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Abstract
What are young Australians’ understandings of, and attitudes to, the military and military service? This article describes a pilot study of 320 young Australian university students’ attitudes to the military and military service during a time when Australia was engaged in the Afghanistan war. The main purpose of this study was to develop a survey instrument for further work in researching civil–military relations in Australia. Civil–military relations describe the complex set of relationships between the civil and military spheres. The role of the military, the relationship between the state and the military, the division of labor between civilian and military entities, foreign policy, and knowledge of military service are some of the fields that constitute a study of civil–military relations. This article reports on beliefs about, and attitudes to the specificities of military service and responses to the broader field of civil–military relations.
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Since the 1990s, Australia has progressively increased its engagement in overseas operations, from Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, through Cambodia, Rwanda, East Timor, and Iraq to the present day, to name but a few. At the time of conducting this survey Australia was engaged in the Afghanistan war. This article reports on a pilot study of undergraduate, pre-service teachers’ attitudes to the military and military service. The focus of this research is civil–military relations (Feaver & Kohn, 2001) with a particular focus on beliefs and attitudes about the military and military service.

Civil–military relations describe the complex set of relationships between the civil and military domains. The role of the military in liberal democracies, the relationship between the state and the military, or the state and/or the military and civil society are key points of interest in this field of study. One theme in the military literature is the idea of the “culture gap” (Rukavishnikov & Pugh, 2006, p. 132). This notion recognizes that the military subject is profoundly a resocialized subject, and the military institution is a distinctly different domain from that of civil society.

This article reports on the study’s assessment of beliefs about, and attitudes to, the specificities of military service and their views of civil–military relations more broadly. Questions around these matters provided the opportunity through open-ended survey questions to discuss attitudes to war, state violence, foreign policy, and beliefs about the role of the military in Australian society (attitudes to the military). More specifically, responses to the survey sought students’ knowledge about service, the roles of different services (e.g., Navy, Air Force, and Army), and other distinctions within the military such as Army Reserves or Australian Regular Army, or commissioned and non-commissioned officers (attitudes to military service). An examination of both attitudes to the military and military service together would allow a consideration of the relationship between military attitudes and military propensity. The relationship between these variables and attitudes to authority will be reported elsewhere.

The survey questions were derived from three different sources. The first source was Ken Rigby’s (1982) attitudes to authority index. The aim of this part of the survey was to determine the strength of correlation between particular attitudes to authority and military service. The aim of this part of the survey was to determine the strength of correlation between particular attitudes to authority and military service. We were working on the hypothesis that pro-authority attitudes positively correlate to pro-military sentiment and subsequent higher military propensity. This is not reported on in this article.

The attitudes to the military and military service aspect of the survey were developed in relation to the Triangle Institute Security Studies Survey on the Military in the Post–Cold War
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activities. The SMPCWE relates, as explained above, to understanding the civil–military culture gap. The SMPCWE consists of 81 questions on a range of issues including U.S. foreign policy goals; threats to U.S. sovereignty; broad social, political, and religious values; the role of the media; knowledge of and attitudes toward military values and activities as well as various demographic questions.

We surveyed male and female undergraduate students in a teacher education program at Flinders University. The matter of gender was an important focus of the analysis in the present study given the public organizational challenges the Australian Defence Force (ADF) has faced, and continues to face around women’s participation in the organization. The principal and most recent example is the Skype Affair, where in 2011 six male cadets conspired to watch one of the group have sex with a female cadet colleague at the Australian Defence Force Academy (ADFA). The sex was consensual. The broadcast by Skype to the other men in an adjacent room was not. The incident sparked public dismay and a series of cultural reviews in an alleged culture of male bullying and harassment. As a consequence, all gender barriers were lifted for women’s employment in the ADF, and the question of how women will be treated in traditional all-male domains becomes paramount.

Qualitative questions included in the survey, in terms of type of service, attitudes to serving in a theater of operations and attitudes to a Gap Year were designed to provide information on generalized knowledge of, and attitudes to, the military. By placing the respondent in the position of assuming their role in such contexts their responses provided a window into their particular views of the situation and their general view of the role of militaries.

