THE ARMY PROFESSION: A NARRATIVE

A Monograph

by

Major Sean P. Finnerty
United States Army

School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

2013-01

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this 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 (0704-0188), 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 YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
17-05-2013	Master's Thesis	OCT 2012 – MAY 2013

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

The Army Profession: A Narrative

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)

Finnerty, Sean P.

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD
100 Stimson Ave.
Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
Army Doctrine 2015 depicts the Army as a profession consisting of two sub-professions: the Army Profession of Arms and the Army Civil Corps. This all-inclusive model of the Army as a profession is ahistorical and begs the question why Army leaders adopted it. Surveying key profession of arms models, the sociological study of professions, organizational theory, and narrative theory suggests Army leaders may have developed the Army Profession concept as a rhetorical device aimed at improving or reinforcing discipline within the Army. Organizational theorist, Valerie Fournier described a theory of professionalization in which an organization's leaders could use the concept of a profession to inculcate behavioral norms within the organization. The research into the Army Profession concept supports the inference that Army leaders developed the Army Profession concept as a rhetorical device.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Army profession, professionalization, narrative theory

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**	UU		**19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER** *(include area code)*
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified		37	

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: MAJ Sean P. Finnerty

Monograph Title: The Army Profession: A Narrative

Approved by:

_____, Monograph Director
William J. Gregor, Ph.D.

_____, Seminar Leader
Michael J. Lawson, COL

_____, Director, School of Advanced Military Studies
Thomas C. Graves, COL

Accepted this 23rd day of May 2013 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

THE ARMY PROFESSION: A NARRATIVE, by Major Sean P. Finnerty, 37 pages.

In 2010, the Secretary of the Army, John M. McHugh, and the Army Chief of Staff, General George W. Casey, directed the TRADOC Commander, General Martin Dempsey to conduct a review of the Army profession. General Dempsey's review gave rise to the Army Profession Campaign. In the literature supporting the Army Profession Campaign, Army leaders described the Army as a profession with two sub-professions: the Army Profession of Arms and the Army Civilian Corps. Defining civilians a part of the military profession is a significant departure from existing practice and raises the question, why did Army leaders adopt the Army Profession concept?

To determine why the Army profession included civilians, it was first necessary to investigate how the concept of a profession has evolved. The concept of a profession was first applied to civilian occupations before it was imported into discussions of the military. Both history of the civilian and military uses of the term profession revealed that the Army Profession concept is ahistorical. Surveying key profession of arms models also illustrates Army leaders broke with tradition by making the Army Profession an all-inclusive model. A review of narrative and organizational theory suggests Army leaders may have developed the Army Profession concept as a rhetorical device rather than a literal description of the Army. One organizational theorist, Valerie Fournier described a theory of professionalization in which an organization's leaders could use the concept of a profession to inculcate behavioral norms within the organization.

Examining Army doctrine and Army Profession Campaign literature supports the inference that Army leaders intended the Army Profession Campaign to serve as a rhetorical construct with which they could improve discipline throughout the force. A review of the literature and doctrine support the conclusion that Army leaders were greatly concerned with improving discipline at the time they adopted the Army Profession concept. A review of the literature and doctrine prove Army leaders were aware of narrative theory. A review of the same materials proves Dr. Snider, the chief architect of the Army Profession Campaign, was aware of Fournier's argument that a professionalization rhetoric campaign could improve self-discipline within a workforce.

The research into the Army Profession concept through the lens of narrative and organizational theory does not conclusively prove Army leaders developed the Army Profession construct by applying Fournier's theory. However, the evidence collected supports the inference that Army leaders did develop the Army Profession concept as a rhetorical device. Furthermore, the evidence makes clear Army leaders chose to employ professionalization rhetoric as a possible way to correct observed behavioral deficiencies or to prevent a forecasted decline in discipline.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS

ACPME	Army Center of Excellence for the Professional Military Ethic
ADP	Army Doctrine Publication
ADRP	Army Doctrine Reference Publication
CAPE	Center for Army Profession and Ethic[1]
CGSC	Command and General Staff College
DA	Department of the Army
EXCEL	Excellence in Character and Ethical Leadership[2]
MNF-I	Multi-National Forces, Iraq
TRADOC	US Army Training and Doctrine Command
US	The United States of America

---

[1]Formerly ACPME

[2]2009 ACPME study conducted through surveys of MNF-I personnel.

INTRODUCTION

> There will be times when we are going to be conducting operations that you won't
> understand. They are going to make you uncomfortable. People you know and love are
> going to be hurt because of this; and, we want the American people to say, "That's OK,
> we trust you."
>
> —Brigadier General Sean B. MacFarland

In April 2011, the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) hosted a panel on the profession of arms and civil-military relations. During his opening remarks, General Sean MacFarland cautioned the audience that public trust in the military could be easily lost through misdeeds and unprofessional behavior. Highlighting some egregious examples of such behavior, General MacFarland listed Vietnam body counts, the Aberdeen Proving Grounds drill sergeants sex scandals, Abu Grahib, the "Revolt of the Generals," and the controversy preceding General McCrystal's resignation. General MacFarland said the Army must police itself:

> If we don't hold ourselves accountable, then our political masters will. They will step in
> and then you get friction between civil-military relations[sic]. We need to show that we
> don't need their help; that we're doing OK. We do that through accountability,
> transparency, integrity and expertise.

According to General MacFarland, healthy civil-military relations rely on credibility and trust.[3] Credibility and trust derive from discipline.[4] Therefore, systemic indiscipline would threaten not just military effectiveness but also civil-military relations. General MacFarland was not alone in thinking the Army needed to fundamentally reexamine discipline and develop methods to reinforce it throughout the service.

---

[3] Sean B. MacFarland, "Opening Remarks," (Panel, The Profession of Arms and Civil-Military Relations, Lewis and Clark Center, Fort Leavenworth, K.S., 4 April 2011), Combined Arms Research Library. In its latest doctrinal publications, the Army describes discipline as "the ability to control one's own behavior."

[4] U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Army Doctrine Publication No. 1, Change 1, *The Army* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013), 2-7.

The panel at which General MacFarland spoke was part of the Army-Wide Profession of

Arms Campaign that Army leaders later renamed the Army Profession Campaign.[5] These

campaigns arose from a directive cosigned by the Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of

Staff. In 2010, the Secretary of the Army, John M. McHugh, and the Army Chief of Staff,

General George W. Casey, tasked the US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)

Commander, General Martin Dempsey, to conduct a "comprehensive review to examine the state

of [the Army's] profession after nearly a decade of war." Secretary McHugh and General Casey

specifically tasked the TRADOC Commander to provide "analysis of trends and indicators of

individual and unit behavior" as part of his findings as well as "an assessment of the impacts of

the last nine years on the force and to recommend changes to Army policies and programs to

strengthen [the Army] as an institution."[6] The Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of Staff

directed this review after receiving an Army Center of Excellence for the Professional Military

Ethic (ACPME) report indicating a need for increased ethics training at all levels throughout the

Army. General George Casey had commissioned the ACPME Excellence in Character and

Ethical Leadership (EXCEL) study after he received a request from Multi-National Forces, Iraq

(MNF-I) Commander, General David Petraeus. General Petraeus asked to have a study conducted

to examine "factors that serve as determinants of Soldiers' ethical beliefs, attitudes and

behaviors."[7]

---

[5]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Center for Army Profession and Ethic, "History of CAPE," (February 26, 2013), http://cape.army.mil/history.php (accessed March 22, 2013).

[6]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, "Terms of Reference for the Review of the Army Profession in an Era of Persistent Conflict," by George W. Casey Jr. and John M. McHugh (October 27, 2010), http://cape.army.mil/repository/ProArms/TOR%20Signed.pdf (accessed February 25, 2013).

[7]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Army Center of Excellence for the Professional Military Ethic, "ACPME Technical Report 2010-01 MNF-I Excellence in Character and Ethical Leadership (EXCEL)," by Sean T. Hannah and John Schaubroeck (West Point, NY: Army Center of Excellence for the Professional Military Ethic, 2009), 22.

Perceptions of a decline in ethical behavior among service members were not limited to Army leadership. In November 2012, Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta ordered General Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to assess military officer ethics training.[8] The media inferred from the order that Secretary Panetta and President Obama had lost confidence in their military subordinates. Major news outlets ran stories describing a rash of indiscrete, unethical, and alleged illegal behavior by flag officers. In U.S. News, Bill Briggs suggested "high-profile cases of alleged misconduct" were symptomatic of "a much larger issue affecting the armed forces."[9] In the Associated Press, Lolita Baldor described Brigadier general Jeffrey Sinclair's alleged criminal misconduct—for which he will face court martial and a possible life sentence—as "the latest in a series of missteps by military leaders," thereby insinuating such serious offenses had become commonplace.[10] By providing specific examples in which the institution's credibility came into question as the result of indiscipline, high visibility misconduct cases have reinforced General MacFarland's argument the Army must do more to police its ranks itself.

Building on the ACPME report recommendations from the EXCEL study, Army leaders converted the Army Profession of Arms Campaign from a dialogue about the profession of arms into an educational campaign designed to teach service members—both uniformed and civilian— that they are members of the Army Profession and as such must behave as professionals. In fact, "inculcating the ideas of the Army Profession" became part of the Army's Strategic Planning

[8]Elisabeth Bumiller, "Panetta Orders Review of Ethics Training for Military Officers," *The New York Times* (November 16, 2012), http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/16/us/panetta-orders-review-of-ethics-training-for-officers.html (accessed January 02, 2013).

