031—Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps. (U.S. Army, 2007, p. 1). This study focuses on the Army JROTC program.
JROTC provides a rigorous program of instruction in leadership, citizenship and adventure skills. JROTC cannot, by regulation, recruit for the military (U.S. Army, 2012), a fact known by few civilians. JROTC cadets take elective courses in high school as part of the normal school day that educate in the areas of leadership, service learning, technology skills, emotional intelligence, citizenship, communication skills, learning skills, life skills, financial planning and career skills. Students express interest in joining the program, enroll in the elective class, and receive the title of cadet, a person in learning. Cadets wear military style uniforms and earn different rank levels through leadership development and the attainment of life skills. Additional activities outside the classroom include adventure training, confidence building and leadership development, as well as community service projects, drill and fitness competitions, parades and outdoor adventures.

Prior to the early 1900s, the JROTC program did not exist. The National Defense Act of 1916 created Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (SROTC), more commonly referred to as Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) in colleges, and JROTC in high schools. The authorization of federal military equipment and military retired teachers with a prescribed citizenship curriculum were allocated under this act.

To understand the circumstances that led up to the establishment of the ROTC program in 1916, it is useful to examine earlier history of military schools in the United States. American military schools that maintained an equal balance between military and core academic instruction developed in the 18th century. The Continental Congress authorized a continental laboratory and military academy on October 9, 1776. This field academy educated officers without taking them away from their maneuvers (Duemer,
2006). Founded in 1802, the United States Military Academy at West Point is considered the first military academy in the United States, and the first military high school in the United States was Carson Long Military Institute, New Bloomfield, PA, established in 1836 (Rogal, 2009).

The contributions of Alden Partridge, a superintendent of the military academy at West Point, were significant because he is known as the founder of ROTC. While attempting to enforce discipline at West Point, Partridge would argue with faculty about military drill time and the time devoted for academics, contending that not enough time was devoted to physical fitness and drill. This led to an investigation into his conduct and a termination from his West Point position by the President of the United States, James Monroe. Partridge was described as a man who held that students should be trained to perform the duties of a citizen in war and in peace (Long, 2003). He wanted to produce citizen soldiers, and this could not be done at West Point. Following his ouster from West Point, Alden Partridge established the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy (now Norwich University) in 1819, and then established many southern military schools. It was Norwich University and Partridge’s efforts of establishing southern military schools that provided the U.S. Army with an expanded officer corps and the citizen soldier ideal.

Military colleges rose to prominence in the South during and after the Civil War. Many people believed that the large increase of colleges offering military training in southern schools was a result of southern protectionism, but the Morrill Act was the most likely reason (Andrew, 2001). The Morrill Act provided for each state to receive federal land in order to increase the number of agricultural colleges in the United States. States
could either establish colleges on the federal property or use proceeds from its sale to fund land grant colleges. These colleges taught subjects relating to agriculture and the mechanical arts. Between 1857 and 1861, Rep. Justin Morrill restructured the wording and proposed that the act include a military training requirement. In 1862, the Morrill Act was finally signed into law. At most schools the military training requirement was not taken seriously.

Retired military officers began teaching by 1893, but many officers were allowed to teach and conduct training according to personal preferences (Texas A&M University-Kingsville, 2011). This resulted in less core course specific instruction and more focus on drill and parade maneuvers. The support of university officials for the military establishment and the military training program declined. The lack of consistency among military instructors resulted in waning support at many colleges, with universities refusing to provide adequate facilities, course credit or professor status for military instructors.

In the years leading up to America’s entry into World War I, attention began to focus on preparing a consistent officer corps for the Army. The Army Chief of Staff, General Leonard Wood, introduced a summer camp training program for high school and college students in 1913. By 1915, this summer camp program expanded to include men between the ages of 20 and 40 where thousands of participants were trained. Around the same time, Ohio State University developed its own standards for military training programs at Land Grant Universities, and proposed legislation to institute national standards for college military training programs (Texas A&M University-Kingsville, 2011).
In November 1915, representatives from civilian and military training institutions met in Washington, DC and drafted a bill to create ROTC. This bill, based largely on the Ohio State University standards, was incorporated into the National Defense Act which passed in June 1916, thus establishing ROTC as it is known today (Texas A&M University-Kingsville, 2011). High school JROTC units were established at two public high schools, Leavenworth High School in Kansas and Kamehameha Schools in Honolulu, Hawaii (at that time a U.S. territory), by 1917. Several other units were operating in military high schools (Long, 2003).

Information on JROTC’s early years is scarce. During the 20th century, college ROTC has not always had unequivocal support. It may be assumed that high school JROTC programs mirrored society’s changing support levels of the ROTC programs through the first five decades of the 1900s, though there is a lack of specific information available in the published literature about the early JROTC program in high schools. A study by Long (2003) helped to reduce this lack of information by examining primary source documents from the Adjutant General and Chief of Staff through the National Archives. He chronicled and documented the establishment and early development of the JROTC program.

It is important to develop data and information on the JROTC program since its mission and objective are inherently different from ROTC programs. JROTC may be an even more important method of increasing civilian exposure to the military than ROTC in colleges. ROTC’s mission is to commission active duty Army officers, while JROTC’s mission is to motivate young people to be better citizens, similar to scouting programs.
Rapid growth of JROTC between 1920 and post-World War II indicated growing support in cities. In 1920, a revision of the National Defense Act strengthened ROTC, and that program grew steadily between World War I and II. By 1923, there were 126 established JROTC units with over 38,000 cadets enrolled, mainly at large city high schools throughout the country (Long, 2003). A 1953 report on JROTC enrollment revealed 301 schools with operating JROTC units with a total of over 56,000 enrolled cadets (Long, 2003).

JROTC expansion to other military branches in 1964 led to expanded opportunities. The ROTC Vitalization Act of 1964 opened both ROTC and JROTC to other branches of the service in addition to the Army. The expansion increased the use of retired officers as program instructors and established scholarship opportunities for college students. The Act capped the number of JROTC operating units at 1,200 schools. In 1967, control of ROTC and JROTC programs was finally centralized under Continental Army Command (CONARC), and the JROTC unit cap was increased to 1,600 units. In 1968, a Department of Defense directive mandated by Public Law 88-647 provided the overall objectives of the modern JROTC program (Perusse, 1997):

1. Develop informed and responsible citizens
2. Strengthen character
3. Understand the basic elements and requirements for national security
4. Help form habits of self-discipline
5. Develop respect for authority in a democratic society
6. Develop an interest in the military services as a possible career
In the early 1990s, expansion of JROTC programs was seen as a possible solution to urban violence (Collin, 2008). In 1992, in response to the uprisings in Los Angeles following the acquittal of the police officers in the Rodney King beating case, Colin Powell (former ROTC cadet, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1992) influenced President George H. W. Bush to call for the revision of the laws governing JROTC (Collin, 2008). Powell felt that the discipline taught in the JROTC program could stem the violence in the cities. This change expanded the maximum number of JROTC units allowed to 3,500 from 1,600 (Collin, 2008) and offered financial incentives to inner city schools to welcome the military into the schools. The data collected by Long (2003) illustrates the increase in JROTC enrollment in the seven years following this legislation. In 1992-93, there were 856 JROTC units in operation with a total enrollment of approximately 125,000 cadets. By 1998-99, there were 1,370 JROTC units enrolling over 231,000 cadets (Long, 2003).

New expansion targets for JROTC were implemented in the new millennium. In 2001, language limiting the number of established JROTC units was removed from the legislation completely. In 2006, the law established specific expansion targets by service branch as shown below.


(a) In General.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall take appropriate actions to increase the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps is organized under chapter 102 of title 10, United States Code.
(b) Expansion Targets.—In increasing under subsection (a) the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps is organized, the Secretaries of the military departments shall seek to organize units at an additional number of institutions as follows:

1. In the case of Army units, 15 institutions.
2. In the case of Navy units, 10 institutions.
3. In the case of Marine Corps units, 15 institutions.
4. In the case of Air Force units, 10 institutions.

The legislation was further amended in October 2008 with expansion goals targeting no less than 3,700 JROTC units (all branches) by 2020. The legislation reads as follows:


(a) Plan for Increase.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall develop and implement a plan to establish and support, not later than September 30, 2020, not less than 3,700 units of the Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps.

National distribution of Army JROTC units shows geographic inconsistencies. As military schools were established based upon the model developed by Alden Partridge, a disproportionate number of JROTC units became situated in the South. As of April 2010, there are a total of 1645 high school U.S. Army JROTC units worldwide (including schools in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Department of Defense schools in the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Japan, Korea and
Germany) with an enrollment of approximately 286,000 cadets. The map in Figure 1.1 shows the approximate distribution of Army JROTC units in the continental U.S. in 2010 (U.S. Army, 2010).

Figure 1.1. U.S. Army JROTC Unit Distribution in 2010. From *Army JROTC: A character and leadership development program.* (p. 1), by U.S. Army, 2010, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.

To evaluate whether the distribution of Army JROTC units is evenly distributed throughout the United States, the researcher collected data for secondary student population and number of JROTC units by state. Assuming 100 members per JROTC unit, an estimate of the percentage of students enrolled in JROTC was calculated for each state. Table 1.1 lists the states, in descending order, of percent of students enrolled in JROTC. Southern states generally show a much higher percentage of students enrolled in JROTC than northern states. The data supports the assertion that JROTC units are not equally distributed and that the JROTC opportunity is not equally available to students throughout the United States (see Table 1.1).
Table 1.1

Secondary Student Population Enrolled in Army JROTC Units in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th># of JROTC units</th>
<th>Secondary student population</th>
<th>Estimated JROTC enrollment</th>
<th>% of students enrolled in JROTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>250,688</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>174,471</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>259,533</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>243,859</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>236,819</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>511,461</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70,039</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>333,283</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>559,379</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24,552</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>950,563</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42,780</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>154,185</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>113,089</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>424,781</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1,507,931</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45,119</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47,266</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>154,586</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>323,329</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31,650</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32,685</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>201,888</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>272,805</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103,129</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>317,146</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66,388</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>566,085</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>362,647</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,467</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>158,716</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>742,070</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>361,179</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55,029</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>489,931</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td># of JROTC units</td>
<td>Secondary student population</td>
<td>Estimated JROTC enrollment</td>
<td>% of students enrolled in JROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>673,696</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,254,439</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>636,983</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>345,836</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>174,157</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70,760</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>192,696</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>355,776</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165,212</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>209,393</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,054,397</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>294,664</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,054</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>314,875</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94,991</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>17,193,019</td>
<td>168,700</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Secondary student data obtained from U.S. Census Bureau (2011 American Community Survey). Number of JROTC units obtained from U.S. Army JROTC website.

The public laws that cover JROTC appropriations mandate that units must be fairly and equitably distributed throughout the nation. However, JROTC units are established based upon the request of school district officials, principals and superintendents, which does not result in equitable distribution. In order to maintain a JROTC unit, the high school must enroll at least 100 students or 10% of the total population of the high school. These mandates can be of concern for continuation of JROTC programs in a high school if enrollments decline.

In order to understand the relationship between JROTC and its acceptance in public schools, the study is framed within the theories of civil–military relations. A discussion follows describing political theories related to civil–military relations, the civil–military gap and the history of these theories. JROTC, as a youth citizenship
program, may be one of the best programs available to enhance civil–military relations in the 21st century.

**Theoretical Rationale**

The convergence theory of civil–military relations described by Janowitz (1960) provides the framework of this study where programs such as JROTC that bring the military and civilians together are preferable. However, a later theory by Schiff (1995) provides an updated view that depends less on how large a gap exists between civilian and military society, and more on the level of agreement between the main players (civilians, political elites and military).

Civil–military relations is an interdisciplinary field of study (Feaver, 1999) involving scholars from history, sociology, military and political science as well as policy analysts. Historically, the study of civil–military relations has been dominated by political and social scientists. Political scientists are concerned with the institutions of political control and the who, what, when, where and how government decisions are made. Sociologists are concerned with the integration of the military with society (Feaver, 1999).

Among military scholars, militarism and militarization has come to be defined as excessive control by the military in the civil–military relationship. Militarization has to do with how a society equips and prepares itself for military conflict, while militarism is the artificial, and therefore to be avoided, increased demand for national security by manipulating the threat, or by improving the armed forces beyond the necessary level. This approach of civil–military relations is used to justify the level of sacrifice demanded from citizens (Bacevich, 2013). The worries of an inappropriate relationship have
centered on dangers of military takeover, undue military interference with civilian judgment and uncooperative military–civilian interaction in the policy process.

Civil–military relations describe the relationship between civil society as a whole and the military organizations established to protect it. How they interact, communicate and how the interface between them is structured and regulated is part of this definition (Hooker, 2004). More narrowly, civil–military relations describe the relationship between civil authority of a given society and its military authority. Cohen (2001) proposes three aspects of civil–military relations: the relationship between society and the armed forces as a whole, the interaction between civilian and military institutions, and power relations at the highest levels of government. Control of the military is the functional aspect of this relationship. While scholars and theorists do not agree on precise definitions, several elements of civil–military relations are common (Peabody, 2001). The normative belief is that civilian control over the military is preferable to military control of the political state. Civilian control of the military is usually strong when civilians are in charge. The central concern for scholars studying civil–military relations is to explain how civilian control over the military is established and maintained (Burk, 2002). Based upon changing interactions between political, military and societal institutions, civil military relations involves a balance between a military that is large enough to defend its citizens against all enemies but not too large as to acquire the ability or threaten to initiate a coup d’état (Feaver, 1996).

The modern field of civil–military relations is grounded in post-World War II American society. Although civil military relations can be traced to the early development of the United States and even further back through the writings of Sun Tzu,
The Art of War (1971), the history of the civil–military gap and modern work in civil–military relations began in 1946 following World War II (Cohn, 1999). It was during this period that sociologists began to study the impact of a large loss of life and the integration of the military back into civilian society (Feaver, 1999). A large downsizing of the military after the war and the prediction that industrialization would result in the war that would end all wars (Desaulniers, 2009) caused the government to rethink the draft. Occupation and constabulary forces were needed to occupy Japan and Germany (Janowitz, 1960). To avoid the effects of extreme downsizing of the Army, President Harry S. Truman called for Universal Military Training (UMT). UMT would provide one year of military training to eligible men and then return them back into civilian society (Desaulniers, 2009). The citizen soldier ideal would provide contact by putting the military back into civilian society. Despite UMT never being passed by Congress, this was considered the best civil–military relations period in the history of the United States due to the strong connection between the military and civilian sectors.

The other two periods that have impacted civil–military relations include the Vietnam War through the introduction of the All Volunteer Force (AVF) and the post-Cold War period (Cohn, 1999). During this time, the amount of contact between American society and the military decreased dramatically, greatly influencing civil–military relations.

The military draft in the United States was a key factor in dividing American society. The draft was reinstated in 1949 in preparation for the beginning of the Korean War and the ROTC at colleges and universities was still providing diverse personnel to the Army (Downs & Murtazashvili, 2012). The military enjoyed massive growth during
this time with little drawdown of personnel. Historians repeatedly use the term “large standing army” to describe the military during post World War II (Dempsey, 2010). A massive military buildup would not have been possible without the willingness of society and a national sense of collective responsibility to serve (Dempsey, 2008). The draft and ROTC were considered more linked to society and generated a much more diverse Army than solely relying on West Point cadets (Desaulniers, 2009). In this way, the United States may have found the best methods of sustaining military contact with society while also attempting to maintain civilian control. As ROTC numbers at major universities started to decline and the Cold War lingered through the start of the Vietnam War, Huntington and Janowitz provided two different theories on civilian control of the military (Nielson, 2005).

Professionalization of the military produced two divisions in the study of civil–military relations. Samuel Huntington noted a conflict between the values and attitudes of the military versus the civilians in society when he published *The Soldier and the State* in 1957. Morris Janowitz introduced the convergence theory when he published *The Professional Soldier* in 1960. Both scholars addressed military effectiveness and civilian control and disagreed about how the military should be structured and ultimately utilized within society and in preparation for war (Dempsey, 2008).

Huntington proposed a theory of separation between military and society based on military autonomy. In 1957, Samuel Huntington called for a distinct separation of the military from political affairs called the institutional theory of objective civilian control (Dempsey, 2008). He felt that civilians should dictate military security policy but should leave the military to determine what wartime operations were necessary to secure the
civilians policy objectives (Burk, 2002). In this way political loyalty is upheld with
civilian bosses in return for the professional autonomy of the armed forces.

Janowitz’s theory focused on integration and assimilation of the military into
society. Morris Janowitz proposed the convergence theory in 1960 in contrast to
Huntington’s institutional theory. Janowitz explains civil–military cooperation as a result
of the involvement of military personnel with society. The more that the military is in
contact with society, the better are civil–military relations. To Janowitz, the more the
military understands society by engagement with citizens, the more society will
understand the military and this leads to strong civilian control (Feaver & Kohn, 2001).
In order to perpetuate the citizen soldier ideal that was proposed by Janowitz, he called
for the development of a national service program that included a military component to
provide youth with opportunities to serve the nation (Burk, 2002). As opposed to the
institutional theory, professionalism was not the ideal status for military personal to attain
according to Janowitz. Instead, military service was an obligation of citizenship and the
citizen soldier ideal may be the best status that the military could attain toward
establishing improved civil–military relations.

After World War II, Samuel Huntington incorrectly predicted that the United
States Army would weaken and become less effective if it did not separate away from an
increasingly liberal and degenerate civilian society (Feaver & Kohn, 2000). Yet the
United States military did not weaken as Huntington may have expected (Burk, 2002).
Morris Janowitz did not believe in such a clear separation of the military from civilian
society, and after World War II public support was high, even for the proposed legislation
of the UMT under President Truman (Desaulniers, 2009). This support continued through the post-World War II period, until the next major conflict in the late 1960s.

The Vietnam War caused a dramatic divide in civil–military relations. Public views of preferential treatment, allegations of racial bias and college deferments decreased positive military contact with society through the Vietnam War period. By this time, the draft that had been in place since 1949 became an unequal system of enlistment (Desaulniers, 2009) due to an increasing number of young men avoiding the draft through college deferments and other avoidance techniques. As predicted by Huntington, the decline in discipline and increase in individuality changed society. The military was not adapting to that change (Cohn, 1999). The convergence theory proposed by Janowitz called for the integration of the military into society (Feaver & Kohn, 2000). Because of the extreme individualistic environment in society at this time, neither theory could explain if there would be an increase in the likelihood that civilians could come to know about the military through contact (Cohn, 1999). ROTC units on many college and university campuses were closed. Following the Vietnam War, antimilitary politicians advocated decreases in defense budgets and curtailment of officer commissions. With the decrease in the size of the armed forces there were few opportunities for civilians to gain direct exposure to the military (Desaulniers, 2009).

Once the United States decided that the All Volunteer Force (AVF) would provide some of the same positive outcomes of the draft, a widening distance in civil–military relations occurred (Cohn, 1999). It did not increase civilian contact with the military as it became easier for civilians to view the military as different because they made a different lifestyle choice (Lewis, 2010). However, a potential problem under the
AVF is that a self-selecting military may not reflect the diversity of the society it is drawn from (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). The convergence theory suggests that the military is becoming more and more a stranger to society—conservative and resistant to change. By opening opportunities to women and gay men and lesbians slowly and reluctantly, the military is not keeping pace with values that are more rapidly becoming the norm in society. The convergence theory called for less military autonomy and more integration between military and civilian systems. As the Army emphasized the professional soldier, society continued to prefer a separation between the military and society (Schiff, 2009) and a “type” of enlistee was expected under the AVF (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). Moskos (2002) viewed the AVF as the disparate fight between society’s fundamental values and the military values of selfless service, duty, and patriotism. Yet the AVF was starting to seem like just another job where citizens could decide on an occupation without feeling a sense of obligation (Cohn, 1999). The shift from the draft to the AVF widened the distance between civil–military relations and increased the total number of military force personnel in preparation for the ideological threat of the Cold War between the U.S. and Soviet Union.

The Cold War introduced highly skilled, lethal military capabilities needing a large number of personnel yet further segregating the military from society. United States global interests during the Cold War resulted in American military global reach in military operations other than war (MOOTW) and a peacetime role expansion for U.S. armed forces (Peabody, 2001). Janowitz believed that if society changed, the military should adjust to these changes through adaptation, integration and interaction (Downs & Murtazashvili, 2012). The convergence theory is criticized for not examining the military
as a segmented modern organization. Some military units remain so intentionally isolated from civilian society that integration will never occur. Delta Force, Navy Seal Team 6, and the Special Forces employ personnel who function at the fringe of military service. A concept of “corporateness” rather than integration is used to explain the reasons for selecting the military simply as an occupation, not as an institution. In other words, some people join the military specifically because of the nature of the highly skilled, clandestine occupations they train for, rather than because of the military institution itself. It is the job, not the organization, which interests them. This illustrates traditional isolation of some military personnel who, to a high degree, define civil–military relations (Tagarev, 1997). Some part of the military will accommodate involvement and engagement between civilians. The convergence theory may not account for the growing number of segmented clandestine military units during MOOTW.

