



DRDC Toronto No. CR-2009-159

**Technical Memorandum:
A Training Evaluation Framework for PSTC MilObs Course**

by:

Michael H. Thomson
Andrea L. Brown
Courtney D. Tario
Barb D. Adams

Humansystems® Incorporated
111 Farquhar St.,
Guelph, ON N1H 3N4

Project Manager:
Michael H. Thomson
(519) 836 5911, ext. 301

PWGSC Contract No. W7711-078110/001/TOR
Call-Up 8110-14

On behalf of
DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

as represented by
Defence Research and Development Canada Toronto
1133 Sheppard Avenue West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M3M 3B9

DRDC Scientific Authority
Megan Thompson
(416) 635-2040

September 2009



Principal Author

Original signed by Megan Thompson on behalf of Michael H. Thomson

On behalf of Michael H. Thomson, Megan Thompson (CSA)
Humansystems Inc DRDC Toronto

Approved by

Original signed by Keith Stewart

Keith Stewart

Acting Head, Collaborative Performance and Learning

Approved for release by

K.M. Sutton

K.M. Sutton

Chair, Document Review and Library Committee

Abstract

A current Applied Research Project (ARP) of the Collaborative Performance and Learning Section (CPL) at Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Toronto explores moral and ethical decision-making (MEDM) in Canadian Forces (CF) operations (16kk, 16re02). A major focus in this program of research has been field studies conducted at the Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC) Canadian Forces Base (CFB) in Kingston. CF personnel preparing to deploy as United Nations Military Observers (UNMOs or Mil Obs) undertake a number of training activities meant to enhance and develop their skills particular to Peace Support Operations (PSO). Over the course of a month long training program, CF personnel receive intensive preparation, using a combination of classroom training and scenario-based training. One such scenario-based exercise simulates a human rights violation. In this scenario, unarmed trainees attempt to negotiate the lives of civilians who are being verbally and physically abused by two armed police. Our research program to date has examined a number of psychological processes during this scenario, such as aspects of moral intensity (physical proximity of the victim, MEFS I), emotion (MEFS II) and teamwork (MEFS III). The current work provides PSTC instructor requested materials that are drawn from the results of these studies.

First, we created a set of PowerPoint slides that detail the most critical findings in the three field studies. Second, we generated a list of the open- and closed-ended questions that trainees asked during the scenarios across all three studies (MEFS I, MEFS II, MEFS III). This list is provided as a means to underscore PSTC instruction to trainees, i.e., emphasizing the use of open-ended questions for eliciting situational awareness. Tables have been created that include specific examples of open- and closed- ended questions seeking both general and specific information. A separate table was constructed in which the common themes were extracted from these questions, as well as prototypic examples of questions asked by the trainees. The third, and final section of this report, includes the preparatory activities that lay the ground work for a PSTC training evaluation. Specifically, the evaluation is intended to explore how well the training that UNMOs receive at the PSTC during the Mil Obs course translates into actual operational experience. This report concludes with possible next steps toward the evaluation and a plan for data collection.

Résumé

Un Programme de recherches appliquées (PRA) en cours de la Section de la recherche concertée sur le rendement et l'apprentissage (Section RCRA) à Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDDC) Toronto explore la prise de décisions morales et éthiques (PDME) dans le cadre des opérations des Forces canadiennes (FC) (16kk, 16re02). Les études sur le terrain menées au Centre de formation pour le soutien de la paix (CFSP) à la base des Forces canadiennes (BFC) de Kingston sont l'un des importants champs d'intérêt de ce programme de recherches. Les membres des FC qui se préparent à partir en mission en tant qu'observateurs militaires des Nations Unies (UNMO ou Ob mil) entreprennent un certain nombre d'activités d'entraînement destinées à améliorer et développer les compétences propres aux Opérations de paix des Nations Unies (OPNU). Pendant un mois, les membres des FC suivent un programme de préparation intensif faisant appel à une combinaison de formation en classe et d'instruction en situation. L'un des exercices proposés met en scène une situation de violation des droits de la personne. Dans ce scénario, les stagiaires non armés tentent de négocier les vies de civils qui sont victimes de violences physiques et verbales de la part de deux policiers armés. Notre programme de recherche a examiné jusqu'ici un certain nombre de processus psychologiques au cours de ce scénario, tels que les aspects de l'intensité morale (proximité physique de la victime, MEFS I), émotion (MEFS II) et travail d'équipe (MEFS III). Les travaux fournis actuellement par les instructeurs du CFSP demandent des documents qui sont tirés des résultats de ces études.

Premièrement, nous avons créé une série de diapositives PowerPoint qui montrent en détail les découvertes les plus importantes des trois études sur le terrain. Deuxièmement, nous avons rédigé la liste des questions ouvertes (à réponse libre) et fermées (à réponse préétablie) que les stagiaires ont posées durant le scénario lors des trois études (MEFS I, MEFS I et MEFS III). Cette liste est fournie afin de mettre en évidence l'instruction du CFSP aux stagiaires, c'est-à-dire mettre en valeur l'utilisation de questions ouvertes pour provoquer une connaissance de la situation. Des tableaux contenant des exemples précis de questions ouvertes et fermées destinées à obtenir des renseignements généraux et particuliers ont été élaborés. On a également préparé un tableau distinct dans lequel les thèmes communs ont été extraits de ces questions; ce tableau contient aussi des exemples prototypiques des questions posées par les stagiaires. La troisième et dernière section du présent rapport comprend les activités préparatoires qui jettent les bases d'une évaluation de l'instruction du CFSP. Plus précisément, cette évaluation a pour but de découvrir dans quelle mesure l'instruction reçue par les UNMO au CFSP dans le cadre du cours d'observateur militaire se traduit en une réelle expérience opérationnelle. Le présent rapport se termine en présentant les prochaines étapes menant à cette évaluation ainsi qu'un plan pour la collecte de données.

Executive Summary

A current Applied Research Project (ARP) of the Collaborative Performance and Learning Section (CPL) at Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Toronto explores moral and ethical decision-making (MEDM) in Canadian Forces (CF) operations (16kk, 16re02). A major focus in this program of research has been field studies conducted at the Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC) Canadian Forces Base (CFB) in Kingston. CF personnel preparing to deploy as United Nations Military Observers (UNMOs or Mil Obs) undertake a number of training activities meant to enhance and develop their skills particular to Peace Support Operations (PSO). Over the course of a month long training program, CF personnel receive intensive preparation in basic survival (e.g., mine awareness, first aid) as well as in more complex skills (e.g., negotiation and risk assessment), using a combination of classroom training and scenario-based training. One such scenario-based exercise simulates a human rights violation. In this scenario, unarmed trainees encounter armed police (a sergeant and constable) verbally and physically abusing two civilians and forcing them to dig what could be their own graves. Trainees are challenged to use the negotiation skills they have learned in classroom lectures and exercises to fulfil their mission mandate, and to advocate for the fair treatment of the civilians in an effort to promote a successful resolution for all parties.