[9]Bill Briggs, "Panetta Orders Review of Ethical Standards amid Allegations of Misconduct among High-level Military Leaders," *U.S. News* (November 15, 2012), http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/11/15/15166642-panetta-orders-review-of-ethical-standards-amid-allegations-of-misconduct-among-high-level-military-leaders?lite (accessed January 02, 2013).

[10]Lolita C. Baldor, "US Army Brigadier General Jeffrey Sinclair to Face Court Martial," *NewsComAu* (December 19, 2012) http://www.news.com.au/news/us-army-brigadier-general-jeffrey-sinclair-to-face-court-martial/story-fnejlrpu-1226540509621 (accessed January 02, 2013).

Guidance in 2013.[11] Both academics and military service members have written numerous articles debating the nature of the profession of arms and the concept of an Army Profession reaching no consensus on any point of the debate. This suggests the concept of an Army Profession has been misunderstood. This misunderstanding may reduce the potential benefits of the Army Profession Campaign.

In 2010, having concluded his internal review of the profession, the TRADOC Commander published a 60-page pamphlet, *The Army Profession: 2012, After More Than a Decade of War*, which became an Army White Paper. In it, he declared the Army to be a profession. This declaration was an abrupt departure from preceding scholarship regarding the profession of arms and professions in general. Most debates involving whether or not a military is a profession have typically involved refinements of the notion of a profession of arms. The TRADOC Commander broke with both academic and military tradition when he asserted the Army was a profession in itself—consisting of two subordinate professions: the Army Profession of Arms and the Army Civilian Corps.[12] The Army's description of itself as a profession is clearly at odds with earlier descriptions of professions. Army leaders must be aware the concept of an Army Profession is problematic to many members of their audience. Yet, the Army spent millions of dollars socializing the idea and included it in its latest doctrinal manuals. Army leaders have made the concept of the Army Profession an integral part of Doctrine 2015.[13] Assuming Army leaders recognized describing the Army as a profession begged academic resistance bordering on scornful ridicule, why did Army leaders adopt the concept of an Army Profession?

---

[11]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, *Army Strategic Planning Guidance* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013), 13.

[12]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Center for Army Profession and Ethic, *The Army Profession: 2012 After More than a Decade of Conflict*, White Paper, (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012), i.

[13]U.S. Army, ADP 1 *The Army*, 2-1.

To answer this question it is first necessary to understand how people have historically used the concept of a profession to describe certain occupations. Understanding how people have historically used the concept of professions will establish the fact that the Army's description of itself as a profession is ahistorical. It will also suggest possible motives behind occupational leaders' attempts to garner recognition of their occupation as a profession. The best place to uncover the evolution of the profession as a concept is in the field of sociology. Having established the definitions and the application of the concept of professions, it becomes necessary to examine how the concept has been applied to the US military. This can best be done by examining models of what is traditionally called the profession of arms. Examining models of the profession of arms will reaffirm the ahistorical nature of the Army's Army Profession construct and support inferring Army leaders were aware they were breaking with academic and military tradition by adopting the Army Profession model. Examining the profession of arms concept will also explain—at least partially—why so many people resist the Army's inclusion of DA civilians in the Army Profession. Establishing the contentious nature of including DA civilians in the Army Profession will support the inference Army leaders did so because including DA civilians added them to the campaign's audience in terms of a narrative rhetorical construct.

Sociology and political science demonstrate the Army Profession Campaign breaks with history and tradition but those fields do not offer answers as to why Army leaders chose to do so. A review of narrative and organizational theory is necessary to answer the question. Narrative theorists argue reality is subjective; it is both experiential and contextual. In this way, according to narrative theory, discourse can create an individual's reality.[14] Organizational theory builds on narrative theory by suggesting organizational leaders can shape individuals' self-identities and their understanding of their roles within an organization through discourse and development of an

---

[14]Elinor Ochs and Lisa Capps, "Narrating the Self," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25, no. 1 (1996): 22.

organizational culture. Valerie Fournier documented business leaders trying to make employees self-regulate their behavior by telling those employees they were members of a profession and explaining what constituted acceptable behavior within that profession. James Pierce built on Fournier's concepts examining how leaders could use the concept of a profession to inculcate "values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, [and] behavioral norms" within the organization.[15] A basic understanding of narrative theory and Fournier's contribution to organizational theory supports the inference that Army leaders were attempting to implement Fournier's model by adopting the Army Profession construct.

Examining Army doctrine, Army Profession Campaign literature, official Army publications, memorandums, and Army sponsored research will support the argument Army leaders intended the Army Profession Campaign to serve as a rhetorical construct with which they could improve discipline vis-à-vis Fournier's professionalization model. Examining those sources will provide evidence indicating 1) Army leaders perceived a serious and systemic discipline problem, 2) Army leaders were aware of Fournier's model or a similar one, 3) Army leaders knew including DA civilians and others traditionally excluded from the profession of arms would create resistance to the concept of an Army Profession. The evidence supports each of these inferences.

The examination of the Army Profession concept through the lens of narrative and organizational theory suggests Army leaders developed the Army Profession Campaign as a rhetorical device to establish and control an internal-Army narrative with which they could reinforce individual self-discipline. Army leaders were never interested in an academic debate. They were, from the outset, looking for a way to correct observed behavioral deficiencies or to prevent a forecasted decline in discipline.

---

[15]James G. Pierce, "Is the Organizational Culture of the U.S. Army Congruent with the Professional Development of Its Senior Level Officer Corps?" (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2010), 20.

NON-MILITARY PROFESSIONS

To understand the questions surrounding the Army Profession concept, it is necessary to know how and why people have historically applied the concept of a profession to other occupations. Reviewing the evolving concepts of a profession serves three purposes. First, it highlights the ahistorical nature of the Army's description of an all-inclusive Army Profession. Second, it reveals the motives people have had when they applied the concept to their own or other favored professions. Third, it suggests that the act of categorizing occupations as professions or something other than professions is not simple classification in accordance with a set of unbiased and generally accepted criteria. It is important to demonstrate this point since so many of the scholars supporting the Army Profession Campaign purport to do just that. To accomplish the above listed purposes, this section presents a brief history of the sociological study of professions. It then presents five sociological theories of professions which taken together represent the broader field of study. Contrasting the Army Profession Campaign with these theories also illustrates in what particular ways it diverges from sociological applications of the theory of professions.

Sociologists began studying professions as early as 1934 when Carr-Saunders and Wilson published, *The Professions*. The study of professions has undergone many changes. At first, the study was limited to classification of occupations into categories. Those categories were little more than a division of skilled labor into profession and non-profession. Sociologists who espoused these models argued professions were occupations that had certain organizational and social characteristics that differentiated them from nonprofessional occupations. The authors of these early models did not address how occupations became professions.[16] Theories of that

---

[16]Elizabeth H. Gorman and Rebecca L. Sandefur, "'Golden Age,' Quiescence, and Revival: How the Sociology of Professions Became the Study of Knowledge-Based Work," *Work and Occupations* 38, no. 3 (August 2011): 278.

process, or *professionalization*, did not emerge until the late 1940s.[17] Proponents of early

professionalization theories assumed occupations became professions through a gradual

progression. They assumed the occupation's practitioners did not intentionally drive the process.

Researchers later developed theories of professionalization in which occupational practitioners

motivated by several factors drove the process of their own professionalization. The practitioner-

driven theories differed mainly in whether the practitioners were selfish or altruistic in wanting

their occupation to become a profession. During the early to mid 1960s, some sociologists began

to see professionalization in terms of social mobility and egalitarianism. To them, professionalism

became movement along a spectrum with professions on one end and labor on the other. This

reduced any distinction between professions and non-professional occupations to a distinction of

degrees instead of a true demarcation. Although the study of professions had entered a theoretical

realm, it fundamentally remained categorization of occupations.

In the 1960s and '70s, the study of professions began moving away from categorizing

occupations towards asking questions about society's relationship to professions. Sociologists had

become less interested in categorizing occupations and more interested in how occupations they

presumed to be professions benefited society. As could be expected, another school developed

that rejected the assumption professions benefitted society. This school viewed professions in

terms of workplace monopoly and focused on the role of the state in professional licensing. One

branch of that school focused on asking who benefited most. Did society or the individual

members of a profession benefit most when an occupation's practitioners convinced the rest of

society that their specialty necessitated recognition as a new profession?[18] Some sociologists saw

the process of professionalization as an "accretion of public recognition" rather than any actual

---

[17]Andrew Delano Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 4.

[18]*Ibid*, 5.

change within the occupation. In other words, an occupation became a profession when society recognized it as such.[19]

In the 1980s, sociologists turned their attention to the perceived competition between professionals and non-professionals and between professionals and other professionals. Since the 1980s, interest in the study of professions generally has decreased among sociologists. If at all, they examined professions as an element of the study of the organization of labor and the study of work. Recently, the study of professions has emerged inside studies of the self-ideation of workers and worker motivation. Rather than categorizing occupations, sociologists following this line of reasoning, examine professions and professionalism as a "discourse." They ask how managers use that discourse to mold subordinates' self-identity and self-discipline.[20]

Many of the academic works examining the distinction between professions and occupations focused on developing criteria by which to measure an occupation and determine the merit of its practitioners' claim of professionalization. In *Professions in Civil Society and the State: Invariant Foundations and Consequences*, David Sciulli presented a model based on criteria that were developed by Michael Burrage, Konrad Jarausch and Hannes Siegrist. Those criteria were:

1. It establishes a monopoly in the labor market for expert services.
2. It establishes a monopoly in the labor market for expert services.
3. It achieves self-governance or autonomy, that is, freedom from control by any outsiders, whether the state, clients, laymen, or others.
4. Training is specialized and yet also systematic and scholarly.
5. Examination, diplomas, and titles control entry to the occupation and sanction the monopoly.[21]

---

[19]Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts, "Rethinking the Concept of Professionalism: The Case of Journalism," *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 4 (2003): 555.