During the later years of the Cold War, the state National Guard and federal Reserve units became more important to the total Army force and the global MOOTW missions. Leading up to and through the Korean War and Vietnam, as citizens were becoming less willing to endure the hardship of military service, national citizen soldier programs did become more common but less accepted by society (Downs & Murtazashvili, 2012). Huntington did not consider these forces as part of his separation of military professionalism from civilian society. The National Guard and Reserve may have always been considered the model example of contact between civilians and the highly skilled citizen soldier. It is this contact between the civilian world and the military that defines civil–military relations, and is the subject of study and debate.
Differences in values and attitudes between the armed services and civilian society define the civil–military gap and threaten the effectiveness of military and civilian cooperation (Feaver & Kohn, 2000). There is a concern that the differences in values and attitudes which make up the cultures of military and civilian society have become so divergent that it may affect national security (Cohen, 2000). The civil–military gap has been described in multiple, sometimes contradictory, ways: as a perceived crisis, as a real conflict and even as a fictional description of the state of military affairs that expresses an inaccurate view of the military and society (Hooker, 2004). Other definitions of the gap describe the cultural and geographic isolation of the military from civilian mainstream society. Where there are few or no military personnel around, the civil–military gap widens.

Military restructuring in the mid-1990s reduced contact between the military and American society. Feaver and Kohn (2000) propose that the differences in values and attitudes of the military may be influenced by the lack of military bases in large urban areas due to the 1994 Base Re-Alignment and Closure Act (BRAC). This act closed many military bases or moved them away from population dense areas of the United States. Areas where the civilians had a high likelihood of coming in contact with military personnel and having interaction with the military were reduced. This recent development in societal change has resulted in a widening of the civil–military gap (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). The military aligning their resources in areas which would best benefit their goals of training, recruitment and public support shifted resources to Southern portions of the United States.
A major effort to study and define the status of the civil–military gap at the turn of the millennium was sponsored by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies (TISS). This group is a consortium of faculty members from several universities, including Duke University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). One of the questions posed by the study was “What is the nature or character of the civil–military gap in the year 2000?” The answers to that question may be useful in establishing the current nature of the civil–military gap.

The TISS study analyzed values and attitudes of key stakeholder groups including the general public and the military. The TISS study consisted of a large survey of approximately 250 questions administered to almost 5,000 people in three key groups of people: the general public, influential civilian leaders and rising military officers. Surveys were mailed to civilian leaders and rising military officers between fall 1998 and spring 1999. The general public was contacted via telephone in September and October of 1998 and used a shortened form of the survey. The design of the study was meant to allow comparisons with earlier surveys of attitudes about foreign and domestic policy issues, including surveys conducted in the Vietnam War era. The selection of participants in the “civilian leader” category followed procedures established by Holsti and Rosenau in the Foreign Policy Leadership Project (FPLP) in 1996.

The TISS study data should be viewed with caution due to limitations of the sampled groups. It may be important to note that the military subgroup is focused on up and coming officers, with surveys being administered to cadets at the national service academies, students at the staff colleges in the different service branches, and students and graduates of the career capstone course at the National Defense University. A
criticism of the survey is that enlisted personnel were not used and therefore it is important to keep in mind that any conclusions drawn from this survey are based on a select set of military officers rather than a representative sample of the military service from all ranks including officers, warrant officers, and enlisted. The “civilian elite” category targeted survey recipients who were listed in directories such as “Who’s Who in America” and directories of prominent citizens in categories such as women, American politics, media, foreign affairs, clergy, and labor.

The Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies proposed five reasons for the causes of the civil–military gap. The first cause is less military generational influence. Fewer Americans have contact with military service now than in past decades (Dempsey, 2008). As veterans of major U.S. conflicts die off and only 1% of the current population serves in the military (Desaulniers, 2009), there are fewer family members to explain the military culture. A second cause is fewer people joining the military. The Vietnam War and implementation of the AVF had the largest detrimental impact on the civil–military gap in our country’s history (Bacevich, 2013). The third cause is the military being viewed as an occupation versus an obligation to serve. A fourth cause is the downsizing of the military due to the high tech environment. Replacing military personnel with machines has decreased the overall numbers of military personnel. The fifth cause is the quality versus quantity of recruiting. Most young people who join the military serve fewer than 10 years (Segal & Segal, 2004). A large majority who leave are the best that America has to offer (Taylor, 2011). After a short military career, many of the top officers who graduated from West Point and other prestigious colleges leave military service for civilian employment. These five proposed causes of the gap may point to
contact with the military as being the primary reason for the differences in values and attitudes between military and civilian society.

There is skepticism over whether a contact gap even exists. The isolation of the military from civilian society causing value and attitude differences is the principle factor noted most often to define the gap. But military presence in civilian society is widespread and America understands the value system of the military through a large amount of contact (Hooker, 2004). The National Guard and Reserve component make up a large portion of military presence in society and have been deployed in war at higher rates than at any other time in history (Taylor, 2011). A high percentage of married service members living in off-base housing, increased participation of the military using the college G.I. Bill, and many military members holding second jobs are examples of the military being quite visible in civilian society (Hooker, 2004). Because of this high level of military integration into civilian society, some scholars believe that the gap is exaggerated and fictional. According to Kilner (2001, p. 1), “the values gap just does not make sense” because as a moral ideal, there is no gap in ideals between the American society and the military. The definition of the civil–military gap may then turn to a gap of moral standards of behavior, where contact has little or no effect upon national security and the possibility of a coup.

Society may have changed the way it looks at the military by civilians not understanding military motives and overestimating what the military can do with only 1% of the wartime population serving. America has accepted that the military must be different in values and attitudes of discipline, personal sacrifice, and duty (Hooker, 2004). The civil–military gap is constituted by isolation of the military from civilian
communities and the resulting difference between civilian and military values (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). Some researchers argue that the gap does exist and could cause problems for U.S. society and national defense. Others, like Hooker (2004), believe that there is no contact gap and no large misunderstanding of the military in society nor any discourse in values and attitudes that exist. Some researchers state that there is a civil–military gap, but agree that nothing needs to be done in the United States for now.

The TISS study (Feaver & Kohn, 2001) reports that if nothing is done to narrow differences in values and attitudes, then there are three problems that may arise and may reveal why the civil–military gap in values and attitudes matter. One, if civilian support and understanding of the military remains, resources for training and defense preparation will decrease. Two, there are current problems concerning diversity under the AVF which has the most wide range effect of widening the civil–military gap. If the gap remains, recruiting and retention will become even more difficult. Three, if there continues to be an increasing number of government officials who have not served in the military then cooperation between the armed forces and civilian control by politicians may diminish. Civilians may no longer control the military (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). When the civilian control or the degree that the military’s civilian bosses can no longer enforce their authority on military matters decreases, a coup becomes a possibility (Hooker, 2004). Throughout the history of the United States and the development of a large standing Army, a coup may have always been possible but not probable. Scholars use this argument to downplay the seriousness of the civil–military gap by implying that if there is no threat of a coup, there is no problem (Cohen, 2000).
The RAND Corporation study analyzing the civil–military gap in the post-9/11 period confirmed earlier findings about the values and attitudes of military personnel (Szayna, McCarthy, Sollinger, Demaine, Marquis, & Steele, 2007). The military respondents were more Republican (political) and more conservative (ideological) than their civilian counterparts. In particular, the more conservative views of the military on domestic issues, particularly social or moral issues, are the major source of the civil–military gap according to this evaluation (Feaver & Kohn, 2001). The major differences between the groups related to military personnel policies were related to women in combat, sexual harassment policies, and attitudes toward gay men and lesbians serving in the military. The more conservative military officers tended to be very conservative on these issues, differing widely from the civilian leaders they were compared with (Szayna et al., 2007).

One of the most recent theories proposed after the Cold War is the concordance theory by Rebecca Schiff in 2009. Her book, titled "The Military and Domestic Politics: A Concordance Theory of Civil–Military Relations," provides an alternative method of determining if a coup is more or less likely (Inbody, 2010). These one word descriptors may be used to describe Huntington’s theory of separation, Janowitz’s theory of integration and Schiff’s theory of agreement. By the standards of the concordance theory, it does not matter if the military is or is not detached from civilian society. The concordance theory does not regard separation of institutions as the reason military intervention is less likely. Instead, it is when the three sides of the military, the political elites, and the citizens agree on four indicators that civil control is maintained. These four indicators are the social composition of the officer corps, the political decision
making process, the recruitment method, and the military style (Schiff, 2009). The concordance theory explains the institutional and cultural conditions that affect relations among the three sides and it predicts that if the three sides agree on the four indicators, military intervention is less likely to occur (Schiff, 1995). Although inspired by the convergence theory by Janowitz, it is agreement and not engagement that is explained as the key to civil–military relations utilizing the concordance theory. The four indictors have been used as a way to examine military function in the United States as well as other countries (Schiff, 2009). Schiff accounts for the role of cultural values and attitudes in the interaction of these players. Political or civilian elites are defined as the influential members of a government.

**Agreement one.** The social composition of the government describes the agreement of whether the officer corps should reflect the society as a whole with enough economic, ethnic and religious diversity (Schiff, 2009). The diversity of the military in an AVF may have the most damaging effect upon this indicator and the civil–military gap.

**Agreement two.** The political decision making process describes the agreement of how much the military can become involved or participate in matters of budget, equipment quality and quantity and the size of the military force (Schiff, 2009). This indicator may involve political party affiliation but does not imply a particular form of government. The possible higher percentage of Republicans, conservatives or libertarians in the military may have a significant impact upon this indicator.

**Agreement three.** The recruitment method describes how the country may pursue people to serve their country by either coercive or persuasive methods. Coercive
recruitment is forcible conscription of people and taxation to obtain supplies for military purposes (Schiff, 2009). The debate concerning reinstatement of the draft in the United States may have a significant impact upon this indicator.

**Agreement four.** Military style describes an agreement of what the military should look like according to ethos and what the country thinks about military appearance (Schiff, 2009). Military ethos is the cultural values and attitudes of the Army (U.S. Army, 2006). Symbols such as awards, ribbons and rank convey a type of power or authority over people. Uniforms may reflect a certain military style of a country. Hoods and masks may reflect a certain military style for the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Plain clothes reflect the military style of Israel. Style is about defining or limiting social boundaries and becomes a way in which the military differentiates itself from politics and society. Uniforms have always been a symbol of separateness or interaction depending upon the values and attitudes of a country (Schiff, 2009).

Schiff’s less U.S. centric and more global civil–military relations theory is centered on agreement between military and society, regardless of the level of integration or separation. For the most part, civilian society may rather have the military separated from day-to-day matters. Schiff’s concordance theory provides a new focus toward analyzing cultural values and attitude differences between the military and civilians. Schiff offers a method for studying global civil–military relationships that may not suppose the United States as baseline (Inbody, 2010). It takes into consideration both military and civilian separation and integration, as long as there is agreement on the indicators. It takes into consideration the strength of civilian control of the military
depending on how many indicators that the military, political elites and citizens agree to agree upon.

In summary, the field of civil military relations is a subject of ongoing study to define and describe the relationship between civilian and military society. It is generally agreed among scholars that while there is a need for a strong military, civilian control of the military is essential to avoid the possibility of a coup. Finding ways to increase military integration into civilian society can help achieve this needed balance.

Research Questions

The focus of the study is to explore the relationship between high school administrators’ values and attitudes and the unequal access to JROTC in high schools in the United States. The general question this study will explore is:

1. How do the values, attitudes, and beliefs of high school administrators influence their support for establishment of JROTC in schools? That general question is supported by these related questions:

2. In what ways do the administrators’ life experiences influence their initial responses to photographs of JROTC cadets engaged in typical cadet activities?

3. How do the administrators’ life experiences influence their thought process about offering JROTC in school?

Significance of the Study

There have been no previous studies regarding unequal access to JROTC by high school students. Most studies examine and compare college level respondents from the service academy, college ROTC, and civilian non-military college students. High school JROTC information is very limited. No study has examined the civil–military relations
gap and its effect upon unequal access to JROTC in high schools. The study will purposely include urban, suburban, town and rural schools. This study may be relevant to the U.S. Army, ROTC Cadet Command and recruiters in the attempt to identify barriers to offering JROTC in public schools.

JROTC provides important opportunities for schools and students. Identifying factors that may increase the number of schools that welcome JROTC may expand the common ground educational opportunities of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) for students’ career exploration. This career interest test provides high school students with information regarding career opportunities, scholarships and the future job outlook in the United States. For schools, the initiatives for expansion of the school day may assist in providing meaningful citizenship programs for students after school. Activities such as adventure training, parades, flag ceremonies, physical fitness competition and community events will highlight a seven day a week extracurricular program. The significance of the study to the U.S. Army, in general, is that by identifying characteristics that would make a community receptive to introducing a JROTC program, expansion opportunities may be streamlined, allowing for easier and faster establishment of new JROTC units in underserved areas, thereby fulfilling the stated objective of fair and equitable distribution throughout the nation.

**Definitions of Terms**

Definitions pertinent to this study include:

*ROTC*: General term referring to either JROTC or SROTC, or to both programs collectively.
**Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC):** A program of instruction provided at the high school level, which is administered jointly by the military and the local school board.

**Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (SROTC):** A program of general military instruction offered at the college level, including the fundamentals of drill and staff procedures in the Basic Course during the first two years and tactical techniques in the Advanced Course during the last two years which leads to a commission.

**Gap:** short for civil–military gap, the actual or perceived difference in values and attitudes between military culture and civilian culture of a society.

**Summary**

The purpose of the study is to explore how high school administrators’ attitudes and values may impact the unequal access to JROTC in the United States. Review of the history and structure of the JROTC program, and current data on the distribution of JROTC programs in the United States supported the contention of unequal access. The theoretical framework of the civil–military gap was explained through several competing theories.

The convergence theory proposed by Morris Janowitz in 1960 advocated for the increased interaction and integration of the military into the educational establishments of the United States. Janowitz called for a mandatory national service program for youth. Because post-World War II is considered the beginnings of the civil–military gap, the influence that JROTC had on the gap problem may not have been considered by many scholars at that time. However, it is Janowitz’s theory that initially guided this study. The competing theory was the institutional theory proposed by Samuel Huntington in
1957. His theory calls for the separation of the military from civilian society in order for effective civil–military control to advance the normative view that the civilians must always control the military. The institutional theory opposes the integration of the military in society that JROTC may attempt to accomplish. Schiff (2009) proposes the concordance theory that highlights dialogue, accommodation, shared values, attitudes, and objectives through agreement between the military, political elites, and society. Together, these theories supporting and opposing military integration provide the professional and philosophical backdrop of this study.

JROTC brings the military to high schools thereby offering equal opportunity to students and providing societal familiarization with one of the most important institutions of our country. Increasing the number of people who obtain knowledge of the military culture through the nation’s secondary school system offers one of the few ways that the armed services can directly interact with larger segments of society (Corbett & Coumbe, 2001). The existing data on established Army JROTC units shows that the current situation does not achieve the Army’s stated objective of fair and equitable distribution of JROTC units throughout the United States. Southern states are more highly represented by JROTC participation than northern states. This situation results in unequal access to JROTC opportunities for secondary students in the United States. Since JROTC is uniquely positioned to expose civilians to military ideology without the pressure of military enlistment, actions to present the JROTC opportunity more equitably may serve to narrow the civil–military gap throughout the United States. This study will explore the values and attitudes that may make a school administrator receptive or nonreceptive to establishment of a JROTC program in a diverse selection of communities.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

The purpose of the literature review was to examine the empirical research regarding the field of military sociology as it pertains to the civil–military relations gap, specifically as expressed through distribution of high school JROTC units in the United States. The parameters of review included the peer reviewed journals Armed Forces & Society, Journal of Political and Military Sociology, Military Psychology, and the Journal of General Education from 2000 to 2013, using the keywords Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps, JROTC, civil–military relations, civil–military relations gap, Senior Reserve Officers Training Corps, SROTC, ROTC, civil–military relations, cultural gap, demographics gap, policy preference gap, and institutional gap. The keyword “relations” was substituted with the word “gap” in many key words and phrases. All nonempirical studies and articles were excluded including those that focused on military effectiveness, military operations during war, and military policy regulations. No research prior to the year 2000 was included although some articles that were published after 2000 discussed prior years’ occurrence. For example, the study conducted by Bachman, Freedman-Doan, Segal, and O’Malley (2000) examined the years 1976 to 1997. Accordingly, 16 studies and 4 books were used to determine the state of the science.

The possible causes of the civil–military gap were organized into four categories based on the work of Rahbek-Clemmensen et al. (2012). To assist in the identification of
the cause and effects of the civil–military gap, they defined the gap in terms of four separate types called The Four Dimensions of the Civil–Military Gap. These four dimensions include (a) the cultural gap, referring to whether the attitudes and values of civilian and military populations differ; (b) the demographics gap, referring to whether or not the military represents the U.S. population in its partisan and socioeconomic makeup; (c) the policy preference gap, which is defined as disagreements about public policy issues, and (d) the institutional gap, concerned with whether the relationship between the military and civilian institutions such as the education system are in harmony. This chapter includes a methodological review of the research, a discussion of important literature gaps, a conclusion of what scholars have found specifically in terms of JROTC and civil–military relations, and recommendations for future research.

**Empirical Literature Review Parameters**

Source limitations of the literature review included the four military service branches and their defense departments. This was particularly important because ROTC is limited to the U.S. Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force. Because JROTC and its counterpart program in college, SROTC, are designed as officers’ programs, enlisted contributions to civil–military relations may be less important. It should also be noted that although civil–military relations is international in scope, the current study was limited to the United States.

**Peer reviewed journals and books.** The most significant source of peer reviewed empirical studies came from *Armed Forces & Society*, the official journal of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society (IUS). Other journals used as sources of studies included the *Journal of General Education, Military Psychology,* and
the *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*. In addition to these journals, several significant books were used as background information sources. Feaver and Kohn’s *Soldiers and Civilians, The Civil–Military Gap and American National Security* (2001) provided much of the background related to convergence theory as well as summarizing multiple relevant studies about the civil–military gap. *The Civil–Military Gap in the United States: Does it Exist, Why, and Does it Matter* by Szynza et al., (2007) and published by the RAND Corporation was a major source of information that guided policy in U.S. Army operational effectiveness as well as providing information on the status of the civil–military gap in the post 9/11 era. Information on convergence theory was obtained from Janowitz’s book, *The Professional Soldier* (1960), while Huntington’s institutional theory was described in his book *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil–Military Relations* (1957). Schiff’s concordance theory was outlined in her book *The Military and Domestic Politics: A Concordance Theory of Civil–Military Relations* (2009). The book titled *Arms and the University* by Downs and Murtazashvili (2012) was a valuable and most recent source of information regarding the integration of ROTC within civilian universities.

**Database searches.** The process of searching various databases involved a comparison of references contained in each study selected from the literature review. Following Creswell (2013), once an article was located, terms that were used in the key words section became terms for building subsequent searches. An encyclopedia, 21st Century Sociology (Bryant & Peck, 2007) was the first literature source that revealed the science of civil–military relations. Journals were searched next followed by books, policy papers, and studies. The rationale for using these databases was that the political
science and military science are where the debate is occurring at the current time. 
Sociological discussions were less abundant in the database searches (Siebold, 2001). 
Sociologists have been struggling to bring the civil–military debate into their subfield of influence for many years. 

The databases searched included Academic Source Complete, Article First, EBSCO, ProQuest First Search, ProQuest Central, SAGE, Worldcat Political Science, and Educator Source.

**Keywords used.** Keywords used in the search for studies related to the topic included various permutations of terms such as Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps, JROTC, Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps, SROTC, civil–military gap, civil–military relations, values, perceptions, demographics, political, myths and prejudices, institutional differences, and socioeconomic background.

**Significant Findings of Empirical Literature Review**

The four dimensions of the civil–military gaps proposed by Rahbek-Clemmensen, et al. (2012) helps researchers conceptualize the types of civil–military gaps. Civil–military gaps are defined as actual or perceived differences that exist between civilians and the military. Scholars will refer to civil–military gaps and confuse the reasons why the gaps exist, because there is an absence of clear definitions and understandings for the gaps affecting civil–military relations. Rahbek-Clemmensen et al. (2012) structure of the four categories (Institutional Gap, Policy Preference Gap, Demographic Gap, and Cultural Gap) was used as an organizational framework to conduct the literature review.

Within each categorical definition, each study was reviewed through the lens of equality, identifying different types of equality addressed by the study when possible.
This classification focused attention on inequality as a potential cause of the civil–military gap, which may lead to an understanding of the unequal access to JROTC throughout the country. The four main inequality categories were gender, race, political, and sexual orientation. Studies that did not address inequality in one of these terms were classified as “none,” meaning only that they did not define the gap within one of the selected “lenses.” Table 2.1: Matrix of Gap Definition and Equality Lens cross-referenced where each study was classified according to both the Rahbek-Clemmensen categorization and the equality lenses. Each study was listed by author and year in the intersecting box of gap categorization and equality characterization.

In addition to the individual studies listed in the table, three chapters from Feaver and Kohn’s book (2001) and Davis, 2001; Gronke & Feaver, 2001; and Holsti, 2001 described studies that fall within the cultural gap category, though not within an equality lens. The RAND corporation study (Szayna et al., 2007) also fell within the same categorization.

Two of the sixteen studies reviewed were not included in the analysis. Pilster and Böhmel (2011) was determined to be irrelevant as it studied coup-proofing in foreign countries and did not relate to the civil–military gap in the United States. Franke and Gutieri (2009) was eliminated as it explored differences only within branches of the U.S. military but did not make any comparison to the U.S. civilian population.

