

**MILITARY EXPERIENCE AND THE SHAPING OF NATIONALISM IN
THE U.S. ARMED FORCES**

by

Carolyn L. Zook, PhD

Bachelor of Arts in German and International Relations, Lake Forest College, 1999

Master of Science in Sociology, Portland State University, 2008

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology

University of Pittsburgh

2016

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences

This dissertation was presented

by

Carolyn L. Zook, PhD

It was defended on

March 24, 2016

and approved by

Waverly Duck, PhD, Assistant Professor, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Susan Zickmund, PhD, Associate Professor, University of Pittsburgh, Department of

Medicine and Clinical and Translational Science

Dissertation Co-Advisor: Mohammed Bamyeh, PhD, Professor, University of Pittsburgh,

Department of Sociology

Dissertation Co-Advisor: Rachel Kutz-Flamenbaum, PhD, Assistant Professor, University of

Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Copyright © by Carolyn L. Zook, PhD

2016

MILITARY EXPERIENCE AND THE SHAPING OF NATIONALISM IN THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

Carolyn L. Zook, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2016

This study examines the agency of individuals, their understanding of nationalist messages, and how these messages are then incorporated back into the everyday. Specifically, I ask: What combat experiences explain a soldier's critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S. following their combat deployment? What structural factors resonate at the individual level? How are broad messages of national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted and consequently incorporated into everyday lives? Sociological work on nationalism has largely ignored the American case, as well as individual level data in current research on nationalism; gaps this dissertation aims to fill. To answer these questions, I used a mixed methods approach to collect and analyze two data sets: 1) a quantitative survey on nationalistic attitudes of soldiers, and 2) in-depth, semi-structured interviews with U.S. soldiers who served in combat zones of the Iraq or Afghanistan wars. These questions were conceptualized by focusing on three key areas of soldiers' combat experiences: 1) Recruitment: Soldiers who enlisted because of 9/11 will view their combat experiences with a more nationalistic view than those who enlisted prior to 9/11. Findings showed that 9/11 was not as important of a factor as initially thought, but rather that soldiers are committed to service in general; 2) Combat: Soldiers who served in a combat zone will rationalize significant experiences with a more nationalistic view than those who report no experience of significant or difficult events.

Findings suggest that soldiers did not overtly make a connection with their significant experiences using national rhetoric, but they do maintain ideals rooted in the values and beliefs of the country; 3) Returning Home Post-Deployment: Soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources. Findings suggest that social networks made for both an ease of transition to civilian life, but also complicated it in terms of strained family dynamics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	IX
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 UNDERSTANDING NATIONALISM	8
2.1 NATIONALISM OR PATRIOTISM?	9
2.2 IDEOLOGY AND HEGEMONY	23
2.3 STATE-FRAMED AND COUNTER-STATE UNDERSTANDINGS OF NATIONALISM	33
2.4 CONTESTING FRAMINGS OF WAR.....	36
2.5 CONCLUSION	38
3.0 METHODOLOGY.....	40
3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND QUESTIONS.....	40
3.2 RESEARCH GOALS	42
3.3 WORKING HYPOTHESES, INDEPENDENT/DEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	44
3.3.1 Recruitment.....	46
3.3.2 Combat	48
3.3.3 Background	49

3.3.4	Return Home Post Deployment.....	50
3.4	DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	52
3.4.1	Reflections on Self.....	52
3.4.2	Methodological Approach: Statistical Descriptives.....	54
3.4.2.1	Data Set #1 and Access: Survey	54
3.4.2.2	Data Cleaning	60
3.4.2.3	Running Analyses.....	62
3.4.3	Methodological Approach: Thematic Narrative Analysis.....	63
3.4.3.1	Data Set #2 and Access: In-depth Interviews	64
3.4.3.2	Thematic Narrative Analysis	69
3.5	CONCLUSION	70
4.0	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....	72
4.1	MILITARY RANKINGS AND DEMOGRAPHICS.....	72
4.2	BACKGROUND OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS	76
4.3	ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA.....	77
4.4	CONCLUSION	81
5.0	STRUCTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING NATIONALISM	82
5.1	RECRUITMENT.....	83
5.1.1	Commitment to Service.....	84
5.1.2	Cultural.....	88
5.1.2.1	Socio-economic	88
5.1.2.2	Acculturation.....	93
5.2	COMBAT: THE COSTS OF WAR.....	97

5.3	REINTEGRATION.....	106
5.3.1	Re-acclimation	107
5.3.2	Moral injury	120
5.4	CONCLUSION	126
6.0	LOYALTY	128
6.1	LOYALTY IN MILITARY LEADERSHIP	130
6.2	LOYALTY TO COUNTRY VERSUS GOVERNMENT	140
6.3	LOYALTY IN INDIVIDUALS: EDWARD SNOWDEN	154
6.4	LOYALTY IN INDIVIDUALS: ANTI-WAR PROTESTERS	158
6.5	CONCLUSION	164
7.0	CONCLUSION.....	166
	APPENDIX A	172
	APPENDIX B	182
	APPENDIX C	190
	APPENDIX D	192
	APPENDIX E	193
	APPENDIX F	196
	APPENDIX G.....	197
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	209

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Conceptions of Nationalism.....	15
Table 2. Military Rankings	73
Table 3. 2013 Military Demographics	75
Table 4. Background of Survey Respondents (n = 174).....	77
Table 5. Sex, Marital Status, Mean Age	78
Table 6. Educational Level and Minority Status	78
Table 7. Bivariate Correlations.....	79

PREFACE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation has been a decade in the making. Along the way, many individuals have influenced, inspired, and supported my efforts, and I am eternally grateful for the large support network I have, quite literally, across the globe.

I would first like to thank with all sincerity my wonderful dissertation advisory committee: Dr. Mohammed Bamyeh, Dr. Suzanne Crage, Dr. Waverly Duck, Dr. Susan Zickmund, and my dissertation chair, Dr. Rachel Kutz-Flamenbaum. This Committee has taught me what working as a team means. Your patience, insights, advice, and mentorship have brought my life-long goal of earning a PhD to fruition. I have learned far more than I could have ever imagined working with such a supportive, intelligent group. To Rachel: I am so very grateful for the times you pushed me, never allowing me to take the easy way out, as well as for the times you showed me mercy.

To my dearest Mother Hen – This dissertation belongs to you as much as it does me. I honestly could not have done this without you by my side. Words fail to express how grateful I am for your encouragement, honesty, sisterhood, friendship, and presence in my life. I made it here because of you. Corinne, Jane, and Sharon – your constant

companionship, positive outlook, dedication, friendship, encouragement, and sheer amazingness astound me; words cannot describe. You are all stuck with me for life.

To those I admire and love beyond the walls of Pitt – there are so very many of you whose support, understanding, love, laughter, and belief in me carried me through the darkest moments of self-doubt. I am so very grateful I have the best friends in the world and an amazing, supportive family.

To the children in my world that remind me to slow down, be honest, dance, take a nap, laugh, and find pleasure in the tiniest of things: Sofia, Ezra, Josephine, Thea, and Aaron. I love you all more than you can imagine.

A very special thank you to the service men and women who participated in this study, sacrificed so much to serve, and were willing to expose themselves and old wounds to talk with me. I am so inspired by your experiences. Thank you also to Rod for his service and expert input and advice on military terminology and culture.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

While it has been nearly 15 years since the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Towers in New York City, U.S. citizens are still impacted by ongoing wars, scrutiny in locations where large crowds gather, and overall extensive monitoring and suspicion. Indeed, it has become a way of life for Americans, and most of the rest of the world, such that so much scrutiny is accepted in the name of safety. As the intense emotions surrounding 9/11 begin to fade into history, they are replaced with new unsuspecting terror attacks and wars, culminating in continued, escalating fear. One way government officials quell this fear and garner support for sending forces into combat zones is frame it within the context of upholding American values and ideals – freedom, safety, security, pursuit of happiness. This resulted in an approximately 70% support rate of U.S. citizens for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 (McCleary, Nalls and Williams 2009). The support was based on four claims: 1) Iraq had weapons of mass destruction that could be used against the U.S., 2) Saddam Hussein was involved in the 9/11 attacks, 3) Iraqi citizens would welcome the U.S.’s liberation from the Saddam regime, and 4) the war would be over in a matter of months (McCleary, Nalls and Williams 2009). Each of these key arguments were framed by the government and disseminated to convince U.S. citizens that invading Iraq was necessary, even welcomed by Iraqi citizens, and that combat would be quick.

Yet it is not just American citizens that need convincing but also military personnel – the very ones going into combat zones. Following the Vietnam War, the U.S. military replaced the selective service draft with an all-volunteer model. Now that the military could no longer require young people join military forces, frames of patriotism, duty, and machismo emerged. The military needed to identify frames that appealed to youth who could then be recruited.

Frame alignment process (Goffman 1974; Snow et al. 1986) is useful to explain the ways in which soldiers define nationalism. Framing guides our actions by defining events as meaningful. Experiencing war, a volatile, dangerous, and life-changing event, demands particular frames to make experiencing the trauma of war make sense. The state produced hegemonic frames of patriotism to make enlisting and going to war worthwhile for the soldiers. Frames such as “I served my country” or “I was doing my patriotic duty” can help justify and make sense of soldiers’ war experiences, though some soldiers internalized counter hegemonic frames based on their war experiences (i.e., “War is unpatriotic” or “Serving in the military was not worth the actions I had to take in war”).

It is the agency of individuals, their understanding of nationalist messages, and how these messages are then incorporated back into everyday lives that this study will explore. Specifically, I ask: What combat experiences explain a soldier’s critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S. following their combat deployment? What structural factors resonate at the individual level? How are broad messages of national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted and consequently incorporated into everyday lives? To answer this research question, I used a mixed methods approach to collect and analyze two data sets: 1) a quantitative survey on nationalistic attitudes of soldiers (n =

174), and 2) in-depth, semi-structured interviews with U.S. soldiers (n = 18) who served in combat zones of the Iraq or Afghanistan War.

Defining nationalism and patriotism is key to this research. These terms have different meanings to scholars than within popular culture. Conventional U.S. attitude balks at being called a “nationalist” as it evokes extremist tendencies, associated with parochialism and imagined supremacy (Pei 2003). Being labeled as a patriot, however, is respected and revered in the U.S. – it denotes the hardworking, pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps, Americana life we see and imagine in cultural icons. From an individual agency perspective, it is the “nationalists” who are willing and at the ready to go “above and beyond” to answer the call to defend the country. In the U.S., these individuals are often referred to as “patriots”.

Sociological work on nationalism has largely ignored the American case as well as ignored nationalism at the individual level. Theories on nationalism are largely situated from the perspective of state-building or state reconstruction. State and global perspectives inform our understanding of the historical importance of nations and the reconstruction of nationalism, particularly in times of a grand societal overhaul (the fall of the Soviet Union is one such example). However, these broader theories of nationalism overlook the agency of individuals who receive nationalist messages. That is, how do individuals engage with the social structures of the military combat environment?

The hegemonic group in society, that is, the group of leaders that hold political and social power, often uses war to espouse particular nationalist messages.¹ The

¹ War is but one vehicle used to disseminate nationalist messages. There are many other ways nationalist messages are put before the public, however, the focus of this dissertation is on war and nationalism.

dominant class uses its hegemonic power to serve its interests and emit a dominant culture that permeates throughout the sectors of society. The non-dominant group (*subaltern*) is not excluded from this hegemonic influence, as when there is a hegemonic group, there necessarily is a group to counter it. For example, government leaders serve as the group in the U.S., which emits hegemonic nationalist rhetoric to garner support for war. However, anti-war activists (*subaltern*) counter the hegemonic power to circumvent the dominant rhetoric and serve the purposes of the movements' mission, that is, suggesting that peace is more in line with the nationalist message.

Loyalty is an important concept in the discussion on the nationalist message as it pertains to soldiers' sense of loyalty to government, country, military commanders and unit, as well as friends and family. Where these key targets of loyalty differ lies in the hegemonic dominance; while most soldiers cited a strong loyalty to their country, many were hesitant about their loyalty to the hegemonic group. This makes sense when we acknowledge the passivity of the country and its population: that is, most of the country's population is not in the dominant group that makes decisions on military and war strategy. Thus, loyalty to the population is much easier to impart, while loyalty toward the decision makers (i.e., government) is more tenuous. It is in this regard that loyalty matters, and is necessarily tied to nationalism.

Despite the connection between war, nationalism and loyalty, little is mentioned in scholarly works on how soldiers interpret nationalism on an individual level and how soldiers' experiences in war may influence this interpretation. Therefore, this study explores how experiences in combat inform a soldier's interpretation, understanding, and internalization of nationalism.

This introductory chapter outlines the main questions addressed in this study. I also discussed the theoretical framework used to engage and analyze the study's data, as well as the methodological approach. The remainder of the dissertation is outlined as follows:

Chapter 2, Literature Review, begins by outlining the various understandings of nationalism in the literature along with critiques and theories of nationalism, how scholars understand the differences between nationalism and patriotism, how nationalism and patriotism pertain specifically to the United States, and how these terms are applied in the dissertation. Next, the literature on ideology and hegemony is explored, along with how these concepts relate to nationalism and war. The differences between state-framed and counter-state understandings of nationalism and war is explained, and gaps in the literature that call for in-depth exploration on how military experiences re-shape discourses of nationalism and war are identified.

Chapter 3, Methods, discusses the research design and questions of this study, as well as identifies the primary research goal, outlines key concepts, and explains the data collection, population studied, and methodology of analysis. The methodological approach of the survey was simple statistical frequencies and descriptives, the purpose of which was to illustrate background information of survey respondents (not statistical strength). The in-depth interviews were analyzed using thematic narrative analysis, which refers to texts in a "storied form", placing emphasis on *what* is said rather than *how* it is said.

Chapter 4 presents a statistical analysis of survey data, including an overview of the five branches of the military, each branch's rankings, and demographic and population statistics. Statistical descriptives of survey respondents were analyzed, identifying relevant demographic background information of respondents. Last in this chapter, I analyze a multiple regression of nationalism and background demographic information.

Chapter 5 gives an in-depth examination of the key findings of this study as they pertain to each of three key concepts: 1) recruitment, 2) combat, and 3) reintegration. The first section, Recruitment, examines soldiers' commitment to service, how soldiers' socioeconomic status played a role in enlisting in the military, and the importance of soldiers' acculturating and learning how to "be" military. The next section, Combat, postulates that soldiers who served in the combat zone rationalize significant experiences in a more nationalistic view than those who report no experience of significant or difficult events. To investigate, data is drawn from respondents' experiences during deployment and in combat. This examination includes dangers of war, leadership in war, corruption in war and in the military, life and death during war, and soldiers' overall impressions of deployment. Next, Reintegration anticipates soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources. The reintegration process of interview respondents post-deployment is examined. This includes soldiers' re-acclimation to civilian life, re-establishing a civilian persona, struggles with post-deployment employment, and grappling with moral injury.

Chapter 6, Loyalty, examines the findings on the emergent concept of loyalty. Preliminary ideas suggested there was a place for loyalty – to country, to government, to one’s military unit, or to all three – in soldiers’ narratives connecting their combat experiences and national sentiment. The findings on loyalty are divided into four main sections. The first, Loyalty in Military Leadership, explores the structures of the military organization and distinguishes between formal and informal leadership. Soldier narratives of military leaders are recounted. The second section, Loyalty to Country versus Government, examines the difference in meaning of loyalty to country and that of government, and if a country being at war matters in terms of loyalty. Third, Loyalty in Individuals: The Edward Snowden case, examines the actions that show one’s loyalty or disloyalty to the U.S., using Edward Snowden as an exemplar. Last, Loyalty in Individuals: Anti-War Protesters, takes a similar approach to the Edward Snowden Case, but using anti-war protesters as its case. This dissertation concludes with an overview of each chapter’s main points, a summary of the findings of the work, and suggestions for future research.

2.0 UNDERSTANDING NATIONALISM

The central question I seek to address in this dissertation is: What combat experiences explain a soldier's critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S. following their combat deployment? Subsidiary questions include: 1) which structural factors resonate at the individual level? and 2) how are broad messages of national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted and consequently incorporated into everyday lives? In order to begin to answer this question, this chapter explores the literature and discussions on nationalism, hegemony, and framing.

Sociological work on nationalism has largely ignored the American case, a gap the dissertation aims to fill. I begin by outlining the various understandings of nationalism in the literature along with critiques and theories of nationalism, how scholars understand the differences between nationalism and patriotism, how nationalism and patriotism pertain specifically to the United States, and how I apply these terms in the dissertation. Next, I explore the literature on ideology and hegemony and how these concepts relate to nationalism and war, following by an explanation of the differences between state-framed and counter-state understandings of nationalism and war. I then identify gaps in the literature that call for in-depth exploration on how military

experiences re-shape discourses of nationalism and war, followed by a summary of this chapter.