[20]*Ibid.*

[21]David Sciulli, *Professions in Civil Society and the State: Invariant Foundations and Consequences* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 45.

These criteria are representative of the criteria implicitly or explicitly stated in nearly all theories of professions and professionalization proposed during the last half of the twentieth century. It is worth noting the first criterion would undermine the Army Profession model's claim that reservists are professional. The third criterion poses issues for the Army Profession because the subordination of the military to civilian control undermines any Army claim to professional autonomy. Authors of the Army Profession Campaign have chosen to focus on the second, fourth, and fifth criteria. They have done so by emphasizing Army expertise, albeit vaguely defined, while recommending changes to Professional Military Education (PME) curriculum and a return to a system of annual recertification.

In 1964, Harold Wilensky reacted to a growing body of work which suggested many if not all occupations were beginning to meet the criteria for professions by writing "The Professionalization of Everyone?" In that article, Wilensky argued there were two criteria for determining whether an occupation was truly a profession. His proposed criteria stipulated that to be a profession the work performed must require substantial training, and second that members of the profession had to perform according to a set of shared values including one to place the interests of the client above the practitioner's own interests. He called this the "service ideal." That notion remains strongly tied to the concept of professions and appears to be included in the Army Profession model.

Wilensky also offered a historical sequence of professionalization that he developed from his understanding of the histories of occupations he accepted as true professions. According to Wilensky, several occupations were professions as early as the middle ages. Applying his criteria, including the requirement to have a service ideal, he said some groups of military commissioned officers had attained professional status as early as the sixteenth century but dentists, architects, engineers, and CPAs did not attain that status until the turn of the twentieth century. According to Wilensky's theory, not all occupations will become professions. Because his criteria were fixed, his theory suggests professionalization is something that can be measured. Because anyone can

apply his criteria, Wilensky argued, a non-professional occupational group attempting to convince nonmembers that it was a profession would risk ridicule.[22]

Ignoring that precaution, the authors of the Army Profession model chose to focus on Wilensky's concept of a service ideal. The campaign literature stresses the sacrifices of service members and civilians to show that all the members of the Army Profession place their needs after the needs of their client, the American people. In this way, those authors made the Army Profession model appear to fit Wilensky's otherwise exclusionary theory. This may be one reason all the Army Profession Campaign literature stresses values, creeds, oaths, and other outward signs that members of the Army adhere to a norm of selfless-service.[23]

In *Sociology, Work, and Industry*, Tony Watson categorically rejected the utility of criteria as a means of determining whether an occupation was a profession or not. In doing so, he echoed Howard Becker's notion that the distinction between occupations and professions centered entirely on cultural symbolism and an image. However, Watson departed from Becker by recognizing one perquisite for practitioners of acknowledged professions: social status. Echoing Wilensky's skepticism of many occupations' claims of professionalism, Watson suggested elevated social status was itself enough incentive to explain why "occupations as varied as industrial managers, estate agents and embalmers [were] getting together and pursuing some elements of . . . professionalization." Although Watson's argument appears at first glance to undermine the Army Profession Campaign's claims, it actually does not. Since members of the Army already enjoy high social standing in the form of public trust, Watson's argument fails to discredit the Army Profession Campaign. However, his theory must be included in this survey

---

[22]Harold L. Wilensky, "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 138-142.

[23]U.S. Army, *The Army Profession,* The word, service, appears 32 times in this 52-page pamphlet.

because Watson cemented the precedent of dismissing criteria as a way of objectively delineating professional and non-professional occupations. [24]

Abbott approached the concept of professions by examining what he described as the "system of professions." According to Abbott, at the time he began describing a system of professions, most other theorists considered only one occupation or profession at a time. Perhaps because he took a systems approach to professions, his theory has remained influential among military intellectuals and their academic counterparts[25]. Abbott centered his theory on jurisdictional competition. According to Abbott, once the client calls upon the professional, the client should take a relatively passive role and allow the professional the freedom to decide how best to resolve the matter. Like Watson, Abbott rejected definitions built on criteria. Abbott cited Geoffrey Millerson in arguing against supposedly unbiased sets of criteria with which one could categorize occupations as professions because Abbot felt such criteria usually "reflected political concerns."[26]

Although they did not follow Abbott in dismissing criteria, the Army Profession Campaign's authors appear to have been influenced by Abbott. The Army Profession Campaign literature trumpets Abbott's notion that expert work is the application of abstract knowledge on behalf of a client. Also, comments such as those made by General MacFarland regarding US civil-military relations reflect Abbott's theory of professions as it regards jurisdictional disputes between a member of a profession and his or her client.[27] However, Abbott's rejection of criteria lists as a litmus test for professions remains a point of departure between his theory and the Army

---

[24]Tony J. Waston, *Sociology, Work and Industry* (London: Routledge, 1997), 226-228.

[25]Systems theory proponents argue that one must consider myriad levels of interactions between actors involved in a group dynamic.

[26]Abbott, *The System of Professions*, 4-15.

[27]MacFarland, "Opening Remarks."

Profession Campaign literature. In all of the Army Campaign literature, Army leaders go to great lengths explaining exactly how all five Army cohorts meet necessary criteria.[28]

Elizabeth Gorman and Rebecca Sandefur argued Sociology had turned away from theories of professions and professionalization. According to Gorman and Sandefur, recent trends in sociology indicate a general rejection of the classification of occupations into professions and non-professions. They suggest researchers are no longer interested in excluding any occupation from their field of study. Gorman and Sandefur argue in favor of classifying certain occupations not as professions but rather "knowledge-based work." They suggest all occupations in which the practitioners serve their clients through the application of expert knowledge belong to this category. Knowledge-based work is, therefore, a broader category than professions. In it, what were previously described as criteria for inclusion or exclusion become "variables . . . to be explained by the characteristics and actions of individuals, organizations, and organizational groups."[29] There is no evidence to link Gorman and Sandefur's theory directly to the Army Profession Campaign. However, their theory serves to illustrate that Sociology is currently trending away from the conceptualization of professions as objectively distinct from non-professional occupations.

The concept of professions has been discussed academically more in conjunction with non-military occupations than the military. That overview provides several lessons applicable to this examination of the Army Profession Campaign. First, although sociologists have studied the concept of professions since at least 1934, they have not reached a consensus as to what delineates a profession from an occupation. Second, many occupational practitioners have sought to professionalize or garner societal recognition of their occupation as a profession for a number of reasons ranging from purely financial to purely social. Third, it is probably not possible to

---

[28]U.S. Army, *The Army Profession 2012*, 5; 30-34.

[29]Gorman and Sandefur, "The Study of Knowledge-Based Work," 276.

deduce a list of unbiased, subjective criteria with which to distinguish professions from non-professions. Fourth, proponents of such lists often develop their criteria to support the inclusion of a favored occupation among professions. Fifth, there is no historical precedent among sociologists for including all ancillary members of an occupation as professionals given one recognizes the occupation as a profession. In fact, many sociologists who have written on the subject have gone to great lengths to exclude certain sub-groups. Sixth, sociologists are increasingly unlikely to accept categorization of occupations as scientifically meaningful. This last point lends credence to the hypothesis that Army leaders intended the Army Profession Campaign for an Army-internal audience.

THE US MILITARY AS A PROFESSION

Having established how and why people have historically applied the concept of professions to non-military occupations, it is now necessary to apply the concept to the US military specifically. Traditionally, people applying the concept to the military have called the resultant profession, the profession of arms. Examining how the concept of a profession of arms emerged in the US serves three purposes. First, it will demonstrate that the Army Profession Campaign's broadly inclusive definition of an Army Profession breaks with tradition. The departure from accepted definitions of a profession reinforces the inference that Army leaders made a conscious decision to include all cohorts in the Army Profession. That inference suggests the conclusion Army leaders wanted as broad an internal audience as possible to receive the Army Campaign narrative. Second, examining the concept of a US profession of arms will illustrate how models of professions have affected military service members' self-identities to the point of effectively restricting behavior. Third, examining the concept of a US profession of arms will present a possible motive that may have influenced Army leaders to adopt the Army Profession Campaign: to provide ammunition in a jurisdictional struggle with the Army's client. It is necessary to examine the idea that Army leaders employ concepts of military professionalism

14

to gain psychological advantage over their civilian leaders, but jurisdictional struggle is not central to the larger argument about the Army Profession Campaign. However, jurisdictional struggle must be dismissed if the inference is to be made that the Army Profession Campaign is primarily an internal information campaign designed to reinforce discipline within the force. This section presents three competing models of the profession of arms to show how Americans have understood the concept of a profession of arms.

Many historians wrote about an American Profession of Arms. While many of the models contradict each other in one way or another, they nearly all agree that the profession of arms is exclusive. Historian Russell Weigley said the United States Army began to professionalize its regular commissioned officers as early as 1817. In describing those professionalization efforts, Weigley focused entirely on the regular officer corps.[30] Weigley's model described the US Army as a non-professional occupation, the Army writ-large, containing a profession consisting of regular officers. Weigley's model of a profession of arms mirrored many models of non-military professions such as the legal profession. According to those models, the clerk filing papers or helping research cases was not viewed as a co-equal member of the legal profession. These models held that the trained practitioners, doctors and lawyers, were full members of the profession while their supporting staffs were not. Many people writing on the topic took the notion of exclusivity to extremes debating which military specialties should be included or excluded. It is not surprising that discussions about a profession of arms have so often devolved into arguments over who should and who should not be included. The very phrase, profession of arms, carried exclusive implications. That is why Army leaders replaced it with the phrase, Army Profession. The Army Profession Campaign's authors explicitly state this in *The Army Civilian Corps – A Vital Component of the Army Profession*. On page 5, the text reads:

---

[30]Russell Frank. Weigley, *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 81; 171.