Our research program to date has examined a number of psychological processes during the human rights violation scenario. In the first field study (MEFS I), research examined the impact of a dimension of moral intensity on MEDM and negotiation behaviour by varying the physical proximity of one of the victims (female) in the scenario to the trainees. The second field study (MEFS II) conducted during the human rights violation scenario examined the impact of emotion on the negotiation behaviour of the trainees. The third field study (MEFS III) investigated the impact of teamwork on negotiation behaviour and the perceived level of participation of all team members in the scenario. The current work provides PSTC instructor requested materials that are drawn from the results of these studies.

First, we created a set of PowerPoint slides that detail the most critical findings in the three field studies. Second, we generated a list of the open- and closed-ended questions that trainees asked during the scenarios across all three studies (MEFS I, MEFS II, MEFS III). This list is provided as a means to underscore PSTC instruction to trainees, i.e., emphasizing the use of open-ended questions for eliciting situational awareness. Tables have been created that include specific examples of open- and closed- ended questions seeking both general and specific information. A separate table was constructed in which the common themes were extracted from these questions, as well as prototypic examples of questions asked by the trainees. PSTC leaders and instructors have expressed considerable interest in evaluating their training course to determine how relevant the training is to current UNMO operations. The third, and final section of this report, includes the preparatory activities that lay the ground work for the PSTC training evaluation. Specifically, the evaluation is intended to explore how well the training that UNMOs receive at the PSTC during the Mil Obs course translates into actual operational experience. To start the process of designing this evaluation, the research team convened a two-hour discussion session with 3 PSTC course instructors at CFB Kingston to determine the most critical objectives of the Mil Obs course. An evaluation framework was developed as a result of the discussion. Next steps for the PSTC training evaluation are proposed.

Sommaire

Un Programme de recherches appliquées (PRA) en cours de la Section de la recherche concertée sur le rendement et l'apprentissage (Section RCRA) à Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDDC) Toronto explore la prise de décisions morales et éthiques (PDME) dans le cadre des opérations des Forces canadiennes (FC) (16kk, 16re02). Les études sur le terrain menées au Centre de formation pour le soutien de la paix (CFSP) à la base des Forces canadiennes (BFC) de Kingston sont l'un des importants champs d'intérêt de ce programme de recherches. Les membres des FC qui se préparent à partir en mission en tant qu'observateurs militaires des Nations Unies (UNMO ou Ob mil) entreprennent un certain nombre d'activités d'entraînement destinées à améliorer et développer les compétences propres aux Opérations de paix des Nations Unies (OPNU). Pendant un mois, les membres des FC suivent un programme de préparation intensif en survie élémentaire (p. ex., instruction sur les mines, premiers soins) ainsi que de la formation axée sur le perfectionnement de compétences plus complexes (p. ex., négociation et évaluation des risques). Ce programme fait appel à une combinaison de formation en classe et d'instruction en situation. L'un des exercices proposés met en scène une situation de violation des droits de la personne. Dans ce scénario, les stagiaires non armés rencontrent des policiers armés (un sergent et un constable) qui agressent verbalement et physiquement deux civils tout en les forçant à creuser ce qui pourrait être leur propre tombe. Le défi des stagiaires consiste à utiliser les techniques de négociation qu'ils ont apprises en classe et lors d'exercices afin de remplir le mandat de leur mission et de préconiser le traitement équitable des civils, le tout dans un effort visant à encourager un règlement de la situation qui convienne à toutes les parties.

Jusqu'ici notre programme de recherche a examiné un certain nombre de processus psychologiques présents lors du scénario portant sur la violation des droits de la personne. Dans la première étude sur le terrain, (MEFS I), les chercheurs ont examiné les répercussions d'une dimension de l'intensité morale sur la prise de décisions morales et éthiques (PDME) et sur le comportement des stagiaires en matière de négociation en faisant varier la distance physique entre l'une des victimes (la femme) et les stagiaires. La deuxième étude sur le terrain (MEFS II), menée dans le cadre du scénario portant sur la violation des droits de la personne, s'est penchée sur les répercussions des émotions sur le comportement des stagiaires en matière de négociation. La troisième étude sur le terrain (MEFS III) s'intéressait aux répercussions du travail d'équipe sur le comportement des stagiaires lors de la négociation ainsi que sur le niveau de participation perçu de tous les membres de l'équipe dans le scénario. Le présent travail fournit la documentation demandée par les instructeurs du CFSP, documentation qui est tirée des résultats de ces études.

Premièrement, nous avons créé une série de diapositives PowerPoint qui montrent en détail les découvertes les plus importantes des trois études sur le terrain. Deuxièmement, nous avons rédigé la liste des questions ouvertes (à réponse libre) et fermées (à réponse préétablie) que les stagiaires ont posées durant le scénario lors des trois études (MEFS I, MEFS I et MEFS III). Cette liste est fournie afin de mettre en évidence l'instruction du CFSP aux stagiaires, c'est-à-dire mettre en valeur l'utilisation de questions ouvertes pour provoquer une connaissance de la situation. Des tableaux contenant des exemples précis de questions ouvertes et fermées destinées à obtenir des renseignements généraux et particuliers ont été élaborés. On a également préparé un tableau distinct dans lequel les thèmes communs ont été extraits de ces questions; ce tableau contient aussi des exemples prototypiques des questions posées par les stagiaires. Les dirigeants et les instructeurs du CFSP ont manifesté beaucoup d'intérêt envers l'évaluation de la formation qu'ils

donnent. Cette évaluation permettra de déterminer le niveau de pertinence de cette instruction par rapport aux opérations menées actuellement par les UNMO. La troisième et dernière section du présent rapport comprend les activités préparatoires qui jettent les bases d'une évaluation de l'instruction du CFSP. Plus précisément, cette évaluation a pour but de découvrir dans quelle mesure l'instruction reçue par les UNMO au CFSP dans le cadre du cours d'observateur militaire se traduit en une réelle expérience opérationnelle. Pour démarrer le processus de conception de l'évaluation, les membres de l'équipe de recherche ont tenu une séance de discussion de deux heures avec trois instructeurs du CFSP à la BFC Kingston afin de déterminer les objectifs les plus importants du cours d'observateur militaire. À l'issue de ces discussions, un cadre d'évaluation a été mis au point. Des suggestions sont faites concernant les prochaines étapes du processus d'évaluation de l'instruction donnée au CFSP.