2.1 NATIONALISM OR PATRIOTISM?

Nationalism and patriotism have very different meanings to scholars than they do within popular culture. U.S. citizens balk at being called a “nationalist”, considering it an insult, and, even, evoking extremist tendencies as “we” watch, in horror, “their” nationalism (Billig 1995; Pei 2003). Being labeled as a patriot, however, is respected and revered in the U.S. – it denotes the hardworking, pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps, Americana life we see and imagine in such cultural icons as Norman Rockwell paintings and the like. Although popularly referred to as “patriots”, scholars refer to “nationalists” as those who are willing and at the ready to go “above and beyond” to answer the call to defend the country.

Yet, as Michael Billig so aptly put it, “Our [American] nationalism is not presented as nationalism” because “our” nationalism does not evoke the “dangerously irrational, surplus, and alien” response often associated with nationalism (Billig 2004: 55). Therefore, as Billig argues, “‘our’ nationalism appears as ‘patriotism’ – a beneficial, necessary, and often, American force” (2004:55). American loyalties – such as reciting the Pledge of Allegiance in school – are framed as patriotic because nationalism evokes an irrational and fanatical psyche, and reciting the Pledge does not elicit this type of behavior – it is an everyday, even mundane, task for school children, rarely, if ever,

evoking a sense of national pride and fervor (Connor 1993). This is precisely what Billig refers to as “banal” nationalism; that is, the mundane, everyday expressions of nationhood. Using the American flag as an example, Billig argues that symbols of Americanism are so prevalent, we hardly notice them, and they fade into a background of nationalism as we carry about our day-to-day activities. These symbols of our nation are always around, but hardly stir the national sentiment, unless in a specific event: national holiday, sports arena, and the like. Thus, banal nationalism is the implicit, behind-the-scenes, everyday expressions of nationalism; not the extremist perceptions the literature often associates with nationalism (Billig 1995). Billig takes issue with this thread of literature that distinguishes nationalism as irrational and fanatical and patriotism as docile and prideful, as well as the claims that “we” are patriotic and “others” are nationalists because terms like loyalty and patriotism leave out the object to which the loyalty is being shown: the nation-state (2004). Billig thus broadens the term “nationalism” to encapsulate the ways that nation-states are reproduced, including banal nationalism in contrast to the overt, fanatical understanding of nationalism (2004). Nationalism in scholarship is further problematic in that it leaves out the frames through which individuals interpret national sentiments, thereby connecting them to the nation-state. It is this, the agency of individuals, their understanding of nationalist messages, and how these messages are then incorporated back into everyday lives I am most interested in exploring.

Scholarly literature on patriotism and nationalism is immense and complex. This literature on nationalism tends to focus on 20th century European politics or state-building (DiMaggio and Bonikowski 2008), typically defining nationalism as arising when there is

a common political allegiance to an identity (religious, cultural, linguistic, ethnic) that exists independently of the polity (Taylor 1999), creating two oppositional camps: one's own nation in opposition to and intolerant of all other nations (Grosby 2005). Patriotism is typically described as "love of one's homeland" (Alter 1985) and refers to "a strong sense of identification with the polity, and a willingness to give oneself for its sake" (Taylor 1999: 228). Patriotism is a loyalty to a country's institutions and a zeal for its defense and an attachment of loyalty to a particular community without hatred for those who are not members of one's nation (Grosby 2005; Kedourie 1994). Yet only some social scientists distinguish between patriotism and nationalism (Alter 1985; Calhoun 1997; Grosby 2005; Janowitz 1983; Taylor 1999), while others do not (Billig 1995; Gellner 1983; Kedourie 1994; Pei 2003), and still others view patriotism and nationalism on a continuum. Authors who make the distinction between patriotism and nationalism tend to characterize patriotism as "good" and nationalism as "bad" (Calhoun 1997). For example, key characteristics of the above definitions seem to argue that nationalism is irrational, even fanatical, whereas patriotism is simply love of one's country or a development of a civic consciousness (Calhoun 1997; Janowitz 1983). Where patriotism is viewed as "defensive", nationalism is cast in an aggressive light, exhibiting sentiments of ethno-national superiority (Pei 2003) thereby a central cause of conflict (Snyder 1976).

Pei (2003) argues that American nationalism is hardly recognizable as such, in the traditional understanding of nationalism as ethno-national supremacy because civic voluntarism – as opposed to state coercion – has dominated American cultural displays of allegiance with the country. Fourth of July celebrations, for example, are largely held by civic associations, paid for by business associations, and state-sponsored events are

noticeably absent (Pei 2003). Any obvious attempt of the state to institutionalize U.S. nationalism has been met with resistance by the populace, for fear of government impeding on individual liberties.

Pei outlines three unique characteristics of American nationalism that explains why it is largely implicit. First, U.S. nationalism is based on political ideals, not cultural or ethnic superiority. Americans firmly believe their values are, or should be, universal and any threat to Americans is an attack on their values. The 9/11 attacks are an ideal example: response from American government elites and media framed the attacks as an assault on American values and personal freedom (Pei 2003). Second, American nationalism is triumphant, not aggrieved. Historically, most societies' nationalism is stimulated by grievances caused by external powers. Take, for example, countries once under colonial rule like India and Egypt are some of the most nationalistic societies (Pei 2003). Triumphant nationalists, on the other hand, are forward thinking and celebrate positive wins. For instance, American nationalism derives its meaning from its victories in peace and war, and has little patience for aggrieved nationalists whose history is rooted in national defeats (Pei 2003). Linked to triumphant nationalism, the Pei's third characteristic of American nationalism is forward looking, as opposed to the reverse in other countries. While past historical glories, such as previous wars deemed successful, are indeed a part of American national identity, Americans do not dwell on these, but rather look forward to "better times ahead". This forward thinking quality of American nationalism clashes with that of other countries; Western military invasions throughout the world are not forgotten and viewed with suspicion when, for example, the U.S. claims to "liberate" the Iraqi people. (Pei 2003).

DiMaggio and Bonikowski (2008) adopt a broader view of nationalism, understanding it as a domain rather than a specific set of ideas or symbols. They aim to understand how a particular set of beliefs or attitudes (i.e., love of country) is distributed, rather than labeling these beliefs and attitudes as more or less nationalist. In other words, the authors understand the focus of nationalism in scholarly works as representations of the nation, interactions of these representations, and the consequences of such for social identity and political action. In a departure from other researchers, DiMaggio and Bonikowski (2008) use the term “nationalism” to understand views that reflect one’s nation-schemata. They reserve more specific terms, such as pride and national attachment, to define the content of these attitudes.

National identity is a shared sense of commonality among a group of individuals residing in relatively close geographic proximity (Anderson 2006). While the difference between nationalism and national identity is perhaps subtle, it is important to distinguish that nearly everyone has a national identity (or even two or three), but not necessarily everyone has a sense of nationalism. For example, when an individual associates his or her self with certain attributes of a nation, it is an expression of a dominant form of nationalism. Symbols like McDonald’s, Coca-Cola, football, and baseball decidedly encompass a culture of dominant nationalism. Nationalism might be expressed by flying the U.S. flag in one’s front yard or through discourses of one’s “duty” to defend the country. The depth of nationalism can vary by degree – an individual can have more or less “nationalism”. Thus, I argue that the defining attribute that distinguishes nationalism from national identity is *insularity*. That is, those who are described by cosmopolitanism scholars as “locals”, with few (or no) global connections and maintain a globally closed

position (Casanova 2011; Haller and Roudometof 2010; Hannerz 1990; Kutz-Flamenbaum and Duncan 2015; Roudometof 2005).

In discussions on nationalism, we must not ignore, somewhat paradoxically, also mentioning cosmopolitanism. A natural tension exists between cosmopolitanism and nationalism, due to a conflict of values. Cosmopolitanism signifies the openness and inclusiveness of one's connections to other places around the world (individual level) or those who have few (or no) global connections and maintain a closed position (locals) (Casanova 2011; Haller and Roudometof 2010; Hannerz 1990; Kutz-Flamenbaum and Duncan 2015; Roudometof 2005). Yet, this understanding of cosmopolitanism leaves out degrees of attachment to a locality, culture, and economics. Roudometof (2005) distinguishes between "thin" cosmopolitanism and "rooted", wherein thin cosmopolitanism refers to those with low levels of attachment to localities, allowing them to more easily move outside the borders of their own culture or nation. Rooted cosmopolitans maintain local attachments while also embracing a worldly openness (Roudometof 2005). By this definition then, nationalism can be local or rooted.

Yet what precisely *is* nationalism is a complex question without a straightforward answer. DiMaggio and Bonikowski (2008:7) outline the varying types of nationalism in a helpful table, below (see Table 1). As shown in Table 1, the literature typifies nationalism across two main categories: political or cultural (columns in Table 1). The political column identifies and distinguishes between theories, mostly from the scholarly fields of comparative politics and historical comparative sociology. These theories depict nationalism as an ideology in which political elites use to mobilize mass support for elite-organized ventures (such as war). Political elites elicit feelings of nationalism by

homogenizing the citizenry through science, technology, and other cultural means (national language, education, media) (Frisch 1989; Gellner 1983; Janowitz 1976; Posen 1993). The state garners citizen loyalty through these means and in turn, produces an obedient and patriotic citizenry, in which rhetoric of “who we are” becomes part of the internal, national discourse, creating a unified force (Frisch 1989; Melucci 1989; Tilly 2004). The second column in Table 1 portrays nationalism as an element of culture which is located within the hearts and minds of the population and in the symbols and practices citizens encounter in their everyday lives (Billig 1995; DiMaggio and Bonikowski 2008).

Table 1. Conceptions of Nationalism

	Political (focus on elites and on nationalism as an element in political strategy)	Cultural/Cognitive (focus on lived culture, ideas, and/or sentiments of non-elites)
Narrow “nationalism” refers to specific ideology	Gellner (1983): “a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent”	Kosterman and Feshbach (1989): “a perception of national superiority and an orientation toward national dominance”
Broad “nationalism” refers to domain but does not specify content	Tilly (2002): top-down nationalism as claims-making by states on citizens on the basis of collective narratives; bottom-up as claims-making on states by sub-national groups based on similar stories	Brubaker (2004): “a heterogeneous set of ‘nation’-oriented idioms, practices, and possibilities that are continuously available or ‘endemic’ in modern cultural and political life”

Nationalism on a large-scale reaches its fever pitch during times of national disasters or during national crises when its ideals, values, or people are threatened. It is during these times when discourse of national unity and security is constructed, much as

we saw in the days and weeks following 9/11. Immediately following 9/11, the U.S.'s conceptualization of "freedom" shifted from "everyone minds their business" to more scrutiny of one another and ourselves.² Schildkraut (2002) speaks to this in her work on conceptions of American identity, distinguishing between ethnoculturalism and incorporationism, noting the differences pre-9/11 and post. Where ethnoculturalism centers on the idea that white Protestants from North European background are the definitive American identity, incorporationism focuses on the immigrant legacy in the U.S. as a shared experience, celebrating and embracing the ethnic diversity of the country. After 9/11, however, the immigrant experience was met with suspicion of an "enemy within" (Schildkraut 2002). By framing an increase in screening and security in response to the "attack on America", the citizenry accept the inconveniences that come along with it. Further, when the President and Congress decide to go to war in the name of freedom and protection of American values, freedom, and lives, it is much easier for civilians to agree and accept these stringent measures in the name of safety. While there will always be varying levels of nationalism, higher levels are reached in times of crises, with lower levels in times of complacency, i.e., extended periods of peace.

Another important discussion to consider concerns the seemingly overpowering role of militarized engagements in world politics, versus utilizing other tools for conflict resolution. While militarization is an important aspect of U.S. national identity, other countries rest their national pride on a lack of militarized engagements. For example, Canada's national identity rests on its pride in playing the "peacemaker" role. Costa Rica

² An example of this might be the post 9/11 "See something, say something" campaign that encourages people in public spaces to report suspicious persons or activities to the authorities.

exemplifies its national identity in its pride for a lack of military. Other countries stand in stark contrast to the U.S. in which militarization is a part of the national identity (not without contestation from certain groups, however) (Smith 2011). This militarization culture is illustrated in the amount of taxpayer dollars that goes to support military spending. In 2012, 19% (\$689 billion) of the federal government budget went toward defense and international security assistance (N.A. 2013). The vast expenditures of U.S. money on the military make for an important and engaging topic of consideration. It is important to consider these debates to extend our understanding of foreign policy engagements and to recognize that national identity is not always linked to militarized foreign policies (Smith 2011).

That said, in the context of world history, war has been a key element in the development of the nation-state (Tilly 1992). Tilly, in his analysis on the rise of European states, argues that the development of the nation state is an unintended result of elites pursuing their self-interests. He argues those that control “concentrated means of coercion” (1992:14), that is, military and police forces, weaponry, and the like, used these means to grow the population and resources over which they held power. When the elites met no interference, they conquered other territories, expanding their nation-states. When they were met with challengers, they made war. This presents two main dilemmas: first, in conquering other territories, leaders of the conquering states are then obliged to administer the land, goods, and people they defeat. This distribution of resources, goods, and services, along with the arbitration of conflicts, distracts from war (Tilly 1992). The second dilemma of creating war to expand a nation’s territory concerns the very resources required to prepare for and implement war. War requires resources of armies,

weaponry, food supply for the armies, training, and so forth. In order to fund the war, structures of taxation and administration were set in place, thereby growing and formalizing the structure of the state (Tilly 1992). As the structures formalize and expand, incorporating newly defeated territories, leaders work to coalesce the population via structures of nationalist claims, creating a common national identity around which the population can bond.

Nationalist claims rely on two key factors: 1) the states' capacity to monitor and control resources within its boundaries and 2) the readiness of other states to support the state's priority in regards to this. Tilly (1992, 1994) outlines two understandings of nationalism: state-led and state-seeking nationalism. State-led nationalism refers to the mobilization of a population within an existing state around a strong identification with that state (Tilly 1992). Rulers, speaking in the name of a nation, demand that citizens identify themselves with that nation (and other interests of the state) (Tilly 1994). State-*seeking* nationalism refers to a mobilization of stateless people around a claim to political independence (Tilly 1992). Representatives of the population who did not have collective control of a state claim an autonomous political status (or a separate state) on the assumption that the population has a distinct, yet coherent, cultural identity (Tilly 1994).

State-led and state-seeking nationalisms emerged only in the past two centuries, becoming key elements of national and international politics. After 1800, the frequency in which populations revolted in the name of their nationalities increased dramatically. State-led nationalism grew from an effort of rulers to accomplish two related programs: to extract ever-expanding means of war (money, men, material, etc.), and to substitute top-down government for indirect rule through intermediaries who had considerable

autonomy in their own jurisdictions. The creation of large-standing armies, populated from the national citizenry, stimulated the national identity campaigns (Tilly 1994).

Since the incorporation of the U.S. as a country, military conflicts and violence were actively protested; the first growth period of the anti-war movement in the U.S. occurred at the end of the War of 1812 (DeBenedetti 1980). Rising evangelical Christianity and a generalized sense of “human perfectibility” (DeBenedetti 1980: 12) inspired these first anti-war activists to gather in protest against the sin of war. Peace activism ebbed and flowed throughout the Civil War, with resources and energies focusing on abolition. The anti-war movement slowly and cautiously regained strength during the late nineteenth century industrialization movement, taking on the practicality of the times. This is represented in the passing of leadership to businessmen and lawyers. World War I proved to be a major turning point for the peace movement as the war demanded mobilizations of mass societies and resources for the sake of the war. The modernization process required advances in science, technology, and military strategies. Thus what DeBenedetti refers to as “the most disturbing paradox of this century”: while the war waged on and peace became more necessary, it also became more remote (DeBenedetti 1980). From post WWI, the modern peace movement arose to resolve this paradox.

Over the next generation, peace activists pushed forward their cause via the League of Nations, the World Court, various treaties and disarmament agreements (DeBenedetti 1980). However, an increase in conflicts (anti-colonialism in Asia, Lenin’s succession in Russia, the rise of fascism), resulting in a global conflict, resulted in most U.S. peace activists deciding “war was more necessary for the moment than peace”

(DeBenedetti 1980: 14). Indeed, the bombing of Pearl Harbor solidified the sentiment and identified WWII as a “just war”, given the rise of Hitlerism and European and Japanese military expansion in Asia. “Just war”, in the framework of the anti-war peace activists, argues that certain exceptions for “just causes” can be made *for* war. This just war position was, and still is, the ethical norm for all of Western civilization, largely influenced by Catholic social teachings and the writings of St. Augustine; it determines under what circumstances war can be justified (Chatfield 1999, Falk 2010). There is some evidence that, while the doctrine does not prevent war altogether, it does at least make war less destructive or less likely (DeBenedetti 1980; Falk 2010).