Very shortly into the campaign, however, it became apparent that the necessity to include Army civilians in the conceptualization of the Army as a military profession precluded the "of Arms" description for all the Army. With the current force structure Soldiers simply cannot perform their lethal craft effectively without the support of a highly professional Civilian Corps.[31]

In other words, a traditional understanding of a profession of arms could not achieve the purpose underlying the Army Profession Campaign. Weigley's model of a profession of arms not only excluded civilians, it excluded the majority of the US Army.

Weigley was not an outlier when it came to describing a profession of arms is terms of exclusion rather than inclusion. Of course, the conceptualization of a US profession of arms has changed over time. Over the years, a few theorists came to dominate the fields of sociology and political science in studying the US military. By surveying those theories, it is possible to gain an understanding of how the concept of a US profession of arms evolved. It also illustrates how ahistorical the Army Profession is. Samuel Huntington, Morris Janowitz, and Charles Moskos are the three theorists who best represent how Americans have traditionally applied the concept of professions to the US Army.

In *The Soldier and the State*, Samuel Huntington, a political scientist, presented a prescriptive rather than descriptive model of the profession of arms. His model was at its core extremely exclusive. He did so to support his arguments about United States civil-military relations. Huntington argued civilian policy-makers should defer to military leaders on purely military decisions. Huntington presented the military officer as "a professional man" worthy of the same "deference [from the public] which it gives to the civilian professionals." In this regard, Huntington's model of a profession of arms was similar to Abbott's theory of professions. According to each of them, once the client engaged the professional, it was in his or her best interest to allow the professional to make any further decisions as long as those decisions remained within the expertise of the professional. Huntington's profession of arms was highly

---

[31]U.S. Army, *The Army Civilian Corps*, 5.

16

exclusive. At the time Huntington proposed his model, no one had yet taken any steps to professionalize the noncommissioned officer corps. Therefore, one could dismiss his exclusion of enlisted personnel. However, Huntington found reasons to exclude the majority of commissioned officers as well. Huntington centered his model on expertise and specifically defined that expertise as "the management of violence." Huntington seized on the management of violence as a way to describe the specific act that embodied the "service" the profession of arms provided society. Huntington specifically disqualified "the auxiliary specialists contained within or serving the military profession."[32]

It is not surprising that a concept calling for deference to professional judgment remains highly popular among military service members. It underpins much of the writing on the profession of arms. However, it is unlikely that this notion more than tangentially motivated the authors of the Army Profession Campaign. The main reason this is highly unlikely is that the Secretary of the Army, a politically appointed civilian official, was involved in the campaign's development from the outset. Additionally, Army Profession Campaign literature emphasizes military subordination to elected civilian leaders. The Army Profession has an entire section dedicated to civil-military relations and lists subordination as one of the foundations of those relations.[33] In publishing ADP 1, Change 1, Army leaders made very specific changes to the text. They added section 2-26 and 2-27. Specifically addressing the issue of subordination, the text reads:

> Civilian control of the military is embedded in our Constitution and serves as the cornerstone of our military. Military professionals understand this and appreciate the critical role this concept has played throughout our history. Equally important, this concept requires that military professionals understand the role of our civilian leaders and their responsibilities to the civilian leadership.

---

[32]Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State; the Theory and Politics of Civil-military Relations* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957), 7-12.

[33]U.S. Army, *The Army Profession*, 29-33.

With those words, current Army doctrine shaped by the Army Profession Campaign, echoes Huntington's call for an apolitical profession of arms. Huntington insisted that members of the profession of arms remain politically neutral. Many Army officers have so internalized Huntington's model of military professionals that they even abstain from exercising their Constitutional right to vote. Surely, this is an example wherein a conceptualization of professions influenced an individual's self-identity to the point of restricting what would otherwise be expected behavior.

Fundamentally, Morris Janowitz agreed with Huntington's assertion that a profession of arms included only military commissioned officers. Unlike Huntington, Janowitz, a sociologist, was less interested in delineating who was and who was not a member of the profession. He was more interested in how the profession was changing. Also unlike Huntington, Janowitz did not describe the profession as apolitical. According to Janowitz, military professionals reluctantly became involved in political decision-making when realities forced them to accept a "broader definition of their role than their self-conceptions, traditions, and logic would have suggested." Janowitz described a "narrowing skill differential between military and civilian elites" which blurred the boundary of the profession's expertise. Janowitz presented a commander-centric model of the profession of arms in which the commander's role was shifting to a more technical and managerial one. According to Janowitz, military commanders retained a "heroic leader" role mainly as the foundation for the profession's self-identity and its public image.[34] This understanding of Janowitz's model of a profession of arms supports the argument that an appeal to self-identity is central to the Army Profession Campaign. Janowitz's model also supports the assertion that the Army Profession concept is ahistorically inclusive.

---

[34]Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier, a Social and Political Portrait* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1960), 8-12; 349.

Charles Moskos, who studied under Janowitz, developed a conceptualization of the profession of arms radically different from that of either the Huntington or Janowitz models. Moskos rejected Huntington and Janowitz's models of the profession of arms in favor of a model of the military "as a social organization" undergoing changes. Although Moskos offhandedly dismissed models of the profession of arms that excluded enlisted personnel, he suggested the entire military was moving away from a professional model. Moskos argued that the US Army failed to meet two criteria: recompense linked to the "individual expertise" and the practitioner's expectation that he or she would remain in the profession for the duration of his or her working life. According to Moskos, the Army lost its service ethic when conscription ended. He argued that the Army had begun attracting volunteers with "monetary inducements." Moskos predicted the Army would continue to shift away from a professional model and possibly even unionize.[35]

Of the three highlighted theories, Moskos's presents the most divergence from the Army Profession model; however, it tacitly supports the Army Profession's inclusivity. Assuming there is an Army Profession, Moskos's theory would not exclude any subordinate group within the profession. Unlike those of Huntington or Janowitz, Moskos's theory rejects the Army Profession at its base. Given the myriad changes the Army has undergone since Moskos wrote, it is unlikely he would agree it is now a profession. If anything, Moskos would likely be surprised it has not unionized.

The theories of Huntington, Janowitz, and Moskos reveal considerable disagreement on how to define a profession of arms. However, taken together, their theories provide several points applicable to an examination of the Army Profession Campaign. First, and foremost, models of the profession of arms have been exclusive. Scholars and practitioners have gone to considerable lengths debating who should or should not be included. Although Army leaders partially

---

[35]Charles C. Moskos, Jr., "The All-Volunteer Military: Calling, Profession, or Occupation?" *Parameters* (Winter 1977): 23-26.

sidestepped this concern by dividing the all-inclusive Army Profession into two subsets, it is unlikely that contrivance will satisfy profession of arms traditionalists. Second, Huntington's admonishment for military professionals to remain apolitical provides an example of professional narrative affecting individuals' self-identity to the point of modifying behavior. Third, although military service members maybe attracted to the idea of client-professional deferment, they remain staunchly dedicated to Constitutional subordination of the military to civilian leadership. The Secretary of the Army's involvement in developing the Army Profession Campaign negates concerns the campaign's authors intended to influence political leaders through Army Profession messaging.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND NARRATIVE THEORIES

Having established sufficient reason to question Army leaders' motives for adopting the Army Profession concept; and, having established that traditional scholarship on the subject of professions and the profession of arms offers no satisfactory answers, it becomes necessary to examine other disciplines. In this case, the fields of choice are organizational theory and anthropology. Anthropology offers a theory of narrative as a means by which groups establish collective identities.[36] Organizational theorists apply narrative theory to organizations to describe how organizations develop organizational identities and to what degree those identities help regulate individual behavior.[37] This section presents these theories to illustrate how they might provide an explanation of why Army leaders adopted the Army Profession model and why they continue to allocate resources to inculcate Army personnel in their ideas about the Army Profession.[38]

---

[36]Ochs and Capps, "Narrating the Self," 22.

[37]Pierce, "Is Culture Congruent with Professional Development?" 20.

[38]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, *Army Strategic Planning Guidance* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013),13.

According to Ochs and Capps, narrative is the way people cognitively process sensory inputs into experience. Narrative explains why experiences are subjective. Ochs and Capps reject the notion that people can directly experience and share an understanding of disembodied objectivity. Instead, people create their own independent realities. Ochs and Capps call these realities personal narratives. According to this narrative theory, an individual's subjective reality influences how the individual perceives everything including his or herself. Ochs and Capps argue that these subjective realities can directly shape individuals' "feelings, beliefs, and actions."[39]

Army leaders embraced narrative theory. They embodied it in the planning process as part of Army Design Methodology. The text on page 2-5 of *The Operations Process*, reads:

> In a broad sense, a narrative is a story constructed to give meaning to things and events. Individuals, groups, organizations, and countries all have narratives with many components that reflect and reveal how they define themselves. . . . They incorporate symbols, historical events, and artifacts tied together with a logic that explains their reason for being.[40]

It is possible Army leaders or at least the authors of the Army Profession Campaign believed narrative theory could somehow allow them to shape the organizational identity of the Army and the individual self-identities of Army service members. In describing narrative theory, Ochs and Capps examine exactly the issues General Petraeus asked the Army to research which led to the EXCEL Study.[41] If the EXCEL Study helped motivate the Secretary of the Army to order a review of the Army's profession, the Army Profession stemmed from a set of questions to which narrative theory appears to offer a tantalizing answer. Being anthropologists, Ochs and Capps made no recommendations in how exactly someone could apply narrative theory to a specific group of people. Some organizational theorists, on the other hand, appear to do exactly that.