The qualitative survey questions sought to establish broader reasoning behind the respondent’s attraction to different services, to enlistment or commission, and to the attraction of the Gap Year. These questions sought to elicit indications of attitudes to the military and military service, which provide indications of propensity to serve. Being a pilot study, we sought to permit the respondents to indicate to us the key directions of study. This serves the function of informing more directed survey development in its subsequent form. We anticipated that the responses would fall into the realm of reported responses in the North American studies of civil–military relations and military propensity that are explained in more detail in the next section of this article.

The respondents were also asked to indicate their perceptions of the different services. Other questions asked the respondent to indicate their disposition toward serving in a theater of operations, and to broadly discuss their perceptions about the disadvantages and advantages in serving in the military. These questions sought to elicit beliefs and attitudes about the broader role of the military in society, questions of conscription and voluntary service and the place of the Australian military in contemporary global military activities.

Method

Participants

The sample of 320 students was completing an undergraduate Education course in 2009. The majority (80.8%) of participants reported that they were undertaking at least one degree in education; one in eight (12.9%) were working toward an arts degree, while the remainder (6.3%) were enrolled in another degree course, such as science or health. Most (69%) of the respondents were women and the average age of respondents was 21.7 years (SD = 6.8 years). More than three quarters (78.9%) of participants were aged between 17 and 22, inclusive. Just less than half (46.9%) of the participants indicated some religious affiliation, while 23.4% reported no religion, and 29.7% did not answer the question. The respondents were predominantly White Australian, with the majority (85%) identifying as Anglo-Celtic or Caucasian and Australian born. About 4% identified as mixed-Australian, for example, Greek Australian, 6% as European, and one Indigenous Australian.

Materials and Procedure

The survey instrument used in this study is currently called the Young Australians’ Attitudes to the Military and Military Service Questionnaire (YAMMMS). The YAMMMS Questionnaire included the Attitudes to Authority Questionnaire (ATAQ; Rigby, 1982) as well as an Attitudes Towards the Military Questionnaire (ATMQ), some demographic questions and some questions which asked respondents about their preferences for joining the military. The ATMQ included questions on the subjects of compulsory/voluntary service, differences among the services, and the role of the military in society. These provide information on both service-related matters within the military and in the domain of civil–military relations. Examples of these questions can be found in the appendix.

We were informed in particular by questions that focused on the role of the military, knowledge of military services, types of military service and the nexus between military service, liberal values, and the potential for aggression inherent in military training. We used 7-point Likert-type scales to measure attitudes toward military service. Respondents were also asked to indicate their thoughts about the advantages and disadvantages of joining the military and how they would feel if they were required to serve in an area of
operations (site of conflict). These questions also elicited beliefs about the role of the military in society, the place of national service or conscription, and Australia’s engagement with global military activities.

Participant responses were analyzed using IBM SPSS v 17.0. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using maximum likelihood robust estimation (MLR) with Varimax rotation was undertaken using MPlus v6.11 for both Military Attitudes and Attitudes toward Authority. Non-parametric tests were used when Levene’s test suggested that there was no homogeneity of variance (Field, 2009).

Effect sizes were calculated using Cramer’s $V$ where chi-square tests were undertaken, and Rosenthal’s (1991) $r$ was used to estimate the effect size for analyses of variance. Reliability was computed using Hancock and Mueller’s (2001) “coefficient H.” This coefficient is considered to be a better measure of reliability than Cronbach’s alpha as it allows for the weighting of variables rather than treating them equally (Brunner & Heinz-Martin, 2005).

The qualitative data were themed and coded using Microsoft Excel. This involves a process of free coding, and developing themes as organically as possible, with no direct relation to the broader literature. Free coding evolves into axial coding, the combining of free codes to develop principal themes that are directly related to the literature (Charmaz, 2006). This article expresses a report on selected themes arising from the study. The data were subsequently disaggregated by sex and responses between men and women were compared.