1. Introduction

An ongoing research initiative of the Collaborative Performance and Learning Section (CPL) at Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Toronto has explored moral and ethical decision-making (MEDM) in Canadian Forces (CF) operations. A major focus in this program of research has been field studies conducted at the Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC) Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Kingston. CF personnel preparing to deploy as United Nations Military Observers (UNMO or Mil Obs) undertake a number of training activities meant to enhance and develop their skills particular to Peace Support Operations (PSO). Over the course of a month long training program, CF personnel receive critical training in basic survival (e.g., mine awareness, first aid) as well as in more complex skills (e.g., negotiation and risk assessment), using a combination of classroom training and scenario-based training. One such scenario-based exercise simulates a human rights violation. In this scenario, unarmed trainees encounter armed police (a sergeant and constable) verbally and physically abusing two civilians and forcing them to dig what could be their own graves. The civilians plead for their lives, continuously declaring their innocence and imminent death should the trainees leave. The trainees are kept at a distance (approximately 60 feet) from the two civilians by the lead police officer, the sergeant (Sgt). Trainee teams, led by a designated team leader and consisting of 2 to 4 members, must negotiate with him (the Sgt) only. Team members observe the proceedings between the Sgt and the team leader, offering their assistance and input from time to time. Trainees are challenged to use the negotiation skills they have learned in classroom lectures and exercises to fulfil their mission mandate, and to advocate for the fair treatment of the civilians in an effort to promote a successful resolution for all parties.

Our research program to date has examined a number of psychological processes during the human rights violation scenario. In the first field study (MEFS I), research examined the impact of moral intensity (i.e., the salience and vividness of the characteristics, such as proximity, of a moral issue; Jones, 1991) on MEDM and negotiation behaviour by varying the physical proximity of one of the victims (female) in the scenario to the trainees. The second field study (MEFS II) conducted during the human rights violation scenario examined the impact of emotion on the negotiation behaviour of the trainees. Specifically, trainees either confronted a neutral negotiation partner or an angry negotiation partner to determine if trainees confronted with an angry Sgt would either “take on” the Sgt’s emotion (known as social contagion; van Kleef, De Dreu, and Manstead, 2004) or act more strategically to try to diffuse the situation by lessening one’s demands and increasing offers and concessions (known as the strategic choice hypothesis; van Kleef et al., 2004). The third field study (MEFS III) investigated the impact of teamwork on negotiation behaviour and the perceived level of participation of all team members in the scenario. Specifically, research examined particular team behaviours emerging in instances in which team members briefly met together to discuss their options in the scenario free of interference from the Sgt. The intent of these three studies together was to vary some aspect of all three parties’ behaviour and determine the resulting effects on the negotiation. In MEFS I, the victims behaviour was manipulated. In MEFS II, the police’s behaviour was manipulated. And in MEFS III, the trainees’ behaviour was manipulated. Data analysis investigated the impact of these manipulations on UNMO trainees MEDM and negotiation behaviour.

Following the completion of each field study, the research team shared the results with PSTC leaders and instructors. During the MEFS III briefing, the PSTC Commandant and senior instructor

asked for the main findings of each of the studies to be briefly summarized in a PowerPoint presentation to assist them in integrating this information into the course curriculum. As well, they thought that it would be useful to have a list of the open- and closed-ended questions that trainees asked during the scenarios as a vivid means to underscore PSTC instructions to trainees emphasizing the use of open-ended questions as the most effective means of eliciting situational awareness. Finally, PSTC leaders and instructors have expressed considerable interest in evaluating their training course to determine how relevant the training is to current UNMO operations. Specifically, how relevant is the training to operations and how could it be made more relevant? The following work then includes the main findings from the three field studies and a table of the open and closed-ended questions. It also includes the initial activities for a more holistic evaluation of PSTC training in future work.

2. Method

1. PowerPoint Presentation

The first component of this project included creating a set of PowerPoint slides that detail the most critical findings in the three field studies. For each study, the slides include a brief description of the field study, the experimental manipulation, and the main findings. The PowerPoint presentation concludes with “Lessons Learned” from the three studies. Because the slides are meant to be integrated into the PSTC training curriculum, a research team member ensured that the information included on the slides were succinct and relevant for PSTC training purposes. However, it was important to provide as much context in the slides so that future PSTC leaders and instructors can understand enough of the research purpose and results.

2. Open- and Closed-ended Questions

At the end of each Field Study, the Contractor and the DRDC scientific authority (SA) briefed the Commandant on the findings. Across these briefings, two particular codes that interested PSTC instructors were 1) asking situation *specific* information about what is happening in the scenario and 2) asking *general* information not directly relevant to the specific situation. The former referred to questions in the immediate vicinity (e.g., “What are those two people doing?”), while the latter referred to questions outside the physical area of the scenario (e.g., “How long have you lived in these parts?”). For MEFS I and II, we had only coded questions based on the criteria situation specific and situation general. However, PSTC instructors showed an interest in determining if trainees were asking open- or closed-ended questions, as trainees are instructed to exercise the former over the latter when negotiating. Open-ended questions are encouraged in training because they yield more information than closed-ended questions, which often result in “yes” or “no” answers. While briefing the instructors on MEFS II, they asked if we could code also for open-ended versus closed-ended questions for the upcoming MEFS III trial. Briefing and reporting on MEFS III, therefore, included tables of open- and closed-ended questions. PSTC instructors thought having the list of questions categorized in this way was useful for training purposes. After reviewing the tables, PSTC instructors asked if we could go back to the data from MEFS I and MEFS II and produce similar tables (i.e., situation specific open- and closed-ended questions and general open- and closed-ended questions). For this contract, a research member watched all the videos from the previous studies and documented the open- and closed-ended questions from MEFS I and MEFS II.

The original datasets used for MEFS I and II included an excel spreadsheet listing all of the behavioural codes, including the two codes of interest (i.e., seeking situation specific information and seeking general information). A member of the research team sorted the original file by code and then created a new excel spreadsheet listing only the two behaviours of interest. Also included in the new spreadsheet was the study date (month and year), the session number, the team and team leader identifier, the condition (experimental or baseline), open- versus closed-ended question code, the start and end time the question appeared in the particular scenario, who in the scenario asked the question (e.g., team leader or a team member) and to whom it was directed (e.g., Sgt, victims, UNMO, etc.), and a word-for-word account of the questioning. These verbatim accounts as well as open- versus closed-ended questions were separated by study and incorporated into table format, which included those already broken out for MEFS III. Any duplicated questions, questions

that did not make sense, or questions that were incomplete because the speaker was interrupted were not included in the table.

In total, five tables were created for this requirement. These include:

- Closed-ended questions seeking general information;
- Closed-ended questions seeking situation specific information;
- Open-ended questions seeking general information;
- Open-ended questions seeking situation specific information; and
- Common questioning themes and prototypic examples.

Within these tables, common themes emerged. These were further broken down into sub-themes. A fifth table was created that included examples extracted from the original four tables. The final table includes the most frequently occurring themes and prototypic examples of open- and closed-ended questions from MEFS I, II and III.