Over the next 15-20 years following WWII, peace movements were seen as suspect, if not subversive, until the changing tides of the 1960s: the Civil Rights movement, protests against nuclear testing, feminist rights, all brought together new constituents and organizations. Students, intellectuals, and feminists largely drove these movements. With the rising cultural shifts of the 1960s, the U.S. activist movement was strong and organized when the Vietnam War began. DeBenedetti (1980) argues these peace activists worked to expose the idea that peace could be achieved through war and the Vietnam War pushed citizens to consider the place of peace within the American tradition. Positioning peace in the national rhetoric entails interacting and engaging with shifting frames of varying ideologies.

A constant “tug and pull” between dominant and alternative ideologies can shift discourse (Woehrle, Coy and Maney 2009). This shifting occurs through which Snow et al (1986) calls “framing” or “frame alignment process”. The idea of framing comes from Goffman’s frame analysis theory (Goffman 1974) that states frames are used in everyday

affairs to create order out of chaos by organizing and giving meaning to daily events (Brashears 2005). Framing is defined by Snow et. al as “the linkage of individual and SMOs [social movement organizations] interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values, and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary” (1986:464). In other words, for participation in a movement to be initiated and maintained, an individual’s personal beliefs and values must somehow be reflected in the organization’s primary goals. Gamson (2004) understands frames as thought organizers, distinguishing a certain point of focus from what is around it. Simply put, “A frame spotlights certain events and their underlying causes and consequences, and directs our attention away from others” (Gamson 2004: 245). Frames, then, give shape and support to ideas and messages important to those disseminating the information.

Framing is necessary to organize our experiences and guide our actions through defining events as meaningful. State leaders can promote equilibrium with citizens by identifying a common social problem and resolution to solve it (Snow et. al 1986). Frames offer individuals a “schemata of interpretation” so they have a means to label and identify that which surrounds them (Woehrle, Coy and Maney 2009). In short, frames present a particular view of a specific event or situation upon which the person or organization disseminating the information wants others to focus. Framing makes a particular, partial view of a given situation more central such that what is centered in the “frame” is the focus of attention (Woehrle, Coy and Maney 2009). To illustrate this point, Woehrle et. al (2009) offer the example of different framings of “peace” at an anti-war demonstration. A sign that reads, “Peace is Patriotic!” frames opposition to a specific

foreign policy or militarized invasion in terms of one's commitment to their nation as a citizen. Another sign at the same demonstration that reads, "No blood for oil!" frames the foreign policy under question as based upon greed and wealth. It is important to recognize that actors utilize multiple frames, rather than relying on only one (Gamson 2004).

Although framing is typically concerned with social movements, we can apply it in this study on military combat soldiers. Frame alignment process is useful in explaining the ways in which soldiers define nationalism, in particular, as it relates to the state's version of nationalism. As mentioned, framing guides our actions by defining events as meaningful. Meaningful events can be placed on a continuum of positive to negative, and frames aid to make those events understandable. Experiencing war, a volatile, dangerous, and life-changing event, demands particular frames to make experiencing the trauma of war make sense. The state produces hegemonic frames of patriotism to make going to war worthwhile for the soldiers. Some soldiers internalize these frames to justify and make sense of their war trauma, while other soldiers internalize counter hegemonic frames based on their war experiences. Thus, frame alignment is an important tool in understanding how war experiences explain a soldier's critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S.

For the purposes of this dissertation, I align most closely with DiMaggio and Bonikowski's (2008) understanding of nationalism. That is, the focus of nationalism is the representations of the nation, interactions of these representations, and the consequences of such for social identity and political action. I add to DiMaggio and Bonikowski's definition of nationalism (2008) by focusing on individual agency in the

context of nationalism. Individual agency refers to the efficacy of human action; the ability of one to act within a given environment, engaging with the social structures in that environment (Sewell 1992). Concepts of pride and national attachment are indeed important to the research at hand, but these terms define the content of nationalist attitudes rather than the agency of individuals, their understanding of nationalist messages, and how these messages are incorporated back into everyday lives. Social structure can be understood in three levels: the socioeconomic system (macro), social ties between individuals and organizations (meso), or how cultural values shape the norms of behaviors in individuals (micro). Ideology is also structural – that is, it is developed through new understandings of the world through the vehicle of language – language is constructed to represent our ideologies and thereby transform and disseminate them (Anderson 2006; Hall 1986). It is in this way that language is structural.

2.2 IDEOLOGY AND HEGEMONY

This section explores the literature on ideology and hegemony and how these concepts relate to nationalism and war. To understand discourses on nationalism and war, we must first engage in a larger, theoretical discussion on ideology and hegemony. Ideology refers to the series of languages, concepts, categories, and systems of representations which different classes and social groups use to make sense of, define, and “render intelligible” the way society works. Ideology is tasked with giving an account of how social ideas arise in general, and, more specifically, it concerns the ways ideas of different kinds take

hold in the minds of the masses and thereby become a “material force” (Hall 1986). In short, ideology is useful for understanding how a particular set of ideas comes to dominate the social thinking in a given historical era (Hall 1986). During a particular historical “bloc” (Gramsci 1971), ideology is used to unite the nation-state and to maintain its dominance and leadership over society as a whole (Hall 1986). As Marx would say, the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class (Marx 1978).

Ideology is concerned with the processes in which new forms of consciousness and new understandings of the world arise and thereby move the masses into action against the prevailing system (Hall 1986). Ideology is concerned primarily with languages of practical thought that stabilize power and domination, or reconcile and accommodate the masses to their subordinate place in society. Language is key to ideology as it is through language which things are “represented” and the vehicle through which ideology is generated, transformed, and disseminated (Anderson 2006; Hall 1986). However, as important as language is in our conceptualization of ideology, it is also problematic because language is not a fixed entity; the same social relation can be differently represented and interpreted. Language can construct different meanings around what is the same social relation or phenomenon (Hall 1986). Different discourses of the same phenomenon produce different definitions of the system within which society operates, and situates the actors differently in relation to the process itself (Hall 1986).

Swidler’s (1986) cultural toolkit, or repertoire, helps conceptualize how ideology matters culturally. Navigating through the complex wealth of daily information we receive – both conscious (i.e., reading an article, watching the news on television) and subconscious (i.e., American flags as commonplace they aren’t noticed, automatically

standing when hearing the national anthem) – requires an ability to sift through, interpret, and, if necessary, act upon, the myriad of symbols, social interactions, and constructs we encounter everyday. We do so in the context of our own values and belief systems - selecting different pieces of a known repertoire to construct a truth. Our cultural toolkit allows for the wealth of cultural knowledge to be at the ready, drawn out when needed (Swidler 1986).

The “ideological struggle” does not take place by displacing one mode of thought entirely with another wholly formed system of ideas (Gramsci 1971). Rather, we articulate the different conceptions of a particular idea (i.e., “support our troops”) within a chain of associated ideas. For example, as varying discourses of “support” are produced, we extend our understanding of what “support” means, recognizing the meaning is dynamic and fluid. Thus, the idea of “support our troops” includes showing support by not speaking out against the war and agreeing with the government decision to go to war. On the other hand, anti-war groups could argue they do support the troops by demanding all troops are brought home, out of the war zone, safely and swiftly (Woehrle, Coy and Maney 2009). Both examples are versions of “support our troops”, but use different conceptions of what the idea of “support” means and entails. Further, ideologies do not become effective as a material force because they are disseminated from the needs of the social classes. Rather, ideological conceptions become effective when it can be articulated to the masses and to the struggles between the different forces at stake (Gramsci 1971; Hall 1986).

Ideologies are only effective if they connect with a particular group of social forces. In this sense, then, ideological struggle is part of the general struggle for

leadership; that is, hegemony (Gramsci 1971; Hall 1986). Hegemony refers to the everyday intersections between political, social, and cultural elements of society. The dominant class uses its hegemonic power to serve its interests and emit a dominant culture that permeates throughout different sectors of society. The non-dominant group (*subaltern*) is not excluded from this hegemonic influence. The subaltern is best understood through Gramsci's emphasis on the creation of an alternative hegemony (Williams 1977). When there is a hegemonic group within society, there necessarily is a group to counter it. For example, because state leaders³ serve as the group in the U.S. which emit hegemonic rhetoric, state leaders rely on this dominant position to garner support of the public that best serves the leaders' interests. However, the subaltern maintains counter hegemonic power to circumvent the dominant rhetoric and serve the purposes of counter movements.

To be clear, hegemony in the Gramscian view is not the escalation of a whole class to power with its already formed philosophies, but rather the *process* by which a historical bloc of social forces is constructed and comes to power (Gramsci 1971; Hall 1986). Therefore, the process of hegemonic domination connects the relationship between ruling ideas and ruling classes (Hall 1986). Yet, ruling ideas are not *guaranteed* dominance by their mere coupling with ruling classes. The effective pairing of dominant ideas to a particular historical era that has produced hegemonic power in a particular period is what the process of ideological struggle is meant to secure. Ruling ideas, then, acquire dominance through the *process* of hegemonic domination (Hall 1986).

³ I use the term "state leaders" to refer to government and military officials, as well as the intellectual elite.

Hegemony is rarely, if ever, implemented by overt force or explicit domination. Rather, and somewhat paradoxically, hegemony is exercised with account to the interests of the subaltern. In this understanding of the expression of hegemony, the dominant group makes sacrifices in its attempt at equilibrium among the populace (Gramsci 1971). Sharp illustrates this effort at equilibrium by suggesting that power is not intrinsic to rulers, but rather granted by consent of the populace (Sharp 1973). Thus, if the public is aware of what is taking place, and has an alternative ideology from which to draw on, they can withdraw their consent if disagreements arise. Here again, we see the usefulness of Swidler's cultural toolkit (1986) – the public can draw from varied pieces of their toolkit to make sense of the hegemonic rhetoric. Aligning hegemonic frames within the cultural context gives meaning, even emotion, to those frames. In addition, social actions are not solo performances, but rather operate on an interactive scale among constituents, allies, rivals, enemies, and authorities. Given this interdependent relationship, it behooves the ruling elite to attempt equilibrium (Markoff 1996; Tilly 2004).

Nationalism is conceived as a common project, invented by national elites. Instrumentalists assert the leaders of nationalist movements (i.e., heads of state) have ulterior motives. In particular, instrumentalists challenge the nation's espousing of cultural elements as a strategy for covering up political and economic ends (Leoussi 2007). Brubaker (1998) refers to this as "elite manipulation", which views nationalism as a product of manipulative elites who are believed to stir up nationalistic passions at will. However, Brubaker counters that it is not always easy, or even possible, to "stir up national passions" or to evoke anxiety, fear, or resentment out of the citizen base. To sustain those passions for an extended period of time proves more difficult still. Thus,

Brubaker argues, while elite discourse does play a role in the construction of the interests of the citizen base, it is not something that can be done “at will” and is far more complex a process than simply deploying a mere few tricks (Brubaker 1998), as it involves operating within the confines of a false consciousness of the population. False consciousness comes about when a subordinate class suffers from an “obscured reality”. That is, the subordinate class is unaware of the systematic social realities of their subordination, exploitation, and domination by the dominant class (Little n.d.). Thus, while the ruling class makes a visible effort to extend their interests to the public as a matter of incorporating equilibrium (Sharp 1973), it is, according to the concept of false consciousness, merely an obscured reality.

Brass (1991) argues that in modern democracies, elites influence the masses to garner support for their competition against other elites in order to gain positions of power and prestige. The masses will support the elite individuals who spark emotionally powerful ideas relating to a common heritage, common cultural values, and religion. The state taps into these emotionally powerful sentiments of loyalty and shared national identity to gain support for its actions.

Group identification on a national scale creates bonds of solidarity among its members (Li and Brewer 2004). National identity is shared by a group of people who likely have never seen nor met one another except on the small scale of neighborhoods or community groups; yet they share a perceived common history and culture with one another (Anderson 2006; Gillis 1994; Li and Brewer 2004; Posen 1993). This shared, national identity stems from various cultural and historical institutions that produce and disseminate information from a country’s past that connects individuals together who

otherwise might not have much in common. The state elicits feelings of nationalism by homogenizing the citizen mass through science, technology, and various cultural mechanisms such as a common national language, standardized, mandatory education, and the media (Frisch 1989; Gellner 1983; Janowitz 1976; Posen 1993). The state aims to generate sufficient loyalty through citizens' "embrace of propaganda and indoctrination" (Frisch 1989: 1153), exemplified by training productive, obedient, and patriotic citizens who share positive emotions toward the U.S., its people, and its relations with other nations (Frisch 1989). Melucci (1989) argues similarly in his discussion on collective identity, stating that a collective identity is a "negotiated process" in which the "we" referenced is given meaning. The rhetoric of "who we are" becomes part of the internal discourse and constitutes a unified force (Melucci 1989; Tilly 2004).

The goal of deploying collective identity is to transform mainstream culture and values, even its policies and structures, by providing an alternative organizational form (Bernstein 1997). Collective identity, then, is a process in which leaders and members socially construct a "we" that becomes part of their definition of their self. The merging of individual and collective selves, however, is rarely, if ever, complete, as we have multiple self-identities built around our varying social roles. Inevitably, conflicts arise among our individual self-roles and our collective roles. Identity can also be examined along a continuum from education to critique. A collective identity deployed for critique confronts the various values and practices of the dominant culture. Identity deployed for education challenges the dominant culture's perception of the minority. Collective identity deployed for education limits conflict by not taking aim at the morality or norms of the dominant culture (Bernstein 1997). While Bernstein's work (1997) is situated in

the social movement perspective, her theories outlined here are relevant to this work's focus on deploying a national collective identity, particularly in times of war. This understanding of the necessity for collective identity in a nation speaks to the importance of state leaders framing the message of collectivity in a way that resonates with the constituency (Gamson 1991; Gamson 2004).

Cultural conditions for national identity are expressed in the uprooting, dislocation and loss of a sense of community (anomie) due to modernity's urbanization and scientific reasoning (Kedourie 1960). One argument contends that nationalism was developed by alienated intellectuals as a way to cope with the "coldness" of modern times (Kedourie 1960; Leoussi 2007). Nationally, the state disseminates cultural materials to bring a shared identity to the masses. This process of cultural mechanisms also applies to military mobilization. The state draws on national solidarity to garner support for its military actions by promoting ideals of the "good" citizen, loyalty to the nation, and patriotic duty. In exchange for freedom and protection from external threats, citizens are expected to serve in the armed forces to ensure these freedoms. Hence the American adage, "Freedom isn't free".

War provides the state with an entry point into an "unprecedented concentration of hegemony" because periods of war demand a large-scale sacrifice of the people (Gramsci 1971: 238) and may have a divisive effect on the nation (Li and Brewer 2004)⁴.

This is particularly evident when out of the ordinary events take place and threatens the

⁴ Because modern society is globalized and cosmopolitan, the likelihood of disruption is amplified. When sudden or immense change occurs, it disrupts the social fabric and upsets the sense of connection. As societies continue to grow in size and complexity, our vulnerability to disruptions also increases Neal, A.G. 1998. *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Major Events in the American Century*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

social fabric and current way of life. This results in an “interventionist” government which seeks to constrain the counter-hegemonic attacks to maintain an intact, in control society. An “in control” society is especially important during vulnerable times. When a state is at war, the hegemonic rhetoric differs from the “normal”, everyday functioning of society. During the “normal” everyday functioning of society, those subscribing to a counter-hegemonic ideology are given some consideration. In order to maintain social order during periods of war and stave off opposition to leaders’ decisions and actions, however, hegemony is concentrated, with no room for appealing to the demands of counter hegemonic movements (Gramsci 1971). Further, the threat of force as maintained by the state threatens those who challenge the state too severely. This is more likely during times of war. To achieve concentrated hegemony, state leaders draw on national cultural artifacts that evoke a sense of cohesion and solidarity from its citizens (Li and Brewer 2004).

The state also implements concrete forms of threats to the counter-hegemonic rhetoric, enacting such regulations as the Espionage Act of 1917, the Sedation Act of 1918, and, as a more recent example, the U.S. Patriot Act of 2001. The Espionage Act during WWI allowed the government to open mail in order to prevent anti-war propaganda from spreading, while the Sedition Act allowed for the arrest of citizens who verbally criticized or otherwise undermined the government and its war effort. The repression of those who dissented against U.S. involvement in WWI⁵ came from a

⁵ The most important organization that opposed U.S. involvement in WWI and the draft was the Socialist Party of America. Its members were harassed, and police and civilians broke up the organization’s antiwar, anti-draft activities in the name of the Sedation and

variety of public and private sources, especially at the state and local levels. The harassment and repression of dissenters was entwined within the social fabric of American society, as the wartime nationalism encouraged turning in neighbors, family members, or friends who spoke out against the war effort (Chambers 1987).

The U.S. Patriot Act, enacted following the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center towers, contained four key elements concerning privacy and security as it relates to the U.S. and its citizens. The Act 1) weakened restrictions on law enforcement's intelligence gathering (within the U.S.), 2) expanded Secretary of the Treasury's authority to regulate financial transactions that involve foreign individuals, 3) broadened the authority of law enforcement (and immigration authorities) to detain and deport immigrants suspected of terrorist-related acts or terrorist-related connections, and 4) expanded the definition of "terrorism" to include domestic terrorism (Treasury n.d.).