**Institutional gap.** The Institutional Gap was defined by Rahbek-Clemmensen et al. (2012) as differences between military and civilian institutions. The key variables are “functional differences, institutional identities, and the myths and prejudices” (Rahbek-Clemmensen et al., 2012, p. 673). There were three empirical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gap Types</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Political Orientation</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dowd (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franke (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franke and Heineken (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

studies categorized into this dimension. One of these studies was not used because it examined coup-proofing, a military operational effectiveness issue that did not relate specifically to the civil–military gap in the United States. The two relevant studies included Ender and Gibson’s (2005) analysis of sociology textbooks in the pre-9/11 era,
and the study of Snider et al. (2001) comparing military, ROTC, and civilian students, and their attitudes, values, and beliefs on American Society, military professionalism, and civil–military relations.

Military familiarization by civilian society may be quantified by analyzing sociology books for military content. The study conducted by Ender and Gibson (2005), examined 31 sociology textbooks in order to identify content relating to war, peace, or the military. Since education is one of the primary ways that researchers have recommended to narrow the civil–military gap, educational materials that familiarize students with the military is an important part of civil–military relations. This study was completed because “there were no studies” that examined the content of textbooks available and used to educate students about the military (Ender & Gibson, 2005). The 31 textbooks were each reviewed by two raters. Each rater coded the books for references to the military, either directly in the text, or in pictures, charts or other illustrations. The two codings were compared to assure agreement. All of the textbooks analyzed were published between 1995 and 2001 with the average textbook length just over 600 pages. The study found 129 different concepts mentioned relating to peace, war, and the military, 267 primary references and 118 secondary references, and 146 photographs (Ender & Gibson, 2005). Most of the references were limited to chapters on politics, or political economy. The mentions of peace, war, and the military were “focused far more on war as a social issue than on the institutional features of the military” (Ender & Gibson, 2005, p. 259). It is interesting to note that The New York Times was the most frequently cited reference on peace, war, and the military in the textbooks studied. The pictures centered either on people or tools of war and included a
variety of images. There was a wide variance between the textbooks in terms of frequency of references to peace, war, and the military. The overall conclusion of the study was that in most textbooks prior to 9/11, military sociology and the peace movement were marginally mentioned. In fact, Ender and Gibson said “the military is sociologically an invisible institution to students” (Ender & Gibson, 2005, p. 261). There was little continuity between textbooks in terms of content covered or frequency of emphasis, and what was included does not accurately represent the topic. Overall, it was concluded that the lack of coverage of the military, war, and peace in sociology textbooks contributes to the lack of understanding, which is referred to as the civil–military gap.

Snider et al. (2001) studied the attitudes, values, and beliefs that “inform future officers in the correct understanding about American society, military professionalism, and civil–military relationships” (Snider et al., 2001, p. 249). The study looked at how students responded to questions regarding American society, military professionalism, and civil–military relationships. This research found that there were no significant gaps between attitudes and perceptions of military students in precommissioning undergraduate education and graduating seniors at Duke University. Correlations among the six military institutions were very high (from 0.92 to 0.97), while correlation between the military students and the civilian Duke University students was between 0.78 and 0.87 (Snider et al., 2001, p. 259). While the correlation between the Duke students and the military students was lower than among the military students, the correlation was still quite high. Researchers were surprised at the similarities. There was significant agreement in regard to the central understanding of professionalism. The study described, but did not give supporting data for, an analysis that showed that the difference
between military and Duke students’ views on the impact of females entering military service was more dependent on gender differences than any other variable analyzed (Snider et al., 2001, p. 262). On the question of whether the military should remain male-oriented, gender differences again accounted for the largest portion of the variability in answers (12.6%), more than academy versus ROTC, political liberalism or education of parents (Snider et al., 2001, p. 262). In terms of attitudes of respect, the study found that Duke students and military cadets had a great deal of respect for each other. As to the proper understanding of civil–military relations, researchers found serious misunderstandings as to what constitutes proper civil–military relations on the part of both civilian and military students. Between one fourth and one half of the military academy students surveyed displayed a basic lack of understanding of the appropriate role of the military in setting policy. Where differences existed between military and civilian responses, further analysis indicated that gender, religion, and political identification best explained the results (Snider et al., 2001, p. 264). There was no significant difference between the perspectives of academy and ROTC students on American society. However, both groups exhibited insufficient understanding of correct civil–military relations with the academy students closer to the norm. The study found that neither the academy nor Army ROTC provided officers a sufficient understanding of American society and its changing cultures (Snider et al., 2001, p. 267). This study also included field research through interviews at selected military academies and ROTC detachments to review curricula, and conduct interviews to understand the instructional methodology within the institutions. The researchers observed “of the 77 core tasks included in the precommissioning training program for ROTC, none introduce the future
officer to American society and its changing culture. There is almost no presentation of materials that could create appropriate perspectives and attitudes about American civil–military relations and the role of the officer corps within them” (Snider et al., 2001, p. 269). These findings suggested that there is a need for more work to be done in higher education to provide military officers with a better understanding of civilian culture.

Policy preference gap. The policy preference gap was defined by Rahbek-Clemmensen as “the difference in the policy objectives pursued by military and civilian elites” (2012, p. 673). The key variables of the policy preference gap included “expressed policy preferences, rational gain divergences, historical, and entrenched preferences” (Rahbek-Clemmensen, et al., 2012, p. 673). This gap related to the differences in preferred policy between civilians and military personnel. For example, when contemplating a military action, those with military background were likely to prefer actions with a show of force, while civilians may prefer peacekeeping activities or humanitarian aid strategies. There is only one empirical study categorized into this dimension.

Researchers proposed that there are more than just civil government controllers involved in civil–military relations. The modern military requires the control of other “actors” than just civilians and military (Sowers, 2005). The United Nations, a nongovernmental organization (NGO), is a good example of another “actor” who exerts control in military operations. Therefore, the U.S. government may step aside as others try to influence military actions. The researchers used scatterplots to search for patterns in the respondents’ survey data. The finding of this study was that variance existed in the relationships when there were multiple controllers of the military. The study looked at
the many possible controllers that can affect military relations. The military may perceive various controllers differently and that the environment (the military area of operations) conditioned behavior toward the many controllers. Through this study, it was concluded that the military does not prefer absolute autonomy from civilian control, and does not prefer low levels of monitoring (Sowers, 2005, p. 404). This conclusion may have implications for discounting the military autonomy model and reinforcing the citizen soldier model where the military integrated within civilian institutions is the preferred model. Of the relationships analyzed in this study, the implied relationships for Kosovo officers seemed the most positive. For U.S. officers, the specified relationships were more ideal. U.S. officers stated that there was a “positive benefit of monitoring received from higher superiors,” and that this was “essential for military operations” (Sowers, 2005, p. 404). For today’s soldiers, there is a modern paradigm of multiple relationships with many “actors” (controllers, i.e., the UN). The controller nature of the military is a reality. Control of soldiers by civilians is no longer the only relationship that impacts civil–military relations.

Demographics gap. The demographics gap was defined by Rahbek-Clemmensen et al. (2012) as differences in the composition of the military and civilian populations. The key variables of this demographics gap were geographical origins, ethnicity, political affiliation, and socioeconomic or family background. There is only one empirical study categorized into this dimension.

There are perceptions of misunderstanding that are held by both civilian society and the military. These controversies of misunderstanding between a major institution, the U.S. Army, and civilian society illustrates how the civil–military gap might
discourage young people from entering military careers. The connectedness of military leaders with civilian society was examined by Dowd (2001) by analyzing the political beliefs of U.S. Army general officers. Past research in this area was conducted via limited response surveys and did not allow for qualitative discussion. The Dowd study characterized the civil–military gap as a matter of political inequality. The data concerning political party affiliation found that Republicans far outnumber Democrats and the sample was almost evenly divided between Republicans and Independents. Almost 50 percent of the officers identify as Republicans while 15% identify as Democrats, and almost 40% identified themselves as Independent (Dowd, 2001, p. 347).

Other findings of Dowd’s study (2001) were:

1. Officers who self-identified as Independents were raised in the Northeast.
2. Higher ranking officers were more likely to identify as Independent.
3. 78% of generals at 3 to 4 star rank were Independents.
4. The majority identify themselves as moderate with higher ranks even more likely to be moderate.
5. Sixty percent of the Conservatives are from the South, a region known to be more politically conservative than the rest of the country. This group was also the largest group in the sample.
6. Very few generals self-identified as liberal Democrats.

Although the Army and Marines are conservative for the most part, Dowd’s (2001) study found that generals become more moderate as they progress to higher general officer rank. This study may serve to reconsider the education of officers. One reason general officers become more moderate is by the time officers attain higher rank,
military educational requirements cause these officers to attend schools which emphasize integration of civilian and military institutions. The moderate tendency is a result of interaction with a greater variety of people. These officers see that a wide range of civil–military cooperation is required at higher rank and while working with government officials outside the Pentagon.

Cultural gap. The cultural gap was defined by Rahbek-Clemmensen et al. as “value differences between military and civilian populations” (2012, p. 673). The key variables included “mutual perceptions, norm socialization processes, and organizational path dependencies” (Rahbek-Clemmensen, et al., 2012, p. 673). Eight empirical studies and three chapters of a book were categorized into this dimension. Eight of the studies (Bachman et al., 2000; Davis, 2001; Franke, 2001; Franke & Heinecken, 2001; Gronke & Feaver, 2001; Hawn, 2011; Holsti, 2001; Woodruff et al., 2006) and did not result in an equality classification according to the equality matrix used, while one study (Rohall, Ender, & Matthews, 2006) addressed both gender and political inequality. Matthews et al. (2009) looked at gender inequality, Leal and Nichols (2013) addressed racial inequality, Sondheimer et al. (2013) addressed political inequality, and Ender et al. (2011) addressed sexual orientation issues.

Franke (2001) examined the civil–military gap among members of Generation X. This group is considered by some to be apolitical, individualized, and selfish (Franke, 2001). This study sought to determine whether attitudinal differences or socialization differences would explain Generation X civilian undergraduate student values compared to cadets of the United States Military Academy (USMA) using responses to the Future Officer Survey. The analysis compared values and attitudes of USMA cadets to their
civilian Generation X peers. The research was designed as a cross-sectional study. The comparison across classes was taken to represent real change due to exposure to socialization effects of the West Point and Syracuse University settings, while the comparisons between the two institutions were assumed to represent actual differences in the two populations. The data showed significant value differences between the two groups. The Generation X students from West Point tended to be more conservative (p<.001), more patriotic (p<.001), and more warrioristic (defined by responses to questions about war, combat, and noncombat operations as well as beliefs about the main purpose of the military’s function) (p<.001) than civilian peers attending Syracuse University (Franke, 2001). The results also showed that cadets were less supportive of world institutions and tended to be less self-oriented (more focused on the common good than themselves) than their civilian counterparts at Syracuse University (Franke, 2001, p. 108). Machiavellianism, as used by Franke (2001), is a term that social and personality psychologists use to describe a person who is unemotional, able to detach from conventional morality, and able to deceive and manipulate other people. On the Machiavellianism scale, cadets scored significantly lower than the Syracuse university students (p<.001) indicating that the cadets were more focused on common beliefs, attitudes and norms, and that the civilian students were more individualist oriented, focusing on self-actualization and personal goals rather than the good of the group (Franke, 2001, p. 108). These results confirmed that the next generation of officers will be much like the ideal prescribed by Samuel Huntington (1957) and the institutional theory of military autonomy. The result further confirmed that there is a self-selection component of enlistment reflecting preexisting attitudes and differences that guided their
choice to follow a military career. Through socialization at West Point, results indicated that USMA succeeded in instilling in cadets a desire for service to country that is not found at civilian universities or by civilian peers. USMA cadets may have been motivated to attend based upon service to country and not occupational benefits as civilian students may have made in their college choice. The analysis indicated that there was a gap between West Point cadets and their civilian peers attending Syracuse University, and that gap existed prior to their military school socialization as evidenced by differences between first year students, indicating that a “type” of soldier is self-selected to attend military institutions (Franke, 2001, p. 116). Socialization widened the gap through the years of military school. Value differences between both cadets and civilian students are greater for seniors than freshman in certain categories. In terms of political conservatism, there was very little change from freshman to senior year at either West Point or Syracuse University (Franke, 2001, p. 102). Surprisingly, cadets became less patriotic between freshmen and senior year (p<.05), as did the Syracuse University students, though the difference was only slightly significant (p<.05) for two of the four measured items (Franke, 2001, p. 106). Warriorism among West Point cadets increased significantly (p<.001) from freshmen to senior year, with 92% of seniors agreeing that the military’s most important role was preparation for combat, versus 70% for freshmen (Franke, 2001, p. 106). At Syracuse University, though the overall scores for warriorism decreased from freshman to senior year, the overall difference between classes was not statistically significant (Franke, 2001, p. 107). The measures of Global Institutionalism and Machiavellianism did not change significantly between cohorts at either West Point or Syracuse University (Franke, 2001, p. 108).
A similar study using the same survey instrument was conducted by Franke and Heineken (2001) comparing West Point cadets with cadets at the South African Military Academy. They found that West Point cadets scored much higher on conservatism and patriotism measures (p<.01) as well as on warriorism (p<.001) than the South African cadets (Franke & Heinecken, 2001). South African cadets scored higher on Global Institutionalism and Machiavellianism measures (p<.001) than USMA cadets (Franke & Heinecken, 2001, pp. 581-2). The study also showed that socialization pressures at the USMA at West Point tended to increase cadets’ conservatism and warrior ethos, and decreased their support for peacekeeping operations (Franke & Heinecken, 2001, p. 583).

Hawn (2011) studied the impacts of having military students in the college classroom through a study of students enrolled in five sections of two political science classes from summer 2009 through spring 2011. The study found that discussions and classroom presentations from military students are beneficial to the college classrooms (Hawn, 2011, p. 261). In the test class with mixed military and nonmilitary students, the percentage of civilian students who indicated that civilians can understand the role of the military and service members’ lives dropped from 89% to 69%, while the students demonstrated an increase in knowledge of the armed services via the majority (56%) reporting moderate knowledge in the preclass survey, and 66% reporting a high level of knowledge in the postclass survey (Hawn, 2011, p. 254). A major change was reported in the civilian perception of whether the military respected civilian leadership. In the preclass survey, almost 70% of the civilians felt that the military did not respect (49%), or only sometimes respected (19%) civilian leadership. However, the postclass responses found that 75% felt that the military does respect civilian leadership (Hawn, 2011, p.
254). At the conclusion of the class, only 12% of students felt that there was sufficient interaction between civilian and military service members, when 63% felt the interaction was sufficient at the outset. Results for the control group yielded comparable pre and postclass responses, indicating that civilian views can be changed as a result of providing accurate information through interaction with the military service members (Hawn, 2011, p. 254).

Bachman et al. (2000) provided an analysis of the Monitoring the Future (MTF) initiative by analysis of subsamples of data to determine the extent of the civilian-military differences among young men shortly after graduating high school. Change over the two year period and self-selection versus socialization differences were analyzed. Two different groups of students were analyzed to look for changes in attitudes over time. High school classes from 1976-1985 were grouped as one cohort, and classes of 1986-1995 were grouped as a second cohort for comparison. The conclusions of the study were organized according to three summarizing questions:

1. whether patterns of military attitudes changed in recent years,
2. whether military–civilian differences in military attitudes reflect self-selection, socialization, or both, and
3. how large the military–civilian differences among young men are.

For the first question, results indicated there was little change in the patterns of military attitudes over the two decades studied. In general, the high school seniors headed into the military were more promilitary to begin with than their counterparts, and maintained higher preferences for military influence and military spending than their civilian counterparts (Bachman, et al., 2000, p. 571). However, there were some
statistically significant shifts (p<.05) in the overall views on several points. There was an overall decline in the perceived need for military spending and military supremacy, and an increased willingness to have the U.S. military enter a war situation to protect other countries’ rights (Bachman et al., 2000, p. 584). On the second question, results indicated that self-selection was evident on all dimensions studied (Bachman et al., 2000, p. 577). Socialization was less important than self-selection effects. For the third question, the results indicated that the civilian-military differences were not very large though there were some attitude differences between military personnel and civilians that might indicate a special organizational culture in the armed forces. The researchers noted that these attitudes develop in young men influenced by the military about their job choices, rather than the military directly causing the culture directly (Bachman et al., 2000, p. 578). Rather than being divergent (gap), military and civilian cultures were very consistent with the beliefs of mainstream America, and the military did not appear to be diverging from mainstream society (Bachman et al., 2000, p. 579).

Woodruff et al. (2006) surveyed two Army infantry battalion organizations and analyzed first term soldiers to determine their propensity to have joined the military. The study only included males, as females are not generally included in combat units. The study was described as being racially diverse, though with the notation that African–Americans were not well represented in the sampling. “Propensity to serve” was measured by asking respondents to indicate what their intentions had been after graduating high school. The survey included five choices: join the military, attend the service academy, attend college then join the military, or find nonmilitary employment. A large majority (70%) of first term soldiers had not planned to join. Only 30% reported
a high propensity to join (Woodruff, Kelty, & Segal, 2006, p. 358). The highest percent
motivation to join was for the adventure and challenge (73.9%) and second most frequent
response was to serve our country (65.8%) (Woodruff et al., 2006, p. 359). This
indicated that the motivational factors for joining are more complex than just institutional
reasons. Results indicated that there is a future-oriented enlistment motivation. A
combination of institutional reasons, like service to country and monetary incentives,
drove the motivation to join. People who were motivated to join, did so to gain
educational benefits and were not likely to become career soldiers. While financial
incentives were important motivational factors, the propensity to enlist for soldiers in the
sample included factors other than enlistment bonus or educational repayment money.
Those with a high propensity to serve were more likely to express institutional
motivations than those with low propensity (p<.001) (Woodruff et al., 2006, p. 362). The
study showed that high propensity soldiers were motivated to enlist because of
educational incentives like the G.I. Bill. The data confirmed that low propensity soldiers
in combat arms make up a majority of Army enlistees (Woodruff et al., 2006, p. 363).
Additional findings are that the models used to analyze data in military sociology for
many years do not necessarily explain the complex reasons that motivate people to serve,
that high propensity soldiers are highly influenced by patriotic motivation and by their
plans for service to country and that low propensity soldiers are more responsive to
occupational motivations (Woodruff et al., 2006, p. 363).

Ole Holsti conducted an analysis of the TISS data comparing the military leaders
to the civilian elites. Each of those categories was further divided, resulting in four
subgroups: military leaders and active reserve leaders comprising the military group, and
civilian veteran leaders and civilian nonveteran leaders comprising the civilian elite group. Some of the results of the TISS survey were compared to results of an earlier FPLP Surveys allowing an analysis of changes in attitudes over time (Holsti, 2001). The Holsti study found that one of the largest differences between military and civilians was political ideology, with the military leaning much more heavily to Republican than their civilian counterparts. The results indicated that military leaders were more conservative than civilian counterparts in this study on social issues. Civilian nonveterans were the most liberal category, favoring a liberal stance on both social and economic issues. The libertarians (defined as economically conservative but socially liberal) were the smallest group of both military and civilian leaders. According to Holsti, “the gap between civilian and military leaders tends to be wider and more pervasive in the realm of ideas and values than on more specific policy issues” (Holsti, 2001, p. 93). This conclusion supported an earlier article from noted writer, Thomas Ricks (1997), which revealed that members of the military were becoming more partisan than in the past and that they were predominantly Republican.

In another study, James Davis used TISS data and data from the General Social Survey from the NORC to compare the military with the general public (Davis, 2001). This study used the TISS survey results of the general public (referred to as the “mass”) and the civilian elites, and compared their attitudes and opinions to high ranking Army and Navy officers (referred to as the “brass”), as well as to cadets at the three service academies. His study was trying to prove the existence of a “gap” between military and civilians that was postulated by Thomas Ricks in a 1997 study comparing Marines and the general public. The main conclusion of the Davis study was that there are large
differences in attitudes and opinions between the Brass and the Mass, but that some of the differences were unexpectedly in the liberal direction. A significant finding related to current events of gay men and lesbians serving in the military showed there to be a very large gap between military and civilian groups, even after accounting for demographic differences. Davis states “demography and ideology tend to separate the Brass from the Mass, but the effects often move in opposite directions and thus cancel each other out” (Davis, 2001, p. 128).

Gronke and Feaver (2001) conducted a study using the TISS data and other supporting documents to determine whether high levels of public confidence in the military supported the belief that there is no problem with the size of the civil–military gap. The questions focused on whether the apparent strong public support was “masking latent alienation and distrust that suggest the existence of deeper ideological and attitudinal divides between the military and the public it serves” (Gronke & Feaver, 2001, p. 131). Their analysis of the TISS data confirmed that on the surface, there is widespread confidence in the military. However, further review of attitudes revealed large and potentially concerning gaps. When a person had a greater connection to the military, the more confidence that person had in the military as an institution. With the decreasing size of the military and the evolution of the AVF ensuring that fewer and fewer people have direct connection to the military, there was a fear that this gap will only grow in the future. The study found a large amount of alienation, particularly between military elite and civilian elite groups when evaluated using a “moral crisis” scale. Military elites as a group viewed civilian society as troubled and in need of reform, and believed that the adoption of military values would help society. Civilian
elites tended to think that traditional military culture is not essential. The final conclusion of the Gronke and Feaver study was that “there is reason to worry about the differences in opinion and belief between civilian society and the military and to be vigilant about finding ways to manage it” (Gronke & Feaver, 2001, p. 161).