3. Preparatory Activities for PSTC Training Evaluation

The third, and final section of this report, includes the preparatory activities that lay the ground work for the PSTC training evaluation. Specifically, this evaluation is intended to explore how relevant the current training activities during the PSTC Mil Obs course map on to the requirements in current UNMO operations. To start the process of designing this evaluation, the research team convened a two-hour discussion session with 3 PSTC course instructors at CFB Kingston. Instructors were identified on the basis of their rank (one major and two captains) and experience instructing the Mil Obs course. Before this meeting, the research team developed a number of pertinent questions in order to facilitate the discussion. Topics included the kind of information PSTC staff hoped to gain from the evaluation and how they intended to use it; determining the long-term outcomes for trainees associated with the Mil Obs course; and identifying the critical training activities meant to further the long-term outcomes of the Mil Obs course. During the discussion, members of the research team asked questions to generate discussion and to clarify points that had been made. The discussion with PSTC course instructors was recorded using a Sony Mini-disc recorder. The information gained from the PSTC Instructors discussion was used to develop a program evaluation framework. This framework can be used to develop measurements for a PSTC training evaluation seeking to understand the relevance of the course material to actual United Nations deployments.

3. Deliverables

3.1 Main Research Findings from Three Field Studies (MEFS I, II, III)

The following section includes a copied set of PowerPoint slides that detail the most critical findings in the three field studies (the contract includes the PowerPoint presentation). Please see Annex A.

3.2 Open- and Closed-ended Questions from Three Field Studies

The following section includes five tables showing specific categories of questions that Military Observers asked of the Sgt during the human rights violation training scenario at PSTC. These include:

- Closed-ended questions seeking general information;
- Closed-ended questions seeking situation specific information;
- Open-ended questions seeking general information;
- Open-ended questions seeking situation specific information; and
- Common questioning themes and prototypic examples.

As some of the questions were asked in a very specific context, their meaning might be unclear. For these, further context is added in brackets as necessary. Table 1 shows the closed-ended questions seeking general information asked by trainees throughout the three field studies.

Table 1: Closed-ended questions seeking general information

MEFS I	MEFS II	MEFS III
Have you seen any [human rights violations in the area]?	And that's [at the police station in town] where your supervisor is?	Do you have a higher boss, someone to talk to or are you under direct orders?
[Is the police station] just down this road?	Do you have children at all? Family in the area?	Is [the area] getting any better or worse with the UN around?
How long have you been working for the police?	So when's somebody in custody, you can't talk to him?	How many guys are there, it must be a pretty big [prisoner] camp?
And the number there [for the police station], the local phone number?	What police department are you from?	There must be a lot of guys out looking for the PLA guys?
Do you have contact with [your commander]?	What language do you speak other than English?	Have you seen any other groups (terrorists) around?
[Pointing to the Sgt's earplug] Do you have some music there?	Is it safe for us to go straight into the village?	How long have you been with the WIA?
And what's the name of the town?	Is there any other police in the area than yourselves?	Do you know a phone number we can reach him [Capt] at?
Are you from the national police?	What kind of vehicles are you going to transport [the prisoners] in?	Did it happen before that you had to deal with terrorists?
How many kms [do] you cover?	Does [the inspector] plan to come around soon?	Who's your contact at the police station?
How big is your police station?	What's the name of the town? [where the police department is located]	How far down the road is your HQ?
So what prison do you work for?	Have you had to investigate any [abuse in the area]?	Are you familiar with the UN?
Is it possible to get your frequencies?	Do you have radio communications with Capt Smith?	Do you live in this area?
And who is your commander?	How long you've been police now?	Do you like listening to music?
What's the road name?	There's been fighting then?	Do you find that the UN is neutral?
How long have you been in town?	Your boss, what is his name?	A lot of PLA guys in this area right?
Where's your higher commander?	How many terrorists were killed then?	Do you have a phone on you?
Who is the mayor of your city?	Where you live, this area?	What is your boss's rank?
And how far is the town?	Do you know about other people in the area being injured by police?	
How do you move around? By vehicle?	Where was the [civilian's] farm?	
You have a hospital over there [at the station]?	And your village is where?	
When we get to the station, they'll be cleaned up and kept in a nice place?	Where are they standing trial?	
Which prison is it?	And where do you work Sgt?	

Table 2 shows the closed-ended questions seeking situation specific information that trainees asked throughout the three field studies.

Table 2: Closed-ended questions seeking situation specific information

MEFS I	MEFS II	MEFS III
These people are involved in this problem? [re: civilians involved in terrorism]	Now this terrorist organization that killed your brother, they are from around this area, I understand?	Is your government aware you are holding these people and are you sanctioned to do that?
How often do you bring people out here and how many?	When you picked them up did you tell their families where you were taking them?	How long have you guys been doing an interrogation like this?
So is this your normal way of interrogating?	You got, you got a radio? Can you contact [your Captain]?	Are you having problems with these people?
Are there other investigations happening?	Are you being told by your boss to do this?	Do you normally treat [the civilians] this way?
And [your commanding officer has] authorized this [investigation]?	And how long do you expect these men to be digging here?	Who else do you have right here with you?
And then you take the prisoners back to [town]?	Have you got the paperwork on you [proving they're terrorists]?	Do you know the names of those people?
You're walking back and forth it must be safe.	Is it safe for us to walk [around here], without worry about mines?	Is that all you're going to do is make them dig a hole?
Is there anybody else around here?	How many terrorists are normally buried here?	How long are you going to keep them in custody?
[The civilians are] from what group?	Are they prisoners or are they working?	Is your radio down?
Is this a cemetery?	Where are you taking them, to your station?	[The civilians] are not soldiers?
When will you be done, today?	Did you find them?	Is everything okay over there?
You have terrorists here?	So what's your name?	No rank? [referring to civilians]
Are they prisoners of war?	Do you know the names yet?	Is that your supervisor right there?
[The civilians are] not military?	Do you know who we represent?	You are part of the militia?
When did you come?	So these aren't farmers?	Are you in charge of this area here?
Do you have [the civilian's] names?	Have they had their trial yet?	You are from the WIA?
No communications whatsoever?	What's his name?	Are there mines around here?
Are they armed?	Is this a police operation?	These people are your detainees?
When did you catch them?	So they're digging graves?	
We're just a military observer team meeting a patrol here, are you the patrol?	Do you normally do this with people?	
Oh, there are land mines?	Have they been to jail?	

MEFS I	MEFS II	MEFS III
And Corporal, he's Eastland?	Do they have weapons?	
	Who's directing those guys, you?	
	Are they Eastlanders?	
	So this is a graveyard here?	
	Are these citizens of your country or are they foreigners?	
Does your partner have any ID?	When are they standing trial?	
	What's your Constable's name?	
	What's your rank?	
	So you view them as traitors?	
	Are there mines in the area?	
	Are you in charge?	

Table 3 shows the open-ended questions seeking general information that trainees asked throughout the three field studies.