Results

The following discussion outlines several pillars of the project. First, an insight into the relationship between attitudes to the military and military propensity. In future work, we will explore this factor’s relationship with attitudes to authority. We then discuss attitudes to military service, unpacking the civil–military relationship in greater depth in terms of attitudes to type of military service and the services themselves. The responses we recorded in our original survey correspond to the kinds of issues outlined in the North American research. We develop this further to include matters of negative propensity—reasons articulated for not supporting the military or military service. The responses to the survey are strongly gendered and this aspect of the findings is considered throughout the general discussion.

Attitudes Toward the Military

An EFA identified four factors for the Attitudes toward the Military questions. However, subsequent confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) indicated that only three of these factors were dimensions of an overall military attitude factor (see the appendix). This is illustrated in Figure 1, which is the outcome of a second-order CFA, including the three factors as latent variables, each of which acts as an indicator of a favorable military attitude (also a latent variable). This abbreviated structural equation model is interpreted by considering that the factors in the model reflect different facets of a favorable attitude to the military.

As shown in Figure 1, a favorable attitude toward the military was aligned along three aspects. This included having pro-military sentiments (Factor 1), espousing beliefs that the military benefits society (Factor 2), and supporting a view that it was not the case that the military promotes aggression (Factor 3). This was indicated by the negative relationship ($-0.59$) between the military promotes aggression factor and overall favorable military attitude. In contrast, pro-military sentiments and beliefs that the military benefits society were strongly indicative of a favorable military attitude, shown by the large positive relationships of 0.91 and 0.80, respectively.

Military Service

Themes that emerged coincide with The U.S. National Research Council’s (2004) research into Attitudes, Aptitudes, and Aspirations of American Youth. This research described five basic dimensions to military propensity, as does our study:

- **Learning Opportunities:** Develop self-discipline, develop leadership skills, job preparation, and learn new skills.
- **Working Conditions:** Work autonomy, work as a team, mental challenge, interesting job, work with people you respect, near family, and personal freedom.
- **External Incentives:** High-tech environment, money for education, good pay, job security, parental approval, and earn respect.
As shown in Table 1, men and women differed in the military service they indicated they would join. Women were more likely than men to report that they would join the Navy, whereas men were more likely than women to indicate that they would join the Army or Air Force.

The key distinction in determining preference for a service was between a positive or negative identification with the service, its medium of activity (e.g., Army—land, Navy, sea), and/or its core activity (flying, land warfare, or nautical activities). One in four respondents identified negatively with their service choice (e.g., I hate flying so I would join the Navy), 25% of women and 22% of men’s preferences, respectively. One in three respondents explained their preference for service in positive terms: 30% of women and 31% of men’s responses, respectively. Nearly half of preferences were explained on other terms. Responses indicated a concern with interest, comfort, and proximity to danger. It is hypothesized that non-negative rationalizations for joining the military indicate pro-military and pro-service attitudes.

Respondents displaying positive identification described wanting to fly jets, enjoying the sea or working with tanks or "guns":

- because I like planes and helicopters,
- I love being outdoors, commando courses, and so on would imagine a lot of the training to be like this.

Respondents were more likely to positively identify with the Air Force, the Army and the Navy, respectively. One in three female and 8% of male respondents preferring the Air Force demonstrated a positive identification with flying or aviation. Twenty-five percent of female respondents preferring the Navy indicated their preference was because of an affiliation with the ocean and marine activities.

Respondents displaying negative identification explained that they were afraid of flying, did not like the sea, did not like the possibility of armed combat, said that it would be unpleasant to die on a ship, or did not want to drown. Respondents who negatively identified with a service explained:

- "the navy fights in less battles; less violence;"
- "because I am scared of being on boats for too long and I am not at all interested in flying too much."

Issues such as confined space on Navy ships or submarines were expressed, as was motion sickness as a deterrent from flying. The Navy had a greater proportion of negative identification than the other services.