Another major effort to study the civil–military gap was undertaken by the RAND Corporation at the request of the Army shortly after 9/11. The study’s goal was to understand the implications of the civil–military gap on military effectiveness, the then-current military actions against terrorist groups, and to determine if there were any recommended actions needed to close the gap (Szayna et al., 2007). This study used the TISS data as a basis for analysis. While the TISS data was collected in the pre-9/11 timeframe, the analysis was completed post-9/11 and used information through 2005 as a framework. The RAND study focused only on the comparison between military officers and civilian leaders, and did not address the attitudes and values of the general public. The overall conclusion about the character of the civil–military gap in the post 9/11 world as analyzed by the RAND Corporation was very similar to the earlier findings based on the same data set (Holsti, 2001). The military respondents were more Republican (political) and more conservative (ideological) than their civilian counterparts. In particular, the more conservative views of the military on domestic issues, particularly social or moral issues, were the major source of the civil–military gap according to this evaluation. The study revealed that the difference was a combination of the effects of self-selection on political attitudes, informal socialization among like-minded officers that reinforced these views, and a military lifestyle and code of conduct that tended to reinforce social conservatism (Davis, 2001). The major differences between the groups
related to military personnel policies were related to women in combat, sexual harassment policies, and attitudes toward gay men and lesbians serving in the military. The more conservative military officers tended to be very conservative on these issues, differing widely from the civilian leaders they were compared with (Szayna et al., 2007).

Ender et al. (2011) investigated attitudes toward gay men and lesbians in the U.S. military among civilian undergraduates, ROTC cadets, and military academy cadets. Coincidentally, the timing of the study shortly before repeal of Don’t Ask Don’t Tell (DADT) established this study as a baseline of undergraduate attitudes toward acceptance of gay men and lesbians in the military. Selected data was used from the Biannual Attitude Survey of Students (BASS) administered between the fall of 2002 and spring of 2007. The data used by Ender et al. (2011) for this study included 31 different institutions, 1192 civilians, 664 ROTC cadets, and 1201 cadets from West Point and the Air Force Academy. Researchers identified the independent variable of military affiliation as well as other variables such as sex, political affiliation, and educational level (year at university/institution). Over half, 53%, of military academy cadets and 41% of ROTC cadets agreed with barring gay men and lesbians from the military compared to only 13% of civilians (Ender et al., 2011, p. 166). Socialization within the institution had an impact on attitudes only for academy cadets, and that relationship showed that academy cadets became more tolerant as a result of socialization (65% of freshmen as opposed to 49% of seniors agreed with banning gay men and lesbians from the military) (Ender et al., 2011, p. 167). Between educational levels within the institutions, civilian students and ROTC had no statistically significant difference from freshmen to senior year. The least tolerant group is academy first year cadets who then became more
tolerant over time (Ender et al., 2011, p. 170). Among civilians, the least tolerant were conservative men. The authors noted that it will take time to change institutional practices through strong leadership in order to successfully integrate gay men and lesbians and women into combat positions (Ender et al., 2011, p. 170).

In a 2009 survey of cadets at the United States Military Academy, Sondheimer et al. (2013) examined ideological (political) beliefs of academy cadets, and their perceptions of civilian communities’ ideology, as well as their perceptions of how civilians perceived the military ideologies. The study used a four quadrant grid to examine cadet social and economic ideologies, and used a website (Political Compass) that generated a single point to represent each cadet based on a series of responses. The researchers found that cadets see themselves as being politically different from their college peers, with 69% perceiving themselves as a group to be ideologically conservative while the civilian undergraduate sector was perceived to be liberal (73%) (Sondheimer, Toner, & Wilson, 2013, p. 129). Cadets also classified the military as a whole as being conservative (60%), while only 8% rank civilian population overall as conservative (Sondheimer et al., 2013, p. 129). Military cadets felt that the civilian population as a whole perceives the military to be conservative (78%) (Sondheimer et al., 2013, p. 130). The reality was that, as a group and based on the self-reported ranking using the Political Compass instrument, cadets were moderate and very close to being liberal according to this study. Forty percent of the cadets were ranked as liberal by the self-assessment data, and only 23% placed in the conservative category (Sondheimer et al., 2013, p. 130). The researchers concluded that “Cadets believe that military and civilian populations occupy drastically different ideological spaces” (Sondheimer et al.,
2013, p. 132) which clearly represents a perceived military–civilian gap, which is not supported by the actual data on cadets’ ideological leanings. The researchers posed the follow up question of whether there may be something about socialization in the military that instills this gap and a particular view of society that may cause differences in perceptions of the military and civilian society (Sondheimer et al., 2013, p. 132).

Rohall et al. (2006) conducted a study examining attitudes on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and found gaps both politically and on a gender basis. The study surveyed college undergraduate students, West Point cadets, and ROTC cadets at nine geographically diverse institutions in early 2003, after the war with Afghanistan was already underway but before troops were sent into Iraq. One weakness of this study was that political affiliation and race were combined into the Democrat and non-Caucasian categories due to relatively low numbers of participants in the various categories. The level of support for going to war in Afghanistan was 97% from West Point, 96% from ROTC, and only 88% for civilian students, a statistically significant difference between military and civilian (one-way ANOVA, F=9.13, p<.001) (Rohall et al., 2006). Attitude differences about the war in Iraq were also statistically significant: 89% support at West Point, 83% support from ROTC cadets, and only 70% of civilian students (one-way ANOVA, F=8.85, p<.001) (Rohall et al., 2006). Support for war varied most significantly by gender and political affiliation. Males and Republicans were much more likely to support war than female Democrats. A total of 98% of men but only 84% of women supported sending troops (t= -5.07, p<.001) while 99% of Republicans and 89% of Democrats support sending troops to Afghanistan (t= -4.84, p<.001) (Rohall et al., 2006). Gender differences showed 87% of men compared to 65% of women support
sending troops to Iraq \((t= -5.58, p<.001)\) (Rohall et al., 2006). Political differences were represented by a difference in support for troop mobilization at 93% of Republicans and only 67% of Democrats \((t= -7.03, p<.001)\) (Rohall et al., 2006). The strongest correlation of attitudes about war seemed to come from being civilian. Civilian college students were more strongly opposed to war than military cadets were in support of war \((r= -.16, p<.001\) for war in both Afghanistan and Iraq) (Rohall et al., 2006). The two strongest factors concerning attitudes toward war included gender and political ideology. Being male showed a positive correlation with approving of sending troops into Afghanistan and Iraq \((r=.25\) for both wars, \(p<.001\)). Similarly, being Republican was associated with supporting both wars \((r=.20\) and \(r=.30,\) both \(p<.001\)). Rohall et al., (2006) concluded that a significant gap exists in terms of political orientation and gender, and suggested that the gap can be narrowed by making the armed services more representative of society.

Increasing the number of people from diverse backgrounds could help to reduce the divide between military and civilian populations. Since women represent about half of the U.S. population, the numbers may need to increase from the current 15% level in the military to better reflect society. Further recommendations included special training for incoming military personnel and more exposure to the opinions of the larger American public (Rohall et al., 2006).

Another study focusing on gender inequality as a definition of the cultural gap was conducted by Matthews et al. (2009). This study used data from the BASS in a sample of 509 ROTC cadets, 218 West Point cadets, and 598 civilian college students. Respondents were first year students representing all 50 states and geographic regions of the country. The survey consisted of 185 questions with sets of responses such as “do
you approve of women serving as a jet fighter pilot, truck mechanic or nurse in a combat zone.” The number of military jobs out of nine jobs that women “should” be allowed to do was added and calculated into a sum of responses. This score, called an APSUM, was taken to represent a student’s level of approval for women serving in diverse military jobs. The results showed that overall, military cadets are less approving of women being assigned to a wide variety of military jobs than civilian college students. Although women have been integrated into West Point, they are not seen as equals in all jobs in the military or specifically at the academy. ROTC cadets (mean APSUM = 6.55) were more approving than West Point cadets (mean APSUM = 6.21) but less approving than civilian students (mean APSUM = 7.63) (Matthews et al., 2009). When comparing specific potential jobs, women were more likely to approve than men in all cases. Approval rates by females for women to serve in an array of jobs varied considerably, with almost universal support for women as a typist in the Pentagon (over 97% approval for all groups) and truck mechanic (approval rate from 88.6% to 97.1% with no significant differences between groups), to broad ranges of approval for jobs such a jet fighter pilot, military commander and hand-to-hand combat soldier (Matthews et al., 2009). These social attitudes may impact the length of time women may choose to continue military service.

Leal and Nichols (2013) studied military attitudes of Army spouses toward senior civilian leaders in the United States using the 2004 Military Families Survey as a data source and found the civil–military gap could be defined by racial inequalities. Approval ratings were collected for President George W. Bush, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and Secretary of State Colin Powell. The survey included responses from
1,053 respondents drawn from 10 large military posts in the United States to questions such as “Do you approve of the way the president is handling the war?” By evaluating military spouses’ approval levels of various politicians, racial, and ethnic approval percentages were compared to identify gaps. Secretary of State Colin Powell had the highest approval rating (76%) with President George W. Bush (65%) second and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld in the lowest rating with 61% (Leal & Nichols, 2013). Regression results showed that Latinos, Republicans, and spouses of soldiers with more time in service were most supportive of President Bush (Leal & Nichols, 2013). Latinos were more supportive of President Bush than either African Americans or Anglos. In contrast, findings indicated that African Americans were less supportive of President Bush than were any other ethnic group. Four variables were significant for all three leaders evaluated. These variables were ethnicity (Latinos always more positive), race (African Americans always more negative), partisanship (Republicans always more positive), and assessments of the Iraq war (less favorable always more negative) (Leal & Nichols, 2013). Only one variable, officer rank, was solely significant with Donald Rumsfeld. Spouses of officers had a negative attitude towards his leadership (Leal & Nichols, 2013). Although Powell had the highest overall approval rating, he was rated less favorably by African Americans. The researchers used the term “descriptive representation” to conclude that even as the first African American Secretary of State, this did not lead African Americans to respond positively about his leadership (Leal & Nichols, 2013). Researchers found that Hispanics may be an encouraging group of future enlistees because even in the middle of the war, Latinos remained very positive of the military and of civilian leadership (Leal & Nichols, 2013).
Methodological Review

The literature review included 21 empirical studies related to the civil–military gap. Two were excluded for irrelevancy. Of the 19 remaining studies, 89% were quantitative studies, 5% were qualitative, and 5% were mixed studies. Overwhelmingly, the studies involved the use of surveys, while a few used interviews for data collection. Some of the surveys used for data collection were established surveys routinely conducted for data collection, including the Strategic Leadership Survey (Franke & Guttieri, 2009), Future Officer Survey (Franke, 2001), and (Franke & Heinecken, 2001), two studies using the Biannual Attitude Survey of Students (BASS) (Ender et al., 2011 and Matthews et al., 2009), the Monitoring the Future (MTF) survey (Bachman et al., 2000), and the Survey of Military Families (Leal and Nichols, 2012). Other studies developed surveys specifically for that particular study. Five studies (Davis, 2001; Gronke & Feaver, 2001; Holsti, 2001; Snider et al., 2001; and Szayna et al., 2007) involved analysis of data extracted from the Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies.

Many of the studies focused on comparing values, attitudes, and beliefs between civilian and military populations in a college setting. The most often used representative group for military students was the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Student civilian populations were included from a broad range of colleges and universities throughout the United States. Most of the collegiate studies also included a third group of students, those enrolled in ROTC programs at civilian colleges and universities, representing a sort of civilian-military blend of military trained students embedded in civilian institutions.
Other populations studied included U.S. military officers, spouses of military members, precommissioning officers, and first time enlistees in the U.S. military.

**Research Gaps and Recommendations**

Characteristics that would indicate that a community and its citizens would support the military may be some of the same characteristics that would also welcome JROTC in high schools. Outward patriotic show of support does not mean that the community would welcome JROTC. Hooker (2004) calls this “patriotism lite.” Most of the empirical literature about the nature of the civil–military gap compares the United States Military Academy, college ROTC (SROTC), and nonmilitary civilian students. It is difficult to narrow the characteristics or define the gaps that are preventing equitable offering of JROTC in high schools without associating it with the military or armed forces. Yet, as society begins to understand the unique purposes of each program, JROTC becomes more welcomed in high schools as a routine elective course. The more that the program tailors topics toward general education, the more acceptable it becomes to teachers and administrators.

The literature does not directly examine JROTC in the context of civil–military relations. Snider et al., (2001) has compared college ROTC attitudes and values to find that academy and ROTC cadets lack sufficient understanding of civilian society.

Under representation of women in the military remains a concern. According to the Department of Defense, women represent only 15% of the total Army (Matthews et al., 2009) yet women comprise approximately 50% of the U.S. population. Single gender education may widen the gap and does not provide JROTC equal opportunity. The most recent local initiatives to open single gender charter schools and schools of civil justice
programs may establish a JROTC program with the correct thinking that it will add a
citizenship component that is a valuable addition to the thematic curriculum.

Coeducational schools provide an exchange of values between males and females. Males
favor war most often when compared to females (Rohall et al., 2006). The socialization
that occurs within military schools exacerbates gender specific differences. Therefore,
single gender high schools may not provide equal opportunity of JROTC.

Differences in political ideology between the military and society were found to
be significant by Dowd (2001), yet Sondheimer et al. (2013) found that among USMA
cadets, the perceived political differences were greater than the actual differences. Hawn
(2011) found that exposure to military personnel during college classes significantly
changed student views about the military, and the nature of the civil–military gap.

Military officers tend to be more conservative than the general public and mostly
Republican. However, as officers proceed through promotions to the general officer
level, Dowd (2001) found there is a change from politically conservative to moderate.
“General Officers may be the last bastions of liberalism in the military” (Rahbek-
Clemmensen, et al., 2012, p. 672). It may be assumed that if a community is
conservative and Republican, it will be more likely to provide JROTC opportunities to
students.

Tolerance of gay men and lesbians in the military was found to be greatest among
civilians with only 15% opposed. West Point cadets would be most likely to agree with
preventing gay men and lesbians from joining the military, 53%, compared to 41% of
ROTC cadets (Ender et al., 2011). It may be assumed that the more tolerance a
community extends to diverse populations, the more equally it will provide JROTC opportunities to students.

Much of the research provided assumptions about community characteristics that may be likely to provide JROTC opportunities. The gap in the literature involves a specific and descriptive account of which civil–military relation gaps contribute to unequal access to JROTC throughout the United States. The research gap is more of a knowledge issue than a deliberate discrimination issue about characteristics preventing equitable JROTC opportunities for high school students.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

In the analysis of available literature describing the civil–military gap, the majority of the studies analyzed fell under the “culture gap” definition as established by Rahbek-Clemmensen et al. (2012). The culture gap refers to differences in attitudes, values, and beliefs between military and civilian populations. Within this definition, studies were analyzed for conclusions about the source of the gap related to inequalities of gender, race, political leanings, and sexual orientation. Almost half of the studies fell within one of these classifications. Of the studies that could not be quantified by these criteria, they did help to define the size and/or nature of the civil–military gap.

Current studies revealed that the civil–military relations gap does have some impact on support of the armed services and national security. Most research about the civil–military gap and ROTC has been limited to comparisons between ROTC, West Point, and civilian students.

Researchers unanimously agreed that a gap does exist but there is no danger of coup in the United States. Disagreements surrounded how wide the gap has become and
what causes the gaps. Political affiliation has been identified as having an impact on the
gap. Research studies revealed that self-selection is only part of the cause. The All
Volunteer Force (AVF) of the military in the United States has been speculated to cause a
widening of the gap. Through self-selection to attend military training schools and the
impact upon the AVF, the gap is widened as only a “type” of citizen rather than most
citizens begin to understand the military. To decrease the civil–military gap, seminal
research by Feaver and Kohn (2001) suggested increasing military presence in society,
increasing understanding of various military sponsored organizations/ military affairs,
and strengthening civil–military instruction in the numerous training schools offered to
military personnel through professional military instruction. Although the causes for the
gap problem may not be clear, what is known is that misunderstanding of any significant
institution in the United States does not result in genuine positive outcomes.

Considering the study’s problem statement of whether JROTC is being offered
equally throughout the United States, the existing literature does little to address this
question. Based on the literature reviewed and identification of the significant gap in the
literature related to JROTC, it is determined that a study related to attitudes and values of
high school administrators about military in general, and JROTC in particular, would be a
valuable contribution to the research. Chapter 3 provides a thorough description of the
proposed study and methods to be used in conducting further research.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

JROTC, as a national youth citizenship program, is not being offered equally to students throughout the country. The main purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to explore how values and attitudes of high school administrators may affect unequal access to JROTC in public schools. The methodology chosen was interpretative phenomenology because, among other reasons, this approach considers it an impossibility to totally clear the mind of preconceptions and participate in any endeavor with complete neutrality (Balls, 2009). Interpretative phenomenology involves exploring “the meaning of a phenomenon as it is lived by other subjects” (Englander, 2012, p. 14). Researcher experiences are used to interpret those of others. In this case, the researcher’s life experiences have shaped the research topic, questions, and interpretations. A description of these experiences follows the research questions below.

The general question this study explored was:

1. How do the values, attitudes, and beliefs of high school administrators influence their support for establishment of JROTC in schools? This question was supported by the following questions:

2. In what ways do the administrators’ life experiences influence their initial responses to photographs of JROTC cadets engaged in typical cadet activities?
3. How do the administrators’ life experiences influence their thought process about offering JROTC in school?

This chapter included the selected research methodology and design, selection process of participants, and the instruments used in the investigation. The chapter concluded with a discussion of data analysis and a summary of the study.

**Epoche—Researcher Background**

The U.S. Army, military school and college, and JROTC defined the researcher’s chosen career. The researcher was a retired U.S. Army Lieutenant Colonel, having served as a medical service corps inspector general (IG) spanning 24 years of active duty following 4 years at a junior and senior military college (one coeducational and the other all male). U.S. Army IG’s are fact finders for the commander who must maintain a clear distinction between being an extension of the commander and their sworn duty to serve as fair, impartial, and objective investigators and interviewers (U.S. Army, 2001). However, this training as an IG may have influenced how the researcher would conduct the interviews. In the end, previous researcher experience is acknowledged, bracketed, and becomes part of the interpretive analysis (Pringle, Drummond, McLafferty, & Hendry, 2011). Therefore, participants need to know what defined who the researcher was as the primary data collection instrument and interpreter of this qualitative study. Because of the extreme military bearing of the researcher, a separate paid interviewer was solicited to conduct the semi-structured interviews.

Limiting the subjectivity of the study, the proposed interviewer’s background was a high school chemistry teacher with six years of teaching experience. Further compensating for researcher gender bias, this professional teacher was female, with no
military service background. The background demographics of the paid interviewer were an important strength in this study because it reduced bias that the researcher might have found difficult to control in the interview setting.

The researcher attempted to reduce bias in all parts of the study by not wearing a military uniform, preventing researcher contact with participants as much as possible and using the paid female interviewer throughout the research process. However, in the context of various enclosed appendices, participants were provided information establishing the researcher’s military background.

**Research Context**

The study took place in the greater Rochester, New York area. Participants were solicited from alumni of St. John Fisher College (SJFC), and were categorized according to high school classifications defined by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), with at least one each from the four major classifications. Appendix A defined the classifications of Urban, Suburban, Town, and Rural high schools. Rationale for studying the classifications was to cover the full geopolitical and socioeconomic spectrum of participants because administrators are considered extensions of the communities they serve. The interviewer conducted face-to-face interviews in office space at SJFC or at participant schools, at the discretion of participants.

**Research Participants**

As explained by Creswell (2013), phenomenology is research inquiry that identifies the essence of human experiences about a phenomenon as described by participants. The phenomenon of interest in this study was the influence of background experiences with the military on the likelihood of a high school administrator supporting
a JROTC program in the school. High school principals were selected for this study because, according to Army JROTC cadet command regulation 145-2, they are the primary decision maker and gatekeeper to initiate JROTC in a high school (U.S. Army, 2007). Assistant principals were also included as they often become principals as a next step in their career progression. Other administrators were included if they had progressed to a position above principal and had decision making authority at a district level.

The background information collected from each participant included educational and work background including school classification, hometown (allowed for geographic specific life experiences), gender (allowed for male/female life experiences), and family history of military service (allowed for parent, child, and self- influences). Participants volunteered and could withdraw from the study at any time, and were offered compensation for the interview in the form of a retail gift certificate.

Data Collection Techniques

This study was a primary research study involving data collection from a select group of participants. The study employed a photo elicitation interview technique whereby photographs were used to get participants “to reveal their unconscious feelings and experiences without them being aware of doing so” (Matteucci, 2013, p. 192). The approach of this study mirrored Matteucci’s study, utilizing a five-step approach based on the work of Dempsey and Tucker (1994) which established a widely used protocol for photo elicitation studies. The steps included sourcing photographs, selecting specific photographs, preparing an interview schedule, conducting the interview, and analyzing textual data.
Harper described photo elicitation as “inserting a photograph into a research interview” (Harper, 2002). Historically, the use of photo-interviewing provides thicker data than only using verbal interviewing for data collection (Dempsey & Tucker, 1994). In this study, the photographs were researcher selected rather than participant selected or generated. This methodology of researcher selected photos was described in a study of tourist experiences of flamenco in Spain (Matteucci, 2013) where the researcher carefully selected eighteen photographs that were felt to embody the experience of flamenco dance. Participants then used those photographs as starting points to describe their personal experiences as a tourist coming to this particular town to learn flamenco. Photo elicitation has also been used to study military identity in a study of British soldiers (Woodward & Jenkings, 2011), lending credibility to the concept of using this method to study military subjects. In the Woodward and Jenkings study, participants selected photographs from their own collections to represent their identity and used those as starting points for discussion. Photo elicitation further narrows the description of research instrumentation that was used in data collection.