Table 3: Open-ended questions seeking general information

MEFS I	MEFS II	MEFS III
What is, where's your general frequency for the police bulletin?	Just now before we leave just for our own safety, any main areas of terrorist activity that we should watch out for?	So in your opinion, how are the prisoners being treated at the camp, are they being well fed?
So how did you do through the war?	And if I wanted to read up on this report, where would I go? Is there a number to this?	Tell me your perspective on that. [referring to UN helping terrorists]
How, how are you going back to the police station?	Just out of curiosity, explain how your judicial system works.	What kind of problems do you think the UN should take care of?
Go where? [re: Sgt saying he has to go]	What do you mean? [about the UN delivering food to Eastland]	Anything more you can tell us, how can we contact you?
And who would the police be?	So you would like more [supplies], what is it that you would like?	What have you been told about the UN?
	I was wondering, do you know where [the inspector] might be right now?	But there must be a prisoner camp near by?
	Why [can't you talk to someone when their in custody]?	Well is there anything else to talk about?
	Oh, how come [you can't explain the judicial system]?	How are things in this area?
	How were you able to apprehend your suspects?	
	Where can I meet with you?	
	Where is the police station from here?	
	So how do you talk to your inspector?	
	Who trialed them?	
	What sort of terrorism?	
	And where's the federal prison?	

Finally, Table 4 shows the open-ended questions seeking situation specific information that trainees asked throughout the three field studies.

Table 4: Open-ended questions seeking situation specific information

MEFS I	MEFS II	MEFS III
What kind of danger do you mean by that? [re: Sgt saying UNMOs in possible danger by being there]	Have you heard, are there any other villagers that are in this predicament here?	So what are the intentions with [them], what are you going to do with them after you're done interrogating them?
It's difficult for me to understand, so maybe you can explain to me? [re: Sgt saying it's valuable work to punish the prisoners]	[The police investigation is] regarding what?	[re: Sgt dealing with terrorists] How do you plan on doing that?
You want to give us a reason why there [are] headstones there, or a cross?	What's the writing on the board over there?	What exactly are you getting the guys to do then?
Who do you think the insurgents are? [re: Sgt's statement about road side bombs]	The hard path is over here, why are you taking this dangerous route?	So what's the usual process, they stay here dig holes for a while?
Why are they yelling that they're going to be killed?	Well how do you take orders from the chain of command then?	How are the civilians getting out of hand?
Can you tell me maybe what's happening here?	Sgt what's the ear piece you have in your ear?	How are we making their job hard Sgt? [referring to the Constables' job of keeping the civilians busy working]
Can you tell me a bit about the investigation?	Why [can't we make contact with them]?	What other organizations would come in here with weapons?
What exactly are they being charged with?	Why is there a cross there on the ground?	Where are you going [referring to the Sgt going down to speak with his Constable]?
Breaking [the civilians] down for what?	And why are they doing [forced labour]?	So what are you doing for these guys [civilians] you're making work?
So what kind of prisoners do you have here now?	What type of investigation are you carrying out now?	Who are these civilians?
What's your plan here with these terrorists?	What kind of police business?	What are your intentions?
Where are [the other prisoners] now?	What's the work they're doing?	What is your job?
Where did you get [the civilians]?	And what's their punishment?	What have we done to upset them [referring to the civilians]?
Why are they digging holes?	Oh, who are they digging graves for?	So what are they building back there?
What are the signs all about here?	Oh, how's the investigation going?	What are those two crosses there?
And why can't you tell us the names?	Who are those two people?	I just want to know what's going on.
Why are they not cooperating?	Why are they not going to the station?	Why do you have weapons?
Where are you taking [the prisoners]?	Why can't you talk to me?	What are they digging?
What are you trying to find out?	Interesting, what were those orders?	
Okay, so what's your plan?	These people, where are they from?	

MEFS I	MEFS II	MEFS III
What kind of work are they doing?	And what are they burying?	
What [are] the normal procedures?	Where will you be taking them?	
How do you interrogate them?	Where are the bodies that they're burying?	
Why not? [re: why they can't go look at the holes the civilians are digging]	What's dangerous about [the area]?	
What is the situation now?	Oh where [are] the mines?	

To provide greater context, the research team also identified a number of themes and sub-themes with respect to the questions that UNMO trainees asked during the human rights violation scenario. Table 5 categorizes the themes and sub-themes, and includes example questions related to it.

Table 5: Common questioning themes and prototypic examples

Themes	Sub Themes	Examples
Identification	Names (People, Places)	Who is your commander? What's the name of the town? What's the road name? What's your name? What's your Constable's name? Who do you think the insurgents are [of the road side bombs]? Who are those two people?
	Ranks	What is your boss's rank? What's your rank? No rank [referring to civilians]?
	Identity	And who would the police be? You wouldn't have some ID on you by any chance? Are these citizens of your country or are they foreigners? And Corporal, he's Eastland? Does your partner have any ID? Right and do you know who we represent? [The civilians are] from what group?
Location-based	Places (Buildings, Towns)	Where do you work Sgt? Where is the police station from here? But there must be a prisoner camp near by? How far is the town? Where's the federal prison?
	People	Where are the bodies that they're burying? Where's your higher commander?
	Residence	Do you live in this area? Where are these people from?
Rationale-based	Civilian Activity	It's difficult for me to understand, so maybe you can explain to me [how it's valuable work]? What's the work they're doing? What's their punishment? And why are they doing [forced labour]? What are they digging? What is the hole being dug for? And how long do you expect these men to be digging here?
	Gravesite	You want to give us a reason why there [are] headstones there, or a cross? What's that marker? That's a graveyard isn't it?
	General	Can you tell me what's going on here? What's happening here?
Time-based	Before	When you picked them up did you tell their families where you were taking them? When did you come? When did you catch them? Have they been to jail?
	After	And the jail where they're being housed is at the police station? When are they standing trial? And what's going to happen to these guys you call murderers? So what are the intentions with [them], what are you going to do with them after you're done interrogating them? Where are you taking [the prisoners]?
Investigation	Investigation	How were you able to apprehend your suspects? Can you tell me a bit about the investigation? What exactly are they being charged with? [The police investigation is] regarding what? Are there other investigations happening?
	Interrogation	What sort of interrogation are you proceeding with? How do you interrogate them? How long have you guys been doing an interrogation like this?
Security	UNMOs	Just now before we leave just for our own safety, any main areas of terrorist activity that we should watch out for? Is it safe for us to go straight into the village? Are there mines in the area? What kind of danger do you mean by that? You're walking back and forth, it must be safe?
	Sgt	The hard path is over here, why are you taking this dangerous route? Are they armed?
	Civilians	You'll take him back to the hospital?
Personal/Rapport building	Sgt	So how did you do through the war? How long have you been working for the police? Do you have children at all? Family in the area? Do you like listening to

		music? You married? How long have you not had food now?
--	--	---

3.3 Mil Obs Training Evaluation Framework

The research team received documentation from the Peace Support Training Centre that detailed the most critical performance objectives in the Military Observer (MilObs) Course. This documentation detailed the kinds of skills that military personnel were meant to acquire while on the course and the means in which PSTC Instructors impart those skills. The following tables identify these most critical performance objectives (i.e., outcomes) in the PSTC MilObs course and the activities meant to ensure these. The first core performance objective, employ personal sustainment skills, and the knowledge/skills and Mil Obs course activities associated with it are detailed in Table 6.