### Table 1. Men and Women’s Preferences for Joining the Military.

| Would join | Men⁴ | Women⁵ | Total⁶ |
|------------|------|--------|--------|
| Army       | 40   | 68     | 108    |
| Navy       | 10   | 48     | 58     |
| Air Force  | 45   | 79     | 124    |
|            | 95   | 195    | 290    |

*Missing = 1.

• **Patriotic Adventure**: Opportunity for adventure, physical challenge, doing something for your country, foreign travel, domestic travel, and doing something to be proud of.

• **Equal Opportunity**: Equal employment opportunity for women, equal employment opportunity for minorities, and prevents harassment.

These criteria are all covered in the following responses. These were measured statistically in the U.S. research, and emerged qualitatively in this study. The open design of the qualitative study aimed to give an indication of the fit between the U.S. survey and common responses in the Australian sample.

The key themes for serving, and the type of service one would prefer include interest, comfort, proximity to danger, family, skills and training, fitness and lifestyle, challenge, autonomy and self-actualization, status, and country. These themes give not only an indication of reasons for service but also implicit values toward the military and civil–military relations. An emergent question is, what are the degrees of difference in pro-authority, pro-military, pro-service evident in service preference (i.e., is the army more authoritarian and conservative than the other services)? How is that distributed across social indicators of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, socioeconomic status (SES), or location?

Men and women differed in their pro-service attitudes. Overall men were more pro-service than women (Mann–Whitney U, Z = -2.18, p < .029, effect size = 0.12—that is, difference between men and women was very small). Men and women did not significantly differ in any other attitudes toward the military that is, no differences were found between them in terms of their scores on the service differences and service benefits factors.

The initial question regarding service in the survey investigated service preference. Close to one half of respondents indicated a preference for the Air Force (42.8%), just more than one third of the participants indicated that they would join the Army (37.2%), and one in five (20.0%) indicated that they would join the Navy.

|             | Men⁴ | Women⁵ | Total⁶ |
|-------------|------|--------|--------|
| Would join  |      |        |        |
| Army        | 40   | 68     | 108    |
| Navy        | 10   | 48     | 58     |
| Air Force   | 45   | 79     | 124    |
|             | 95   | 195    | 290    |

*Missing = 1 (4%).

*Missing = 25 (11.4%).

*Missing = 4 (4%).
Nearly half (45%) of those indicating a preference to join the Army justified their preference on the basis that they did not like the idea of working on the ocean or in the air. The principal justification for not serving in the Army was to avoid danger, death, and violence. The Air Force and Navy were seen as less violent and less likely to involve danger or threat of death, trauma, or injury.

The Army appealed to respondents because of the security of being on the ground, a sense of capacity to escape from danger, and a focus on ability and physical fitness.

- “I feel the army is the most important part in a war and I feel much better about being on the rough conditions of the ground . . . ”
- “army because you have a better chance of escaping”
- “. . . physically demanding, improve personal fitness.”

In positive terms, male respondents who indicated a preference for the Army explained that they were attracted to land activities including bush survival, physical activity, fitness, and tactical ground warfare (e.g., sniping, infantry patrols and the appeal of “military combat”):

- “They get to do cool stuff like shoot guns, go out bush and physically fight for our country!”
- “I like physical activity and being pushed physically.”

The notion of teamwork and was articulated as a reason why the Army was more appealing than the Navy or Air Force:

- “in my opinion would be a better team environment”
- “bit more orientation on your ability; more team based principles”

The focus on ability and teamwork highlights the appeal of infantry section-based forms of work for example. A male respondent explained,

- “infantry soldier/rifleman—from experience of a mate joining he has gained great experience of being independent and “leader” from such a young age (18).”

This was also expressed in terms of brotherhood pride and mateship. These terms were not used by those respondents who indicated preference for the Navy and Air Force.

A small proportion (6%) of respondents cited familiarity as influencing their service preference. Familiarity included having served in cadets in that service, family tradition, or having friends within that service. Typical statements included,

- “. . . because my dad was in the air force”;
- “. . . army follows family tradition.”