---

[39]Ochs and Capps, "Narrating the Self," 19.

[40]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Army Doctrine Reference Publication no. 5-0, *The Operations Process*, (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013), 13.

[41]U.S. Army, EXCEL Study Report, 1.

In 1999, Valerie Fournier described a business practice in which the leaders of an organization use the concept of profession as a "disciplinary mechanism." According to Fournier, the leaders of an organization could achieve collective behavior modification through appeals to individuals' self-identity. Those appeals took the form of describing the collective group as a profession and describing acceptable behavior for professionals. According to Fournier's theory, once an individual self-identified as a professional, he or she felt compelled to behave within professional norms. By establishing those norms, the leaders of the organization essentially established individual behavioral limits. In this way, organizational leaders could affect control through individual self-discipline. Fournier's theory might appeal to Army leaders concerned with discipline. Of particular note, Fournier examined how business leaders applied this form of control in cases where employees were unlikely to self-identify as professionals. In such cases, within the workplace, leaders used the rhetoric of professionalization to describe employees as professionals and their labor as the exercise of some expertise. She argued this did not undermine its meaning. Fournier saw that a business' employees could be motivated to behave in certain ways depending on the degree to which they internalized the profession label. In this way, Fournier's theory explained why businesses within traditionally non-professional occupations would expend considerable time and resources describing themselves as professions. Fournier's theory also explained why business leaders did not specify a subset of employees and instead labeled all their employees members of a profession. Assuming Army leaders were aware of Fournier's theory or similar ones, Army leaders may have included DA civilians as one of the profession's co-equal cohorts to ensure DA civilians also internalized the professional label.[42]

In 2010, James Pierce examined professionalization in terms of organizational culture. According to Pierce, organizational culture includes "values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions,

---

[42]Valerie Fournier, "The Appeal to 'Professionalism' as a Disciplinary Mechanism," *The Sociological Review* 47, no. 2 (1999): 281.

[and] behavioral norms."[43] Pierce argued that organizational culture regulates individuals' behavior within an organization. Although falling short of Fournier's suggestion that organizational leaders could actively influence the variables of organizational culture, Pierce argued anyone knowledgeable about an organization's culture could predict future behavior by carefully analyzing the variables of organization culture. According to Pierce, the functionalist perspective of organizational theory suggested organizational leaders could manipulate the variable elements of organizational culture and affect change in behavior within their organization. Pierce's argument supports the idea organizational culture could be used to control behavior and the MNF-I Commander's original concern about the "determinants of Soldiers' ethical beliefs, attitudes and behaviors".[44]

This section presented the concepts of narrative, self-identity, and organizational culture. As has been discussed, narrative is a means by which people self-identify as members of groups. According to Ochs and Capps, the narrative process shapes feelings, beliefs, and actions. Pierce suggested such control was theoretically possible according to proponents of the functionalist perspective of organizational theory. Fournier described how business leaders have adopted the rhetoric of professionalism for the specific purpose of modifying employee behavior. Furthermore, Fournier argued that applying the label, professional, to non-professional occupations did not appear to undermine observed positive outcomes. This section suggested Army leaders might have adopted the Army Profession Campaign as a way to operationalize narrative theory to improve or maintain discipline by appealing to individuals' self-identities. Fournier's observations support Army leaders in their inclusion of DA civilians and all uniformed service members, to include reservists, in the Army Profession construct.

---

[43]Pierce, "Is Culture Congruent with Professional Development?" 20.

[44]*Ibid*.

THE ARMY PROFESSION CAMPAIGN LITERATURE

It is possible at this point to argue that Army leaders intended to use the campaign to socialize the idea of a profession so that individuals would behave within limits of professional norms. The Army argument consists of four elements. The first point is that Army leaders perceived a wide-scale current or pending problem in discipline. The second point is that Army leaders intended to target individual behavior through narrative appeals to self-identity in a manner similar to Fournier's model of professionalism. The third point is that Army leaders knew that including DA civilians and other "cohorts" would create controversy and generate resistance to the campaign. Army leaders decided to make the Army Profession construct universally inclusive to broaden the reach of its message to the widest audience possible and thusly maximize potential benefits of the campaign. The fourth point is that, in keeping with narrative theory, large portions of the Army Profession Campaign literature serve primarily to sell the narrative. The best example of this is the White Paper, "The Army Civilian Corps – A Vital Component of the Army Profession."[45]

The Army, the Army's capstone doctrinal publication, follows Fournier's model almost exactly. ADP 1 opens with "The Soldiers Creed and Warrior Ethos" followed by "The Army Civilian Creed" and includes "The Army Values" as a diagram in the second chapter, which outlines the Army Profession. Although discipline is the topic of only one short section of the chapter, the first recommended reading is *Army 2020: Generating Health and Discipline in the Force Ahead of the Strategic Reset,* also known as, "The Red Book"; and the word, discipline, appears fifteen times in ADP 1. From this, it can be inferred that ADP 1's authors were concerned with maintaining or improving discipline within the Army. The manual comingles the Army

---

[45]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Center for Army Profession and Ethic, *The Army Civilian Corps – A Vital Component of the Army Profession* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012).

Profession concepts with value and belief artifacts as support for the conclusion that Army

leaders adopted a Fournier- style approach to the Army Profession Campaign.[46]

The Army Strategic Planning Guidance, 2013, also supports this conclusion. In the

section outlining the Army Campaign Plan's second objective, the Army Profession appears

twice. First, the text reads, "leadership development must inculcate the ideals of the Army

Profession."[47] Lower, on the same page, the text reads:

> Continued focus on the Army Profession, a self-policing organization, skilled in the
> practice of arms, is essential to inculcating the gains of the last 11 years while
> simultaneously eliminating the deleterious effects of prolonged combat."

This passage suggests Army leaders want to use the Army Profession Campaign to improve or

reinforce discipline throughout the force.

The idea that exposure to persistent combat has had, is having, or will have a negative

effect on discipline throughout the force carries across all the Army Profession Campaign

literature. Other Army documents suggest Army leaders remain greatly concerned with this issue.

In "The Red Book," Army leaders described the problem:

> Stress was increasingly placing Soldiers at risk, Soldiers who were suffering from
> physical and behavioral health issues and in need of more vigilant leader oversight, risk
> mitigation and medical healthcare . . . it also discovered a growing high-risk population
> of Soldiers engaging in criminal and high-risk behavior with increasingly more severe
> outcomes including violent crime, suicide attempts and suicide, and accidental death. [48]

Although the above quotation and the remainder of the report clearly suggest Army leaders have

been considering all available options to improve discipline, they do not directly support the

conclusion that the Army Profession Campaign is itself one such effort.

---

[46]U.S. Army, *The Army*, i-ii; 2-3, References-3.

[47]U.S. Army, *Army Strategic Planning Guidance,* 13.

[48]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, *Army 2020: Generating Health and Discipline in the Force Ahead of the Strategic Reset, Report 2012, Revision 2* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012), 4.

CAPE Senior Fellow, and intellectual-chief-architect of the Army Profession Campaign, Don Snider, addressed the issue during an Army Profession Campaign forum at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, titled "The Army Profession – Standards and Discipline". Dr. Snider served 30 years in the Army before starting an academic career in which he specialized in military professionalism. In his opening remarks, Dr. Don Snider explained the issue of professionalization as being one of role identity. He explained the motives behind the Army Profession Campaign by outlining all the issues that appeared in *The Army Profession*. He said initial surveys indicated two critical problems within the Army: 1) people not upholding the Army Values, and 2) a lack of trust. According to Dr. Snider, the Army Profession Campaign would address both of those issues through a process of professionalizing the force. Dr. Snider said the Army has gone through drawdowns before alluding to post-Vietnam reductions in the size of the Army. Dr. Snider told the audience that Army leaders started the Army Profession Campaign because they had, in regards to discipline, determined that, after 10 years at war, the Army was struggling to maintain current standards. During the same forum, Dr. Snider addressed why the Army Profession Campaign included an appeal to the individual's self-identity:

> What caused you to think and accept an identity and therefore a motivation that you were uniquely a professional? This is an issue of role identity. Identity is where we start. The institutional identity of the Army is a profession and the individual identity that you are a professional.[49]

He indicated that individuals who assumed a professional self-identity would likely internalize the behavioral norms outlined in emerging Army Doctrine 2015. In Doctrine 2015, Army leaders communicated those norms partially by including creeds and mottos. This was exactly in keeping with Fournier's model.

Dr. Snider was aware of Fournier's model of professionalization because he edited The *Future of the Army Professions*, an anthology of essays in which, many of the authors refer to

---

[49]Don Snider, "Opening Remarks" [seminar, Ft. Leavenworth, KS. December 5, 2012].

Fournier's model. The book contains numerous examples of authors describing or recommending models of professionalization similar to the one Fournier outlined. Gayle Watkins and Randi Cohen provided the best example:

> Internalized values . . . and member commitment provide the most powerful means of achieving . . . control over those engaged [in combat]. These control systems, known to organizational theorists as "clan control," are most often developed in small, horizontal organizations and professions.[50]

Since McGraw Hill published that anthology in 2005, it is possible to infer Dr. Snider knew about clan control at least as early as 2005.

Army leaders included the Army Profession Campaign's appeals to self-identity most notably in Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) 6-22, *Leadership*. The section on character, presents the Army Values, the Soldier's Creed, and the Army Civilian Corps Creed. On page 3-5, the text reads, "effective leadership begins with developing and maintaining a leader identity. Identity refers to one's self-concept."[51] ADP 6-22 provides the most cut-and-dry examples of Army leaders employing Fourier's model of professionalization.