Table 6: Mil Obs course activities in support of employing personal sustainment skills

Performance Objective	Standard	Knowledge/Skills	Courses
Employ Personal Sustainment Skills	Personal Security	• Knowledge for operating in a mined environment • Knowledge of preventative measures to operate in a hostage/hijack situation • Knowledge of survival skills for hostage/hijack situation • Ability to make risk and threat assessment • Knowledge of evacuation and personnel recovery procedures • Field craft • Survival IAW	• Security – risk & threat • Security – protection • Law of armed conflict • Use of force • Explosive threat awareness • Mission terrain • Mission intelligence • Mission operations
	First Aid	• Knowledge of MilOb medical kit • Knowledge of triage and vital signs • Ability to treat ballistic and blast injuries	• Combat related first aid
	Health & Hygiene	• Ability to prepare for austere environments • Knowledge of preventative medicine • Ability to react to health and hygiene symptoms	• Preventative medicine
	Administration & Support	• Knowledge of CF support mechanisms (e.g., allowances and benefits) • Knowledge of UN administration • Knowledge of Peace Support Operation • Knowledge of ROES • Cultural Awareness	• General knowledge of UN • Human rights awareness • Cultural Awareness

The desired course outcomes listed for employing personal sustainment skills can be directly trained and assessed by the PSTC Instructors. Another core performance objective, employ military observer team skills, and the knowledge/skills and Mil Obs course activities associated with it are detailed in Table 7.

Table 7: Mil Obs course activities in support of employing military observer team skills

Performance Objective	Standard	Knowledge/Skills	Courses
Employ Military Observer Team Skills	Act as a MilObs team member	• Ability to manage critical incidents • Ability to manage combat stress • Ability to engage in conflict resolution • Knowledge of briefing techniques • Knowledge of roles and responsibilities	• Personal conduct • PSO environment • PSO environment – practical • Stress management • Duties of a Military Observer (comms equipment; UN comms; Ex radio check; Staff duties; FFE)
	Manage a MilObs team	• Ability to organize team site • Ability to operate communications equipment	• Managing diversity
	Direct a MilObs team	• Situational awareness • Ability to manage mission information • Ability to balance team resources • Ability to manage team dynamics	• Duties of a Mil Ob (Handling information)

The desired course outcomes listed for employing military team skills can be directly trained and assessed by the PSTC Instructors. Another core performance objective, conduct military observer functions, and the knowledge/skills and Mil Obs course activities associated with it are detailed in table 8.

Table 8: Mil Obs course activities in support of conducting military observer functions

Performance Objective	Standard	Knowledge/Skills	Courses
Conduct Military Observer Functions	Conduct patrols	• Ability to navigate of land, air, and sea • Ability to use 4x4 vehicle - o Maintenance - o Security when driving - o Driving techniques	• Patrolling theory • Patrolling – practical • Navigation • Navigation (dismounted) • Tactical driving
	Conduct observation	• Ability to identify military AFV/AC • Ability to monitor use of force • Ability to react to human rights violations • Ability to conduct static and mobile observations • Ability to conduct mounted and dismounted observations	• Observation theory • Observation - practical
	Investigations	• Ability to conduct crater analysis	• Investigation • Investigation – crater analysis
	Inspections/verifications	• Ability to handle small arms	• Inspection/verification • Foreign weapons
	Perform disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities	• Ability to perform DDR activities	• DDR

Again, the desired course outcomes listed for conducting military observer functions can be directly trained and assessed by the PSTC Instructors. Another core performance objective, employing communication skills, and the knowledge/skills and Mil Obs course activities associated with it are detailed in table 9.

Table 9: Mil Obs course activities in support of employing communication skills

Performance Objective	Standard	Knowledge/Skills	Courses
Employ Communication Skills	Ability to conduct media interviews		• Media awareness • Multicultural communication skills
	Ability to conduct negotiations		• Counter IED
	Ability to perform liaison tasks		• Liaison

Like the other performance objectives, employing communication skills can be directly trained and assessed by the PSTC Instructors.

PSTC Instructors mentioned a number of other vital skills for Mil Obs that they believed could be coached, but could not be directly trained or assessed. Table 10 highlights the coachable skills for individuals and for teams.

Table 10: Required coachable skills for Mil Obs trainees

COACHABLE SKILLS	
As an individual	• Adaptability • Flexibility • Patience • High tolerance for frustration • Open-mindedness • Self-motivator • Initiative • Self-confidence • Perseverance • Self-reliance • Sense of humour
In a team	• Communication • Tact • Tolerance • Cohesiveness • Diplomacy • Understanding • Cultural sensitivity • Cooperation • Global awareness • Situational awareness • Unbiased/non-judgmental

PSTC Instructors believed that these coachable skills were critical for Mil Obs to have as an antecedent to learning and developing the core performance objectives (i.e., personal sustainment, Mil Obs team skills, Mil Obs functions, and communication skills). One particular attribute that PSTC Instructors thought was vital was adaptability. Indeed, many of the course exercises are constructed in order to test this attribute. It will be important for the evaluation to be able to determine which coachable skills influence the development of the core performance objectives.



4. Way Ahead

The next step for the PSTC training evaluation is for the research team to establish measures based on a curriculum and training analysis of the PSTC Mil Obs course. The information gathered in this analysis will provide the necessary information to generate quantitative and qualitative instruments to effectively evaluate the PSTC training program in regards to its relevance to actual UN operations. Data collection is meant to assess just how relevant those outcomes and training activities are for UNMOs in operations. The evaluation will determine how well the training that UNMOs receive at the PSTC during the Mil Obs course translates into actual operational experience.

To complete the evaluation, the research team proposes data collection at three points. Time one would include reviewing trainees' feedback regarding the course that is currently provided to PSTC at the end of each activity and the course. As well, the research team will administer the evaluation survey. Time two data collection would be conducted part way through the trainees' deployment. Finally, time three would be when trainees return from their tours. Data collection would include not only the evaluation survey, but also an interview in order to collect qualitative data. To increase accessibility and minimize costs to the project, administering an on-line survey is suggested.

5. References

JONES, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent Model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366-95.

THOMSON, M.H., TARIO, C.D., ADAMS, B.D., & BROWN, A.L. 2008. Collaborative team decision-making in a realistic CF training scenario. *Draft Report*. Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada Toronto.