This study involved the use of two researcher-selected photographs depicting typical JROTC cadet activities, one with cadets in uniform and one with students in civilian clothes (Appendix B). The photographs served as a lens into the participants’ life experiences with the military. Selection of appropriate photographs was critical to the success of the study. Hundreds of photos were gathered from various Internet websites and carefully reviewed to select those most appropriate to address the research questions and focus on the research phenomenon. Elimination criteria for photos included photos with too much emphasis on combat (war fighting skills), as well as those showing all
male or all female JROTC cadets (gender focus) and those containing overt display of American flags (patriotism focus). The two photos selected contained numerous elements of typical JROTC activities in a high school without overly emphasizing any one criterion. Photo 1 contained a wide array of rank, happy, and unhappy expressions as well as the U.S. flag. Photo 2 was selected specifically because it contained weapons used in military style ceremonies, though the students were not in uniform. The two photos depicted different elements of the JROTC program in ways that were intended to stimulate various reactions from participants.

The semistructured one-on-one interviews between participant and independent interviewer were based on an interview protocol developed by the researcher (Appendix C). Interview questions were designed to address phenomenological reactions and experiences, and elicited information about participants’ life experiences that shaped their reactions to the two photographs. All participants answered open-ended questions, which allowed them to expand on their responses as appropriate. The interviewer asked clarifying questions until the participants seemed to have completed their thoughts on each question. Participants were asked to reflect on how their background experiences with the military may have impacted the likelihood that they would support JROTC in their school. All interviews were recorded for transcription.

Procedures Used

Participants were solicited through direct invitation during fall 2013. Six participants volunteered. At least one school from each NCES school locale category was included. None of the participants included in the study currently had a JROTC program.
All participants completed an informed consent prior to participating in the study activities. The consent form included purpose of interview, time commitment, risks and benefits, explanation of possible compensation, and confidentiality.

Participant confidentiality was protected by removing the names of the participants from the transcribed material and by renaming the participants using a color coding system. There was a possibility that participants could be identified by high school name and NCES definitions of school types; therefore, no school names were collected. High schools were only referred to by NCES definitions (urban, rural, etc.). It was therefore possible, but not likely, that the principal of a high school could be identified and their confidentiality compromised. Transcripts have been retained as part of the dissertation documentation but have been renamed to eliminate identifying information.

Data Analysis

Data analysis based on interview transcripts allowed the researcher to explore the phenomenon of participants’ perceptions of JROTC and the connections to the participants’ background experiences with the military. Bracketing was the first step in data analysis where the researcher identified any preconceived experiences and bias in order to best understand the participants’ experiences in the study (Creswell, 2013). Bracketing was used to limit the researcher’s potential bias, yet selection of the photos used in the study involved researcher knowledge and experience with the military.

The recorded semistructured interviews were transcribed using a paid transcription service through www.rev.com. Transcripts were then reviewed for
accuracy, edited as necessary, and identifying information removed by the original interviewer.

The researcher analyzed meaningful parts of the taped transcription and separated them as standalone segments using the template for coding a phenomenology study (Creswell, 2013). Coding was completed using Computer Assisted/Aided Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS), Atlas.ti. All significant statements in the transcripts were considered and given equal merit by using what Creswell (2013) identified as horizontalization, the second step in data analysis process. The data was analyzed for significant statements, sentences, quotes, or groups of wording that provide an understanding of the administrators’ experiences as described from the prompting photos. The researcher separated the meaningful parts of the transcription by using reflective notes recorded both during and immediately after the interviews and since considering the research topic.

After identifying the meaningful segments, coding the information from the additional analysis of textural and structural descriptions occurred (Creswell, 2013). A master list of codes was maintained until all transcripts were analyzed and the meaningful segments cycled each time the transcripts were reviewed. Groups of common statements were categorized together. The researcher looked for common experiences in the form of statements of participants’ feelings related to the phenomenon of interest. This was the third step in data analysis called clustering of meanings in which the researcher noted the repetitive statements (Creswell, 2013) and placed them into themes. When statements appeared in all or most of the transcripts and if the statements were clear enough to be placed together in a categorized group, the theme was considered reliable.
Finally, the essence of the phenomenon was revealed, which identified possible barriers to equal access to U.S. Army JROTC in Rochester, NY area high schools. Data analysis progressed from the narrow experience of considering service in defense of their country through use of the photo prompts to the essence of a broader and more detailed description of what and how they have experienced the value of military service for themselves and for others. When the core meanings of the phenomenon were identified, the essence of the phenomenon was revealed.

**Verification**

Verification is the process that occurred throughout the data collection and analysis which assured the results were accurate and trustworthy (Creswell, 2013). Verification strategies used in this study included (a) description of the researcher background and potential bias, (b) description of the participants, (c) identification of methods for data collection and analysis, (d) testing of data collection techniques prior to conducting participant interviews through a trial of photographs in a graduate level class, as well as video-recorded practice interviews by the paid interviewer, and (e) peer reviews by the interviewer and a PhD colleague.

Prior to starting the study, the researcher described his bias in the researcher background section. The researcher answered the study questions as if he was a participant to document his potential bias. A personal journal was maintained throughout the interviewing process to help prevent personal bias from influencing the analysis.

To assess the effectiveness of the prompting photos and to practice distinguishing meaningful statements, a test trial of photos was conducted in a graduate class of 30 students. Codes were collected through the photo prompt question “write down five
words that describe how you feel about the photo.” By doing this, a question and photo evaluation was achieved by obtaining colleague results before using the prompts for research (B. Blaine, personal communication, July 10, 2013). Of the 150 words collected to describe feelings toward the photos, many were repeated. A list of a priori codes and concurrent themes based on the exercise was prepared (Appendix D). This preresearch evaluation of the question and photos was a helpful test trial for future separation of meaningful segments of the data and data analysis.

During the data analysis phase, referring to the original transcripts allowed the researcher to compare what was first said, what the participant meant to say, and the degrees of clarity of what was actually said in the interview. Feelings of expression that were not obviously clear were not taken forward to the coding. The use of a paid interviewer helped investigator triangulation while completing data analysis and providing corroborating evidence (Creswell, 2013), as the interviewer was able to provide a third party interpretation of the transcripts. This helped counter researcher bias, adding validity to the results of the study. Finally, the researcher included a reliability check in the form of two peer reviewers, the interviewer and a colleague mentor who recently received a Ph.D. by completing a qualitative study.

Summary of Methodology

This interpretative phenomenological study, a photo elicitation interview, involved a voluntary sample of high school administrators in upstate New York. The study aimed to uncover the life experiences that impact the likelihood of an administrator to consider offering the JROTC experience within their school setting. The researcher background, participants, data collection instruments, data management plan, and data
analysis were reviewed. Finally, the verification processes included for this qualitative phenomenological study were described.
Chapter 4: Results

Epoche

Similar to the instructions given to a trial jury to analyze only the evidence presented in court and to avoid usual inferences, the researcher was very aware of personal prejudice during the research due to a long career in the U.S. military. The researcher used epoche, also called bracketing or phenomenological reduction, to suspend judgments about the phenomenon of the research participants as they considered JROTC in their high schools. This significantly reduced possible researcher prejudice that might have influenced the participant responses during the interviews. Bracketing allowed the researcher to set aside prejudices and predispositions regarding the phenomenon being investigated (Creswell, 2013). Key phases and statements from interviews were written in a journal and mentally bracketed in order to see information as if it were presented for the first time.

The researcher retired from the U.S. Army at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel after 24 years of active duty service. The researcher’s primary skill identifier was clinical laboratory manager, managing hospital laboratories for 15 to 18 years. During the later part of the researcher’s military career, the primary skill identifier was inspector general, a fact finding and investigation service for the U.S. Army. Inspector generals are fact finders for the commander. An inspector general acts as the eyes, ears, voice, and conscience of the U.S. Army across the spectrum of operations (U.S. Army, 2010).
researcher conducted thorough, objective, and impartial inspections, assessments, and investigations, and fact finding interviews. These activities involved providing assistance and training for Department of Defense (DOD) personnel and active duty soldiers including general officers, also called flag officers. Additional responsibilities were to advise and assist U.S. Army leaders to maintain Army values, readiness, and effectiveness in the promotion of well-being, good order, and discipline of the unit.

Following military retirement, the researcher started a second career as a high school biology teacher. After teaching biology and chemistry classes in a public school for one year, the researcher acquired employment as a U.S. Army JROTC instructor, his employment at the time of this study. Before starting any interviews, the researcher documented his feelings based on the photos and interview questions trying to bracket out preexisting ideas about the research question. Following each interview, the researcher made notes about his initial impressions and thoughts of the interview in a journal.

Because of this background, it was important for the researcher to hire an interviewer having minimal military contact. The paid interviewer was a high school chemistry teacher with 7 years’ experience at the time of the study. The interviewer never served in the military but had indirect military contact through her father, an Air Force reservist. The interviewer was familiar with the public educational system, U.S. Army JROTC, and school administrator duties and responsibilities. The interviewer and researcher conducted two practice interviews prior to the participant interviews. This allowed the interviewer to refine the techniques of photo elicitation phenomenology research based on the specific research questions. In addition, the interviewer conducted
an interview with the researcher using the interview protocol in order to document his experiences using the same interview technique. The interviewer and researcher were both aware of the importance of having open, receptive, and interactive communication with the study participants. An unfiltered and naïve presence toward the collection of information was necessary and objectively achieved.

The researcher’s own perspective was that a U.S. Army JROTC program in a high school was an important educational resource for administrators. The researcher felt that JROTC was not offered in schools because it was associated with recruiting young people into a profession associated with war and the military. This view was consistent with the description of the civil–military gap and the civic education of nonmilitary students.

**Participant Demographics**

Participant demographics were summarized in Table 4.1. There were four female and two male interviewees. All but one were Caucasian, the other was African American. There were three suburban school administrators, one rural, one urban, and one town school administrator. The administrators represented various levels of socioeconomic status schools, from very poor (over 80% free and reduced priced lunch) to relatively wealthy (less than 20% free and reduced price lunch). Levels of limited English proficiency tended to mirror the free and reduced price lunch status, and were also an indicator of socioeconomic status. Enrollment figures are also shown for comparison.
Table 4.1

Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>NES School Class.</th>
<th>School’s % Free/Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>School’s % Limited English Proficient</th>
<th>HS Enroll (* 7-12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>472 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>204 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Race: C = Caucasian, AA = African–American

Yellow was a female, Caucasian administrator of a medium sized, public, suburban school district with a relatively low population of poor students. She had been an administrator in her current district for two and a half years, and was an administrator in another suburban district for six years prior to that. She did not have work experience in any other school classification. She grew up in a small town in a rural setting.

Green was a male, Caucasian administrator of a small, public, town school district with a low population of poor students. He had been an administrator in the district for three and a half years. He had work experience in a rural school for six and a half years and suburban teaching experience for one and a half years. He grew up in a town similar to the size of his school district.

Blue was a male, Caucasian administrator of a medium-sized, suburban, public school with a very low population of poor students. He had been an administrator for
four years, and always worked in the same district. He grew up in a suburban area as a child.

Purple was a female, Caucasian administrator of a medium-sized, public, suburban school district with a low population of poor students. She had been an administrator for seven years in a rural district prior to recently moving to the suburban district. She taught in a suburban district, and did her student teaching in an urban district. During her early childhood, she grew up in an urban to suburban area, and at the age of twelve, moved to a rural area.

Pink was a female, African American administrator in a small, urban, public school with a very high population of poor students. She had been an administrator for eleven years. She grew up in an urban setting. All of her work experience had been in an urban setting.

Red was a female, Caucasian administrator of a small, public, rural school district with a high population of poor students. She had been an administrator for eight years. She grew up in a rural setting. She had some work experience in urban schools, but most of her experience was in rural school districts.

**Interview Format**

The six participants were individually interviewed using two photographs as prompts to elicit information about their lives, focusing on military contact in their background. They were also questioned about which photograph more closely depicted JROTC in their opinion, and whether they would or would not support JROTC in their schools. The results of their conversations were analyzed and summarized according to
themes that were common across most or all of the interviews. Significant omissions of expected results were also summarized.

Results

Research question 1. One of the primary questions addressed through the research methodology was to determine how administrators’ life experiences influenced their initial responses to photographs of JROTC cadets engaged in typical cadet activities. The two photographs used in the study contrasted the activities that are typically seen in high school JROTC. Photo #1 depicted cadets in dress uniforms and elicited the most positive feelings from the participants while photo #2 showed students in civilian clothing with weapons being instructed by an adult in military clothing, which elicited more negative feelings from the participants. Administrators were asked to consider the photographs during two separate periods of the interview. Administrator responses to the photos were obtained by asking the administrators to look at the two different pictures and describe their feelings. The paid interviewer stated “Don't describe what you see in the pictures, instead describe what you feel.” From these responses, the essence of understanding the photographs was obtained.

Theme 1: The uniform matters. The theme that emerged most clearly from this research question was that a polished military uniform and military style were the predominant identifiable characteristics of JROTC, leading to an overall positive response to both photographs. This supporting research question was connected to the theme of military style or how the life experiences of school administrators affected the way they identified with people in the military. There was a common perception between the military and civilian population about how the military should look, what
characteristics should guide military beliefs, and what citizens think about the military.

Military style was important because it reflected how something appeared and the JROTC uniform stands as a symbol of military power and authority (Schiff, 2009). The JROTC uniform was how administrators related and expressed what most represented JROTC in the high school. The uniform was an important symbol that helped explain core civilian values when compared to Army values. Most administrators stated that the uniform was the most identifiable part of the photographs. Specifically in photo #1, the uniform was what set the two photos apart from each other. The uniform was how administrators related and expressed what most represented JROTC.

*Evidence.* Yellow stated, “I think of the uniform, not so much the kids because if these kids (referring to photo 2) had the uniform on, I'd say the same thing. I think of it automatically connected to the uniform.” This statement reflected Yellow’s acknowledgement of photo #2 and Yellow’s feelings that it wasn’t the age of the cadets that was the most identifying feature of the photo. Instead it was the uniform and Yellow’s feelings about the JROTC uniform that was more a reflection of Yellow’s life experiences than any other parts of the photos.

Blue, reflecting upon students who return to the high school after graduation, stated, “when students come back; they come back in their full dress. They want to look good, and they want to show off that pride, and so that’s what I would picture.” According to Blue, the uniform was a reflection of pride and belonging. It was expressed as more than just a uniform, but rather a style of dress. Purple also chose photo #1 and stated “This picture or photo number 1 looks more like what I would think of because you see them in the uniform.”
Red expressed feelings for the photos in this way:

I taught in a neighboring district where I did have a couple of my students who got involved in the ROTC. I know that they did get attire like this. They were able to dress. I remember some of the junior ROTCs. Well, the boys that are in ROTC. I don’t even know if you still call it junior at that age. I remember sort of the same thing that they did have full attire.

Red reflected upon the life experience of schooling and seeing a group of people that were set apart by their dress. The feelings that Red expressed were inspired by more than just parts of the uniform or the accessories of flags and patriotism. It was the “full attire” that provoked feelings that the uniform was what set the photos apart.

Even the administrators who expressed more uncertainty or conflict in their feelings about the photographs eventually settled on photo #1 as most representative of JROTC because of the uniform. Pink responded to photo #1 by stating:

Actually I feel puzzled. I feel a little bit sad. I have lots of questions about what I’m looking at. It conjures up feelings of inequity for me. I’m wondering where these young boys are. They’re obviously pretty young. It’s bringing up more questions for me. They are highly decorated to be such young kids. I’m wondering why. I’m wondering who they are.

Pink viewed the photos very closely and with skepticism by stating:

I can see the … I’m looking. I can see … Actually I still can’t see that writing with my magnifying glass. I’m just wondering why these are all smiley faced white boys. I’m wondering where the people of color are. It just makes me feel that whatever program this was, it certainly did not represent what the … It
certainly is not diverse.

Pink, the only African–American participant, was the only administrator that expressed feelings of inequity in response to the photo based upon race, stating:

That’s where the sadness comes in because I see this smiley faced kid here. You don’t very often see pictures of smiley faced African American youth dressed as these kids are. They obviously took a lot of time. This is obviously a point of pride for them. I would just really like to see more diversity in this. I know that it’s only a snapshot. Without background information, that’s why I have so many questions about it because I’m not certain of the background. I’m also wondering why these helmets are so shiny.

Shown photo #2, Pink expressed more positive feelings:

This is what I would have hoped for in the first picture. I am seeing some children of color here. I am seeing some kids that obviously are getting some type of training. Actually for myself I like the fact that the girls are here. I like that a lot. This is conjuring up some feelings of being happy that these kids are involved in doing some hard work.

Yet, when Pink was asked to select the photo that most represented what JROTC would look like in the school, she selected photo #1.

Definitely the first one (repeated). It looks like they’re at a point of graduating with some kind of a ceremony. It looks like this might be a program that’s just starting out (referring to picture 2). It looks like they have to wear navy blue tops. Maybe that’s just a coincidence. Yeah, I don’t know. It’s definitely the first picture.
Pink continued to doubt what she was feeling by stating:

Maybe I’m all wrong, maybe it’s a cult. You look at how these kids are decorated, the epaulettes or the chords out of the epaulettes. I did make a huge assumption. Maybe I’m just assuming, maybe it’s just an assumption that I’m looking at. I can’t even read that writing, I wish I could. Are these kids JROTC or ROTC?

Pink also described her nephew who is enrolled in a JROTC program in a different state, and expressly mentioned the uniform as a defining characteristic of the program.

At this point he’s really, he’s thriving in school, he’s an A student. He dresses the part. He loves the shiny shoes. He loves the military cut pants, slacks I guess they call them. It’s a good thing. It’s a really good thing for him. I look and I see my kids. I do know that it would be very beneficial for some of them to be involved as well.

Although Pink felt that photo #1 lacked diversity, she felt that the first photo was more representative of JROTC. Only Green selected photo #2 as most reflective of JROTC in the schools. Observing photo #2, Green stated:

I feel a little of anxiety for the youth in the picture, having served for a brief period of time myself, like I know that they are … this looks like some sort of orientation or training to me. I’m feeling some of the anxiety that I felt in my first cadet formation with rifle training. They are young. I think that’s a part of my experience is these training folks are younger than what I would typically expect for a military type presentation. I can feel a little bit of anxiety, more curiosity, and maybe a little bit of a protective instinct for them, wanting to make sure that
they are comfortable.

Green continued:

This (picture 2) tends to be more representative of the different populations that I’ve worked with as kids or students first and then gaining military experience in addition to that. The different clothing, I think the diversity that I see. Some of the expressions …. I don’t know, I guess it seems like more of a typical expression like the students that I see here. Very committed, focused, uncertain, and there is a curiosity, looking over here, trying to learn, figuring it out, looking off at something.

Green was also the only administrator who served in the military and had direct military contact. Even as Green mentioned the diversity in photo #2, he expressed his feelings beyond diversity. Green selected photo #2 based on the feeling that students were “trying to learn” and “figuring it out” in the photo. Green continued to express his feelings by stating, “Again, you can infer they’ve been taught how to be this buttoned down but there’s not the instructor right with them.” Green used military phrases (buttoned down) and noticed the absence of an instructor in photo #1.

To summarize, the administrators interviewed cited the military uniform as the one thing about the photos that was most representative of JROTC for them. The uniform symbolized the program more than anything else in the photos, based on the administrators’ backgrounds, exposure to JROTC, if any, and personal feelings.

**Research question 2.** The second main research question addressed through the interviews was: How do the values, attitudes, and beliefs of high school administrators influence their support for establishment of JROTC in schools? Three themes emerged
after considering participants’ responses to the interview questions:

1. Administrators Have a Large Military Contact Reach

2. Administrator Deeper Purpose is Providing Opportunities,

3. Matching Personal Values to Army Values.

**Theme 2: Administrators have a large military contact reach.** One reason that participants felt that military style, the uniform, was such an identifying part of JROTC was a result of past military contact they experienced in their lives. According to Dempsey (2008), as a result of military base closings and force drawdowns, fewer and fewer Americans have contact with the military. However, the study found that, contrary to expectations based on research, the participants all had significant amounts of military contact. Military contact was defined as either direct or indirect contact. Direct contact was defined as a participant having served directly in any of the U.S. armed services (Army, Marines, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard). Indirect contact was when a participant personally knew someone in any of the U.S. armed services and interacted with that person in some way. All six administrators had some military contact and even when this military contact was negative, there was still widespread support for Army JROTC. It was found that the military contact was perceived as overwhelming positive. The degree of contact could be an important part of a participant’s values and positive feelings about JROTC and the military.