Other reasons that were disparate and of lesser consequence included patriotism, “a good experience to help serve our country,” and the appeal of personal development including skills, “more technical job opportunities,” and “because the skills attained in the air force would be of use outside the military.” The justification of physical fitness for service preference was entirely related to the Army. Other reasons included humanitarian interests and perceptions of status that were described across all three services.

All services had various kinds of status assumptions attached to them. The Air Force was considered prestigious, the Navy had a small representation of comments about sexism and the Army also was described in a small number of cases as “blokey” and likely to be more “brutal” but also, “more important.”

The questionnaire did not provide the opportunity to indicate whether one would refuse to join the military. However, although all respondents completed the preference for service question, they were able to qualify that response in the open questions. Of those who responded to these questions, 5% indicated that they would, given the choice, never join the service, due to a non-violent disposition, a refusal to use force, refusal to put themselves in danger, or the incapacity to be away from their home and family.

**Pro-military sentiments** and a belief that the military benefits society were more likely among those who indicated that they would join the Army. These sentiments were evident in responses to the open questions about serving a Gap Year and advantages and disadvantages of serving in the military.

### Serving in Gap Year

Less than half (43.2%) of the participants reported that they would serve during a Gap year, but men were more likely than women to report this (see Table 2).

When the factors were examined more closely, people who reported that they would consider serving in a Gap year were more likely to have **pro-military sentiments**, believe that the military benefits society, and that the military does
not contribute to producing aggressive and violent behavior.\textsuperscript{9} Pro-military sentiments were evident in the open research questions in statements such as “I think it’s good to have opportunity to join the military because you can freely serve your nation.” Around 14\% of women and 5\% of men explained that pride in the nation, or the opportunity to serve the country was an important factor in serving with the military. Five percent of responses contained reference to the military as an institution that propagated violence. Violence in this sense referred to abuse, bigotry, enhancement of individual capacity for violence and sexual and gendered violence. Using violence as an element of the occupation was not included.

### Perceptions of the Gap Year

Responses were collected on perceptions of the Gap year scheme. The majority of respondents (74\%) thought that the scheme was a good idea. Three percent stated that it was not something they would be interested in, even if they thought it was a good idea. Predominant reason for their support was that the Gap year gave young people greater options:

- “I think that this is a beneficial scheme, as it would be a great experience for the people who undertake it. They would learn important skills that they would use for the rest of their lives.”

Only some men made reference to income as an inducement (2\%). The Gap Year was regarded by some as a good way of trialing military life (9\%),

- “I think it is probably a good idea as it gives people an opportunity to give it a try without committing themselves to anything really demanding.”

The development of skills, discipline, independence, and maturity before they went to university, as well as presenting a “great opportunity” was a key explanation for about 11\% of respondents. Men and women’s responses were similar in content.

A small number (7\%) were negative about the Gap Year. These responses suggested that the Gap Year was a deceptive way of increasing recruitment and likened it to a form of national service,

- “This scheme is obviously meant to entice youth into the military through a ‘try before you buy’ mentality.”
- “I think it’s a way to bribe young people who are in financial hardship to be part of a hypocritical organization.”

Men were marginally more disapproving of the Gap Year than women.

### Serving as an Enlisted or Commissioned Officer

The majority (57.8\%) of students reported that they preferred to serve as a commissioned officer, whereas one third (33.1\%) indicated that they preferred to serve as an enlisted soldier and 9.1\% indicated that they either had no preference or would not serve as either.

Approximately 10\% of the respondents also made the point that the Gap Year should be a choice, and that it should not be compulsory, whereas 2\% of respondents argued that the Gap Year would better serve the nation if it was in the form of a Green Corps, or other forms of volunteering. Only women made reference to the Gap Year as being a choice and not compulsory. These responses indicate a negative relation to national service, or conscription of some kind.

### Discussion

This pilot study has raised several key issues regarding the development of a useful survey instrument for understanding attitudes to the military and military service in Australia. Broadly, this inquiry sits within the field of civil–military relations however it also provides relevant information to the military institution for its recruitment activities.