An attempt to appeal to individual's self-identity can be seen throughout the Army Profession literature as far back as the EXCEL Study. The authors of the EXCEL Study recommended that Army commanders:

> continue to reinforce the Army Values in all Soldiers and leaders [because] higher internalization of Army Values was related to lower transgressions, and higher moral courage, moral confidence and intentions to confront others for misconduct.[52]

All the Army Profession Campaign White Papers include myriad comingling of the argument that the Army is a profession and the normative artifacts of that profession. The authors of those papers couched their descriptions and arguments in support of the Army Profession with language

---

[50]Randi C. Cohen and Gayle L. Watkins, "In Their Own Words: Army Officers Discuss Their Profession," in *The Future of the Army Profession*, ed. Don M. Snider and Lloyd J. Matthews (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005), 116.

[51]U.S. Army, *Army Leadership*, 3-5.

[52]U.S. Army, *EXCEL Study Report*, 22.

that appeals to their readers' pride if not vanity. At the same time, the authors appear to have included every creed, code, oath, and set of rules available. The final section of *The Army Profession: 2012, After More Than a Decade of Conflict*, provided the most eloquent example of this rhetorical artistry. At one point during its evolution, the Army White Paper supporting the Army Profession Campaign included the Army Values, The Soldier Rules, the NCO Creed, the Officer and Warrant Officer Oath of Office, The Soldier's Creed and Warrior Ethos, The Army Oath of Enlistment, the Department of the Army Civilian Corps Creed, and "Standards of Exemplary Conduct" from Title 10 United States Code Section 3583.[53] In 2012, when speaking about the Army Profession Campaign, Dr. Snider acknowledged such artifacts were means that the Army used to maximize audience internalization of assigned values.[54] The fact that the Army Campaign literature and the doctrine that followed contains normative artifacts wherever the profession is mentioned supports the argument that the Army Profession Campaign's authors were knowingly trying to follow a theory of professionalization similar to the one Fournier described. Fournier described corporate leaders appealing to employees' professionalism while simultaneously offering lists of competencies and codes of conduct. Army leaders have done exactly the same thing in the Army Profession Campaign.

No other feature of the Army Profession Campaign was more controversial or caused more rancorous debate than its near universality. Before Army leaders cemented the Army Profession in Army doctrine, they socialized the concept by publishing a series of Army White Papers, and conducted numerous surveys in what began as an educational campaign. Although everyone involved in the campaign who has discussed it on the record insists the Army Profession emerged from the previous profession of arms due to simple logical necessity, that

---

[53]U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army, Center for Army Profession and Ethic, *The Profession of Arms, 2011: The Profession After 10 Years of Persistent Conflict* (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2010), i.

[54]Don Snider, "Opening Remarks."

explanation discounts all previous scholarship on professions and the profession of arms. In fact, surveying works by the same scholars who authored the Army Profession literature demonstrates they did not previously concluded that the US Army was in itself a profession. Nor had they previously argued that all members of any military were professionals or equal or even near-equal standing. Given those facts, it is difficult to see how the Army White Paper, *The Profession of Arms,* gave rise to the Army White Paper, *The Army Profession.* Army leaders themselves all but acknowledged the logical discontinuity between the two by producing the extremely belabored Army White Paper, *The Army Civilian Corps - A Vital Component of the Army Profession.* Civilians were never previously included in any definitions, scholarly or otherwise, of a profession of arms. When Army leaders decided to include civilians and all service members, they invented the Army Profession. It is difficult to accept arguments that the Army Profession arose logically through earnest dialogue.

In 1999, Dr. Snider co-authored a monograph with John Nagl and Tony Pfaff. In that monograph, the authors gave only the most cursory nod to acknowledge the idea that non-commissioned officers and Army civilians were professionals. In nearly the same breath, they explained their model of the profession of arms based on sacrifice and obligation:

> The trucker, while he may have certain contractual obligations, cannot be morally obligated to put his and others' lives at risk to fulfill them. He will simply have to live with the penalty, and the customer will simply have to live without the goods. For this reason, especially given the kinds of sacrifices that the officer is required to make, it is important that the obligation run much deeper than a mere "contract."[55]

This example illustrates a cognitive discontinuity between the Army Profession literature and Dr. Snider's earlier works. This suggests that Dr. Snider and his fellow Army Profession authors

---

[55]Don Snider, John Nagl, and Tony Pfaff, "Army Professionalism, The Military Ethic, and Officership in the 21st Century" (Carlisle, PA.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1999), 28.

might have developed their revised, inclusive model of the Army Profession for more reason than simple logic would offer.

Perhaps the change was inevitable since members of each of the Army's five cohorts, Commissioned Officers, Warrant Officers, Noncommissioned Officers, Soldiers, and DA Civilians, conducted TRADOC's review of the profession. It certainly seems unlikely such a panel or panels would fail to include themselves and their peers in the Army's profession of arms given the previously established fact that the rhetoric involved appeals to individual pride. Of course, it is more likely Army leaders simply directed the campaign's authors to include everyone in the profession. No model of professions existed with which the entire Army could be described as a single, all-inclusive profession, the campaign's authors. For this reason, when it emerged, the Army Profession concept included two subordinate professions: the Army Profession of Arms and the Army Civilian Corps. The authors of the Army Profession Campaign described the professions within a profession construct:

> The Army Profession has two complementary and mutually supporting components—the Army Profession of Arms and the Army Civilian Corps. The Army Profession of Arms is composed of uniformed members of the Profession, those skilled in the art of warfare and under unlimited liability in its "killing and dying" aspects. The Army Civilian Corps is composed of all non-uniformed members of the Profession working for the Department of the Army.[56]

The authors of the campaign had not mentioned Army civilians at all in their previous White Papers. Doing so apparently sparked enough debate to necessitate writing another White Paper dedicated entirely to explaining how Army civilians can be seen as a unique profession and how that profession nests with the Army's profession of arms.[57] By the time it became doctrine, the Army Profession had divided into four *fields of professional knowledge* that together formed the Army Profession: a "profession of professions, some uniquely military and others with close

---

[56]U.S. Army, *The Army Profession*, 3.

[57]U.S. Army, *The Army Civilian Corps*.

civilian counterparts."[58] It is reasonable to infer from the fact that the model was changed before becoming doctrine that some people found the concept of an Army profession of arms and co-equal professional civilian corps unconvincing.

To allow the construct to include everyone in the Army, the authors of the Army Profession had to redefine the Army's expert work or the service it provides the American people. Including all uniformed service members required a broader interpretation of expert work than Huntington offered, Including Army civilians in the construct led the campaign's authors to the limits of sophistry. Until Army leaders ended the debate by incorporating the concept into Doctrine 2015, they produced many versions of the White Papers. Each subsequent White Paper included a more complicated description of the Army Profession's expert work. One of the least satisfying was "the ethical design, generation, support, and application of land combat power."[59]

Army leaders may have decided to include Army civilians in the model of the profession to explain how the profession generates, refines, and controls its own special body of knowledge:

> The Army creates its own expert knowledge, both theoretical and practical, for the defense of the Nation through land combat power. This land power is normally applied in Joint Operations through the full spectrum of conflict and the subsequent establishment of a better peace. Such knowledge is unique and is not generally held outside the Army Profession.[60]

Not including DA civilians in the model would mean the Army applied expert knowledge that it, as a profession, created with the help of non-members. Of course, such reasoning ignores the fact that the Army's own description of its professional expertise or special body of knowledge involves joint operations. Therefore, members of the profession must rely on members of other services to help develop that knowledge. If that is the case, the Army Profession concept remains susceptible to questions regarding the development of its special body of knowledge whether or

---

[58]U.S. Army, *The Army*, 2-5.

[59]U.S. Army, *The Army Civilian Corps*, 5.

[60]U.S. Army, *The Army Profession*, 17.

not DA civilians are included. Since the inclusion of DA civilians did not fully resolve the issue of who creates the Army's expert knowledge, the question remains as to why Army leaders included civilians. The supposition that the Army Profession concept was actually narrative packaging to support a model of professionalization similar to the one Fournier described is one possible explanation. The same supposition could answer the final issue the Army Campaign literature raises. At what point does someone become a professional within the Army Profession?

According to the Army Profession literature, members of the Army become professionals immediately upon entering service. According to the model, Army service members become *aspiring professionals* when they swear or affirm their service oaths. Then, after a period of education and training, the Army certifies members as *practicing professionals* subject to periodic recertification. Then, upon leaving the service, prior-service members become *non-practicing professionals* or *non-practicing retired professionals*.[61] The assertion that everyone in the Army became a professional when he or she swore or affirmed an oath of service has been hotly debated.[62] Traditional views of the profession of arms and theories of professions do not lend themselves to supporting the concept of a profession into which someone could enter by simply swearing an oath. A few scholars have argued in favor a profession of arms model which includes all uniformed personnel. Usually those arguments lean heavily towards philosophy relying on the concepts of unlimited liability or social responsibility.[63] However, such arguments do not readily support including DA civilians. Army doctrine writers reached a compromise regarding when service members and DA civilians become members of the profession. They did so by implying someone can be a member of a profession without being a professional. By

---

[61]U.S. Army, *The Army Profession*, 2-5.

[62]Kevin M. Bond, "Are We Professionals?" *Joint Forces Quarterly*, No. 58 (2010): 66, http://search.proquest.com/docviews/527726997.