These acts show how the state maintains order among its citizen population by threatening those who challenge the state's decisions. During times of war, the state can take away certain citizen freedoms and rights in the name of national security or defense. Thus, reinforcement of the hegemonic ideal for the public is imperative during war time to maintain solidarity and social order (Gramsci 1971). Under such circumstances, individuals may be more easily influenced by or susceptible to the states' propaganda promulgating a particular agenda.

U.S. history shows that that it is not always easy for the government to enact war. Military mobilization must be justified and legitimated before citizens will accept

Espionage Acts. Chambers, J.W. 1987. *To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America*. New York: Free Press.

military action. As evidenced in WWI and throughout the 20th century, Americans are suspicious of a large, standing army during times of peace as it contradicts American ideals of individualism and personal freedom (Chambers 1987; Griffith 1982). Thus, the state incorporates discourses of persuasion for the necessity of war by focusing on nationalism, the sacrifice of the individual for the national interest, and loyalty to the state. Anti-war proponents, however, work to counter this rhetoric by suggesting peace and goodwill are also American values that should be upheld. These disparate views are indicative of the dynamicism of war discourse, leading to my focus in the dissertation on unpacking how experiences in combat inform a soldier's interpretation, understanding, and internalization of nationalism, informing how military experiences re-shape discourses of nationalism and war.

2.3 STATE-FRAMED AND COUNTER-STATE UNDERSTANDINGS OF NATIONALISM

Nationalism is generally presented in the literature from two broad perspectives: political and cultural. A political understanding of nationalism involves the equal participation of all citizens in the political process. Nationalism from the political perspective entails two specific threads: first, defense of political independence from an external threat or acquisition of statehood for those who are dominated by more powerful nations, and second, a state-led cultural homogenization of the people. From this second thread, the state “builds” the nation and, consequently, a sense of national identity. A shared national

identity creates bonds of solidarity and provides motivation for being a “good citizen” at the individual level (Li and Brewer 2004)⁶. On the other hand, aspects of cultural homogenization include forced assimilation of the masses to a national culture, forced assimilation of minorities, tension over the very nature of a single national culture, and the loss of personal freedom via state coercion to conform (Leoussi 2007). In extreme cases, an overabundance of national identification (i.e, “hypernationalism”) has been associated with authoritarianism, intolerance, and warmongering (van Evera 1994).

Further, cultural homogenization permits, if not demands, the incorporation of the masses, including those on the margins of society, into the center, as a part of the whole. This engenders, Leoussi points out (2007: 2), “the sharing of common ideas and purposes,” allowing for the use of this solidarity at a later time and building solidarity that cuts across varying spheres of life and classes. In other words, the homogenizing of culture gives individuals from varying backgrounds a common shared identity with the state and each another. Cultural homogenization is the assimilation of the masses to a national culture. It results in the loss of personal freedom via state influence to conform (Leoussi 2007). As previously stated, most school children in the United States recite the Pledge of Allegiance by memory every day. Whether the school children comprehend the meaning of the Pledge or feel a sense of loyalty to the nation when reciting it, the very routinization of the act instills a sense of identification with the nation. What children learn in school – the Pledge, the nation’s history, a standard, common language – can be later used by the state to extend its military interests. By promoting standardized

⁶ However, Brubaker reminds us groups and nations are variables, not fixed entities Brubaker, R. 1998. "Myths and Misconceptions in the Study of Nationalism." in *The State of the Nation*, edited by John Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..

education, language, and literacy, the state ensures an “at-the-ready” cadre of individuals, primed with national ideologies that can be tapped should conflict among nations arise. Compulsory, state-sanctioned literacy makes potential military recruits more accessible to state propaganda, which aids the spread of nationalist ideology (Posen 1993).

Problematic in current literature on nationalism is the level at which it is conceptualized. Typically, the literature is concerned with nationalism at the global, state, or local level. For example, Brubaker (1998) takes a local perspective on nationalism and is primarily concerned with the structures of nation development. I am not dismissing that nationalism is not a part of the construction of a nation. In fact, I argue it is a very important aspect of our global understanding as nation-states are continually reinventing themselves in a global democracy (take the Arab Spring, for example). Yet, something remains missing, in the understandings of nationalism that utilize individual agency in how they interpret and *use* nationalism. How do individuals give meaning to nationalism and patriotism?

Posen (1993) argues that nationalism is a game of confidence in which state leaders convince the common population that they are, in fact, all members of the same nation and trying to obscure inequalities of power or wealth. Accordingly, a shared fate affects all persons inside a nation’s boundaries. For example, novels, films, museums, songs, advertisements for military service, and monuments are created to commemorate a war or honor the victims of war. These cultural artifacts represent a part of national history, shape the national identity of a population, and legitimate or challenge the use of violence to secure the nation’s interests.

Cultural homogenization bridges the political and cultural emphases of nationalism: what makes nationalism political and cultural at the same time is the state's role in creating and disseminating culture. It is in the state's interest to garner support for its ideologies and overall political legitimacy so that it can create, and later utilize, a sense of collective solidarity among its citizens. This type of cultural homogenization is specifically associated with the modern state (Gellner 1983). Specifically, the aim of the modern state is centered on economic growth and general prosperity. Taking account of the economic condition, nation-states that focus on economic growth and prosperity requires nationalism for its homogenizing outcomes on language, literacy, and education. Concerning this economic interest, nationalism pursues the new, scientific culture which has become available in one's language – nationalism is a movement of prosperity via the homogenizing elements (Gellner 1983). The modern capitalist society uses its workforce for the accumulation of profit, but also requires the solidarity of the workers with the owners of the means of production (Hobsbawm 1990). Thus, a common ethno-cultural identity is *invented*, along with a shared past between the two classes, claiming national cohesion (Anderson 2006; Leoussi 2007).

2.4 CONTESTING FRAMINGS OF WAR

The discussion outlined here focuses on militarized engagements as connected to nationalism, the focus of this project. Although nationalism is not necessarily linked solely to militarized actions, debates on nationalism and war highlight the idea of “us”

versus “them” that potentially evokes a particular sentiment that can be harvested by war. Key debates in the framing of nationalism and war are worth closer examination. For example, the framing of nationalism is particularly interesting because nationalism, by its very definition, maintains a sense of exclusivity – to garner a sense of nationalism is to, necessarily, exclude those who “are not” what “we are”. Through various cultural entities we engage in a learned national discourse that identifies who the “we” are and, perhaps more importantly, who the “we” are not. This exemplifies the inclusive/exclusive narrative necessary in developing nationalism. Nationalism includes certain individuals, but is only meaningful if others are excluded. This is exemplified in our earlier discussion on the interconnectedness of war and nationalism, as elites use their means (military forces, weaponry, etc.) to coercively expand their nation-states. When they are met with challengers, war ensues (Tilly 1992). As the structures formalize and expand, incorporating newly defeated territories, leaders work to coalesce the population via structures of nationalist claims, creating a common national identity around which the population bonds, again, identifying the “we” versus “them”.

Theories on nationalism are largely situated from the perspective of state-building or state reconstruction. State and global perspectives inform our understanding of the historical importance of nations and the reconstruction of nationalism, particularly in times of a grand overhaul such as in the fall of the Soviet Union. However, these broader theories of nationalism overlook the agency of individuals who receive nationalist messages. State and global perspectives of nationalism are useful in understanding the construction and reconstruction, and thus the historical importance of nations. Broader understandings of nationalism inform in-depth understandings of how individuals sent to

war evaluate their experiences before and after war. This idea is what is so very intriguing in the study of contested discourses on war from the perspective of veterans. Which structural factors resonate at the individual level? How are broad messages of national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted by individuals and consequently incorporated into everyday lives? Specifically, I am interested in examining how experiences in war inform a veteran's interpretation, understanding, and internalization of nationalism, informing how military experiences re-shape discourses of nationalism and war.

2.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter explored the literature on nationalism, hegemony, and framing as background to answer the dissertation research questions: for military combat soldiers, which structural factors resonate at the individual level? How are broad messages of unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted by these individuals and consequently incorporated into everyday lives? Gaps in the literature were identified by outlining the various understandings of nationalism along with critiques and theories of nationalism, how scholars understand the differences between nationalism and patriotism, how nationalism and patriotism pertain specifically to the United States, and how these terms will be applied in the dissertation. Literature on ideology and hegemony and how these concepts relate to nationalism and war, along with the differences between state-framed and counter-state understandings of nationalism and war were also explored. A call for

in-depth exploration on how military experiences re-shape discourses of nationalism and war was made. Chapter 3 will discuss in-depth the methodology used to complete this study including research design and research questions, goals of the project, data collection and analysis of two data sets: as well as methodological approaches for each.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives an in-depth look at the methodology of the study, beginning with the research design and questions. Next, I discuss the goals of this project, and outline the four working hypotheses: recruitment, combat, background, and return home post deployment. A thorough examination of data collection follows, including an analysis of two data sets: 174 quantitative web-based surveys and 18 qualitative in-depth interviews, as well as methodological approaches for each data set. The last section offers a brief summary of this chapter.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND QUESTIONS

From this research, I aim to understand the personal narratives of soldiers' experiences in various aspects of the military as well as understand how the meaning of nationalism is formulated in the context of first-hand military experiences. I analyzed the personal narratives of combat zone soldiers in terms of their recruitment process, combat zone experiences, personal socioeconomic background, and experiences upon their return home post deployment. This analysis is in the context of the main objective of this research; that is to understand what explains a combat soldier's attitude toward the U.S.

following their combat experiences. I am interested in examining how experiences in war inform an individual's interpretation, understanding, and internationalization of nationalism. Thus, the primary research question of this study is: What combat experiences explain a soldier's critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S. following their combat deployment? Subsidiary questions include: 1) which structural factors resonate at the individual level? and 2) how are broad messages of national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted and consequently incorporated into everyday lives?

I used a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to collect and analyze two data sets: 1) a survey on nationalistic attitudes of soldiers (see Appendix A: Survey Guide), and 2) in-depth, semi-structured interviews with U.S. soldiers who served in combat zones of the Iraq or Afghanistan War (see Appendix B: Interview Guide). Data collection took place over the course of approximately 15 months (January 2014 - March 2015).

My overarching hypothesis is that military combat experiences play an influential role in the internalization of nationalism in combat soldiers. Soldiers in combat zones are in high stress situations, often with their lives in danger, the lives of their fellow soldiers in danger, or first hand experience of other traumatic events. I argue that for soldiers to make sense of these traumatic events or to defend their actions in combat, they revert to nationalistic rhetoric. Alternatively, military experiences in a combat zone may induce a rhetoric that is critical of the U.S. The findings of this study can help us better understand how experiences in the military can influence a soldier's views on nationalism.

I began my research by looking at what specific military experiences play a role in the shaping and internalization of nationalism in a combat soldier. What specific

military experiences influence whether a soldier will maintain a nationalistic or critical view of the U.S.? Do variations in recruitment experiences, experiences upon their return to the U.S., and background factors result in differing views of veterans' nationalism that can be aligned along race, class, or gender lines? If so, in what ways are we able to suggest military experiences influence whether a veteran will maintain a critical or nationalistic view of the U.S.?

Although my hypothesis states that military experiences play a role in the internalization of nationalism for U.S. soldiers, I am open to data that contradict this assumption. As such, it will be particularly interesting to inquire and examine what is at the root of soldiers' views on nationalism, adding nuance and depth to the research question under examination.

3.2 RESEARCH GOALS

My primary research goal is to add individual level data to the current debates on nationalism, which currently focus primarily on state and nation building (DiMaggio and Bonikowski 2008). These studies overlook the individual perspective of how nationalism is reinforced and called upon in times of need, such as when a country goes to war. Nationalism is often treated in the literature as a “whole”, or plural – that which involves “all” of the people in a given nation-state. This is not to suggest that nationalism applies to all citizens in the nation-state in the same way. Rather, I argue that “nationalism” as treated in the literature in terms of its plurality is problematic in that it leaves out the

frames through which individuals interpret national sentiments and connect them to the nation-state. This study pays attention to that individuality, giving a voice to the parts that make up the whole.

This initial research objective extends into exploring if, and how, combat experiences influence a soldier's views on nationalism. Do deployed soldiers maintain a critical or nationalistic view of the United States upon their return home? What factors contribute to criticism of or nationalistic views toward the U.S.? This information can aid in extending the current state-level research to incorporate nuance and perspective into established, and perhaps ever changing, individual perspectives on nationalism.

To aid our discussion on whether military veterans hold critical or national sentiment toward the U.S., four main typologies are used. These four typologies are ideal types only and not intended to be the exemplar in individual national sentiment, but rather a starting point to begin discussions on individual agency in nationalism. First is *critical disposition*. Those who hold a crucial disposition suggest a critical temperament toward the U.S., usually expressed toward government policies, but do not take participatory action. Second, *critical participants* are those who actively engage in activities that express criticism of the U.S. Most who are critical participants also hold critical dispositions. The third type holds a *compliant disposition*. These are individuals who express an agreeable temperament toward the U.S., but do not take participatory action. The last type is *compliant participants*, those that express agreeable temperament toward the U.S. and take action in accordance to conforming to rules, standards, and regulations. Cross-over among the four types can occur within a single situation: one may hold a critical disposition of the Iraq War, but not participate in actions against it.

As with any research, this project calls into question my position as a researcher. To counter any implicit bias in this project, I incorporated a reflexive approach in all aspects of this research project. Reflexivity requires that we acknowledge and situate our many “selves” in conjunction with the research process. Our “selves” fall into three main categories: research-based selves, brought selves (the selves which create our standpoint socially, culturally, and historically), and situationally created selves (Guba and Lincoln 2008). Reflexivity asks that we acknowledge and “interrogate” each of our selves in terms of how it may affect the research. This extends from our relationship with participants in our research study as well as in the writing up of research notes and analysis (Guba and Lincoln 2008). I was cognizant of dichotomous categorizing and thinking throughout this study, not simply utilizing an “either/or” approach to the data gathered, but rather allowed for a range of possibilities in the findings. Lastly, I utilized this research as a tool for extending discussions on nationalism, incorporating into those discussions a personal narrative element that is currently missing.

3.3 WORKING HYPOTHESES, INDEPENDENT/DEPENDENT VARIABLES

This study has four main hypotheses focused on projected key factors: recruitment, combat, background, and return home post-deployment. Each key factor is associated with a research question, aiding in the organization of the data analysis (discussed later in this chapter). The conceptualization of the dependent variable in this study, national identity, is adapted from DiMaggio and Bonikowski’s (2008) paper on varieties of

American nationalism. Their findings indicate a high level of national identification within the U.S. population, as well as high levels of pride and sense of national superiority. They further divide respondents into four “classes” based on their findings: two are extreme classes, with very high and very low levels of endorsement of nationalist claims. The other two classes are more moderate, one with limiting views of American identity but modest levels of nationalist pride, and the other with very high levels of nationalist pride but a rather inclusive definition of American identity (DiMaggio and Bonikowski 2008).

Since research is an iterative process, I did not limit the data or theoretical outcomes strictly to the findings of DiMaggio and Bonikowski (2008). Their work served as a starting point from which I moved into discussions of theoretical framing on hegemony and ideology, as well as expanded upon their ideas on nationalist identity. I anticipated nationalist identity to be exhibited via a complex interlinking of diverse, overlapping, and/or situational views incorporating, but not limited to, hegemonic and alternative ideologies that can shift in meaning through frame alignment process (Snow et al. 1986; Woehrle, Coy and Maney 2009).

Key indicators include analysis of responses to survey and structured interview responses on, broadly, national identity (feeling of “connectedness” to the nation), American identity (what makes someone “American”), and pride in nation (DiMaggio and Bonikowski 2008). Specifically, analysis focused on structured interview questions pertaining to path to service, including when did the respondent decide joining the military might be of interest, how they came to the decision to join the military (including follow-up questions on family members who served in the military), and the sharing of

enlistment experiences. Analysis on questions pertaining to integration also served as key indicators for the dependent variable, including re-integration issues and positive or negative encounters upon the respondent's return to the US if they served during combat time.

Analysis of specific survey questions represented key indicators for national identity, including 5-point Likert scale questions (disagree completely to agree completely) adapted from Kosterman and Feshbach (2008): 1) although at times I may not agree with the government, my commitment to the U.S. always remains strong; 2) the fact that I am an American is an important part of my identity; 3) a person who preferred jail to serving in the U.S. army could still be a good American; 4) a person who does not believe in God could still be a good American; 5) a person who believes in socialism could still be a good American; 6) it is OK to criticize the government; 7) we should have complete freedom of speech, even for those who criticize the country; and 8) people who do not want to fight for American should live somewhere else.

3.3.1 Recruitment

The first independent variable is conceptualized as experiences of respondent's reasons for enlisting in the military. Key indicators include analysis of responses to survey questions asking about: family members in the armed forces (number of family members previously enlisted and relationship to respondent), respondent's education and income levels, and respondent's political and religious affiliations.