**Evidence.** One participant, Green, experienced direct contact in the military services and shared values that have been adopted by the U.S. Army JROTC. When these values, known as the 7 Army Values, were compared to the personal values expressed by the participant, the essence between military contact and values were
linked. Direct participation in the military services also seemed to influence the selection of Photo #2 as being most reflective of what Green felt JROTC looked like in the high school. This was unusual since all other administrators chose photo #1. Close contact by Green was described as “My father was a career Coast Guard. Then my own experience as a cadet at the Coast Guard Academy definitely shaped how I look at these situations a little bit.” Green also indicated that other family members had served in the military: “My grandfather served in the Army. My maternal grandfather.” “My oldest brother was National Guard. Army National Guard.” “Two uncles and I believe they were both Army as well.” Green also had contact with recruiters at his school. Green was the only participant who lived a direct contact experience in the military through his attendance at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

Yellow expressed her close degree of contact with several family members in the services. “My Dad was in the Army, I have a son and a brother who’s a Marine.” “My son guards embassies for the Marines.” Yellow further reflected upon the fact that there was an immediate attraction to military service by stating, “He (my brother) went in right after high school, as soon as he graduated from high school.” Yellow also mentioned an aunt who served in the military and described interaction with recruiters in her school. Yellow’s life experience of military contact was indirect because Yellow did not serve directly in the military. Yet Yellow’s military contact through immediate family members and the degree of contact could be considered close. Yellow’s contact was generational through a father-son connection.

Blue experienced indirect military contact association through relatives and a close family friend. “My cousin enlisted in the Navy when he graduated and he’s 2 years
older than me, and he’s still in the Navy.” “I also have an uncle who was in the Army.”

Even as Blue stated that war had been part of a close family friend’s life, he was still very supportive of the military and of JROTC. “I grew up with a very close family friend who had served in Vietnam. That person still is very close in our family.” In addition, Blue has contact with recruiters from all branches of the military in his school.

Pink also shared her life experience of her brother who served in Vietnam, which could be considered a negative experience based on her description.

He’s my only brother. I was his favorite little sister. He was very young when he went to Vietnam. He was 17. He should not have been in the military at all but he enlisted. He lied as many of our soldiers did. He went in as a little boy and he came out as a shell-shocked little bit older boy. It was too much and his experience was not good. Right now he’s … We didn’t understand that he was shell-shocked. We didn’t understand that he was addicted. He came out addicted. We just didn’t understand. He couldn’t talk about it. Down the road he was able to get help with all of that. There’s a part of him that was left there. There’s a part of him that wasn’t left there I would say. I really think … He abandoned his religion, he became a Muslim. This is all recent knowledge that I have. Right now he’s living the life of a Muslim. He lives in Florida. He’s completely transformed as a Muslim now.

Pink also described numerous other family contacts with military experience.

“Uncles and things like that. A lot of African Americans were in World War II so probably all of my uncles, World War II, Korea.” “A cousin that actually made the military her life. She retired from the military. She’s a nurse in the Navy.”
I have two other cousins that followed in her footsteps. They joined the Navy as well. Actually I have … Jeez, I also have a nephew. This isn’t easy. Yes, I have several military people in my family. I also have a younger nephew who is so into everything that’s going to prepare him to go to the military. He’s in JROTC in Virginia.

Pink also described her father’s military experience: “my Dad was shell-shocked. I’m pissed off because they sent, my Dad served two … He’s World War II, two tours in World War II. They didn’t even bother to teach him how to read. My father could not read.” Pink described a current student who has made a decision to enlist in the Marines: “Our kids have to do a senior project which is a yearlong study of something of your choice really. He decided that he was going to study …. He’s going into the Marines actually.”

Purple described both positive and negative indirect military contact experiences. Purple stated, “Both of my grandfathers were in the armed forces. One was in the Army, one was in the Navy.” “I also had two uncles that are in the military….. My one uncle is in the Reserves, never was deployed. My other uncle was in Vietnam, and spoke nothing of his experience.” She went on to describe her family’s experiences with her uncle who had served in Vietnam this way:

He’s very ill right now. They can’t figure out what’s wrong with him. He’s struggling with a lot of … A girlfriend of mine’s father passed, and they attribute it to Agent Orange. They had some testing. I think he goes to those place, but it’s … I mean, he’s been through a gamut of things. My aunt swears it was from his participation there and maybe things that he might have seen or been around. It’s
a mystery. It’s very … I don’t know. I don’t know how to place it, but it’s like
one of those things you know you don’t talk about. As a kid, you didn’t know, so
you wanted to find out. He just walked and leave the room. Now, you don’t talk
…

Purple described contact in her school with community members: “We have a big
population of retired vets that are very active in our school. They come in and talk. They
talk to our social studies classes.” She also talked about a former student who came back
to speak at school after enlisting:

We had a student come back, and speak as a recent grad and her experiences of
why she chose the Army, what made her make that decision, and she was
extremely articulate. She made that a point. She met with myself and the high
school principal, and just wanted to make sure that she wasn’t promoting because
she’s a recruiter, so she didn’t. I guess there’s certain parameters that they have
to follow, and she wanted to make certain that she wasn’t overstepping what the
Army expectation in terms of recruiting, and that we knew what her message was
going to be. She did a phenomenal job.

Red reflected upon the uniform and military style while also expressing the
essence of how she experienced military contact by stating: “My grandfather always wore
his attire. My grandfather fought in World War II and he was a decorated soldier.” “I
have a family background in that way. Most of my uncles are all U.S. Marines.” “I have
cousins that are my age that are all Marines. I actually have one that is Special Forces
…… He’s actually now working military police and just won an award for his work in
interrogations in Afghanistan.” Red also described her uncle who served in Vietnam this
I also have an uncle on my dad’s side who was drafted into Vietnam. As a child, because they live in Florida and I live in New York, I haven’t experienced it myself but have heard stories from his own children about … Because he didn’t choose to go, because that wasn’t his choice, he still suffers a great deal with traumatic stress. He will every once in a while have nightmares and the whole nine yards and sort of relive it. My dad talks about that. When he was a child and his brother returned from war how it was really hard for him to reintegrate because he couldn’t sleep. He would hide in corners and things like that.

In the school setting, Red described contact with the military recruiters this way:

“With the military folks here right now, they’re running boot camp here a couple of nights a week for some of our high school kids that are at risk.”

Actually, the staff sergeant that usually does our recruiting is the one that’s here putting the kids on the computer and working through their remediation of math and ELA. She comes at the end of the year until we do an awards ceremony and she comes and gives awards on behalf of the Army for certain presidential physical fitness. Along those lines, there’s some awards that they have. She comes and presents those. The kids love her. She’s great with the audience. Yeah. She’s a bit of a presence here.

…..we are currently using the United States Army to help us as mentors. It’s been a great experience working with them because they’re so constant. Even though they’re here and they’re in uniforms, they are constantly reminding all of us administratively, our teachers, our kids, our families, that they are not recruiting,
that they are simply here to be mentors and to help kids be successful in life.

Regardless of the type of contact—direct, indirect, or minimal—all participants stated that their contact experience had a positive influence in supporting JROTC in the school. Despite the tendency of administrators to discuss some negative effects that war and the military had on their contact relationships, these effects did not prevent them from expressing feelings of support when asked if they would offer JROTC in the school. Administrators indicated that they recognized JROTC as a program distinct and separate from recruiters, about whom they had expressed concerns.

**Theme 3: Administrators’ deeper purpose is providing opportunities.**

Administrators clearly expressed that their life calling as an educator was motivated by strong feelings of obligation to expose students to all career options. Opportunity was defined as administrators providing future choices to their students. Interestingly, the word “opportunity” was never used in the interview protocol, or participant solicitation. Yet the theme emerged from analysis of the participant interviews. The interviewer did not lead the participants to use this term, yet nearly every participant used the word “opportunity” as a descriptor of their primary role as an administrator. Administrators were keenly aware that their responsibilities involved the future success of their students. Offering future opportunities for their students was repeated again and again throughout the research interviews.

**Evidence.** After discussing the photos and JROTC, Purple stated, “I think my beliefs come more for options for kids. I think the reason why I went into education is giving kids an opportunity to grow, and I knew I think early on that that’s something that was a value to me. “ and “I would frame it as it’s an opportunity for kids. If we limit
what we offer our kids, then we’re not really doing our jobs as administrators.”

Some administrators used stereotypical expressions of providing opportunities for bringing out the good in selected student populations and improving the behavior of certain students. Yellow felt that the Marines was an important opportunity for her son and stated, “He was not successful in college time and time again, three different colleges. Then he was 22 and there really weren't any jobs.” Yellow clearly felt that the military was an especially good opportunity for a selective grouping of students who are not successful in college. “I think it would be great to have an opportunity for kids.” Yellow’s feelings for former students who enlist in the military were focused on a select group, stating:

I think it's good, especially for some of our students that, like my son, that school's never really been their thing, but they have so much to give and they don't see themselves as smart because they've never been the school smart. My son is very insightful and there's just so much that he has to offer and a lot of great people skills. To see him find something and to succeed in it, and he can be proud of that’s very exciting.

Yellow also stated that there are opportunities in the military for non-college bound students, and these ideas are shared by the students themselves.

It's interesting I meet a lot of students that are always in the assistant principal's office and they're always getting into trouble. It's funny because, I'm thinking of one individual in particular, and he'll say, "But I'm going into the Marines." I'm like, "But you're gonna have to follow rules there."

Green reflected upon the military of the past and how these stereotypical feelings
of the military may still exist today. Green stated, “It was an opportunity. In stories and in movies, a young person, a young man who is struggling and a judge somewhere tells him to either enlist or you’re going to jail.” He also stated that “I think I will be okay if that decision was made but I think limiting recruiters from coming in is limiting options for our student. In a way I don’t think it is my job to say this might be okay for you, that might not be okay for you.”

Pink clearly expressed a current crisis that separates the military as an opportunity for some kids by stating, “They can do this or they can join a gang actually. If they don’t do this, they just might go out and join a gang. These are my honest thoughts on it.”

During the interview with Red, she specifically mentioned the Puerto Rican student groups and how this population could benefit from JROTC and the military in the school. Red clearly stated a conflicting emotion about this opportunity, dismissing it as an option for her own child but recognizing it as an opportunity for others:

I don’t want to bias them in that but I assure you that my own child, my own son, at age 13 hears from me with frequency that the military is not an option. I try to keep my own feelings here to myself. It is their decision with their parents but I cringe at the thought. Some of these kids, especially those that seem to go to the military seem to be my more at risk kids.

Red clearly felt the military was an option for a select group of students, but that future opportunity was something Red does not support for her son. Administrators were aware that JROTC offers greater opportunity for their students, but that feeling of increased opportunity would be offered stereotypically.

In considering JROTC in the school Yellow stated, “I think it would be great to
have an opportunity for kids.” Yellow reflected back to how the military offered greater opportunities for her son, “He’s thinking about it. When he has his bachelor’s, which he will very soon, he’ll be able to have even more opportunities.” Like Yellow, Green compared a local school having fewer resources with another school having greater resources and greater opportunities by stating, “some of them that jump out at me quite a bit from these schools and the role of service and country and military as a possible future for students.” Expressing his thoughts about the military, Blue stated, “In general it really has been an opportunity for them to figure out what they want, and really do a lot of different things.” Feeling that JROTC would increase opportunity in his school, Blue described a former student: “He didn’t know what he wanted to do and so this gave him some direction and let him experience a lot of different things and help him find out who he is.” Administrators expressed feelings in a way that reflected back to their ability to increase opportunities for their students. Purple expressed an internal check of her own openness by stating, “Maybe just that I think in society, we have very closed minds about certain things; and when we limit ourselves, we limit our kids.” Purple seemed to express a deeper essence of this research by stating:

I think it’s important, and I think this just to me, brought to light maybe why, what the purpose of this dissertation and research is. It’s important to have options, and it’s so important to give kids an opportunity. I think that’s what I’m reflecting on, the importance of it I guess.

Some administrators expressed that beyond providing opportunities, expanded options in school could be a life and death responsibility to students as Pink stated:

…if we don’t provide our kids with something to believe in, something that they
have looked, that they can look forward to going after school; one that they can keep their grades up so that they can do it, everybody doesn’t play sports. These are my feelings.

Pink expressed the feeling that there are more opportunities for certain racial groups today by stating, “The fact that yes there are some opportunities out there for our students that before were only afforded to only the students in the [school] or the [school].” Pink was not concerned that JROTC may lead students into joining the military and leaving their homes. She stated:

My heart bleeds when I know that these young boys are going to Afghanistan or wherever it just happens to be the waging war was somewhere. That does not stop me from celebrating when I know that a lot of my young boys here don’t have a shot at life unless they join the service and see different things. They need to get off the corner. They need to have a different perspective on life. I tell them all, “Don’t come back. Don’t come back to [city]. It will suck you in and you will die here.” It’s a very viable option for many of our kids right now.

Pink expressed the struggle that administrators face in trying to provide future opportunities and a hook to give their students options in life. Describing one very specific student and his decision to join the military, she stated:

He hooked up with a recruiter. He’s learned all that he has to do. He actually started ahead of time with the promise that once he graduates from high school, he’ll be able to sign the papers. He’ll be able to go. I am telling you that is that kid’s only shot in life. That’s his only shot. That is, he doesn’t know who his father is. His Mom is crazy. He is a great kid.
Participants expressed a feeling of obligation to parents and to their students. Purple recognized the obligation and pressure for administrators to expose students to multiple opportunities. In poorer school districts, parents may not be able to have these conversations with their students because they just don’t know about the opportunities and may have never seen the options available. The obligation then rests upon the administrators to offer future opportunities. Purple stated:

We have families that come in whose parents, they don’t have the experience or the understanding of what options are out there, and we have kids that are walking out our doors and they have no options. To me, we have to find something that works. If this is something that works for kids, then I’m for it.

Red expressed the crisis of limited options for rural students when she stated: “We have nothing. In rural America, we have nothing. Basically for us, we get recruiters. The Army’s the only one that thinks to take interest……. Our kids aren’t as exposed. They don’t have the options.” When questioned about how she made the decision to bring in the Army to run the after school enrichment program for her students, Red stated:

I guess I didn’t think about it even when we brought the military in to run this. I never polled teachers to see if I was making them feel appalled. I did go full speed ahead without much thought to it. I shouldn’t say without much thought but without thought to how it might make others inside the walls of the school feel. I’m more thinking about it in terms of opportunities for kids and helping them to envision life beyond high school because most of your at risk population doesn’t even think they could get through high school. To give them a taste of
there is life outside of here, and it doesn’t have to be college, and it doesn’t have to be a trade. It could be military, I just think they should see that there’s a buffet of options. Yeah.

Although all participants described experiencing various levels of the heightened crisis for offering more options, most saw JROTC as providing a future opportunity. The words options, future, and opportunity were expressed repeatedly throughout the research interviews.

**Theme 4: Personal values match Army values.** The participants in the study discussed their own personal values in response to an interviewer question. Personal values were defined as the attitudes about the worth of people, concepts, and beliefs (U.S. Army, 2006). Participants were not restricted in any way in their responses, so the values expressed were words of their own choosing. It was interesting to note that five of the six administrators used the word integrity as one of their values. The personal values theme expressed by school administrators was a reflection, in part, of their direct or indirect military contact. As a point of comparison, U.S. Army JROTC values were compared to the personal values expressed by the participants. Closely matched personal values to the U.S. Army values helped answer the general research question of how the values, attitudes, and beliefs of high school administrators influenced their level of support for establishment of JROTC in schools. Table 4.2 compared the personal values expressed by administrators to the U.S. Army values, with exact matches noted in the first column, and close matches (those interpreted by the researcher as meaning a similar or correlated civilian value) in the second column.

Table 4.2
A Comparison of Personal Values with U.S. Army Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Army value</th>
<th>Exact match</th>
<th>Interpretive Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Blue, Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Pink, Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Blue, Purple, Pink, Red, Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 7 U.S. Army values are loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage. During the interviews, participants were asked, “Can you give me the top five values that are important to you, your personal values?” Yellow responded that the personal values of work ethic, respect, and responsibility were most important, matching only one of the U.S. Army JROTC values, the value of respect.

Blue matched two of the U.S. Army values by stating the personal values of service to others, integrity, love, and loyalty. Purple matched two U.S. Army values and stated that the personal values of integrity, humility, compassion, family, and honor were most important. Pink also matched two U.S. Army values by responding that being true to myself, religion, integrity, making a difference in the lives of others, and honesty were the most important. Red matched only one of the seven U.S. Army values by stating that integrity, compassion, ethics, and servantship were the most important personal values. Green stated that integrity, honesty, work ethic, fairness, and loyalty were the most
important personal values thereby matching three of the seven U.S. Army values. The most frequently matched personal values were integrity and honor (interpretive match with honesty). Green matched more U.S. Army values than any other administrator interviewed.

**Research question 3.** With the assumption that life experiences impact personal values, and to some extent, vice versa, participants were questioned about the ways in which their life experiences influence their thought process about offering JROTC in school. Five of the six participants interviewed stated that their life experience did or may have influenced their thought process of offering JROTC in their schools.

**Theme 5: Administrators support JROTC despite lack of knowledge.** All administrators but one stated that they would support JROTC in the schools or would be open to learning more about student outcomes. Most administrators indicated a general lack of knowledge about program specifics or actions required to start a program. However, regardless of the lack of knowledge, the participants overwhelmingly expressed support for the idea of JROTC in their schools. Of the participants who were directly asked, all felt the program should be elective rather than compulsory. One participant expressed feelings of disappointment for not having more information about JROTC.

**Evidence.** Yellow stated:

I really don’t know why we don’t have more information about Junior ROTC. I’ve heard of it at the college level, I know very little about it. It seems like I’m interested in it, I just don’t know why there isn’t, I don’t even know any schools that have it and why we don’t have it. Who promotes it or sponsors it? I have no
idea.

Yellow continued in a frustrating exchange of feelings, “It’s something we should have more information about. I have no idea why we don’t.” When the interviewer asked if Yellow knew about the JROTC program, Yellow stated “Not too much.” When asked how likely she would be to support JROTC in the school, Yellow stated, “oh absolutely, yeah.” Yellow expressed reasons for support that were related to an indirect military contact experience. When asked, Yellow stated:

Two things; the pride and the discipline. I think that hard work, discipline, and pride; you have those things, it carries over in your life. You feel better about yourself. You want to work hard. You see what happens and you set goals. It makes you want to work harder. I see that happening in my son. He was going to parties and working at American Eagle. He's 21, 22 years old and he wasn't going anywhere. Now he's going all over the world; he's going to Africa, he's going everywhere and he's got a lot of pride. He comes to our family with his head held up high. He's talking about his experiences. The harder he works and the more promotions he's gotten, the more pride, the harder he works, it's just a cycle.

On the topic of whether the JROTC classes should be elective or required, Yellow stated:

An elective because I don't think it's for everyone. I think there's some kids who already know what they want to do. They're driven, they have that intrinsic motivation and this isn't of interest to them. To me, a program like this, you really need to make sure you're ... I think once you make something like this for every single person, it can work against your program because it's not a good fit
for every kid. That's just my philosophy. I think everyone can excel and be great at something. It's just figuring out what it is.

Green was more cautious about expressing support for JROTC in the school, admitting that he did not have a lot of knowledge about the program but was curious. When asked about his familiarity with JROTC, Green said “Very basic, yeah not very much at all. I’m curious about it, but I don’t know much about it.” When asked directly about whether he would support JROTC in his school, Green stated:

I’m open to learning a lot more about it. I don’t know if I … I think I’d have to do that before I could consider offering it. I think some of what I’d be most curious about is what has it done for the students? What are the outcomes that they can expect, not necessarily for every individual but what do the percentages show or the stats show these kids do versus other kids do to help my students make an informed decision about whether or not it would be right for them. I’d want to really know its impact first. Then I’d be open to studying, to looking at it, learning more.

When questioned about whether he would envision making the program mandatory or an elective, Green said:

I definitely would think more elective would be my leaning on it….. I also would never want to force it on them. I think it is something that they have to be ready for, they have to select, they have to be drawn to.

Blue, the administrator of the most affluent suburban school, was definitely opposed to supporting JROTC in the school. Blue stated, “Currently students can participate in things like that as an outside extracurricular activity outside of school and I
don’t see changing that right now.” Blue stated, “The students that I know that are connected with that (military) do it through recruiters outside of school.” Blue went on to explain that he felt there was some value in JROTC.

I think there are values in it. If a student was interested in starting a club, which would be the closest thing we would have to a program like that, I think it would be interesting within the climate of the building, so I’m not sure how that would work. I guess I would really need to get a lot more information about it. The proposal would need to be there to look at what specifically they were targeting and the goals within that, and any interest within the school community.

Blue answered interview questions very concisely and concluded with the shortest of all the interviews that were conducted for this research.

Purple indicated that she was more sure of what JROTC is about by stating, “I think this fits in the parameters of my beliefs in terms of what we offer kids, so I would feel comfortable knowing the way that the program is set up. That would be something I would support.” Purple felt that life experiences did not have much to do with influencing thoughts of JROTC support. Purple felt it was more about the individual belief of providing more opportunities for students, as stated previously. According to Purple, providing the opportunity to students impacted her thoughts of support for the program more than her life experiences.

Pink expressed a concern that the school staff may not support JROTC with the same excitement as she had by stating:

Personally I would be very excited about opening a program here. I really would about offering a program here. I don’t know that my staff would be as enthusiastic
about it as I am. We are a building where something such as this I would
definitely take to the staff so that it is a schoolwide decision. Staff and students
actually and parents, it would have to be a schoolwide decision because it is a
radical change from [school name], we’re the people that go out to protest stuff
like this.

Pink’s personal life experience connected to support for JROTC. “Personally,
personal experiences … When I think of my personal experiences, I think of my
experiences with my family and outside of school. Do they influence my feelings about
JROTC? Yes they do.” Pink expressed the importance of involving more than just
administrative staff in supporting JROTC in the school.