This survey was not without limitations. First, the survey was limited to a convenience sample of undergraduate students at one university, so findings cannot be generalized. Second, it was noted that one of the questions in the YAAMMS, namely “no civilian should have to serve in the military if they don’t want to because it supports violence as a form of behavior,” is double barreled. This restricts the interpretation of results, which should be accepted with caution. Third, this was a pilot study and the psychometric properties of the YAAMMS should be confirmed in other studies.
with more diverse samples that have a good balance of gender.

The principal finding was that young people who have pro-military sentiments, beliefs that the military benefits society and a belief that the military does not promote aggression have a favorable attitude to the military. In this study, we did not explicitly ask whether the respondent would join the military. We omitted this question so as to leave open the avenue for responding to questions as if one could join the military. We would consider that including this question, to the end of the survey would be valuable in a reworking of this instrument. In this case, we cannot state favorable attitudes to the military correspond to propensity join the military.

In terms of understanding civil–military relations and the development of this survey these issues emerge. The reasons young people are attracted to military service are not significantly different from the already tested North American survey, the Youth Attitudes Tracking Study (YATS, cited in National Research Council 2004). They included learning opportunities, working conditions, external incentives, patriotic adventure, and equal opportunity. By developing this civil–military relations survey the respondents were able to identify their own perceptions of the military and military service.

Around half of respondents represented military propensity in terms of interest, comfort, and proximity to danger. This was represented in positive—I like flying—and negative—I hate the sea—terms. Propensity was equally shaped by broader civil–military concerns including moral rejection of the military or war, concerns with foreign affairs (e.g., U.S. hegemony), concern with military culture (e.g., regimentation, harassment, sexism, etc.), and self-preservation (fear of danger). The survey will look to developing more defined questions in relation to these broad areas. For example, a specific set of questions will assess young people’s awareness of public scandal representing military culture (e.g., the Skype Affair), and Australia’s military engagements abroad whereas another set will go into greater depth around learning opportunities.

In terms of civil–military relations, this study suggests that understanding both pro-military and anti-military discourse is valuable. This study has indicated that the predominant number of respondents was pro-military and willing to consider service in the military. The military was largely evaluated on its organic function—to undertake military activities. A smaller, but more articulate—cohort described the military and militarism in negative terms.

In terms of civil–military relations, a particular characterization of the military does begin to emerge, however. In this characterization, respondents perceive different degrees of militarism. The Army is the job of danger and immanence. The Navy and Air Force are represented as more civil and technological. However, although the notions of the services and their work are clichéd among this cohort, the military is largely not considered in universal terms. The survey indicates that further inquiry into the negative propensity to serve, and toward the military is also present and worthy of continued investigation.

The gendered aspect of this study is interesting and encourages further development of the relationship between the attitudes to authority and the attitudes to the military element of the study. The survey indicates a tension between the hierarchical, authoritarian character of the military and the importance placed on freedom, democratic values, and participatory dispositions to work that are common in contemporary civil society, and which appear particularly strong among young people. Similarly, the tension between the desire to play a meaningful role in society and diverse employment opportunities are represented in contrast to the traditional command and control military disposition. Women’s responses indicate an attraction to the former values, whereas men represent a stronger connection to the traditional military attributes.

In this sense, the study suggests that the military presents somewhat of a paradox for this sample of young people. It is seen as meaningful and diverse, yet inflexible and regimented. The ADF, for example, might develop its persona as a flexible, diverse, and meaningful occupation that has modernized past the traditionally inflexible, hierarchical, regimented, and conformity/obedience disposition that characterizes traditional militaries. This is clearly indicated as a stronger impulse for women rather than men. As a rule, women preferred the more civil and technological and some men the traditional military role. Women preferred humanitarian and peacekeeping activities over the traditional combat roles. Moreover, women were more predisposed to the role of the commissioned officer in contrast to the enlisted personnel.