I anticipate soldiers who enlisted because of 9/11 will view their combat experiences with a more nationalistic view than those who enlisted prior to 9/11. This is expected because of the patriotic idealism framed by mainstream media and government officials following 9/11. Media framing of the 9/11 attacks uncritically reproduced the language and metaphors used by the Bush administration and the American military, in which the attacks were depicted as starting a retaliatory “war on terror” (Steuter and Wills 2010). As explained in Chapter 2, framing renders “events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action” (Goffman 1974; Snow et. al 1986: 464). In short, frames present a particular view of a specific event or situation upon which the person or organization disseminating the information wants others to focus.

Despite the importance of framing, critics argue that mainstream media risk intensifying conflict in their coverage. The “metaphoric frames and rhetorical representations” used by mainstream media in conflict coverage “decontextualize[s] violence”; that is, by the sheer repetition of war metaphors espoused by the media, war propaganda becomes invisible (Steuter and Wills 2010). The use of rhetorical representations focuses on a conflict’s “irrational elements”, overlooking the reasons for the conflict and missing suggesting potential alternatives to violence. Further, mainstream media often oversimplify the conflict, reducing it into a dichotomous conflict of two parties: “good” and “evil” (Steuter and Wills 2010).

Prior to 9/11, the American ideological framework centered for the most part on ethnoculturalism and incorporationism, rival conceptions of identity. Ethnoculturalism, the idea that American identity is largely defined by white Protestantism rooted in

Northern European heritage and ancestry, has been largely criticized and challenged, but still plays an influential role in shaping how citizens think of what it means “to be” American. The rival conception of incorporationism values cultural diversity, ethnicities, and is based on the country’s immigrant tradition (Schildkraut 2002). The period following the 9/11 attacks, incorporationism was challenged by concerns over a possible “enemy within”. Post-9/11 was a time of deep national identification and intense emotion, even uncertainty. Due to this high degree of uncertainty, collective representations and shared understandings of the nation were in a state of flux. Under such circumstances, “individuals can be easily influenced by subtle activation of different conceptualizations of the meaning of national identity and unity” (Li and Brewer 729-730: 2004). Thus, a difference in soldiers’ narrative of nationalism is expected between those who enlisted because of 9/11 and those who enlisted prior to 9/11.

3.3.2 Combat

The second independent variable is conceptualized as the events and experiences that took place while the respondent was physically deployed overseas for combat, or in other locales training for deployment. Key indicators include analysis of responses to structured interview questions on respondent’s feelings about being deployed, friends and family reactions to news of the deployment, day-to-day life while deployed overseas (i.e., daily routines, sleep patterns), significant deployment experiences, and how deployment changed respondents’ views on war, military, the United States, and their feelings of connectedness (or lack thereof) to the country.

I expect soldiers who served in the combat zone to rationalize significant experiences in a more nationalistic view than those who report no experience of significant or difficult events. Deployment to a combat zone can be traumatizing as soldiers are faced with the death and killing of comrades and civilians, destruction of infrastructure, loneliness and homesickness. Soldiers' active engagement with nationalism and making sense of traumatic combat zone experiences may keep soldiers from questioning or being haunted by traumatic memories as they are "reminded" they protected and defended their country and they fulfilled their "duty" to their country. However, I remain open to the possibility that the reverse may also present itself. That is, because of the traumatic events experienced in combat, some soldiers' may develop anti-nationalistic views emanating from resentment, hostility, or disillusionment for the combat trauma they endured. Additionally, I remain open to the possibility that it was the military experience itself that developed any sense of relevant nationalism for the soldier.

3.3.3 Background

The third independent variable is conceptualized as antecedent background information that will add depth in understanding the basis of a respondent's national identity, American identity, and pride in nation (DiMaggio and Bonikowski 2008). Key indicators include analysis of survey questions asking about: respondent's family members in the armed forces (number of family members previously enlisted and relationship to respondent), childhood family's income levels, parents' education levels, and childhood family's political and religious affiliations.

I anticipate soldiers' background will play a role in shaping their experiences in the military and their sense of nationalism. I will consider gender variation, racial variation, and class variation in my analysis of how military experiences shape one's sense of nationalism. Background is important because it shapes individuals' worldviews in that the opportunities and resources available and accessible can and do vary across background. For example, as of the end of September 2010, female soldiers make up just 14.4% of all active duty armed forces personnel (not including Coast Guard) (Active 2006; Duty 2006). Due to the male dominated armed forces, I expect male soldiers to have more favorable interpretation of their combat experiences and, therefore, more favorable views of nationalism than female soldiers. Further, given the historical oppression of racial minority groups in the U.S., I expect Caucasians to maintain a more favorable interpretation of their combat experiences and nationalism than minority groups. Lastly, I anticipate lower class individuals will have a more favorable interpretation of their combat experiences and nationalism than middle or upper class soldiers as the military offers a job with a steady income and benefits for the soldier and their families. Thus, I expect class to also play a role in shaping a soldier's understanding of nationalism. These background factors offer a complexity to the issue of how military experiences shape one's views of nationalism.

3.3.4 Return Home Post Deployment

The fourth, and final, independent variable is conceptualized as the point in time the respondent returns to the U.S. from their deployment abroad. Key indicators include

responses to structured interview questions on respondent's experiences upon integrating into civilian life post-military, including positive or negative encounters with civilians, feelings about those encounters, and use of available veteran resources upon being deactivated from the military.

I anticipate soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources, as they are able to better maneuver through the transition from deployment back into civilian life. Resources such as mental and physical health support, job or career advising, financial planning, and familial/friendship networks are expected to ease the transition of the soldier. Knowing these resources are available to use may give soldiers a sense of appreciation and respect for the time they served in combat. Yet this is key: returning soldiers must engage with those resources in order to reap the benefits – some may choose not to do so or not be aware of the resources available. In addition, it may be those with access to and knowledge of resources and support networks may still not hold their military experiences in a favorable view due to traumatic events that took place during deployment. Thus, I am open to the possibility that even those soldiers with access to resources and support networks may not hold their military experiences in a favorable view.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The primary aim of this research is to understand, for military combat soldiers, which structural factors resonate at the individual level? How are broad messages of unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted by these individuals and consequently incorporated into everyday lives? To explore this topic, I collected and analyzed 174 survey responses and 18 personal narratives of soldiers about their experiences with recruitment into the armed forces, combat experiences, personal backgrounds, attitudes toward nationalism, and experiences upon returning to the United States. The population studied were veterans of any branch of the military (i.e., individuals who were enlisted but are not currently serving) who served sometime between 1995-2005. Veterans were the target population since current active military members may be less likely to reveal information for fear of compromising their position within the military; or, their responses may skew the overall sample as feelings and attitudes may not fully reflect the individual's beliefs.

3.4.1 Reflections on Self

Before entering a discussion on the methodological approach to data gathering and analysis, I first want to discuss my position, as researcher, within this research process. In analyzing data, it is important to be aware of the inherent biases all researchers have. In quantitative data analysis, the researcher must develop their research tool (here, the survey) in a manner that closely represents what the information is collecting, and permitting a variety of responses. To ensure I was using proper military language in the

survey and captured a proper range of response choices, I sought guidance and feedback from an ex-soldier. Additionally, all survey questions where possible offered the answer choice “other” with a free text-box for the respondent to fill in as they wished. To prevent data analysis bias, I utilized my knowledge and education from graduate courses in statistical methods, several years of assisting on a wide variety of research projects, and reference sources when needed.

In narrative analysis, much of the researcher’s work is based on representational decisions (Riessman 2003): the rapport first established between researcher and participant may influence how or what the participant feels comfortable revealing; the researcher must decide within a split second which prompt or follow-up questions to ask. While these may be thought through ahead of time, researchers are not always aware of which direction the participant narrative may go. The transcription process also requires representational decisions from the researcher: does the researcher include moments when the participant stalls, pauses, uses “um” or “ah” (Riessman 2003)? Lastly, and most obviously, representational decisions of the researcher come into play during data analysis. There is much literature on researcher bias (see, for example Corbin and Strauss 2008 and Riessman 2003), but it is worth noting that, particularly in the analysis stage, as much as researchers aim to depict a story from the perspective of the participants, “readers are constantly directed by the author’s interpretive voice” (Riessman 2003: 32). Any analysis has some amount of interpretive bias – there is no way to avoid it. However, awareness of this fact allows us to be “more conscious, reflective and cautious about the claims we make” in our research (Riessman 2003: 16).

3.4.2 Methodological Approach: Statistical Descriptives

The primary methods of analysis in this study were narrative analysis of interview transcripts and a quantitative examination of survey data. Survey data was input into a statistical software package for supplemental quantitative analysis (SPSS). While the main goal of this research is to explore the cultural meaning and experiences of nationalism in a qualitative manner, statistical descriptives can help us see the larger picture of the respondents' backgrounds. Using SPSS, I ran simple frequencies on the various demographic and background information (education, income levels, religious and political views, race, marital status, age joined military, and size of town and region of the U.S. currently live in) for informational purposes. Quantitative analysis is especially interesting for survey data, and leaves open the possibility for a future research study to complete a larger survey sample that with a focused goal of statistical significance.

3.4.2.1 Data Set #1 and Access: Survey

The strengths of conducting surveys include accuracy, generalizability, and convenience (Marshall and Rossman 2006). Accuracy is enhanced by the quantification, replicability and control over observer effects; meaning, the researcher's presence does not interfere with data outcomes. Results of surveys can be generalized to a larger population, though generalizability is not a primary goal in this study, but rather seeking interpretations of events and the veteran's view on these events is the chief outcome. Surveys also offer the

advantage of rapid analysis and are relatively easy to administer and manage (Marshall and Rossman 2006).

However, there are also drawbacks in using surveys as a methodological approach. While a survey on the one hand can control for accuracy, it cannot definitively assure that the sample represents a broader population. To mitigate this, I took care in my analysis and subsequent write-up of data and to not make generalizations that were either non-existent or too sweeping. Further, the survey was disseminated widely and respondents self-selected to participate, potentially producing inaccurate or questionable information. If any survey data seemed obviously “planted”, I would eliminate from the analysis, however, this did not occur. Other non-obvious erroneous data is a limitation of the study.

The web-based survey (see Appendix A: Survey Guide) was administered through Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com). The University of Pittsburgh has a site license for Qualtrics, and it is the preferred web-based survey administrator of the University of Pittsburgh Internal Review Board. From the secured, internal University of Pittsburgh web page on Qualtrics, they explain the preference for this survey service over others: “Maintaining the security of research subjects’ data is of paramount importance to the Pitt IRB, and the CSSD Security Office has determined that the Qualtrics System meets University Data Security standards” (Pitt Qualtrics). Qualtrics easily exports survey data gathered directly into the software program SPSS.

Surveys were disseminated to a broad population to diversify the response pool and ensure a range of views were included. I utilized my personal accounts on social media (Twitter, Facebook, Craigslist) to send out the survey. I posted as my status update

a brief explanatory paragraph and link to the survey. I encouraged others to share the link widely and freely (see Appendix C: Facebook Recruitment for exact wording of post). Social media was the most effective recruitment tool, with 99/174 of participants who completed the survey heard about it through social media. I also posted on Twitter, but as I do not have as large of a following on Twitter, this method did not prove as beneficial, with just 1 survey participant hearing about it from Twitter.

To post on Craigslist, I first printed a list of all Craigslist websites in the US (<http://www.craigslist.org/about/sites#US>). Next, I printed a list of all U.S. cities near a U.S. military base (<http://www.militarytowns.com/AllCities.asp>). My strategy was to coordinate Craigslist postings in the same cities with a military base nearby. While this method may not capture veterans who moved away from a city near a military base, most cities with military bases have or are near, a large population, hence, a wider number of people who may see the survey posting. In addition, it is assumed that many veterans who retired from the military have roots (home, friends, family, children connected in the community) that would entice them to stay in the same area even after retiring from the military. Once I narrowed the list of Craigslist sites to ones with or near military bases, I began posting (see Appendix D: Craigslist Recruitment for exact wording of post). In several instances, the Craigslist site covered the entire state (Hawaii, Maine, Wyoming, Delaware, District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Rhode Island). If cities with military bases were not on the Craigslist site list, I used Google Maps to identify where the base was located and used the closest Craigslist site city available. For example, Kodiak, AK has a military base, but is not listed on the Craigslist site list. Since Kodiak is 270 miles from Kenai Peninsula, the next closest Craigslist site, I used Kenai to capture those living

in Kodiak. While this was not a perfect solution, it opened the survey to additional respondents.

In smaller states, I simply used all Craigslist sites for that state, even if there was no military base nearby. For example, one Craigslist site is “southeast Alaska”, but there is no military base nearby. Since Alaska has a small population, I included “southeast Alaska” in my postings. To determine “smaller” states, I used a list of U.S. states by population, and made sure the 10 smallest states by population were included in the Craigslist postings. These states include: Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Montana, Delaware, South Dakota, Alaska, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming (http://simple.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_U.S._states_by_population). I also made sure to include major U.S. cities, even if no military base was nearby due to a greater reach of the population. To determine “major” U.S. cities I used a Top 50 Cities in the U.S. by Population and Rank. I made sure each of the cities included on this list were included in the Craigslist postings (<http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0763098.html>).

I initially posted in the “Community<General Community” section on Craigslist for 30 cities. I received a zero response rate after 9 days, and changed where the posting was located from “Community<General Community” to “Event/Class<I’m advertising an event, other than the above”. I used the “start date” of the “event” as the date of posting. The “event duration” was the maximum allowed of 14 days. “Street” was a required field, in which I typed “Anywhere” since an online survey can be completed anywhere. “City” and “zip code” were also required fields in which I filled in the Craigslist site and zip. To gain a local zip code, I looked up cities at www.unitedstateszipcode.org. While most cities have multiple zip codes, I used the general zip code that appeared when typing in a

city name, as the posting will still reach populations outside that particular zip code. The zip code field is only to show where the “event” was to take place. In addition to recruiting on social media, I emailed 43 national veteran organizations, asking them to share the survey with their email distribution lists. This list of the national veteran organizations was found on Wikipedia.

The survey remained “active” (i.e., available online for respondents to fill out) until responses and options for recruitment had satiated, and interviews were complete. The survey received 174 responses, which was enough to offer basic statistical analysis and enough to recruit 18 interview respondents. While additional survey respondents would add statistical strength to the analysis and potentially increased the number of interview respondents, a range of views were represented across a wide spectrum with the number of responses achieved.

The survey asked participants a series of questions on their military background, social activities, demographic information, their views on the U.S. and its people, and a rank order list of issues of importance. Questions in the military background, social activities, and demographic information sections were either text-based (“fill-in-the-blank”) or multiple choice. The text-based questions allowed respondents to be unrestricted in what information was revealed. The multiple choice questions were primarily either yes/no⁷ with the respondent allowed to pick only one answer or a range

⁷ Example of a yes/no multiple choice question where only one answer was allowed: Please mark whether or not you were involved in the following social activities before your military service: Church Group, Yes/No.

of choices where only one option was allowed⁸. One multiple-choice question, “Which of the following types of situations did you experience during your service?” contained a range of choices with as many options allowed as the respondent wished.

In addition to the text-based and multiple choice questions, the survey also contained a 5-point Likert opinion scale that asked how much respondents agreed with a particular statement concerning their views on the U.S. and its people, with “1” representing “strongly disagree” and “5” representing “strongly agree”⁹. The 8 items in the Likert opinion scale were taken from Kosterman and Feshbach’s 1989 study on patriotic and nationalistic attitudes.

The Likert opinion scale items appearing in this survey have been tested over time to measure one’s nationalistic or patriotic attitudes. Kosterman and Feshbach pieced together their survey of 120 items mainly from past studies (see, for example, (Campbell 1973; Comrey and Newmeyer 1965; DeLamater, Katz and Kelman 1969; Ferguson 1942; Lentz 1976; Levinson 1957; Loh 1975; Sampson and Smith 1957; Stagner 1940). Li and Brewer (2004) also adapted parts of Kosterman and Feshbach’s survey (1989) in their study on what it means to be an American post-9/11. My version of Kosterman and Feshbach’s survey used items that specifically asked about nationalistic or patriotic sentiments.

⁸ Example of a multiple choice question where only one answer was allowed: What is your current marital status? Single, Partnered, Married, Separated, Divorced, Widowed, Other, please explain.

⁹ Example of a Likert-scale question: The fact that I am an American is an important part of my identity. Strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree.

The next section of the survey asked respondents to rank order, from most to least important, issues of importance in two distinct categories: 1) participation in activities¹⁰ and 2) meaningful concepts¹¹. Lastly, respondents were asked if they were interested in being contacted for participation in a telephone interview. Respondents could provide their first name, how they preferred to be contacted (by telephone or email), telephone number or email address, which time zone they resided in, and the best times and days to reach them. This allowed for respondents to take just the survey and “opt-in” for the interview if they were interested. It was from this section of the survey I recruited all interview participants. This ensured that I had survey data on all interview participants.