Interestingly, Red had recently introduced a JROTC-like program in the school
being conducted by U.S. Army recruiters. Red stated:

I think right now, in our school, we are currently using the United States Army to
help us as mentors. It’s been a great experience working with them because
they’re so constant. Even though they’re here and they’re in uniforms, they are
constantly reminding all of us administratively, our teachers, our kids, our
families, that they are not recruiting, that they are simply here to be mentors and
to help kids be successful in life.

Red further explained the kind of support that she envisioned if JROTC was
placed in the school by stating, “I think this second picture for me is like the antithesis of
the way that we function here with the military and how they respond to our kids.” These
are the feelings Red expressed when she selected photo #1 as more representative of what
JROTC would look like in the school.
Support for U.S. Army JROTC was very positive for Red. When Red was asked about current knowledge of JROTC, she stated, “Just a little.” Perhaps as an extension of the current use of recruiters, Red stated, “I would support it wholeheartedly. Wholeheartedly.” Red was the only administrator that had already sought the help of the U.S. Army to expand opportunity in the school by allowing recruiters to conduct a JROTC-like program. When asked about elective or mandatory JROTC courses, Red stated:

> I would offer it as an elective. I would never require it, never. Just like I don’t require that everybody take a five-course sequence in art. It’s not … That’s not how it works. That’s not how it works. You want kids to be successful, they have to opt in and out of what they can. You can’t opt out of U.S. history. You could opt out of the Junior ROTC. That’s okay with me. Now, it would have to be strictly an elective.

Overall, the participants in the study expressed support for the JROTC program as they understand it, and saw that it would be a positive addition to their schools because of the opportunity it offers for students. Because of their keen sense of obligation for providing their students with all opportunities available to them, they perceived JROTC to be of value by making students aware of an opportunity that is not currently addressed. None of the participants currently had a JROTC program in their schools, but when questioned about it, they were unsure why they did not. Most participants indicated a lack of information about the program, and lack of knowledge about where to even find information. The theme that emerged was that high school administrators lack information about the availability and benefits of the JROTC program, and would
consider such a program if they had information about it.

**Unexpected or Unanticipated Results**

When considering the results of the research, there was one particular point that was surprisingly absent from the participants’ responses. The phenomenology of the participants’ life experiences as observed through the photographs did not elicit much response or objection about the weapons. The students were pictured using weapons as part of drill and marching and the students appeared to be very young. Especially in photo #2, the weapons appeared taller than the students handling them. During the current period in our society of an increased concern about weapons in school, it was somewhat surprising that no participant expressed opposition to this. Administrators may have assumed that the weapons were demilitarized or dummy weapons. But because of current societal concerns, as students are even prohibited from making pictures or gestures of a gun, this was an unexpected result. Administrators could have mentioned weapons as their opposition of the JROTC program, but did not. Only one participant mentioned the weapons at all. When giving her feelings about the two photographs, Red stated:

I don’t like that. I don’t like this picture. This picture for me looks very much like the recruiting of young children who don’t really know what they’re getting themselves into. In particular, I’m not excited about how young the little man looks right in the front with a gun on his shoulder. My own boys do hunt with their father so guns are part of what we do at our house, but not in this sort of training way. The young women actually look … One of them in here looks afraid to even be touching a rifle. I don’t like the way that looks.
Red came back to the photographs at the end of the interview when describing the JROTC-like program that had been implemented for her students, and compared their program to the second photograph, and stated:

…..but these are the kinds of things they gave our kids. What is the Army’s physical training? (pulls out the Army pocket guide to physical training) Walks them through what that’s going to look like for them. They promised and they promised parents not to recruit but they definitely still talk about the Army’s mission. All of the rules that govern them, their character and their quality, they bring with them. All the safe parts, all the things that make you feel really proud about the military, the United States of America, and our flag. They bring all of that but there’s no pressure, like picture number two here where you’re going to hold a gun. Let’s see if it … Are you comfortable with it or not? It’s not that at all.

Even with the mention of the weapons in a negative way, Red still said she would wholeheartedly support JROTC in her school because of the positive impacts it would have on her students and the opportunities it would offer.

Another point that was never mentioned by any of the participants was an objection to the program based on money or budgets. In thinking about reasons why schools do or do not offer JROTC, it was expected that an initial objection from administrators would likely be based on the expense of the program. However, when administrators were questioned about whether they would support JROTC, there was not a single comment about the cost of the program. Perhaps the lack of discussion about cost is due to the fact that the participants were deep into thinking about their own values
and obligations to students as administrators, thereby surpassing the surface objection of cost and addressing the deeper purpose behind a JROTC program.

Another unexpected result came out of the interviews that was not directly related to the research questions, but was noteworthy because it was mentioned by more than one participant. In discussing military contact and the practice of allowing recruiters to come into the school to make contact with students, two participants expressed concerns based on personal experiences with recruiters during their adolescence. The negative experiences from a previous generation were a factor in their feelings about whether to allow recruiters to have access to students, even when recognizing that the military is a viable option that some students should consider. Of the six participants, all but one allowed recruiters to come into the school to interact with students, but two participants described their own personal exposures to recruiters in high school in terms of very questionable behavior, making them a bit wary of recruiters who come in to their schools.

Purple described her recollections and comparison to today’s recruiters this way:

I think the connotation, like, I think back when I was in school when recruiters were there, they were almost flirty with a girl. It was different where now it’s very professional.

To me, it’s considered something I think more professional in terms of when I thought about it before. It was maybe like, “What did we get in to?” Where now, I see it as a respectable choice where it’s not … Thinking back to high school, I go “I don’t know about this …” because it was more like I said, always came out very flirty with all the girls, and it was not as serious. Maybe it was just the group that came, that interacted with us because I talk to everybody. It’s probably my
own problem, but I see it more as just professional with the kids, and how they talk to them, and offering some things like that.

Pink made a conscious decision to not allow recruiters to come into her school based on her prior experiences with them. In this exchange with the interviewer, she described her biases:

Pink: No. I have one recruiter that has asked for permission to come in. See, that’s a whole ‘nother layer to my thoughts because I think that recruiters push the kids and promise them things that they’re probably not going to get, whereas [name] studied it. He looked at it first and then he made a decision. That is completely different than being sold by a recruiter or deciding I’m going to try JROTC. I want to try ROTC, that’s different for me than a recruiter coming in and selling you a line.

Interviewer: You’ve made a conscious decision of not having recruiters come in?

Pink: I have. The staff has as well. We’re a different school. I can’t remember what the district directives are on recruiters. We are able … There’s an opt out form that the kids sign or parents sign.

Interviewer: Parents have to sign an opt out to not have recruiters contact.

Pink: The kids.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Pink: They don’t come in here unless I allow it. No, I don’t want anybody coming to sell my kids a pot at the end of the rainbow. I’ve not met many recruiters that have really been looking out for the best interest in the people that
they’re recruiting. A long time ago before the district policy changed, I’m talking the early ‘90s, early to late ‘90s, and during the ‘90s, I have recruiters coming in here. They were dating the girls. They were hitting on the girls. I was like, “Are you people crazy?”

Interviewer: Some not so positive experiences with recruiters?

Pink: Not so positive experiences with recruiters, yes.

When Red discussed the JROTC-like program she has implemented at her rural school, she clearly emphasized her feelings about recruiting by repeatedly mentioning that, even though the people running the program are recruiters, they are not recruiting during this program.

I think their (Army) language and our language is a lot the same, very high expectations, expecting character and integrity out of everyone, living by certain internal rules that govern who you are. I think that’s where our pride comes from when we think about the military. It’s the example that they set for who we are as people and how we live. ………. I think you start to see a change in kids in their mannerisms, their behaviors, their understanding that the right decisions come even when nobody’s looking. I think the Army can help us drive that by sending us mentors that are worthy of mentoring.

Interviewer: The people in the Army who come in, are they active duty people? Are they retired military?

Speaker 1: They’re not retired but they are working out of … What do they call it? A field something, I don’t even know. I don’t even know.

Interviewer: Field office or …
Speaker 1: Let me see if I have … The card right here. The one is a recruiter, but not … Yeah. (interviewee picked up the business card off her desk and showed it to me.)

Interviewer: When he’s here, he’s not acting as a recruiter?

Speaker 1: That’s correct. This is the gentleman. This Paul. He does our boot camp training and then there’s a lady that actually comes down. She’s also a sergeant. She does the remediation pieces. She has a bachelor’s degree in human resource. She’s actually a great resource to us…….. I think between the military people that came in, Paul Mosher, sharing his story, and he has done a couple of tours. He definitely has been to Afghanistan. He also talked about other places where he was stationed that weren’t quite combat like that and different experiences that he had. I think there were some kids that thought that was a cool idea, too. No. They’re not actively trying to get kids to sign……… In rural America, we have nothing. Basically for us, we get recruiters. What we said back to them is, “What can you do for us? Partner with us. What else can you offer because we don’t want you to come in and recruit our kids. What else could you provide?”

The Army tends to hunt for kids who don’t know any better and offer them a way of life they would never have, a little money in their pocket, a trip to Germany or riding an airplane for the first time in your life. It bothers me. I want them to have other choices. If they choose that, that’s okay with me but I want them to know that they have choices. Yeah. They don’t in lots of ways. It kills me.
Although the role of recruiters in high schools was not a topic of the study, some of the repeated negative stereotypes of recruiters may hint at an underlying factor impacting administrators’ resistance to any kind of military presence in schools which may be worthy of further exploration.

**Summary of Results**

The study focused on the life experiences of high school administrators, particularly in regards to military contact, and how their life experiences influenced their support or nonsupport of JROTC. The primary purpose of the study was to determine how administrators’ values, attitudes, and beliefs influenced their support, or lack thereof, for offering this opportunity for students. Participants provided rich data about both positive and negative military contact experiences. The photographs elicited feelings ranging from pride to feelings of discrimination and sadness. A patriotic picture of JROTC cadets in uniform did not necessarily prompt administrators to unwaveringly support the program. Some administrators wanted more information about JROTC and generally felt there was some lack of knowledge about offering JROTC in high schools. Regardless of a positive or negative contact experience, almost all administrators were supportive of JROTC and all participants expressed a positive attitude regarding the military in general. The following themes emerged from the research.

1. **The uniform matters.** Military uniforms are the most visible and important characteristic used to identify the JROTC program, and impart strong positive feelings to participants.

2. **Administrators have a large military contact reach.** The participants have extensive contacts with the military through family members, students,
recruiters, and community members.

3. Administrators’ deeper purpose is providing opportunities. School administrators clearly feel that their main professional purpose of educational practice is to expose students to the widest possible variety of options for their futures so they can make informed choices.

4. Personal values match Army values. Administrators’ personal values are in harmony with Army values, leading to commonality of purpose between the JROTC program and administrators’ perceived obligations to students.

5. Administrators support JROTC despite lack of knowledge. Most participants expressed support for the JROTC program within their schools despite having only limited specific knowledge about the program.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this interpretative phenomenological study is to determine how values and attitudes of high school administrators affect unequal offering of JROTC. Beginning with a summary of the research study, this chapter details the implications of findings, limitations, recommendations, and conclusions.

Summary

The study is designed to investigate how high school administrators’ values and attitudes affect the unequal offering of JROTC in high school throughout the United States by addressing the following research questions:

1. How do the values, attitudes, and beliefs of high school administrators influence their support for establishment of JROTC in schools?

2. How do administrators’ life experiences influence their initial responses to photographs of JROTC cadets engaged in typical cadet activities?

3. How will the administrators’ life experiences influence their thought process about offering JROTC in school?

Six high school administrators in upstate New York revealed their background experiences related to the military, as well as their feelings about high school JROTC programs. Two photographs served as effective prompts to enable the participants to freely talk about their experiences. From the participants’ descriptions of their experiences as well as an elaboration of their own personal values, and their feelings
about establishment of a JROTC program in their schools, a number of themes and findings emerge that address the research questions.

Contrary to what was expected, all of the participants have a relatively high degree of military contact and knowledge of the military. Experiences vary from direct military service, to family members who have served, to school-based experiences with recruiters, students, and community members. Despite sometimes negative personal experiences through the military contact, all of the participants express positive feelings about the military in general, and note that the military uniform provides the most visible means of identifying the JROTC program. All of the participants are very focused on their obligation as school administrators to provide students with every available opportunity so they can have successful futures. As a result of that focus, all of the administrators recognize that JROTC provides opportunities for students, and all but one express support for offering the program in their schools.

While it was expected based on research that there may be a lack of support for JROTC in the schools because of geographical and contact gaps, the findings are quite the opposite. Military contact is plentiful despite the study taking place in an area geographically removed from active military installations. Perceptions of the military are very positive. There is a definite overlap between administrators’ personal values and the Army values adopted by JROTC, with both focused on integrity and respect as common values. Through the interview process, it is determined that the gap leading to lack of JROTC programs in these schools is more of an operational gap rather than an ideological gap. In general, administrators are not opposed to the program and what it stands for. Conversely, they are supportive and interested in providing this opportunity.
for their students. However, they lack information on how a school goes about implementing the program, and do not know where to turn to find such information. There are, however, concerns about military recruiters.

The five themes that emerge can be summarized with the following theme statements.

Theme 1: The uniform matters.
Theme 2: Administrators have a large military contact reach.
Theme 3: Administrators’ deeper purpose is providing opportunities.
Theme 4: Personal values match Army values.
Theme 5: Administrators support JROTC despite lack of knowledge.

With so much common ground between JROTC’s mission and high school administrators’ personal convictions about providing opportunity for students, expansion of the JROTC program to provide opportunities in a more equal distribution seems to be mostly a matter of education and information sharing rather than overcoming ideological differences.

Implications of Findings

To compare the study results to the literature, the findings are considered in light of the civil–military gap classifications outlined in Table 2.1. Since the majority of the studies analyzed result in classification within the Cultural Gap category, the analysis is centered on those studies. Most of the studies analyzed in chapter 2 are large scale quantitative studies and differed significantly in their scope and design from the qualitative study conducted here. Therefore, it is difficult to definitively state whether results are supported or refuted. Rather, commentary is provided about whether the study
results supported or did not support the original study findings within the limitations of the small-scale study conducted.

The principal factor most often noted as impacting civil–military relations in the United States is the isolation of the military from civilian society. The decrease in the numbers of military installations due to base realignments and closures is used in civil–military relations literature to explain a decrease in contact between military and civilian institutions within our society (Dempsey, 2008). The Triangle Institute of Strategic Studies found that while there is widespread support of the military by American society, there are fewer Americans sharing contact with military service members now than in past decades (Gronke & Feaver, 2001). This indicates that there are contact gap causations impacting civilian-military relations. The current study did not support the conclusion of lack of contact between the military and civilians. Instead, the theme derived from this study of unequal opportunity of JROTC is that administrators have large military contact reach, supporting Hooker’s (2004) research, which suggested that a contact gap just doesn’t make sense. Military presence in civilian society is widespread and America understands the value system of the military through a large amount of contact (Hooker, 2004). The current study supports the conclusion of Bachman et al. (2000) which stated that rather than being divergent (gap), military and civilian cultures were very consistent with the beliefs of mainstream America, and the military did not appear to be diverging from mainstream society.

These contact gap perceptions may impact how JROTC units are placed in specific locations within the United States. The location of JROTC units in the Southern U.S. and around military bases is illustrated through the unequal distribution of units.
However, the unequal distribution analyzed in the limited geographic area in this study is not due to a contact gap. Administrators describe a large amount of contact through family members, recruiters, and students returning to the school after graduation and military enlistment.

One civil–military relations theory includes the ideology that the military should remain separate from society (Huntington, 1957). Limited contact with the military is also proposed as the reason for differences in societal values and attitudes. There appears to be a failure in clearly identifying what researchers mean when they examine the civil–military gap. Using the matrix of gap definitions and equality lenses at Table 2.1 leads to an evaluation of how the current research supports or does not support the idea that there is a gap in the values and attitudes of civilian and military cultures. Holsti (2001) concluded that the gap between civilian and military cultures is wider for ideas and values than for specific policy issues. Davis (2001) also concluded that there were large differences in attitudes and opinions between military and civilians. However, the current study finds significant overlaps in the values and attitudes that administrators share with the military, leading to JROTC program support in the school. A new emphasis on military values could help even the unequal opportunity of JROTC in the schools. Using current Army values in a way that emphasizes the values expressed by administrators in this study would provide commonality. Leading with integrity, for example, emphasizes the values mentioned by administrators while also allowing the U.S. Army to be true to itself in keeping with more military specific values, such as duty and personal courage. Values expressed as being in common with administrators and explored as the essence of administrator feelings are valuable toward initiating the
conversation with administrators about providing the opportunity of JROTC in high schools.

One major theme emerging from the study is that administrators are focused on providing every possible opportunity for their students. Administrator’s express this responsibility as their most important duty. The essence of administrators’ feelings is that, as long as JROTC is seen as a student opportunity, objections such as cost, use of dummy weapons, and adversative methods of instruction are not mentioned as factors that would prevent equal opportunity of JROTC in their schools. Because of the decline of school wide resources due to costs and a national concern of guns in school, the essence of expressing JROTC as an opportunity comes first with administrators. The study reveals a much narrower civil–military gap than expected in terms of JROTC unequal opportunity. The study by Woodruff et al. (2006) examined the motivations for soldiers to enlist and found that there was a future-oriented enlistment motivation. The majority (70%) of first time enlistees had not intended to enlist upon high school completion, but later determined this to be an appropriate occupational pathway. By bringing JROTC into a school, it exposes students to the military opportunity earlier in life and may lead to a short cut in the process of enlistment, thereby helping young adults to embark on appropriate career paths more quickly.

Civil–military relations are affected by military style, the uniform, symbols, and how society identifies what the military should look like (Schiff, 2009). Photo elicitation in this study reveals that uniforms are the primary way administrators identify with U.S. Army JROTC. Uniforms not only allow JROTC to appear military, administrators agree that the uniform impacts what they think about their positive military life experiences.
These life experiences influence how they feel about JROTC, and their selection of a representative JROTC photograph.

This study also reveals that administrators would offer JROTC as an elective, rather than compulsory, program. Administrators express their strong feelings in terms of life experiences that JROTC should remain, like the military, an organization of volunteer participation. The civil–military debate concerning reinstatement of the draft in the United States and administrators’ feelings may have a significant impact upon military recruitment methods.

Although administrators would overwhelmingly support JROTC in their schools, they express stereotypical views about the students who would be better suited for this opportunity. This lends credit to whether school administrators truly feel the military should better reflect society as a whole with enough diversity. Huntington’s theory of separation of the military from society (1957) fits administrators’ ideas that JROTC is appropriate for certain types of students. Administrators want the JROTC opportunity available for all, think that the opportunity is suited to a particular type of student, and want the program to be voluntary, not compulsory.

Military recruiting is not directly related to the research questions in this study but is mentioned repeatedly in the interviews. The recruitment method describes how the country may pursue people to serve their country by either coercive or persuasive methods (Schiff, 2009). Administrators are not always willing to allow open or unannounced visits to their schools. Some administrators feel that recruiters make promises that they often can’t deliver to their students. They see recruiters as being biased and not keeping the best interests of students in mind as they visit schools. Some
administrators see recruiters as a threat to their students and describe life experiences of recruiters sexually exploiting students. These concerns all relate back to the value of integrity and imply that military recruiters do not always act according to that important value. When discussing armed forces opportunities with students, U.S. Army recruiters must find a way to balance the discussions about the dangers and the opportunities available, and as the public face of the military interacting with young people, must conduct themselves with the utmost professionalism and integrity. The military must live the Army values both within military actions of war and in peaceful operations of enlistment recruiting. Leading with integrity means that recruiters and Cadet Command must practice what the Army proclaims as one of the important seven Army values, integrity.

**Limitations**

This phenomenological study involves one limited geographic area, during a specific time period, and includes six volunteer participants. The participants are chosen as paradigmatic cases of current public school administrators. Because the research relies upon volunteers for the study, the participants may have been predisposed to being supportive of both the military and JROTC, which could bias the results. Administrators may have volunteered because they felt they have something to add to the study and felt comfortable because they had extensive military contact.

Use of a paid interviewer prevents the researcher from having face-to-face contact with participants, thereby limiting the researcher’s ability to obtain nonverbal feedback. Facial expressions and body language could have confirmed complete understanding of military type questions during the most emotional parts of the interview. However, the
researcher had to rely on the interview transcripts, the civilian interviewer’s written reflections and recorded interviews. Important nuances of the participants’ responses may have been missed due to the interview protocol employed.

**Recommendations to School Administrators**

Based on the results of this study, several actions are recommended for school administrators to increase accessibility to JROTC for a wider variety of students. These recommendations center on actions that can be undertaken at the school level in a short to medium timeframe that will result in increased opportunities for students, and more awareness of the military in general within a high school setting.

It is recommended that school administrators engage in a self-education campaign to familiarize themselves with the military and the future opportunities offered for students, both through the enlisted (noncollege) track and the officer preparation (college option) track. Offering as many opportunities as possible for students may require school administrators to learn more about the military and U.S. Army JROTC. The military follows a process and a method to attract people to join the military. This process is not widely understood by high school administrators. Although the administrators interviewed in this study have a large military contact reach, overall, they lack knowledge about U.S. Army JROTC, the mission, and the difference between high school JROTC and college ROTC. This lack of knowledge prevents them from starting a JROTC program within their school and impacts their total support. Some administrators want to see the historical data concerning behavioral and curricular outcomes of the program. Administrators feel that as long as it provides an increased opportunity and provides options for kids, they would support it.
It is recommended that school administrators search for increased opportunities for students. Administrators must make deliberate efforts to actively initiate inquiries about JROTC programs for their schools. Contact can be established through the Army JROTC website (http://www.usarmyjrotc.com/jrotc-program/establish-jrotc-program). Schools in New York State are within the area of responsibility of 2nd Brigade, with contact information below. Schools in locations other than those specified for 2nd Brigade can obtain contact information through the JROTC website, www.usarmyjrotc.com. To begin investigation of the JROTC program, it is advised to review the Information Paper – Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) through the link on the website. Administrators may also wish to complete the Evaluation Worksheet Potential Army Junior ROTC Program (Appendix E) in order to more clearly understand the school responsibilities in offering the JROTC opportunity.