[63]Jessica Wolfendale, *Torture and the Military Profession* (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 48.

retaining the Army Profession Campaign's *aspiring professional* but replacing *practicing professional* with *professional,* the writers of ADP 1, confused the issue by implying aspiring professionals are somehow both professionals and non-professionals.[64] There are many reasons Army doctrine might contain obvious self-contradictions. Conscious use of narrative through rhetorical devices of Fournier-type professionalization is one such possibility.

Army doctrine and the Army Profession Campaign literature readily support the supposition that their authors were applying a model of professionalization similar to the one Fournier described. Army leaders remain concerned that deployments in support of ongoing hostilities have stressed Army personnel. They are further concerned that some level of indiscipline has been one of the results of that stress.[65] The chief architect of the Army Profession Campaign, Dr. Snider, prior to the creation of the Army Profession construct, appears to have employed a more traditional model of the profession of arms. That model specifically included commissioned officers and may have included other uniformed service members. It did not included DA civilians.[66] Dr. Snider acknowledged artifacts such as creeds and lists of values are artifacts the Army uses to help service members internalize behavioral norms.[67] *The Army Strategic Planning Guidance 2013* directs Army leaders to communicate the narrative of professionalization and specifies reasons for doing so that parallel those outlined in Fournier's model of professionalization.[68] As of early 2013, Army doctrine describing the Army Profession contains several self-contradictions that can most easily be explained if the Army Profession construct is understood as a rhetorical device rather than a literal description of the Army.

---

[64]U.S. Army, *The Army*, 2-5.

[65]U.S. Army, *Army 2020: Generating Health and Discipline*, 4.

[66]Snider, et al., "Army Professionalism," 28.

[67]Snider, "Opening Remarks."

[68]U.S. Army, *The Army Strategic Planning Guidance 2013*, 13.

CONCLUSION

In Army Doctrine 2015, Army leaders adopted a description of the Army as a profession. According to the Army's model, the Army Profession includes uniformed service members of all ranks as well as all DA civilians. Individual members of the profession become members as soon as they swear or affirm their service oath. The broad inclusivity of the model is at odds with earlier descriptions of professions in general and traditional understanding of the profession of arms. The model also breaks with traditional concepts of a profession of arms by including DA civilians. There are many possible explanations as to why Army leaders chose to adopt such a model and why they have allocated resources to socializing the concept of an Army Profession within the force. Evidence suggests Army leaders did so in an attempt to follow a model of professionalization in which a business's leaders use the rhetoric of professionalization to convince employees to behave in a manner specified by the business leaders. Fournier, and occupational theorist, described such a model.

In developing the Army Profession concept, authors of the Army Profession Campaign borrowed some elements from earlier sociology of professions. They appear to have been most heavily influenced by Abbott's notion that expert work is the application of abstract knowledge on behalf of a client. Unlike Abbott, the authors of the Army Profession Campaign followed earlier sociological models of professions by establishing lists of criteria by which occupations can be judged as being professions or non-professions. Army literature supporting the Army Profession construct implies there is a commonly understood definition of professions. A survey of sociology suggests otherwise. However, there is no historical precedent among sociologists for including all ancillary members of an occupation as professionals given one recognizes the occupation as a profession.

The Army Profession model is incongruent with traditional models of a US profession of arms. Sociologists and political scientists have written extensively describing models of an American profession of arms. Although Huntington, Janowitz, and Moskos disagreed in many

respects in how best to describe a profession of arms, Huntington and Janowitz agreed on several points. Most notably, their models of the profession of arms were exclusive. Although Moskos described more inclusive model, his model of a profession of arms discounted anyone enticed my monetary inducements. For that reason, he predicted the shift to an all-volunteer force would lead to a deprofessionalization of the Army. In these ways and other particulars, the Army Profession model does not cognitively nest with any of the profession of arms models examined. However, the Army Profession literature retained the message of military subordination to civilian political leaders found in Huntington's *The Soldier and the State*.

Second, Huntington's admonishment for military professionals to remain apolitical provides an example of professional narrative affecting individuals' self-identity to the point of modifying behavior. Third, although military service members maybe attracted to the idea of client-professional deferment, they remain staunchly dedicated to Constitutional subordination of the military to civilian leadership. The Secretary of the Army's involvement in developing the Army Profession Campaign negates concerns the campaign's authors intended to influence political leaders through Army Profession messaging.

A brief examination of narrative and organizational theory suggested Army leaders might have adopted the Army Profession Campaign as a way to operationalize narrative theory to improve or maintain discipline by appealing to individuals' self-identities. Ochs and Capps provided a theory of how individuals' self-identities may be formed not only through direct experience but also through interpretation of those experiences as well as discourse about those experiences. Army leaders have included narrative theory explicitly in doctrine. That evidence supports inferring Army leaders were aware of narrative theory at the time they undertook the Army Profession Campaign. Pierce suggested it was theoretically possible to strongly influence individual behavior by altering elements of organizational culture. Fournier observed business leaders actively employing such methods through the rhetoric of professionalization Fournier reported positive outcomes. Furthermore, Fournier reported the occupation of the individuals

involved had little or no bearing on the outcome regarding behavior. Although there is no evidence Army leaders read Fournier, there is evidence that the chief architect of the Army Profession Campaign, Dr. Snider, was aware of Fournier's work.

Examining Army doctrine and the Army Profession Campaign literature supports the supposition that their authors were applying a model of professionalization similar to the one Fournier described. The literature showed Army leaders were highly that increased operational deployments between 2001 and 2012 had negatively affected discipline throughout the Army. Evidence suggests but does not prove that Army leaders included uniformed service members and DA civilian in the Army Profession construct to maximize potential benefits of the construct as a rhetorical device. *The Army Strategic Planning Guidance 2013* directs Army leaders to communicate the narrative of professionalization and specifies reasons for doing so that parallel those outlined in Fournier's model of professionalization.[69]

---

[69]U.S. Army, *The Army Strategic Planning Guidance 2013*, 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Andrew Delano. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Aldridge, Meryl, and Julia Evetts. "Rethinking the Concept of Professionalism: The Case of Journalism." *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 4 (December 1, 2003): 547-64.

Allen, Charles D. "Redress of Professional Military Education: The Clarion Call." *Joint Forces Quarterly*, no. 59 (2010): 94-100.

Atkeson, Edward B. "Military Art and Science: An Academic Discipline." *Army Magazine*, no. 5 (May 2005): 14-15.

Baldor, Lolita C. and Michael Biesecker. "US Army Brigadier General Jeffrey Sinclair to Face Court Martial." *The Huffington Post* (December 19, 2012), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/26/jeffrey-sinclair-arrested_n_1916919.html (accessed January 02, 2013).

Bastviken, Louise K.D. "Proceedings of the Seminar on Leadership in a Multi-National Environment." *Baltic Security & Defense Review*, no. 10 (2008): 220-36.

Battaglia, Bryan B. "Total Commitment to the Total Force." *Joint Forces Quarterly* 64 (2012): 8-9.

Bergamini, Oliviero. "The Delafield Commission and the American Military Profession." *Journal of American History*, no. 2 (2001): 657-59.

Berinsky, Adam J. *In Time of War: Understanding American Public Opinion from World War II to Iraq*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Bond, Kevin M. "Are We Professionals?" *Joint Forces Quarterly*. No. 58 (2010): 62-8, http://search.proquest.com/docviews/527726997.

Bondy, H. "Postmodernism and the Source of Military Strength in the Anglo West." *Armed Forces & Society* 31, no. 1 (Fall 2004): 31-61.

Brien, A. "Professional Ethics and the Culture of Trust." *Journal of Business Ethics* 17 (1998): 391-409.

Briggs, Bill. "Panetta Orders Review of Ethical Standards Amid Allegations of Misconduct among High-level Military Leaders." *U.S. News* (November 15, 2012). http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/11/15/15166642-panetta-orders-review-of-ethical-standards-amid-allegations-of-misconduct-among-high-level-military-leaders (accessed January 02, 2013).

Broadbent, Jane, Michael Dietrich, and Jennifer Roberts. *The End of Professions? Restructuring of Professional Work*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Bumiller, Elisabeth. "Panetta Orders Review of Ethics Training for Military Officers." *The New York Times* (November 16, 2012). http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/16/us/panetta-orders-review-of-ethics-training-for-officers.html (accessed January 02, 2013).

Burrage, Michael, and Rolf Torstendahl. *Professions in Theory and History: Rethinking the Study of Professions*. London: Sage Publications, 1990.

Caforio, G. "The Military Profession: Theories of Change." *Armed Forces & Society* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1988): 55-69.

Caforio, G., and M. Nuciari. "The Officer Profession: Ideal-Type." *Current Sociology* 42, no. 3

(Winter 1994): 33-56.

Clotfelter, James, and Guy B. Peters. "Profession and Society: Young Military Officers Look Outward." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 4, no. 1 (Spring 1976): 39-51.

Choen, Randi C. and Gayle L. Watkins. "In Their Own Words: Army Officers Discuss Their Profession." In *The Future of the Army Profession*, edited by Don M. Snider and Lloyd J. Matthews, 115-37. 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

Collins, Brian J. "The Officer Corps and Profession: Time for a New Model." *Joint Forces Quarterly*, no. 45 (Spring 2007): 104-10.

Cook, Martin L. "Moral Foundations of Military Service." *Parameters* 30, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 117-30.

Cruess, Sylvia R., Sharon Johnston, and Richard L. Cruess. ""Profession": A Working Definition for Medical Educators." *Teaching and Learning in Medicine* 16, no. 1 (2004): 74-76.

Dalacourt, Charles J. Jr. "Mentorship." *Military Review* 82, no. 6 (November/December 2002): 34-39.

Fitzgerald, T. "Can Change in Organizational Culture Really Be Managed?" *Organizational Dynamics* 17, no. 2 (1988): 5-15.