THOMSON, M.H., ADAMS, B.D., WALDHERR, S., 2007. The impact of emotion on negotiation behaviour during a realistic training scenario. *DRDC T Report No. CR-2008-021*. Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada Toronto.

THOMSON, M.H., ADAMS, B.D., 2006. Moral and ethical decision-making in a realistic field training scenario. *DRDC T Report No. CR-2007-012*. Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada Toronto.

VAN KLEEF, G.A., DE DREU, C.K.W., & MANSTEAD, A.S.R. (2004). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 1. 57-76.

Annex A:



Moral and Ethical Decision-Making Field Studies at PSTC: Main Findings

**Michael Thomson, Barb Adams
Courtney Tario, Andrea Brown**

© Humansystems® Incorporated





Field Study 1

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Field Study 1 - Purpose

- Explored impact of moral intensity on the moral and ethical decision-making (MEDM) and negotiation behaviour in a human rights violation training scenario
- Moral intensity (Jones, 1991) is the perceived salience or vividness of a moral issue (relevant factors include proximity, magnitude of consequences, immediacy, etc.)
- To manipulate trainees' levels of moral intensity, this study varied the physical proximity of the female victim



© Humansystems® Incorporated



Field Study 1 – Experimental Conditions

High Moral Intensity Condition	Baseline Moral Intensity Condition
At 5 minutes into the scenario, the female civilian rushed toward the trainees (stopping within 4 feet and making eye contact) appealing to them for their help.	At 5 minutes into the scenario, the female civilian appeals to trainees for their help the same way as in the high moral intensity condition but stays at the gravesite (approximately 60 feet away).

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Impact of High MI on Behaviour

1. More likely to remain engaged in the scenario (i.e., no team in the high moral intensity condition left the site, despite the Sgt's demands they do so).
2. More frequent proactive negotiation behaviours (e.g., making more attempts to make contact with the civilians and to diffuse the situation as well as taking notes and asking for names).
3. More frequent negative relationship-building behaviours, (e.g., acting without permission, provoking the Sgt, being opinionated and judgemental, threatening the Sgt with future consequences, being sarcastic or condescending.)

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Other Findings I

1. Teams that watched the police lead the civilians into the forest were less satisfied with the quality of their response and with the outcome than teams that either followed or left the situation (i.e., disengaged). (Failure to take a definitive stand?)
2. Team leaders rated the police behaviour as more immoral than did team members, suggesting the greater involvement of the leaders in the negotiation might have influenced their perceptions of the police's behaviour.

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Other Findings II

3. Team leaders also ascribed significantly more responsibility to the police for the events unfolding during the scenario than did other team members.
4. Team leaders were less likely to want to change their behaviour if they could redo the scenario than team members.

© Humansystems® Incorporated





Field Study 2

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Field Study 2 - Purpose

- Varied the anger and agitation of trainees' negotiation partner (Sgt) to explore impacts on their negotiation behaviour and perceptions
- Could “take on” the anger of the Sgt themselves or might strategically adjust their own negotiation behaviour to “bring him down”



© Humansystems® Incorporated



Field Study 2 – Experimental Conditions

Angry Condition	Neutral Condition
The police Sgt exhibited aggressive, uncooperative behaviours associated with anger (e.g., shouting, interrupting, etc.).	The police Sgt acted more neutrally (i.e., <u>less</u> angry) and was more yielding.

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Impact of Anger on Behaviour

1. Trainees worked harder to diffuse the situation, they were more responsive to Sgt's concerns, they showed more empathy for the victims, they asked permission more, and they complied more with the Sgt when he made demands of them.
2. However, they also showed more negative relationship building behaviors, such as being condescending/insulting, expressing critical opinions about police, threatening the Sgt with future consequences, circumventing his authority, and opposing his demands. To some extent, trainees mirrored the Sgt's emotion (social contagion effect).

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Other Findings I

1. Teams that watched the police lead the civilians into the forest rated their anger toward the Sgt marginally higher than those who either left or followed the police and civilians.
2. Team leaders were less likely to want to change their behaviour if they could redo the scenario than team members.

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Field Study 3

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Field Study 3 - Purpose

- How does “working as a team” influence the negotiation performance of teams (e.g., does team “brainstorming” improve the quality of the negotiation?)
- How does having an opportunity to contribute more influence one’s view of the negotiation (e.g., satisfaction with outcome)?



© Humansystems® Incorporated

Field Study 3 – Experimental Conditions

	“Team” Condition	Baseline Condition
After 3 minutes into the scenario	“I thought you guys were supposed to work as a team. I gotta go talk to my partner. I don’t care if you talk, but don’t move around.”	“I gotta go talk to my partner. I don’t care if you talk, but don’t move around.”
After 10 minutes into the scenario	“We gotta leave very soon to get these people to the police station. I gotta talk to my constable. <u>You talk to your team.</u> ”	“We gotta leave very soon to get these people to the police station. I gotta talk to my constable.”

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Impact of “Team” on Behaviour

- 1. Teams shared more information amongst themselves.**
- 2. Team members contributed at least as much as team leaders (and some contributed more).**

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Impact of “Team” on Behaviour

- 3. Team behaviours observed in team huddles were:**
 - information exchange
 - role assigning and confirming
 - back-up (especially when team leader was from a foreign country).
- 4. 8 of 14 teams worked as a team to make final decision (re: the outcome in the 2nd team huddle). The other 6 teams either did not say anything in the 2nd huddle (n=2) or gave suggestions re: negotiation (n=4).**

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Other Findings I

1. **Relative to leaders, team members thought:**
 - they had significantly less personal input into the negotiation
 - their ideas were used significantly less
 - their ideas were significantly less valued
 - they were more likely to wish to redo scenario.
2. **Teams who demonstrated back-up behaviour strongly agreed on questionnaire measures that their teammates provided assistance when necessary; thus, they were attuned to this particular activity.**

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Lessons Learned

- **Face-to-face interaction with a victim appears to increase trainees' moral commitment to remain with the victim.**
- **It is possible to “take on” the emotional state of one's negotiation partner, shaping negotiation behaviours.**
- **Trainees often exhibited negative relationship building behaviours, (e.g., expressing a critical opinion of the police's behaviour), when negotiating with the Sgt.**

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Lessons Learned *cont.*

- **Team members and team leaders may have very different experiences, depending on the level of input each has during the negotiation.**
- **Multicultural teams may show greater team back-up behaviours.**
- **Having an opportunity to re-group as a team may foster improved decision making and negotiation as information becomes shared across the team.**

© Humansystems® Incorporated



Bibliography

- **JONES, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent Model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366-95.**
- **VAN KLEEF, G.A., DE DREU, C.K.W., & MANSTEAD, A.S.R. (2004). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 1. 57-76.**