It is suggested that school administrators and counselors become educated as to the various opportunities available through military service in order to avoid stereotyping. Opportunities exist for both direct enlistment (a noncollege option for students who may wish to pursue a career directly out of high school) and military officer options through ROTC scholarships to college, or service academy appointments. This study notes that some administrators see JROTC as an opportunity for a certain type of student because they lack knowledge about how enlisted and officer opportunities differ from and among each other. Disruptive students and those whose behavior suggests that “school is just not their thing” would be offered the JROTC opportunity. This perpetuates administrators’ feelings that the military is for those who won’t or can’t go to college. Administrator understanding of JROTC means a wider understanding of the military and
how officers are commissioned through the high school JROTC and college ROTC process.

There is a commonality of language, values, and attitudes that emerged from the life experiences of administrators. This commonality transcends and can connect to other welcomed similarities of a high school education. Administrator lack of knowledge of JROTC may also mean that the career exploration portion of the ASVAB, for example, is another missed opportunity in the high school. Self-awareness of all the opportunities that JROTC can provide may address administrators’ concerns of failing to provide all options, opportunities, and future goals to students. There is a common shared mission of JROTC that interconnects with the most important responsibility that administrators feel they should provide to students. Providing JROTC as an equal opportunity to all students is a common desire expressed through this research.

**Recommendations to U.S. Army JROTC Cadet Command**

Based on the results of this study, several actions are recommended for U.S. Army JROTC Cadet Command. These recommendations center on actions that increase knowledge and awareness about the JROTC opportunity among high school administrators, and communicate the acceptability of military style in American society.

Results of this study reveal a lack of specific knowledge about the JROTC program among high school administrators. Advertising of military service opportunities is routinely used in various media. This advertising tends to focus on opportunities after a student graduates from high school. Therefore, Cadet Command should focus upon integrating their mission with the total Army. While administrators understand the overall positive impact the JROTC program has, they lack basic knowledge about where
to find information or how to begin a program within their district. This study reveals that, subject to obtaining this knowledge, most administrators would support having JROTC in the schools.

It is recommended that U.S. Army Cadet Command expand its efforts to educate secondary school administrators about the JROTC program in general, and the process for applying to open a unit, while emphasizing that JROTC is not a direct recruitment tool. Television advertising is one method that could be used for increasing this administrator knowledge, similar to advertising for the Army or National Guard. One forum that could particularly produce good transfer of knowledge to administrators would be for Cadet Command to setup a JROTC booth at state conferences such as the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) or the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). In past years, an emphasis has been to use this venue for advertising the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Test (ASVAB). The military tends to advertise this testing in high schools in a way that distances itself from JROTC, college ROTC, and recruiting for the military. The ASVAB frequently uses school administrators’ conferences as a forum to advertise the test for use by counselors and principals. The ASVAB is presented as a career exploration tool that high school counselors should use to help students make decisions about future opportunities. Cadet Command should target these conferences for the purpose of increasing knowledge about JROTC as a life skills and citizenship program that could be implemented simultaneously with the ASVAB mission. Because ASVAB is used in several high schools that do not have JROTC programs, a joint effort could inform administrators while also expanding potential JROTC programs into high schools that have unequal
opportunities. Administrators may be able to better understand JROTC if Cadet Command regularly advertises the program as part of a continuum of opportunities for students. Including JROTC as part of a curricular relationship with career exploration for students through the use of the ASVAB can help administrators overcome their lack of knowledge about the JROTC program as expressed in the findings of this research.

The marketing of the JROTC program to school administrators can be tailored to address administrators’ obligations of offering students all opportunities to explore their future while minimizing fears of recruitment. The research indicates an intersection of administrators’ values and the Army 7 Values, specifically in the values of integrity and respect. The marketing of the JROTC program should center on these commonalities as a way to address administrator priorities while emphasizing the key highlights of the JROTC program. Focusing on the common language describing educators’ values and the U.S. Army values can underpin the strengths of the JROTC program within the current secondary school culture.

Because uniforms are how administrators identify JROTC in the school, the U.S. Army should continue to allocate large amounts of resources to JROTC units for uniforms and equipment. According to the feelings expressed by administrators, military uniforms and military style are the primary positive way that administrators view JROTC and link it with the military. Cadet Command could meet resource demands when administrators express a need for school wide use of uniforms in their school. Uniforms also open the conversation for administrators to talk about JROTC with other administrators. Cadet Command can use uniforms as another method of expanding the advertising of the JROTC programs and get the conversation started.
Above all, during interactions with school personnel, military representatives should behave with great integrity and professionalism.

Recommendations for Future Research

In considering the scope and limitations of this study, several recommendations for future research are suggested to broaden its scope and applicability. In addition, topics outside the scope of the study, but which centered on a common theme, arose unprompted from multiple participants, suggesting that these experiences may benefit from further exploration.

In this study, administrators express life experiences defining a much narrower civil–military contact gap than was expected. The six participants in the study describe a large military contact reach. Despite statistics showing that less than 1% of the American population currently serves in the active military, all of the study participants describe multiple personal connections with military personnel. To explore whether this amount of personal contact is truly representative of secondary school administrators, additional quantitative research could shed light on the amount and degree of military contact that exists among this population on a broader scale. Differentiation among the degree of contact, for instance direct experience, first degree relative (parent, spouse, child), or more distant contact (more distant relative, personal friends, students, etc.) may provide an interesting lens to explore the relationship between military contact and attitudes about the military in general or JROTC in particular. Quantitative research using a large number of subjects would not only provide the basis for firm conclusions about the impact of various degrees of contact on attitudes about the military, but could also
provide current data to define the extent of the civil–military contact gap at this point in time.

In this study, more than one administrator expresses concerns about military recruiters, fearing that military recruiters make unrealistic promises to students and that they are biased in their recruiting style. Recruiters are perceived to target urban or rural lower socioeconomic status students for direct enlistment. Administrators are fairly knowledgeable about the recruiting process, but would prefer recruiters to be more honest about the risks and opportunities in the military. Administrators also express fears that some recruiters act out predatory behavior, especially toward female students, based on their own past experiences as teenagers. The findings of this study related to recruiters suggest that there is an opportunity for further study related to the roles of recruiters and the perceptions about recruiters in secondary schools in the United States. Both qualitative and quantitative studies may be useful to explore the perceptions and roles of military recruiters in secondary schools in the United States.

Conclusion

The study explores how values and attitudes of high school administrators may affect unequal access to Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) in public schools. Through analysis of available literature, the unequal offering of JROTC is established. U.S. Army data verifies that Army JROTC units are located primarily in the southeastern portion of the United States, with a concentration of JROTC units located near active military installations. South Carolina is the state with the highest number of JROTC units (86) and the highest percentage of public secondary school students enrolled in the program (3.4%). Fifteen states have five or fewer JROTC units, and none
of those states are in the south. Based on percentage of students enrolled in JROTC programs, fifteen states have less than 0.5% of public secondary students enrolled in JROTC, and once again, none of those are southern states (U.S. Army, 2010).

The theoretical research into the civil–military gap results in expectations that this inequality is likely based on a military contact gap, with the belief that high school administrators probably have had little to no military contact in their lives, and therefore are not supportive of military-style programs in their schools. Based on geographical analysis and the data that shows active military installations are more concentrated in southern states after the Base Realignment and Closure Act (Feaver & Kohn, 2001), the general public is likely to have little military contact in areas of the country without active military installations. Current statistics show that less than 1% of the population now serve in the active military (Desaulniers, 2009). Therefore, military contact is at an all-time low, and by extension, it is believed that support of JROTC programs in the schools is similarly lacking.

The study design involves photo-elicitation interviews with high school administrators in upstate New York in order to ascertain whether the expected military contact gap exists, and if so, how that affects administrators’ attitudes toward the JROTC program in high schools. The upstate New York region involved in the study is not home to any large active military installations, and has a very limited number of JROTC programs. The study participants are solicited from alumni and current students of St. John Fisher College’s Executive Leadership Educational Doctorate program, and are employed by schools that currently do not have a JROTC program. Six interviews were conducted by an independent interviewer. Two photographs of students engaged in
typical JROTC-type activities are used to prompt participants to talk about their feelings and their background experiences related to military contact. The interviewer uses a protocol to lead participants through a series of questioning prompts about their military contact experiences, then into a discussion of how closely one or the other of the photos depicts their understanding of JROTC. Participants are then asked how supportive they would be of JROTC in their school. Finally, participants are asked to elaborate on their own personal values. From all of this information, the researcher formulates thoughts on whether the theory of a civil–military gap based on lack of contact exists among educators, and whether a contact gap contributes to the inequality of JROTC offerings in the upstate New York area.

Analysis of the interview transcripts shows that the six participants all have a significant amount of military contact. Simply by virtue of being school administrators, they all have contact with recruiters and former students who have enlisted in the military and then returned to the school in various roles. Apart from the direct educator–military contact, every one of them also has significant military contact through various family members, including parents, siblings, children or other relatives. In one case, the administrator had been enrolled at a military service academy for a time in his early college years, giving him direct experience. Despite sometimes negative military experiences, particularly for those with family members who had served in Vietnam, every administrator expresses positive feelings about the military in general, with the word "pride" used most often to describe feelings related to the military. Participant responses to the photographs, as well as descriptions of family members, friends, and students serving in the military, reveal that the military uniform is a very powerful
identifying symbol of the military that defines military service in the eyes of this group of civilians.

There is a common theme among the participants that they, as school administrators, feel a major obligation to their students to be certain they offer as many opportunities in life as possible. After discussing the JROTC program, the participants feel that the program offers an opportunity to their students that may currently be lacking in their offerings, and most of them express support for the program in the name of student opportunity. Those who do not express outright support were not opposed; they just indicate more information is needed before making such a decision, or that the program would best serve students outside of the regular school day in their district.

Participants do have some stereotypical attitudes about which types of students would be best served by such a program and the military opportunity in general, pointing to their troubled or less academically inclined students as a target population, while missing the opportunities available for stronger students through the military.

The gap that is evident as a result of this study is an operational gap – that is, a gap in knowledge about the logistics of how to start a program in a district, or even where to find the information. There is no gap in understanding the positive benefits of the program, and there is absolutely no opposition expressed from any of the participants. It is clear that none of the participants has ever considered and rejected the program. Rather, none of the participants has ever studied or considered it as an option, and some were perplexed after the interview as to why they had never investigated it. The lack of knowledge and awareness seems to be the biggest barrier to implementation of JROTC in high schools in upstate New York.
The information gathered through the study confirms the findings of some researchers (Hooker, 2004) that the suggestion of a large military contact gap is erroneous, and that the widespread integration of the members of the United States military into civilian society has minimized the civil–military gap. According to Janowitz’s theory (Janowitz, 1960), minimal civil–military gap is the preferred situation which allows a proper balance between military power and civilian control.

Further expansion of JROTC into public schools in the United States is one way to assure the continuation of minimal civil–military gap, and is in line with legislated goals of JROTC expansion to no less than 3,700 JROTC units (all branches) by 2020 (Perusse, 1997). Based on the findings of this study indicating a knowledge and operational gap, it is recommended that U.S. Army JROTC Cadet Command develop a policy and procedure for dissemination of information about the JROTC program to secondary school administrators, perhaps through the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) or the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). The findings of the study indicate that the personal values of school administrators intersect the 7 Army values, specifically on the values of integrity, respect, and honor; therefore it makes sense to develop a marketing plan aimed specifically at those core values to demonstrate how JROTC can enhance those characteristics within a student population.

At the school administrator level, it is recommended that administrators survey the array of offerings currently presented to students and analyze their current situation to identify any gaps in opportunities being presented. With the current education community focus on college and career readiness, attention seems to be focused solely on
college preparation, and a number of students are left with no forward path following high school. School administrators may find that the military opportunity offers underutilized pathways for both the college-bound student through the ROTC or service academy programs, and the less academically inclined student through direct enlistment opportunities, which include career/vocational training. JROTC can be a vehicle to assist in bringing this information into a school district in a positive and supportive way. In this way, the problem of unequal access to JROTC programs can be alleviated while addressing the main objectives of high school administrators by helping to provide students with every possible opportunity for their future career development.
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Appendix A

NCES's urban-centric locale categories, released in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population of 250,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large</strong></td>
<td>Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population less than 250,000 and greater than or equal to 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small</strong></td>
<td>Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population less than 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburb</strong></td>
<td>Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population of 250,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large</strong></td>
<td>Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population less than 250,000 and greater than or equal to 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small</strong></td>
<td>Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population less than 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town</strong></td>
<td>Territory inside an urban cluster that is less than or equal to 10 miles from an urbanized area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe</strong></td>
<td>Territory inside an urban cluster that is more than 10 miles and less than or equal to 35 miles from an urbanized area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distant</strong></td>
<td>Territory inside an urban cluster that is more than 35 miles from an urbanized area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remote</strong></td>
<td>Census-defined rural territory that is less than or equal to 5 miles from an urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is less than or equal to 2.5 miles from an urban cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>Census-defined rural territory that is more than 5 miles but less than or equal to 25 miles from an urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is more than 2.5 miles but less than or equal to 10 miles from an urban cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe</strong></td>
<td>Census-defined rural territory that is more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and is also more than 10 miles from an urban cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Shared Experience Photographs

Photo #1

http://blog.oregonlive.com/clackamascounty/2008/02/JROTC%20ball.JPG
Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Interviewer:

☑ Introduce myself.
☑ Thank them for taking time to meet with me today.
☑ Confirm that Informed Consent has been signed.
☑ Explain how interview will be conducted – recorded interview which will be transcribed later. If at any time you feel distressed, you may ask for the recording to be paused.
☑ Ask if any questions before beginning.

There are two parts of this interview. The first part is the exploration of your experiences and feelings about the dissertation topic. The second part is simply for obtaining background information. Are you ready to begin?

Start tape. Begin read-in.

The time is _______. This recorded interview is being conducted on _____ (date) at _______________ (location). This interview is being conducted to collect data for a doctoral dissertation by researcher Ulises Miranda III in St. John Fisher College’s Executive Leadership Ed. D. program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Look at the two pictures and describe the feelings you have when you look at them. Focus on describing your feelings, not what you see in the pictures. If one of the pictures brings out any strong feelings that the other one does not, please describe that feeling and why that photo makes you feel that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do you feel that your past life experiences affected your response to the photographs? If so, in what way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Please describe in as much detail as possible your life experiences with or any exposure to the military.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prompts, if needed: Have you or any family members ever served in the military? What branches and when? Has anyone you have known had a good or bad experience with someone in the military? Have you ever had a student enlist in the military or be nominated to attend a service academy?
4 Explain how these experiences with the military have affected your life.

5 Follow up: Which of the two photos is closest to what you picture when you think about JROTC and why?

6 Based on your current knowledge of JROTC, how likely would you be to consider offering JROTC as a program in your school? Why would you (or would you not) support this in your school? If you would support it, do you think you would make it mandatory, or an elective course?

7 Do you feel that your life experiences affect your thoughts about whether you would or would not support JROTC in your school?

8 Can you tell me about the values that are important in your life? What are the top 5 values that you live, feel and believe are important to you?

Clarifying questions that can be used as necessary:

- Can you tell me a little more about ..................?
- You said that ........can you explain that a bit more?
- Can you give me an example of ........?
- How did that make you feel?
Appendix D

Results of Photo Prompt Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Attributes</th>
<th>Non-military Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honor</td>
<td>Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td>Confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Unprofessional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Depressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Too Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>Unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood</td>
<td>Non-individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Propagandized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Intimidating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Models</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Coercive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength-building</td>
<td>Monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Disengaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Lack of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Anonymity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concurrent Themes**

Contact with the military, Regional or geographic ideal, Personal military experience (service), Opposition to war (generally), Opposition to war (religiously), Familiar with JROTC, Opposition to Military in Education, Opposition to current politics/ conflict, Cultural differences, Ethnic differences, Gender differences
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Evaluation Worksheet Potential Army Junior ROTC Program

## EVALUATION WORKSHEET

**POTENTIAL ARMY JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM**

For use of this form, see DA Form 1452-2, the program agency is OCSPUR

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 4 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. Please DO NOT RETURN this form to the below address. Send your form to the appropriate OMB Region.

Where insufficient space is provided on this form to record complete observations, comments or recommendations, additional blank sheets will be used, identifying them by corresponding number.

## 1. SCHOOL INFORMATION

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>b. ADDRESS OF SCHOOL (P.O. Box must also provide a street address for shipping purposes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. DATE OF LAST ACCREDITATION EVALUATION

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ACCREDITATION EVALUATION BY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. SUPERINTENDENT INFORMATION

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Name</td>
<td>(2) Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. PRINCIPAL INFORMATION

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Name</td>
<td>(2) Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5. GRADE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated JROTC Enrollments:

## 6. PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES ENTERING COLLEGE (approximately)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. HAS THE SCHOOL EVER APPLIED FOR A JROTC PROGRAM SUPPORTED BY ANOTHER SERVICE?</td>
<td>YES [ ] NO [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SO, WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THAT APPLICATION?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7. HAS A JROTC PROGRAM EVER BEEN DISBUDGED AT THIS SCHOOL? [ ] YES [ ] NO

## 8. COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. TYPE OF COMMUNITY</td>
<td>b. SIZE OF COMMUNITY</td>
<td>c. ARE STUDENTS BUSIED? [ ] YES [ ] NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ARE THERE ANY PROBLEMS RELATIVE TO AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING FOR INSTRUCTORS?</td>
<td>e. WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE PERMITTED TO CONDUCT RECRUITING VISITS TO FEEDER SCHOOLS? [ ] YES [ ] NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NUMBER OF JROTC UNITS IN THE CITY/DISTRICT</td>
<td>g. SPECIFY SERVICES OF JROTC UNITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Use of Classrooms</th>
<th>Shared Classrooms</th>
<th>Administrative Office Space</th>
<th>Dedicated Use of Garbrooms</th>
<th>Shared Garbrooms</th>
<th>Administrative Office Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Proximity to the remainder of the area and to other JROTC areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Noise control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Student Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Maintenance of facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Type of Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Storage area for training aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Type and condition of furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Telephone available to JROTC areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Heating, cooling, ventilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPLY STORAGE AREA

1. Size
2. Proximity to other JROTC areas
3. Construction
4. Environmental considerations: heat, humidity, sewage, etc.
5. Security considerations

### ARMS STORAGE

1. Describe existing facility area

### MAINERSHIP FACILITIES

1. Describe existing facility

### DRILL AREA

1. Outside
2. Inside
3. Size
4. Proximity to other JROTC areas
5. Proximity to the JROTC areas
6. Surface conditions
7. Limitations on use (e.g., gym shoes, rifles prohibited, time available)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION WORKSHEET POTENTIAL ARMY JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES (Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ARE THE FACILITIES COMPLETELY IDENTIFIED BY THE SCHOOL ON THE DA FORM 3728?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MAY INSTRUCTORS RENOVATE FACILITIES IF REQUIRED?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROJECTED SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. IS A RIFLE RANGE A PART OF THE SCHOOL FACILITY?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. WILL THE SCHOOL PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION TO/FROM THE RANGE DURING REGULAR SCHOOL HOURS, AT ITS OWN EXPENSE (Include on DA Form 3728)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. WILL SCHOOL PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION, AT ITS OWN EXPENSE, FOR JROTC ACTIVITIES (such as parades, color guard, rifle matches, drill teams)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ADMINISTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. DO SCHOOL OFFICIALS UNDERSTAND THE PROCEDURES FOR PAYMENT/REIMBURSEMENT OF JROTC INSTRUCTORS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. WHAT LENGTH CONTRACT WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE OFFERED?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. WILL THE SCHOOL PAY JROTC INSTRUCTORS THE MINIMUM OR DOES THE SCHOOL SYSTEM HAVE PAY SCALES ABOVE THOSE FIGURES?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. WILL THE SCHOOL PAY JROTC INSTRUCTORS FOR COACHING DUTIES (official teams)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ADMINISTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. WILL THE JROTC DEPARTMENT BE ALLOCATED A PORTION OF THE SCHOOL'S BUDGET?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WILL CREDIT BE AVAILABLE FOR JROTC PARTICIPATION?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. WILL THIS CREDIT COUNT TOWARD GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE REQUIRED TO MEET CERTAIN STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE REQUIRED TO JOIN A TEACHERS' UNION?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 3. Recommendations

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☐ Recommend immediate establishment of an Army JROTC unit at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☐ The school does not presently have all required facilities available, but school authorities have agreed to provide such facilities before or during the first year of JROTC training, within the timetable specified below. Recommend immediate establishment of an Army JROTC unit at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☐ Recommend against establishment of an Army JROTC unit at this school for the reasons specified below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☐ Is school enrollment approaching capacity? (Explain expansion plan in remarks.) YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☐ List vocational electives and evaluate the potential of a JROTC program to compete for a cross section of the school enrollment. (Explain in remarks.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7. Evaluating Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Name and Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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