Formica, Anthony M. "How the Army Has Garbled the Message about the Nature of Its Profession." *Military Review* 92, no. 2 (March/April 2012): 44-52.

Fournier, Valerie. "The Appeal to 'Professionalism' as a Disciplinary Mechanism." *The Sociological Review* 47, no. 2 (1999): 280-307.

Ginsburgh, Robert N. "The Challenge to Military Professionalism." *Foreign Affairs* 42, no. 2 (January 1964): 255-68.

Gorman, Elizabeth H., and Rebecca L. Sandefur. ""Golden Age," Quiescence, and Revival: How the Sociology of Professions Became the Study of Knowledge-Based Work." *Work and Occupations* 38, no. 3 (August 2011): 275-302.

Gray, David, and Joseph Doty. "Contractors on the Battlefield and Our Professionl Military Ethic." *Army Magazine* 59, no. 7 (July 2009): 20-22.

Griffith, J. "Will Citizens Be Soldiers? Examining Retention of Reserve Component Soldiers." *Armed Forces & Society* 31, no. 3 (Spring 2005): 353-83.

Hedahl, Marcus. "Blood and Blackwaters: A Call to Arms for the Profession of Arms." *Journal of Military Ethics* 8, no. 1 (2009): 19-33.

Herron, Sean. "The Army Profession Ostrich or Phoenix?" *Military Review* 84, no. 1 (January/February 2004): 61-66.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1957.

Janowitz, Morris. *The Professional Soldier, a Social and Political Portrait.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1960.

Jans, Nicholas A. "Career Development, Job Rotation, and Professional Performance." *Armed Forces & Society* 30, no. 2 (Winter 2004): 255-77.

Jans, Nicholas A. "Military Professionalism: Changes in the Australian Defense Force." *Armed Forces & Society* 15, no. 2 (Winter 1989): 171-92.

Jordan, Amos A., and William A. Schless. "Social Sciences and the Military Profession." *Military Review* 43, no. 12 (December 1963): 16-22.

Kasher, Asa. "Public Trust in a Military Force." *Journal of Military Ethics* 2, no. 1 (January 2003).

Kemble, C. R. "Mutations in America's Perceptions of Its Professional Military Leaders: An Historical Overview and Update." *Armed Forces & Society* 34, no. 1 (October 2007): 29-45.

Kohn, Richard H. "Tarnished Brass: Is the U.S. Military Profession in Decline?" *World Affairs* 171, no. 4 (Spring 2009): 73-83.

Lane, Jack C. "The Military Profession's Search for Identity." *Marine Corps Gazette* 57, no. 6 (June 1973): 36-42.

Levy, Yagil. "The Essence of the "Market Army"." *Public Administration Review* 70, no. 3 (May/June 2010): 378-89.

Lucas, George. "Advice and Dissent: The Uniform Perspective." *Journal of Military Ethics* 8, no. 2 (2009): 141-61.

McCoy, Eric A. "Elements of the Profession of Arms and Their Impact on the Military Logistician." *Army Sustainment* 43, no. 4 (July/August 2011): 16-19.

Moelker, Rene, and Gerhard Kummel. "Chivalry and Codes of Conduct: Can the Virtue of Chivalry Epitomize Guidelines for Interpersonal Conduct?" *Journal of Military Ethics* 6, no. 4 (November 2007): 292-302.

Morgan, Matthew J. "An Evolving View of Warfare: War and Peace and the American Military Profession." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 16, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 147-69.

Morris, Janowitz. *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Moskos, Charles C., Jr. "The All-Volunteer Military: Calling, Profession, or Occupation?" *Parameters* (Winter) 1977, 23-31.

Moten, Matthew. "The Army Officers' Professional Ethic: Past, Present, and Future." Carlisle, PA.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2010.

Moten, Matthew. "Who is a Member of the Military Profession?" *Joint Forces Quarterly*, no. 62 (3rd Quarter 2011): 14-17.

Mzur, Diane H. *A More Perfect Military: How the Constitution Can Make Our Military Stronger*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Nielsen, Suzanne C., and Don M. Snider. *American Civil-Military Relations: The Soldier and the State in a New Era*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2009.

Nielson, Suzanne C. "American Civil-Military Relations Today: The Continuing Relevance of Samuel P. Kuntington's The Soldier and the State." *International Affairs* 80, no. 2 (March 2012): 369-76.

Nuciari, M. "Rethinking the Military Profession: Models of Change Compared." *Current Sociology* 42, no. 3 (Winter 1994): 7-21.

Ochs, Elinor, and Lisa Capps. "Narrating the Self." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25, no. 1 (1996): 19-43.

Owens, Mackubin Thomas. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations After 9/11: Renegotiating the Civil-*

Military Bargain. New York: Continuum, 2011.

Pararone, Christopher R. "The Nature of Knowledge in the Profession of Military Logistics." *Army Logistician* 40, no. 6 (November 2008): 39-42.

Parham, Paul B. "The American Military Profession: An Egalitarian View." *Military Review* 54, no. 11 (November 1974): 18-29.

Pierce, James G. "Is the Organizational Culture of the U.S. Army Congruent with the Professional Development of Its Senior Level Officer Corps?" Carlisle, PA.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2010.

Romeo, G., and J. T. Rigsby. "Disseminating Professionalism: The Influence of Selden Hopkins on the USA Accounting Profession." *Accounting History* 13, no. 4 (2008): 415-50.

Sarkesian, Sam C. "The U.S. Military Must Find Its Voice." *Orbis* 42, no. 3 (Summer 1988): 423-38.

Sarkesias, Sam C., and Robert E. Connor. *The U.S. Military Profession Into the Twenty-first Century: War, Peace, and Politics*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Schaub, Gary. "Civilian Combatants, Military Professionals? American Officer Judgments." *Defense Studies* 10, no. 3 (September 2010): 369-86.

Sciulli, David. "Professions Before Professionalism." *Archives Européennes De Sociologie* 48, no. 1 (2007): 121-147, http://search.proquest.com/docview/216947655 (accessed November 15, 2012).

Sciulli, David. *Professions in Civil Society and the State: Invariant Foundations and Consequences*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Shields, Patricia M. "Civil-Military Relations: Changing Frontiers." *Public Administration Review* 66, no. 6 (November/December 2006): 924-28.

Skelton, William B. "Samuel Huntington and the Roots of the American Military Tradition." *Journal of Military History* 60, no. 2 (April 1996): 352-38.

Snider, Don M. "Dissent and Strategic Leadership of the Military Professions." *Orbis* 52, no. 2 (March 2008): 256-77.

Snider, Don M. "Once Again, the Challenge to the U.S. Army During a Defense Reduction: To Remain a Military Profession." Carlisle, PA.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2012.

Snider, Don M., John A. Nagl, and Tony Pfaff. "Army Professionalism, The Military Ethic, and Officership in the 21st Century." Carlisle, PA.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1999.

Snider, Don M., Lloyd J. Matthews, Jim Marshall, and Fred Franks. *The Future of the Army Profession*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

Snow, Donald M., and Dennis M. Drew. *From Lexington to Baghdad and Beyond: War and Politics in the American Experience*. Armonk, NY.: M.E. Sharpe, 2010.

Taylor, William J. Jr. "Military Professionals in Changing Times." *Public Administration Review* 37, no. 6 (November/December 1977): 633-42.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. *Army 2020: Generating Health and Discipline in the Force Ahead of the Strategic Reset, Report 2012*, Revision 2. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Army Doctrine Publication No. 1, Change 1. *The Army*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Army Doctrine Publication No. 3-0*, Unified Land Operations*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2011.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Army Doctrine Reference Publication No. 6-22, Change 1*, Army Leadership*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. *Army Strategic Planning Guidance*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Army Center of Excellence for the Professional Military Ethic. "ACPME Technical Report 2010-01 MNF-I Excellence in Character and Ethical Leadership (EXCEL"). Hannah, Sean T. and John Schaubroeck. West Point, NY: Army Center of Excellence for the Professional Military Ethic, 2009.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Center for Army Profession and Ethic. "History of CAPE." February 26, 2013. http://cape.army.mil/history.php (accessed March 22, 2013).

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Center for Army Profession and Ethic. *The Army Civilian Corps - A Vital Component of the Army Profession*. White Paper. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Center for Army Profession and Ethic. *The Army Profession: After More than a Decade at War*. White Paper. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. Center for Army Profession and Ethic. *The Profession of Arms, 2011: The Profession After 10 Years of Persistent Conflict*. White Paper. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2010.

U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. Army. "Terms of Reference for the Review of the Army Profession in an Era of Persistent Conflict." Casey, George W. Jr. and John M. McHugh October 27, 2010. http://cape.army.mil/repository/ProArms/TOR%20Signed.pdf (accessed February 25, 2013).

Van De Pitte, Margaret. "What is Wrong with a Military Career?" *Peace Review* 19, no. 2 (April/May 2007): 183-89.

Waston, Tony J. *Sociology, Work and Industry*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Weigley, Russell Frank. *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy*. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Wenker, Kenneth, and James Kempf. *Military Ethics*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press Publications, 1987.

Wertheimer, Roger. *Empowering Our Military Conscience: Transforming Just War Theory and Military Moral Education*. Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2010.

Wilensky, Harold L. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 137-58.

Winton, Harold R. "An Imperfect Jewel: Military Theory and the Military Profession." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 34, no. 6 (December 2011): 853-77.

Wolfendale, Jessica. "Professional Integrity and Disobedience in the Military." *Journal of Military Ethics* 8, no. 2 (June 2009): 127-40.

Wolfendale, Jessica. *Torture and the Military Profession*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave
  Macmillan, 2007.