© Humansystems® Incorporated



6. Distribution list

Document No.: DRDC Toronto CR 2009-019

	LIST PART 1: Internal Distribution by Centre:
2	DRDC Toronto Library
2	TOTAL LIST PART 1
	LIST PART 2: External Distribution by DRDKIM
	LCol Perry Poirier Email: Perry.Poirier@ forces.gc.ca Mail: Peace Support Training Centre P.O. Box 17000 Station Forces Kingston, Ontario K7K 7B4 Canada
0	TOTAL LIST PART 2
2	TOTAL COPIES REQUIRED

UNCLASSIFIED

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA (Security classification of the title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)		
1. ORIGINATOR (The name and address of the organization preparing the document, Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g. Centre sponsoring a contractor's document, or tasking agency, are entered in section 8.) Publishing: DRDC Toronto Performing: Humansystems® Incorporated, 111 Farquhar St., Guelph, ON N1H 3N4 Monitoring: Contracting: DRDC Toronto		2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (Overall security classification of the document including special warning terms if applicable.) UNCLASSIFIED
3. TITLE (The complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification is indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C, R, or U) in parenthesis at the end of the title) Technical Memorandum: A Training Evaluation Framework for PSTC MilObs Course (U) (U)		
4. AUTHORS (First name, middle initial and last name. If military, show rank, e.g. Maj. John E. Doe.) Michael H. Thomson; Andrea L. Brown; Courtney D. Tario; Barb D. Adams		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.) September 2009	6a NO. OF PAGES (Total containing information, including Annexes, Appendices, etc.) 41	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total cited in document.) 2
7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (The category of the document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of document, e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) Contract Report		
8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (The names of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development – include address.) Sponsoring: Tasking:		
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.) 16re02	9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.) PWGSC Contract No. W7711-078110/001/TOR Call-Up 8110-14	
10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document) DRDC Toronto CR 2009-159	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers under which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.)	
11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (Any limitations on the dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) Unlimited distribution		
12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (Any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11). However, when further distribution (beyond the audience specified in (11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.)) Unlimited announcement		

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

(Security classification of the title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)

13. **ABSTRACT** (A brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), (R), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual.)

(U) A current Applied Research Project (ARP) of the Collaborative Performance and Learning Section (CPL) at Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Toronto explores moral and ethical decision-making (MEDM) in Canadian Forces (CF) operations (16kk, 16re02). A major focus in this program of research has been field studies conducted at the Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC) Canadian Forces Base (CFB) in Kingston. CF personnel preparing to deploy as United Nations Military Observers (UNMOs or Mil Obs) undertake a number of training activities meant to enhance and develop their skills particular to Peace Support Operations (PSO). Over the course of a month long training program, CF personnel receive intensive preparation, using a combination of classroom training and scenario-based training. One such scenario-based exercise simulates a human rights violation. In this scenario, unarmed trainees attempt to negotiate the lives of civilians who are being verbally and physically abused by two armed police. Our research program to date has examined a number of psychological processes during this scenario, such as aspects of moral intensity (physical proximity of the victim, MEFS I), emotion (MEFS II) and teamwork (MEFS III). The current work provides PSTC instructor requested materials that are drawn from the results of these studies.

First, we created a set of PowerPoint slides that detail the most critical findings in the three field studies. Second, we generated a list of the open- and closed-ended questions that trainees asked during the scenarios across all three studies (MEFS I, MEFS II, MEFS III). This list is provided as a means to underscore PSTC instruction to trainees, i.e., emphasizing the use of open-ended questions for eliciting situational awareness. Tables have been created that include specific examples of open- and closed- ended questions seeking both general and specific information. A separate table was constructed in which the common themes were extracted from these questions, as well as prototypic examples of questions asked by the trainees. The third, and final section of this report, includes the preparatory activities that lay the ground work for a PSTC training evaluation. Specifically, the evaluation is intended to explore how well the training that UNMOs receive at the PSTC during the Mil Obs course translates into actual operational experience. This report concludes with possible next steps toward the evaluation and a plan for data collection.

(U) Un Programme de recherches appliquées (PRA) en cours de la Section de la recherche concertée sur le rendement et l'apprentissage (Section RCRA) à Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDDC) Toronto explore la prise de décisions morales et éthiques (PDME) dans le cadre des opérations des Forces canadiennes (FC) (16kk, 16re02). Les études sur le terrain menées au Centre de formation pour le soutien de la paix (CFSP) à la base des Forces canadiennes (BFC) de Kingston sont l'un des importants champs d'intérêt de ce programme de recherches. Les membres des FC qui se préparent à partir en mission en tant qu'observateurs militaires des Nations Unies (UNMO ou Ob mil) entreprennent un certain nombre d'activités d'entraînement destinées à améliorer et développer les compétences propres aux Opérations de paix des Nations Unies (OPNU). Pendant un mois, les membres des FC suivent un programme de préparation intensif faisant appel à une combinaison de formation en classe et d'instruction en situation. L'un des exercices proposés met en scène une situation de violation des droits de la personne. Dans ce scénario, les stagiaires non armés tentent de négocier les vies de civils qui sont victimes de violences physiques et verbales de la part de deux policiers armés. Notre programme de recherche a examiné jusqu'ici un certain nombre de processus psychologiques au cours de ce scénario, tels que les aspects de

l'intensité morale (proximité physique de la victime, MEFS I), émotion (MEFS II) et travail d'équipe (MEFS III). Les travaux fournis actuellement par les instructeurs du CFSP demandent des documents qui sont tirés des résultats de ces études.

Premièrement, nous avons créé une série de diapositives PowerPoint qui montrent en détail les découvertes les plus importantes des trois études sur le terrain. Deuxièmement, nous avons rédigé la liste des questions ouvertes (à réponse libre) et fermées (à réponse préétablie) que les stagiaires ont posées durant le scénario lors des trois études (MEFS I, MEFS I et MEFS III). Cette liste est fournie afin de mettre en évidence l'instruction du CFSP aux stagiaires, c'est-à-dire mettre en valeur l'utilisation de questions ouvertes pour provoquer une connaissance de la situation. Des tableaux contenant des exemples précis de questions ouvertes et fermées destinées à obtenir des renseignements généraux et particuliers ont été élaborés. On a également préparé un tableau distinct dans lequel les thèmes communs ont été extraits de ces questions; ce tableau contient aussi des exemples prototypiques des questions posées par les stagiaires. La troisième et dernière section du présent rapport comprend les activités préparatoires qui jettent les bases d'une évaluation de l'instruction du CFSP. Plus précisément, cette évaluation a pour but de découvrir dans quelle mesure l'instruction reçue par les UNMO au CFSP dans le cadre du cours d'observateur militaire se traduit en une réelle expérience opérationnelle. Le présent rapport se termine en présentant les prochaines étapes menant à cette évaluation ainsi qu'un plan pour la collecte de données.

14. **KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS** (Technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

(U) moral and ethical decision-making (MEDM); Canadian Forces (CF) operations; Peace Support Operations

UNCLASSIFIED