In summary, the survey responses indicated that with further refinement the YAAEMS would be a valuable tool for understanding attitudes to the military and military service. This study has demonstrated that the predominant attitude to the military is positive or indifferent, that the military is seen in clichéd ways but that these young Australians are engaged with the tradition and roles of the military in today’s world. A small number of respondents were critical of the military in these ways. There are two principal interests in this research for wider Australia, the first being the acknowledgment and maintenance of the civil–military culture gap. A robust and respectful relationship between civic society and the military and the state are crucial to the maintenance of healthy democratic relations. The other is the value that this research has for military recruitment in a world where cultural diversity is an increasingly important challenge, and where recruitment targets have always been difficult to achieve.
Appendix

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in Mplus identified a four-factor solution, \( \chi^2(41) = 55.5, p > .06 \), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.034, RMSEA 90% confidence interval (CI) = [0.000, 0.054], probability RMSEA < .05 = .896, root mean square residual value (RMSR) = 0.027 as shown below.

### Table A1. EFA Model Fit Information

| \( \chi^2 \) test of model fit | Value | Degrees of freedom | p value |
|---------------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------|
| Value                           | 55.504| 41                 | .0648  |
| RMSEA                           | 0.034 |                    |        |
| Estimate 90% CI                 | [0.000, 0.054] | Probability RMSEA \( \leq .05 \) | .896   |
| RMSEA                           | .896  | Root mean square residual value | 0.027  |

Note. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; CI = confidence interval; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

### Table A2. Varimax Rotated Loadings.

| Factor 1: Pro-military service | Factor 2: Benefits of military | Factor 3: Service differences | Factor 4: Military aggression |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Pro-military service           | 0.787                          | 0.200                        | 0.216                        |
| Compulsory military service is a good thing. | 0.824 | All citizens should serve sometime in the Australian military reserves. | 0.874 |
| All citizens should serve sometime in the Australian military reserves. | 0.341 | Conscription is a necessary aspect of community life. | 0.642 |
| Conscription is a necessary aspect of community life. | 0.327 | Military training benefits broader society. | 0.374 |
| Military training benefits broader society. | 0.214 | All school students would benefit from participating in military cadets. | 0.087 |
| All school students would benefit from participating in military cadets. | 0.660 | Navy service is more difficult than service in the Army or Air Force. | 0.078 |
| Military cadet service builds loyalty to the nation. | 0.868 | Air Force service is more difficult than service in the Army or Navy. | 0.087 |
| Army service is more difficult than service in the Army or Air Force. | 0.105 | Air Force service is more difficult than service in the Army or Navy. | 0.098 |
| Air Force service is more difficult than service in the Army or Navy. | 0.398 | Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.044 |
| Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.010 | Failed to load Reserve soldiers are not as professional as regular soldiers. | 0.240 |
| Failed to load Reserve soldiers are not as professional as regular soldiers. | 0.010 | National service is an imposition on every citizen's freedom. | 0.207 |
| National service is an imposition on every citizen's freedom. | 0.060 | Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.010 |
| Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.010 | Failed to load Reserve soldiers are not as professional as regular soldiers. | 0.240 |

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis.

### Table A3. A CFA Identified the Best Fitting Items for the Four Factors as Shown in Table A3.

| Factor 1: Pro-military service | Factor 2: Benefits of military | Factor 3: Service differences | Factor 4: Military aggression |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Compulsory military service is a good thing. | 0.824 | All citizens should serve sometime in the Australian military reserves. | 0.874 |
| All citizens should serve sometime in the Australian military reserves. | 0.341 | Conscription is a necessary aspect of community life. | 0.642 |
| Conscription is a necessary aspect of community life. | 0.327 | Military training benefits broader society. | 0.374 |
| Military training benefits broader society. | 0.214 | All school students would benefit from participating in military cadets. | 0.087 |
| All school students would benefit from participating in military cadets. | 0.660 | Navy service is more difficult than service in the Army or Air Force. | 0.078 |
| Navy service is more difficult than service in the Army or Air Force. | 0.868 | Air Force service is more difficult than service in the Army or Navy. | 0.087 |
| Air Force service is more difficult than service in the Army or Navy. | 0.105 | Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.044 |
| Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.010 | Failed to load Reserve soldiers are not as professional as regular soldiers. | 0.240 |
| Failed to load Reserve soldiers are not as professional as regular soldiers. | 0.010 | National service is an imposition on every citizen's freedom. | 0.207 |
| National service is an imposition on every citizen's freedom. | 0.060 | Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.010 |
| Conscripted soldiers, or national service soldiers, are professional soldiers. | 0.010 | Failed to load Reserve soldiers are not as professional as regular soldiers. | 0.240 |