3.4.2.2 Data Cleaning

Once the data was imported from Qualtrics into SPSS, the data was cleaned. The very first variable was kept as this was “respondent id” to distinguish among respondents. I did change the intricate Qualtrics assigned id numbers (i.e., R_3JjGSwWOPfUI89v) to more streamlined numbers (i.e., 001, 002, etc.). Variables 2-10 were deleted because they were not data points pertinent to the research, and automatically collected by Qualtrics, not a part of the original survey. The deleted variables include: response set; name; external data; email address; IP address; status; start date; end date; finished.

¹⁰ Respondents were asked to rank order from most to least importance the following participation in activities: To serve America through military service; to attend church regularly; to actively participate in local and national elections; to attend or participate in rallies or demonstrations for causes I believe in; to actively participate in community activities.

¹¹ Respondents were asked to rank order from most to least importance the following meaningful concepts: Patriotism; nationalism; education; religion; politics.

Qualtrics automatically assigns variables with a generic, non-descriptive name (i.e., V1, V2, V3, etc.). For clarity, I changed these auto-assigned variable names to specific codes representing the data (i.e., V2 = LRNFRN to represent the survey question, “How did you learn about the survey? Select all that apply.”: A friend forwarded it to me).

Data from text-based questions, those questions which respondents are asked to answer by typing out a response, were cleaned in order to streamline respondents’ answer choices. SPSS interprets discrepancies in spelling and capitalization as separate data points. For example, the question “What is your race?” was text-based, allowing respondents to list as many races with which they identified, or leave blank if they wished. This resulted in numerous data points, although answers were the same or similar, including misspellings. “Cacusian” (sic) was listed as a separate data point than “caucasian” (sic). For clearer and more accurate analysis, I collected all same or similar answers, and assigned numeric codes to each. Allowing respondents to enter text data as they saw fit, then later assigning codes accordingly, allows for quantitative analysis of data best representing respondents’ true answer choices. In short, developing categories out of respondent data is in the spirit of thematic analysis, used in the qualitative data set of this study.

Age was another text-based survey question that also required recoding for ease of data analysis. In the case of age, I used age categories as listed in the 2012 Department of Defense Demographic Profile of the Military Community. Using the same age categories as the military ensures that the data represented in this study is aligned appropriately with the unique culture that is the military.

Some data did not need to be recoded, but simply cleaned up. As noted in the discussion on race, above, when survey questions are text based, respondents are asked to answer the question by typing out a response. Due to discrepancies in spelling and capitalization, answers needed to be streamlined for clearer analysis. The questions that required streamlined answers, included age, race, what state do you currently live in, what is your current religious affiliation (answers to “other” free text box), and what is your current political affiliation (answers to “other” free text box).

3.4.2.3 Running Analyses

After cleaning the data, I analyzed characteristics of individual variables. Univariate analysis was useful to glean information about specific characteristics of the data in isolation from other variables within the data set. Analyzing data points in isolation from others is important in understanding the implications of the study and essential to determine which types of bivariate and multivariate analyses to run (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2003). For this study, it was important to understand the make-up of survey respondents - who are they, where they come from, and their religious/political beliefs. To do so, I ran frequencies from survey questions regarding respondents' background: how old were you when you joined the military, what was the highest rank you achieved in the military, what year were you born, what is your current marital status, what is your race, what state do you currently live in, what is your current household income level, what is your highest level of education completed, what is your current religious affiliation, how often do you attend religious services, what is your current political affiliation, how often do you vote in local or national elections?

3.4.3 Methodological Approach: Thematic Narrative Analysis

While surveys are helpful for accuracy, generalizability, and convenience, they do not offer the ability to examine complex social relationships or intricate patterns of interactions (Marshall and Rossman 2006). To alleviate this, information collected from the survey was used to draw a purposive sample of diverse respondents that showed variation in nationalistic and patriotic viewpoints for structured, qualitative interviews conducted via telephone. Purposive sampling is sampling by selecting respondents based on which individuals will be the most useful for the purposes of the study (Babbie 2005).

I used narrative analysis, specifically thematic analysis, to analyze transcripts of in-depth interviews, as the focus of this research is on the stories of U.S. soldiers' in their search for meaning through their military experiences, their interpretation of these experiences, and the overall influence of their military service in their everyday lives. Narrative analysis refers to texts which contain a "storied form" (Riessman 2003). In understanding our storied experiences, we construct preferred narratives of our past, and these narratives represent ways of knowing, understanding, and communicating (Hinchman and Hinchman 1997; Riessman 2003). Personal narratives, common in qualitative sociological research, include long sections of talk (i.e., in-depth interviews) and require researchers to construct texts for additional analysis (i.e., transcripts) (Riessman 2003).

Narrative analysis is an umbrella methodological approach, within it a variety of typologies¹², including thematic analysis. Thematic analysis places emphasis on the context of text and is particularly suited to oral narratives of personal experiences (Riessman 2003). This method is concerned with *what* is said rather than *how* it is said; it is interested in what is “told” rather than the “telling” (Floersch et al. 2010; Riessman 2003). Thematic analysis identifies meanings produced in the data; by people, situations, and events (Floersch et al. 2010). Similar to grounded theorists, researchers of thematic analysis collect stories, compare units of text, and inductively create conceptual groupings of umbrella and subthemes (Floersch et al. 2010; Riessman 2003). Patterns in the data are recognized by comparing themes with the literature or with prior knowledge of the object under study (Floersch et al. 2010). In this dissertation, sections of interview transcripts were chosen for closer inspection, using thematic analysis as a guide to uncover meaning of U.S. soldiers’ experiences.

3.4.3.1 Data Set #2 and Access: In-depth Interviews

As with the survey method, there are certain advantages and challenges in using structured interviews for data gathering. One challenge is that interviews rely on cooperation of the participant. Participants may be unwilling or uncomfortable sharing certain information with me, or may give untruthful or false information (Marshall and Rossman 2006). I will counter this by assuring the participant they may decline to answer any question they wish, and they may withdraw from the study at any time. Another way

¹² Narrative analysis typologies are not mutually exclusive; different types of narrative analysis can be, and often are, combined. The boundaries among the different typologies are fuzzy (Riessman 2003).

I will alleviate a participant feeling uncomfortable sharing information with me is by conducting all interviews via telephone. Previous studies have shown that telephone interviews are more effective in collecting sensitive or otherwise stigmatizing information than face-to-face interviews (Midanik and Greenfield 2003). Respondents are more likely to provide accurate information over the telephone (Galan, Rodriguez-Artalejo and Zorrilla 2004; van Wijck, Bosch and Hunink 1998). Telephone interviews are also ideal for this study as it is the most reliable method for conducting interviews with veterans. Face-to-face interviews may pose a financial or logistical hardship, thus reducing participation in the study (Zickmund 2013, October 8). Another challenge in using interviews in this study is that it requires superb listening skills and skills with personal interactions, question framing, and probing for elaboration (Marshall and Rossman 2006). While qualitative interviews are an art form and skill that is continually honed by the researcher, I have prior experience in conducting semi-structured interviews during the completion of my master's thesis. Through my previous experience with interviewing, and attention to the mechanics of listening and probing, I feel confident in my abilities to draw necessary information from participants.

Despite these challenges, interviews also have several methodological advantages. First, data can be gathered fairly quickly and in large quantity (Marshall and Rossman 2006), but the data gathered also has a depth and detail often missing in surveys. Thus, interviews will allow for further probing of survey data, adding depth, nuance, and a personal perspective to the study. Another advantage of using interviews is that immediate follow-up or clarification are possible (Marshall and Rossman 2006). If a

story, concept, or answer is unclear to me, I can ask the participant for clarification or more details, resulting in richer, more complete, and accurate data.

Structured, qualitative interviews involved administering standardized interview questions to 18 respondents. This ensured that all participants were given equal opportunities to provide their responses across the same research constructs (Firmin 2008). A structured approach to gathering interview data was appropriate for this study, as it directed the conversation in a focused manner and supplemented the survey data (Firmin 2008).

To recruit participants for the structured interview, I included an option for respondents to agree to or decline permission to be contacted at the end of the survey. I requested email addresses to use for recruitment; telephone numbers to use for recruitment and the interview. While interviews were conducted over the telephone, survey respondents may choose their preference for initial contact (email or phone). I followed up with all respondents who agreed to be interviewed *and* showed variation in nationalistic and patriotic viewpoints. I was also aware of theoretical saturation in my recruitment efforts; understanding theoretical saturation as thematic (i.e., no new data emerges), but also when the ability to develop categories, variation within the categories, and delineating responses among concepts is reached (Corbin and Strauss 2008).

Respondents who provided phone numbers and email addresses were not anonymous, as the survey information is an important recruitment factor to determine an appropriate purposive sample. However, I kept surveys with identifying information confidential on a password-protected computer in a password-protected file accessible only to me. Identifying information will be used for recruitment purposes only.

In-depth interviews (see Appendix B: Interview Guide) took place over the phone, using a Skype phone number. Telephone interviews expanded the reach of this study to soldiers anywhere in the country or the world, not limiting findings to a specific geographic region. Telephone interviews also eliminated the need for soldiers to travel to the interview location, which can be a financial hardship, time constraint, or even a physical impossibility given physical health, mobility, or access to transportation. In addition, some individuals may open up more over the phone, as they feel “anonymous” not making eye contact with the interviewer.

A Skype telephone account was set up to facilitate telephone interviews. Each interview was recorded using an audio recording application, Call Recorder, via Skype that allows for the recording of any telephone conversation, with participants’ knowledge and consent. I advertised the interviews to take between 45-60 minutes. The range of time the interviews took was between 00:22:57 – 01:19:10, with a median interview length of about 42:00 minutes for a total of 17 interviews. Participants for the interview were chosen when they “opted in” at the end of the online survey (see Appendix B: Interview Guide).

By self-selecting to participate in the interview, it gave participants the option of just filling out the survey, or filling out the survey and participating in the interview. Of those who indicated an interest in the interview, I had an approximately 50% response rate that resulted in a completed interview.

I also used snowball sampling with those I interviewed, encouraging interviewees to share the survey link with their friends or anyone they know might be interested. A limitation of the snowball method is the tendency of recruiting a cohort of like-minded

individuals. I wanted to account for variation in views and beliefs for richer analysis of data in the project, so I was cognizant of recruitment limitations and actively sought out participants that offered a range of viewpoints and came from a range of backgrounds. I aimed for a full representation of varied views in my sample. In the sample, I targeted 17 soldiers, from any branch of the military. A key component of this research study is that the soldier was deployed into a combat zone, so I ensured that the soldier was deployed before interviewing.

Once a respondent opted-in for the interview, I contacted them by email, explaining the purpose of the research study, assured them of confidentiality, requesting their permission for audio recording and including a list of potential times for the interview (see Appendix E: Interview Initial Contact). If the participant did not respond to my initial email within 3-4 days, I sent a follow-up email (see Appendix F: Interview Follow-Up), followed by one more reminder email after another 3-4 days. At that point, I assumed the respondent was not interested or did not have the time to participate in the interview, and no further follow-up emails were sent.

If the participant did respond to the email, we agreed upon a mutual date and time for the interview to occur. I called the participant at the agreed upon date and time, and asked if they had any questions and again asked for permission to record the interview for my records. No participant denied my permission to audio record the interview.

I transcribed and analyzed interviews as every few were completed, using a codebook (see Appendix G: Interview Codebook). This method of analyzing transcripts as they are completed is consistent with the grounded theory approach and allows me to ensure I am capturing the data I intend to capture (Strauss and Corbin 1994). Names and

identities of participants remain confidential so that interviewees' military status, benefits, job, or reputation were not put in jeopardy. I ensured any identifiable material, used solely for the purposes of recruitment, was kept separate from interview transcripts. Identifiable information was placed in a secure, encrypted, and password protected folder on my laptop computer.

The codebook was iterative and developed throughout the course of transcription and analysis. After the initial interviews were transcribed and analyzed, a first draft codebook was developed. After each successive group of transcripts was analyzed, the codebook was edited and updated. If changes were made to the codebook, previously coded transcripts were then recoded to ensure that no concepts were missed. This iterative, back-and-forth process continued for all interviews, and, thematic categories were developed, discussed below.

3.4.3.2 Thematic Narrative Analysis

As interviews were completed, transcribed, and coded, I identified broad categories based on the research question and background literature (Aronson 1995; Floersch et al. 2010; Wolcott 2009). Initial categories included: 1) why join military/basic training; 2) in combat/during deployment 3) returning home post-deployment; 4) disruption to life/relationships; 5) loyalty to country; 6) Snowden/Wikileaks; and 7) anti-war protesters.

These categories were identified as important because they speak to themes in answering the research questions: What are the specific experiences that influence whether a U.S. soldier maintains a critical or nationalistic view of the U.S.? Which

structural factors resonate at the individual level? How are broad messages of unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted by these individuals and consequently incorporated into everyday lives?

From the general categories of experiences, I next combined related patterns into sub-themes and, in certain instances, sub-sub themes, to form a more comprehensive picture of U.S. soldiers' experiences and to add nuance to soldiers' experiences (Aronson 1995). These themes were identified from the soldiers' narratives, pieced together through an iterative process to form an aggregate of their collective experiences, while maintaining the individual voice (Aronson 1995). This iterative process allowed me to identify categories with multiple sub-categories that did not always fit within the broader, earlier defined theme, and thus were pulled out to form a new category.

3.5 CONCLUSION

The primary research goal of this study is to add individual level data to the current debates on nationalism. This initial research objective extends into exploring if, and how, combat experiences influence a soldier's views on nationalism. This information can aid in extending the current state-level research to incorporate nuance and perspective into established perspectives on nationalism. Thus, the primary research question of this study is: What combat experiences explain a soldier's critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S. following their combat deployment? Subsidiary questions include: 1) which structural factors resonate at the individual level? and 2) how are broad messages

of national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism interpreted and consequently incorporated into everyday lives?

To answer this research question, I used a mixed methods approach to collect and analyze two data sets: 1) a quantitative survey on nationalistic attitudes of soldiers, and 2) in-depth, semi-structured interviews with U.S. soldiers who served in combat zones of the Iraq or Afghanistan War. The methodological approach of the survey was simple statistical frequencies and descriptives, the purpose of which was to illustrate background information of survey respondents (not statistical strength). The in-depth interviews were analyzed using thematic narrative analysis, which refers to texts in a “storied form”, placing emphasis on *what* is said rather than *how* it is said (Riessman 2003).

Chapter 4 offers an in-depth examination of the findings of this study as they pertain to each of four hypotheses (recruitment, combat, background, and return home post deployment), as well as the broad iterative categories that emerged from the thematic narrative analysis.

4.0 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

This chapter quantitatively analyzes the survey data collected for this study. I begin with an overview of the military, discussing the five branches of the military, each branch's rankings, and demographic and population statistics. Next, I look at descriptive statistics of survey respondents, identifying relevant demographic background information of respondents. Last, I conduct an analysis of survey data, including a multiple regression analysis of nationalism and background demographic information.

4.1 MILITARY RANKINGS AND DEMOGRAPHICS

The U.S. military operates under the leadership of the Department of Defense, the United States' oldest and largest government agency, and the country's largest employer (Defense 2013). The three military departments are made up of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Marine Corps falls under the Department of the Navy. The Coast Guard was a part of the Department of Transportation prior to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Following 9/11, the Coast Guard became a part of the Department of Homeland Security.

The primary responsibility of the Army is to defend the landmass of the U.S, its territories, commonwealths, and possessions. The key role of the Navy is to maintain,

train, and equip combat-ready maritime forces, and maintaining freedom of the world’s waterways. The Air Force provides quick, flexible, and, if necessary, lethal, air and space capabilities. The Air Force can deliver forces anywhere in the world in less than 48 hours and routinely participates in peacekeeping, humanitarian, and medical evacuation missions. The Marine Corps’ primary responsibility is to maintain at-the-ready forces with combined sea-based and air ground units to stabilize or contain international unrest. The Coast Guard provides law and maritime safety enforcements and environmental protections.

The military system is hierarchical and soldiers can rank up based on duty performance, physical fitness, leadership, education, and other attributes. Rankings vary slightly between branches of the military, but are more or less alike across the branches. Table 2: Military Rankings shows the rankings of enlisted members in each branch of the military (Factory N.D.).