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; CI = confidence interval; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

### Second-Order Factor Analysis

Further analyses indicated that only Factors 1, 2, and 4 were indicators of military attitudes in a second-order CFA, \( \chi^2(17) = 36.5, p > .004 \), RMSEA = 0.060, RMSEA 90% CI = [0.033, 0.088], probability RMSEA < .05 = .238, standardized root mean square residual value (SRMR) = 0.033, as shown below.

### Table A4. CFA Model Fit Information.

| \( \chi^2 \) test of model fit | Value | Degrees of freedom | p value |
|---------------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------|
| Value                           | 36.499| 17                 | .0039  |
| RMSEA                           | 0.060 |                     |        |
| Estimate 90% CI                 | [0.033, 0.088] | Probability RMSEA \( \leq .05 \) | .238   |
| RMSEA                           | .238  | Standardized root mean square residual value | 0.033  |

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; CI = confidence interval; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.
Table A5. Standardized Model Results.

| Item                                                                 | Estimate | SE   | Est./SE | Two-tailed p value |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|--------------------|
| FACT4 (military aggression) BY Compulsory military service is a good thing. | 0.818    | 0.043| 18.977  | .000               |
| All military reserves.                                              | 0.878    | 0.027| 32.089  | .000               |
| FACT2 (benefits of military) BY Conscription is a necessary aspect of community life. | 0.629    | 0.054| 11.745  | .000               |
| FACT1 (pro-military service) BY Military training develops aggression in people. | 0.353    | 0.048| 7.313   | .000               |
| Military training develops aggression in people.                    | 0.703    | 0.045| 15.633  | .000               |
| Military training benefits broader society.                          | 0.796    | 0.035| 24.558  | .000               |
| Military cadet service builds loyalty to the nation.                 | 0.666    | 0.048| 13.973  | .000               |
| Military cadet service builds loyalty to the nation.                 | 0.437    | 0.078| 5.622   | .000               |
| Military service supports violence as a form of behavior. No citizen should have to serve in the military if they don’t want to. | 0.914    | 0.056| 16.307  | .000               |
| Military service supports violence as a form of behavior. No citizen should have to serve in the military if they don’t want to. | 0.796    | 0.055| 14.489  | .000               |
| Military service supports violence as a form of behavior. No citizen should have to serve in the military if they don’t want to. | -0.594   | 0.091| -6.530  | .000               |

Military training develops aggression in people.
Air Force service is more difficult than service in the Army or Navy.
Military service supports violence as a form of behavior.
No citizen should have to serve in the military if they do not want to.
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Notes
1. Findings associated with the Attitudes to Authority Questionnaire (ATAQ) will be reported elsewhere.
2. $\chi^2(2) = 7.94, p = .02$; effect size (Cramer’s $V$) = 0.17.
3. The difference between an officer and enlisted personnel was explained.
4. For example, “I like this aspect therefore I would join this service, or I don’t like this aspect therefore I would join another service.”
5. $F(308) = 5.8, p < .05$, effect size ($r$) = .14, and $F(308) = 12.9, p < .001$, effect size ($r$) = .20.
6. Fisher’s Exact: $\chi^2(1) = 5.8, p = .02$; effect size (Cramer’s $V$) = 0.14.
7. Mann–Whitney $U$ 6236, $p < .0001$.
8. Mann–Whitney $U$ 5450, $p < .0001$.
9. Mann–Whitney $U$ 7882.5, $p < .0001$.
10. Fisher’s Exact, $\chi^2(1) = 4.9, p = .02$; effect size (Cramer’s $V$) = 0.13
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