Table 2. Military Rankings

Grade	Army Ranks	Marine Corps Ranks	Air Force Ranks	Navy Ranks	Coast Guard Ranks
E-1	Private PVT	Private PVT	Airman Basic AB	Seaman Recruit SR	Seaman Recruit SR
E-2	Private 2 PV2	Private First Class PFC	Airman AMN	Seaman Apprentice SA	Seaman Apprentice SA
E-2	-	-	-	-	Fireman Apprentice FA
E-2	-	-	-	-	Airman Apprentice AA
E-3	Private First Class PFC	Lance Corporal LCPL	Airman First Class A1C	Seaman SN	Seaman SN

E-3	-	-	-	-	Fireman FN
E-3	-	-	-	-	Airman AN
E-4	Specialist SPC	Corporal CPL	Senior Airman SRA	Petty Officer 3 rd Class PO3	Petty Officer 3 rd Class PO3
E-4	Corporal CPL	-	-	-	-
E-5	Sergeant SGT	Sergeant SGT	Staff Sergeant SSGT	Petty Officer 2 nd Class PO2	Petty Officer 2 nd Class PO2
E-6	Staff Sergeant SSG	Staff Sergeant SSG	Technical Sergeant TSGT	Petty Officer 1 st Class PO1	Petty Officer 1 st Class PO1
E-7	Sergeant First Class SFC	Gunnery Sergeant GYSGT	Master Sergeant MSGT	Chief Petty Officer CPO	Chief Petty Officer CPO
E-8	Master Sergeant MSG	Master Sergeant MSG	Senior Master Sergeant SMSGT	Senior Chief Petty Officer SCPO	Senior Chief Petty Officer SCPO
E-8	First Sergeant 1SG	First Sergeant 1SG	-	-	-
E-9	Sergeant Major SGM	Master Gunnery Sergeant MGYSGT	Chief Master Sergeant CMSGT	Master Chief Petty Officer MCPO	Master Chief Petty Officer MCPO
E-9	Command Sergeant Major CSM	Sergeant Major SGTMAJ	Command Chief Master Sergeant CCM	Fleet Commander Master Chief Petty Officer	Command Master Chief Petty Officer CMC
E-9 (Special)	Sergeant Major of the Army SMA	Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps SGTMAJMAR COR	Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force CMSAF	Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy MCPON	Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard MCPOCG

The most recent available military demographic report from 2013 outlines the population of enlisted active duty military members and officers. The demographic data is represented in Table 3: 2013 Military Demographics. In 2013, women made up 14.5 percent of enlisted members, a slight decrease from 2000 (14.7 percent). However, the percent of female officers increased from 2000 (14.4 percent) to 2013 (16.4 percent).

About one-third of enlisted members (32.4 percent) identified as minority in 2013 (Black or African American, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Multi-racial, or other/unknown), up from 28.2 percent reported in 1995. The percent of minority officers also increased over this same time period from 10.5 percent in 1995 to 22.4 percent in 2013. Almost half of the enlisted military personnel in 2013 were 25 years of age or younger (49.4 percent), the next largest age group being 26 to 30 years (22.5 percent), followed by 31 to 35 years (13.7 percent), 36 to 40 years (8.8 percent), and last, 41 or older (5.5 percent). The average age for enlisted members overall in 2013 was 27.3 years. Few enlisted members in 2013 had a Bachelor’s degree or higher (6.5 percent), with the exception of officers in which the majority had a Bachelor’s degree or higher (83.2 percent). In 2013, over half of enlisted members (52.2 percent) and officers (69.7 percent) reported themselves as married (Defense 2013).

Table 3. 2013 Military Demographics

	Officers	Enlisted Members
Female	16.4%	14.5%
Minority	22.4%	32.4%
25 years or younger ¹³	-	49.4%
Bachelor’s Degree or Higher	83.2%	6.5%
Married	69.7%	52.2%

¹³ Average age for enlisted members was 27.3 years and for officers was 34.8 years.

4.2 BACKGROUND OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

I anticipated soldiers' background would play a role in shaping their experiences in the military and their sense of nationalism. To gain an understanding of the background of survey respondents, I ran a simple frequency analysis of demographic survey data. Demographic data included: average age, proportion of men to women, marital status, race, political and religious affiliation, educational level completed, and average household income.

Table 4: Background of Survey Respondents, outlines the data, showing the mean age of survey respondents is 28. Men made up 83 percent of respondents, and over half were married (55.8 percent). While a quarter of respondents did not answer the race question (25.3 percent), a majority of respondents identified their race as white (53.0 percent). Black/African Americans made up 7.5 percent of the respondent population, and Hispanics made up 4.0 percent. Political affiliations were almost evenly distributed among the three major parties: about a quarter of survey respondents identified as Republican (24.7 percent), with Independents close behind at 22.4 percent. Democrats and those who did not answer the question rounds out the political affiliations at 21.8 percent each. In terms of religious affiliation, the majority of respondents identified as "other" (25.9 percent) when presented with the religious choices of Catholic, Protestant, Other Christian, or Jewish. In analyzing the text responses for "other", 53 percent offered further explanation of their religious beliefs, while the remaining 47 percent left the question blank. Of the 53 percent who chose "other" and offered an explanation, the majority cited they were not religious or non-practicing or identified as Atheist, Agnostic,

or Non-Denominational (10.9 percent). Over half of respondents had at least a Bachelors degree (52.2 percent), and this higher education is reflected in the mean household income range of \$60,000 - \$84,999. It should be noted that the highest income level on the survey, \$140,000 or more, was reported by a sizeable number of respondents (16.4 percent). This is likely due to higher military ranks, which earn a greater income, and the proportion of higher military ranks may be a limitation of this study.

Table 4. Background of Survey Respondents (n = 174)

Female	17.0%
Minority	47.0%
Mean Age	28
Bachelors or higher	52.2%
Married	55.8%
Republican	24.7%
Other religion, not Catholic, Protestant, Other Christian, or Jewish	25.9%

4.3 ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA

Survey respondents closely resembled the military population in three demographic areas: percent female, percent married, and mean age (see Table 5: Sex, Martial Status, Mean Age). Percent female was just 2.5% and 0.6% higher in the survey population than the enlisted military members and military officers, respectively. Percent married was slightly higher in the survey population (55.8 percent) than enlisted members (52.2 percent), but was lower by 13.9 points than military officers (69.7 percent). The military

officer population having a higher rate of percent married can be explained in part by the mean age. Military officers' mean age (34.8) is a bit higher than the enlisted members (27.3) or the survey population (28). This makes sense as military officers are further along in their military careers, and thus, older.

Table 5. Sex, Marital Status, Mean Age

	Survey	Military Officers	Military Enlisted Members
Female	17.0%	16.4%	14.5%
Married	55.8%	69.7%	52.2%
Mean Age	28	34.8	27.3

High education levels and minority status were over-represented in the survey data compared to the enlisted military population (see Table 6: Education Levels, Minority Status). This is seen particularly in education levels, with 52.2 percent of survey respondents holding a Bachelor's degree or higher compared to just 6.5 percent of military enlisted members. 83.2 percent of military officers held the same education level. Minority status was also over-represented in the survey, with 47 percent who identified as minority in the survey population, compared to 32.4 percent of military enlisted members and 22.4 percent of military officers. This over-representation is due to my concerted efforts to recruit a diverse respondent population.

Table 6. Educational Level and Minority Status

	Survey	Military Officers	Military Enlisted Members
Bachelor's degree or higher	52.2%	83.2%	6.5%

Minority	47.0%	22.4%	32.4%
----------	-------	-------	-------

Bivariate analysis of nationalism with demographic independent variables of marital status, age, religious and political affiliations and educational level shows significant correlations, in both 1-tailed (directional) and 2-tailed (non-directional) correlations. Table 7: Bivariate Correlations lists the significant variable correlations using the Pearson Correlation. Pearson Correlation indicates how correlated the variables are to one another. The closer to +1 the variables, the more perfectly positively correlated they are. The closer to -1, the more negative the relationship (i.e., if one variable increases, the other will decrease proportionally) (Field 2005). We can glean from Table 7 there is a negative significant relationship (1-tailed Sig = 0.05) between religion and nationalism – that is, as one variable increases, the other decreases.

Table 7. Bivariate Correlations

	Nationalism	Marital Status	Age	Religion	Education	Political Affiliation
Nationalism	1	-.028	-.027	-.150*	.090	-.055
Marital Status	-.028	1	-.073	-.120	-.135	-.137
Age	-.027	-.073	1	.047	-.262**	-.044
Religion	-.150*	-.120	.047	1	.154*	.290*
Education	.090	-.135	-.262**	.154*	1	.000
Political Affiliation	-.055	-.137	-.044	.290**	.000	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Multiple regression analysis using Nationalism as the dependent variable and race and gender for the independent variables shows no statistical strength in the model. The R square = .015 for this model indicates that sex and race account for just 1.5 percent of variation in nationalism. The remaining 98.5 percent is accounted by some other variable. When education, political and religious affiliations, age, and marital status are included in the model, the R Square improves somewhat (R square = .061), but this still leaves much to be accounted for in understanding nationalism. Other variations of demographic information in the regression model also result in low statistical strength. For example, a model with education level and marital status results in an R square of .008 A regression model replacing education level and martial status with political and religious views results in an R square of .022.

My speculation of the low strength of these regression models is that the demographics used in this study are not significant to explain nationalism as a dependent variable, indicating there are other factors which this regression model does not predict. Thus, the in-depth interviews explored in Chapters 5 and 6 will offer insight beyond demographic data as to what structural factors affect nationalism. The low strength in the regression models is also indicative of military service being spread among social classes and various backgrounds. This is not to suggest that backgrounds are unimportant. Background information does add value and ensures diversity is represented in understanding military experiences. A study that focuses specifically on the variations in military personnel backgrounds and views on nationalism may produce different results.

4.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter explored quantitative data collected for this study, beginning with an overview of the military and its five branches, rankings, and population information. I next examined descriptive statistics of background demographic information of survey respondents, followed by an analysis of survey data focusing on nationalism and demographic information. This chapter sets the background for the 18 interviews conducted, which will be explored in-depth in Chapters 5 and 6.

5.0 STRUCTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING NATIONALISM

This chapter explores three key structural factors that shape national sentiment for combat soldiers: recruitment, combat, and reintegration. As discussed in Chapter 2, I align most closely with DiMaggio and Bonikowski's (2008) understanding of nationalism. That is, the focus of nationalism is the representations of the nation, interactions of these representations, and the consequences of such for social identity and political action. Adding to this understanding is a focus on individual agency in the context of nationalism, individuals' understanding of nationalist messages, and how these messages are incorporated back into everyday lives.

Agency refers to the capacity of an individual to act independently and make his or her own choices. Individuals are limited in their agency by social structures, which can be understood in three levels: the socioeconomic system (macro), social ties between individuals and organizations (meso), and how cultural values shape the norms of behaviors in individuals (micro). Ideology is also a structural element of society – that is, new understandings of the world are developed through the vehicle of language as language is constructed to represent our ideologies and thereby transform and disseminate them (Anderson 2006; Hall 1986).

In this chapter I explore the connection between ideology, national sentiment, and agency in combat soldiers by looking at the three levels of social structure and how they interact with national sentiment. Each level connects to a phase in the military career of soldiers: recruitment (micro), combat (macro), and reintegration (mesa). The experiences relayed in each level do not necessarily stay confined there, as experiences themselves are not neatly confined into specific categories. Thus, the boundaries of each level are fluid.

In recruitment, I explore reasons soldiers enlisted in the military, which include: commitment to service (beyond military service), financial stability, and cultural explanations, which include socio-economic, masculinity, and acculturation into military life. The Combat section examines how maturation and costs of war contribute to soldiers understanding of national sentiment. Last, we look at the reintegration process as the third structural factor of national sentiment. In this section, I explore how reintegrating into civilian life post-deployment can impact relationships, the re-acclimation process in general, soldiers fighting with moral injury, and seeking post-deployment employment.

5.1 RECRUITMENT

Recruitment represents the micro level of social structure, to understand why soldiers joined the military on an individual level. However, to best understand this, we must first look at the how the cultural value of nationalism works to shape national sentiment in individuals. In exploring what motivated soldiers to join the military, respondents

delivered a range of reasons distinguished as commitment to service and cultural. It is important to note that reasons for joining are not mutually exclusive, and often overlap to include multiple categories. For the purposes of clearly outlining these reasons, I will divide this section into each of the three categories, with the understanding that the boundaries around each category are not fixed.

5.1.1 Commitment to Service

I anticipated soldiers who enlisted because of 9/11 would view their combat experiences with a more nationalistic view than those who enlisted prior to 9/11. This was expected because of the patriotic idealism framed by mainstream media and government officials following 9/11. In the aftermath of 9/11, many Americans felt scared and vulnerable, and looked to the country's leaders for reassurance and comfort. This resulted in state produced hegemonic frames of patriotism to garner support, both among the citizenry and military, for invading Iraq. As a result of these frames, the U.S.'s conceptualization of "freedom" shifted from "live and let live" (i.e., everyone minds their business) during times of relative peace, to greater scrutiny of one another; watching out for the "enemy within" (Schildkraut 2002) during times of unrest. This shift in attitude stemmed from an absence of war specific hegemonic government frames to frames that drew support for the Iraq invasion. The structural influence of frames permeates throughout U.S. culture, as is illustrated in the national narrative of soldiers enlisting in the military. Service is a trait valued and revered in the U.S., influenced by multiple socializations – religion,

school, family that all teach us how to serve, why we serve, and the cultural importance in serving.

Contrary to my expectations, few interview respondents mentioned 9/11 as a deciding factor in their decision to join the military (n=3). Of those that did, the responses were less of an overt nationalistic attitude but rather framed as a dedication to service. One respondent, Steven, from New York, describes himself as having a long family history of helping out when the country is in need and has an extensive background in involvement in church organizations, political parties, interest groups, and social and service organizations. He says: “Whenever there has been crises in America, people in my family, on both sides of my family, have stood up and said, ‘Yeah, I’ll do something.’” (Interview with Steven, February 2, 2014).

Shawn’s story is similar; he did not mention 9/11 on his own, and when asked if 9/11 had anything to do with him joining the military, Shawn simply stated, “Oh definitely. It did. It just seemed like the right thing to do at the time.” As with Steven, Shawn did not expand on these feelings of 9/11. However, if we look at Shawn’s involvement with his community beyond military service, we see that he also is dedicated to a variety of social activities: political parties, interest groups, social/sports clubs, and service organizations. Derek, the final respondent to mention 9/11 as having a direct impact on his decision to enlist in the military, says, “[9/11] made me want to join [the military] even more...I think I felt a need for people that would be willing to go do what was asked of them in defense of our country” (Interview with Derek, March 3, 2014). Derek’s response holds the most national sentiment of the three respondents who noted 9/11 had some impact on their military enlistment. Derek speaks not only to a dedication

of service in general, as his involvement in social/sports organizations, church groups, and service organizations reveals, but he also speaks to his dedication to the nation. Derek is willing to go to the defense of the country when asked to do so by his government. Reasons for joining the military need not be mutually exclusive, and respondents' lack of impassioned response toward 9/11 may simply be because they did not feel like revealing emotions around 9/11 at the time they were asked, or because 9/11 is now nearly 15 years in the past, and feelings on 9/11 are, collectively, less impassioned.

There are many factors that can move everyday citizens from having sympathy for a cause to taking action: the psychological or attitudinal personality of an individual, perceived risks, costs, and barriers of participating in a particular action, network affiliation, social network ties, prior experience in activism, or moral shock tactics used by organizations (Gamson et al. 1992; Klandermanns 1993; McAdam 1989; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Oegema and Klandermanns 1994; Oliner 2004; Oliner and Oliner 1988; Shaw, Batson and Todd 1994; Slovic 2007; Varese and Yarish 2005; Wuthnow 1991).

In *Acts of Compassion*, Wuthnow (1991) explores the idea of a compassionate disposition as a requisite for volunteerism in the United States. While the focus of the book is not military volunteerism, Wuthnow's points are applicable in guiding a discussion on those who enlist in the military as an act of service. Wuthnow introduces a paradox between the cultural value of self-interest and maintaining one's compassionate disposition. He asks if one acts out of self-interest (i.e., not for purely altruistic reasons), are they still acting compassionately? Many of the volunteers interviewed by Wuthnow

suggested that self-interest and compassion are not mutually exclusive. Participants in Wuthnow's study indicated many reasons for their involvement, including self-interested incentives such as making friends, improving one's resume, or a return of help in the future. Military veteran respondents cited a range of similar self-interested reasons for enlisting in the military: money for college, steady job, or financial compensation. Wuthnow's respondents also cited "therapeutic" motives such as feeling good, relieving guilt, or personal growth (Perkins 1993). Again, parallels are seen with the military veteran respondents who joined for therapeutic reasons: to out of an abusive home environment or drawn to the structure and order military life offered.

Wuthnow's study points out the varied factors that motivates someone to volunteer, and yet, while many individuals feel they should engage in action, few actually do. We have established there are a wide variety of reasons to join the military, few of which could be considered truly altruistic, yet respondents in this study were not primarily motivated by 9/11 to enlist in the military, but rather were engaged socially.

Individual agency in recruitment and service seeks to explore the influence one has in enlisting. Enlisting in the military requires a commitment to not just to fulfilling a contract of length of service, but also an agreement to conform to military culture, to deployments, and time away from family and friends. Of course, some soldiers enlist for the opportunities of the military – college education, career prospects, and so forth. These motives to enlist are nationalistic, yet not as overt because they uphold the values and beliefs of U.S. culture: freedom, education, employment. These national messages are embedded deeply within the everyday culture and language; they are mostly unseen and unrecognized as a part of the common rhetoric.

5.1.2 Cultural

The above discussion ties in to the cultural aspects of recruitment: socio-economic status and acculturation to military life. Socio-economic factors, in general, include a wide range of variables: occupation and income, place of resident, educational level, racial and ethnic background, and religion. Acculturation to military life encapsulates the process in which young men and women leave behind their civilian identities and take on characteristics of a military professional.

5.1.2.1 Socio-economic

Socio-economic reasons to enlist in the military included the ability to pay for college and the career opportunities the military offers. Certain cultural expectations to join the military debunked conventional wisdom that only individuals with economic or employment needs enlist. Gary joined the military because he felt that military service should be spread out across social classes. He says,

I was very motivated to serve, but it was probably a bit more self-centered than service-oriented. I certainly was conscious of, this was something that the country needed and valued and the military service should be spread across a pretty wide range. You know, it shouldn't just be people from a certain region or a certain demographic or racial ethnic group. So I felt a sort of obligation to participate alongside everyone else who was being asked to serve...But I had to be honest...it was a pretty strong financial

inducement for me to join. I mean, it was something I enjoyed, but the fact that I was going to be well compensated for it and have college paid for was probably as big a factor in my decision as anything.

Gary's comment contains both a patriotic rationale ("felt a sort of obligation to participate alongside everyone else who was being asked to serve") and self-oriented motivation ("have college paid for") to join the military. Gary's comment on social class suggests he is not from a class of individuals that are typically asked to serve. Though he offers no further discussion on that point, previous studies show that those with lower family incomes, larger family sizes, and less-educated parents are more likely to enlist in the military (Asch, Kilburn and Klerman 1999; Kleykamp 2006). For Gary then, whether he knew specifically who was being asked to serve, he knew it typically was not people in his socioeconomic class.

Marty's story of joining the military in some ways contradicts Gary's. While Gary points out that one reason he enlisted was because he felt the duty should be spread throughout a diverse group of individuals, Marty felt that joining the military was what people in his social class did. He says,

I grew up in a military town, so I saw a lot of people in the military. All my neighbors were in the military. I think we were like only one or two non-military families on my block. And so it just kind of seemed like something that people in my community, I guess you would say, in my socioeconomic class, did.

Marty's story is interesting because even though he grew up surrounded by the military lifestyle, his family was not a part of it. Yet throughout his childhood, Marty internalized the idea that joining the military was what people in his social class did. Previous studies note the importance of family and communities as sources of transmission of information, as well as the social and cultural presence of the military institution in influencing young people to enlist (Kleykamp 2006). Thus, it fits that Marty's early childhood exposure to the military, and his identification with military service as a marker of social class, served as an influence for him to join.

Gary and Marty's stories work together to create a narrative of social class as an indicator of who serves, in conjunction with identifying oneself outside of that specified class. Amidst this juxtaposition lies Peter's story. Peter felt that socioeconomically, he was "above" those in his unit initially. He gives an open and honest account on his feelings of having made a mistake in joining the military, saying,

My initial impression [of enlisting], honestly, was I made a huge mistake. Not because of getting up early or the physical aspects...none of that stuff was even remotely hard...I would just meet the caliber of people that I was there with, and I'm like, "Oh my God", everybody here has a story about how they were like, you know, addicted to drugs or they were in legal trouble, or they hate their parents, and there are very few people that joined the army because they wanted to be [t]here...I feel horrible saying this, but at that time I felt like, these people were the ass and trash of

society. Nobody really wants to be here, everybody is like, “yeah, I had to do this because I was on cocaine for a while”. So I thought, “I made a huge mistake. I don’t belong here. I shouldn’t be with these people.”

When pushed to explain what he meant by “shouldn’t be with these people”, Peter explains further the differences he felt between himself his fellow cadets, beyond the drugs and legal trouble. He says,

I just didn’t really click with anybody honestly...just having a different experience [from others]...almost everybody else in my basic training class was like, “Yeah, I graduated from my high school, 110 people”, “I’m from Alabama”, “I’m from Georgia”, and I was just, “Oh, I went to a normal high school with a thousand kids, but you guys all think that’s crazy because you went to...your entire city where ever you were born, raised was these tiny little towns in the middle of nowhere Alabama.”

Earlier, I argued that many of the respondents in this study enlisted due to a penchant for service. However, Peter’s experience upends this argument, as those in his basic training unit were not mostly there because of a dedication to service, but because they were required to enlist – Peter even directly says, “nobody really wants to be here”. Peter’s military experience challenged the conventional wisdom of military ideals: that connections and bonds hold the unit together, particularly during hostile engagements. While we do not know for certain Peter’s expectations of military life prior to his

enlisting, his perceptions of his unit were markedly different than what he experienced, leading to his sense of not “clicking” with anyone. Over time, however, Peter was able to find common ground with the individuals in his unit and form connections. Of this, he says,

But, by the end of basic training, I obviously realized, I was wrong about most of them and they ended up being great people and then, you know, I didn't regret it after that.

Peter admits to thinking he made a mistake in joining the military at the outset, however, as his unit settled into their “new normal”, he was able to form connections and bonds with his fellow soldiers. While Peter did not explicitly say why or how the bonds were formed, previous research shows that participation in a military unit creates “an uncommonly strong bond between military members” (Hinojosa and Hinojosa 2011: 1146). Military training and culture are created around the idea that members are reliant on one another; thus fostering deep, interpersonal connections (Hinojosa and Hinojosa 2011). Shared experiences, especially ones of risk, coupled with physical and social isolation, promote military members to rely on one another for support (Hinojosa and Hinojosa 2011). Despite Peter's initial misgivings about joining the military, he made a successful career for himself: enlisted for a total of seven years, reaching the rank of E6, Staff Sergeant.

5.1.2.2 Acculturation

Learning to conform to military life is somewhat paradoxical to U.S. values, since one of the most valued beliefs citizens hold is individuality. Within that individuality we understand that there are connecting threads that bind us as a people together. This echoes Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, in which he defines the nation as "an imagined political community" (Anderson 1991: 6-7). By this, Anderson understands the nation as imagined because its citizens will never know one another, yet, they feel a connection with each other and "live in the image of their communion" (Anderson 1991: 6-7). Citizens hold in their minds a mental image of their affinity for the nation and the values the nation holds. For example, the U.S. takes great pride and value in individuality. Within this deep reverence for individuality, however, is a need to conform – laws and rules govern our culture so that chaos is prevented. In the military, individuals are called to give up their sense of identity to protect the very individuality they gave up. Moreover, conforming is vital for survival in a combat zone – if a unit does not act as a unit, lives can be lost.

For newly enlisted military members, learning to adopt a professional military persona is a process, one that comes easier to some than others. One major theme of this acculturation process was losing one's civilian identity and, along with it, their individuality. This is seen even before enlistment, when recruiters visited high schools. The same respondent who experienced significant regrets upon first enlisting, Peter, also described being resistant to being recruited. Peter held on to his individual decision-making power as long as he could, ignoring the recruiters because, as he says, he wanted to join on his own terms. He describes his experience with recruiters in his high school:

I used to see recruiters all the time in high school and I never bothered talking to them because I knew, I didn't want to start the process with them and I knew it was kind of like a sales gimmick, you know, once you start talking to them, they're never going to leave you alone. So I just said, 'I know I'm going to join, so when I'm ready and school's just about over, I'll go talk to them. And I literally walked into the office, and said, 'Alright, I'm ready to join.' They were kind of shocked, like, 'What do you mean? We see you all the time in school and...' I was like, 'Yeah, I know, this was gonna be on my terms, on my time, eventually'.

For Peter, it was important to join the military on his own terms, and not fall into what he called a "sales gimmick". As noted above, Peter had known since he was a child that he wanted to join the military, therefore for him, it was a matter of when he would enlist, not if he would.

Once recruited, respondents were indoctrinated into military life; a few respondents found the hardest part of basic training to be the loss of basic, daily freedoms civilians often take for granted. Both Shawn and Brian identify the same sense of loss during basic training. Shawn, when asked "What was the hardest part of basic training for you?" says, "I guess just adjusting to different time standards was tough – not being in control of when you ate, slept, showered. That was tough." Brian reiterates this sense of loss when he answers the same question, "Being told when to eat, when to sleep, when to

use the bathroom.” Brett, in response to the same question, goes a bit further in depth on what he labels as his “re-education”. He says,

I think the hardest part was probably the, sort of...for lack of a better term, sort of the re-education...It’s the learning to be and act an entirely different way that I was brought up to be. So it wasn’t necessarily difficult to be around other people or be away from home, um, but just to learn to be military. I’ve always been sort of a free spirit, sort of independent in that. And, again, not having had a lot of exposure to like, team sports...but just sort of learning that team mentality...it was the most different for me.

Brett points out the differences in mentality of being in the military versus civilian life, particularly when he points out how different and difficult it was for him to be “re-educated” and “learn to be military”.

The anecdotes presented in this section give insight into what many of the respondents mentioned: basic training was physically difficult – though many mentioned being in the best physical shape of their lives – but it was not impossible. The greatest difficulty during basic training was not the physicality, but the psychological side.

Michael describes some of the mental tactics drill instructors used at basic training to try to “break” new recruits, have them obey orders, and bond them together,

After a long flight and then a long bus ride and processing at the station, we’d be up all night and then [drill instructors] would basically kind of go

through this process where they dehumanize you. They shave your head, they take all your personal effects, everything that you own, that you brought with you, is put in the bag, and everything that they want you to have is given to you. So you're basically sleep deprived for the first 24 hours. There's a lot of confusion as far as where you're going, who you're supposed to be responding to. Basically, they're just trying to intimidate you and instill fear and get you to obey orders.

Readapting to a new identity and a new culture is the purpose of basic training – recruits learn how to “be” military. In this processing of “becoming” military, recruits lose many of their individual freedoms – to make phone calls, to eat, sleep, go to the bathroom whenever they want – in the name of building team camaraderie and operating as one unit. The very core of the military is to train soldiers to act as a group of one – not individuals. A further interesting point is that individuality is a furiously harbored and valued U.S. value. The U.S. thrives on individuality – it is a core value deeply imbedded in U.S. culture. Thus, again, the contradiction that the very structure in place – the military – charged with protecting the freedoms and values of the U.S. cannot survive with an individualist mentality.

5.2 COMBAT: THE COSTS OF WAR

Combat serves as a macro structural example of nationalism. Of note are the narrative frameworks of soldiers that center not on national sentiment as much as on the experiences of war: death or injury (either to oneself or witnessing/inflicting it on others), physical and social isolation, and the deprivations of deployment (Hinojosa and Hinojosa 2011). All respondents reported witnessing some type of injury or death while they were deployed. Add to that living for months in high-stress conditions – the heat and sand storms of the Middle East, not having access to simple, everyday amenities U.S. civilians are accustomed to, being away from family and friends, poor leadership – all adds to the daily stressors of combat. Witnessing these traumatic events was rationalized as a cost of war, but the aftermath was also difficult to cope with, resulting in angry outbursts, PTSD, trouble sleeping, or even suicide.

Any deployment into an active war zone has inherent risk involved, but there are certain jobs within the military that are riskier than others. Steven describes this,

You know, the infantry is the branch within the army that is specifically designated to go directly out, to find the enemy, and kill the enemy. That is the mission of the infantry, to find and fix the enemy. In order to do that, you have to put yourself in harm's way. It's not like the artillery where you can sit back and shoot from a distance. The other [side] of that is that the infantry, because they are the ones that bear the most risk of exposure to enemy fire, and being in combat, they also receive the best

training on how to survive, as a platoon, as a team, as an individual. When you're out there, you know you're getting the best training on how to take care of yourself while you're out there. So I felt really comfortable knowing that I had the best possible training there was to survive the experience, but it also meant that, because of that very training I had received, [I] would be directly in harm's way.

Steven mentions that the infantry receives "the best training" in the military because they are on the front lines and seek out the enemy. Given the high vigilance required to serve in the infantry, having "the best training" raises the question of whether some infantry men and women become complacent in the knowledge their training will protect them in a combat situation. While training is a large part of surviving in a combat zone, so too is vigilance. If a soldier decreases their vigilance or becomes too accustomed to being in the combat zone, their sense of risk is lessened, resulting in costly, even deadly outcomes. Steven describes one such experience that cost the life of a soldier:

I'd been up in a guard tower and I was coming down out of the tower, and the guy that was up there replacing me, you know, he was a young guy from a different unit. Before I reached the bottom of the ladder, I heard a "thump" and he had fallen. The reason he had fallen is because he had been shot through the head by a sniper. I mean, think about it, I had been standing where he was standing less than two minutes before he was shot through the head. And the only difference between him and me is that I

didn't smoke. And when he lit up his cigarette, the cherry on that cigarette could be seen from a long distance, and a sniper said, 'Now is the time', and took that shot and hit him and killed him. And I had to go back up the ladder and drag his body down the ladder.

Steven's story illustrates the constant state of alertness soldiers in a combat zone must maintain. Even the simplest, innocuous action, such as lighting a cigarette, can have deadly consequences. To operate within this high stakes environment for several months at a time, it is evident why so many soldiers return to the U.S. with PTSD: jumping at the slightest sounds, swerving while driving to avoid objects on the road, and having little patience when civilians complain about simple, everyday encounters like a long line or bad weather.

In addition to learning how to stay alive, soldiers in combat also learned how to handle the immense, somewhat mixed, emotions that came when their opponents were killed. James conveys the juxtaposition of feeling victorious in "getting" their opponents, but the regret in taking a life,

There was significant loss of life on the local side and the terrorist side and a lot of it due to our actions, and that's really tough to wrap your head around. It wasn't tough at the time, but it was tough later, tough telling stories about it, tough to think about, tough to think that anybody would be really excited about it, you know...you instantaneously have no regard for anyone else's life. You want to be vicious about taking it, and that's

something that's hard to stomach when you so quickly and easily went to that place in your head. It's tough.

For James, he understood that a cost of war was some would lose their lives, but he was disturbed by how easily that killing came to him. James was not the only respondent who was conflicted with the ease of killing in combat. Sarah notes that soldiers and civilians alike are desensitized to killing,

Kind of a good way to think of it is these people that are doing these things, they may not actually be bad people, they may not actually be against us there. It could be one of those situations where you have somebody from Taliban saying, "I'm going to rape your wife, kill your family and you're gonna watch if you don't do this." That stuff happens. You're gonna do what you gotta do to protect your family. I can't get mad at people for that. But to me, it's such a senseless waste of life. So many people, young people, mostly in their twenties, and they're gone. And nobody bats an eye anymore and it drives me crazy.

Sarah understands that the Taliban may well have intimidated citizens into fighting against U.S. armed forces and their allies. She understands that we will all do whatever we can or need to in order to protect our families, but is disturbed by how desensitized we are to killing others, and sees war as a waste of life. In a similar vein, Peter discusses his mental fatigue in going to war. He says,

The first time [we were deployed], we were all gung ho. The second time, you know, it was just, like I said, emotionally and psychologically, it was really hard to go back knowing that one, I as supposed to be out of the army at that point. But at the same time, Iraq had really taken a turn for the worst and so at that point a lot of people just felt like, this is a waste. Like, I don't know why we're going back here when we're just, we're just spinning our wheels here...nobody was really sure, there was no plan in Iraq, there was no idea of what we were doing there.

Not having a clear understanding of why their unit is being deployed, where they are being deployed to, how long the deployment will be, or the overall purpose of the war can lead to low soldier morale, burnout, and negative feelings toward their experiences, the military, or government officials. The events witnessed (death, dying, severe injury) coupled with the unknown (who to trust, where they were being deployed, how long they were being deployed) make for in-depth self-reflections on who the soldiers were prior to deployment, what they gained while being deployed, and the person they became because of the deployment. But not all who witnessed death or injury in combat were desensitized. Shawn, for example, retells the story of a friend, who lost his legs in combat,

A buddy of mine lost his legs. That was a defining moments for me, for all of us. When something bad actually happens, you see it happen. It's

defining. He was in the lead truck, and it was hit with an IED. There was a medic in my truck; I had to push him out of the truck because he was just frozen. He just, just, sat there and stared. He was frozen. I pushed his bag to him to get him out of his trance. There was smoke, it was deafening when the bomb went off. We saw pieces of meat from his leg lying around. The truck had pinned him against a wall when the bomb went off. There wasn't much we could do. By the grace of God, we were able to use some rivets and straps to pull the truck away from the wall. We got the door open, got the guy out. He wasn't alive then, he had lost so much blood. By the grace of God, the medic got his heart started again. He went from being dead to alive. There was a gasp of breath and then he said, 'My legs feel funny.' He survived the blast, but lost both of his legs. Our team leader sat there and cried.

Like others, Gary experienced the trauma of killing during war, but he also relished in the satisfaction of saving lives. He says,

We were airborne...where we accidentally dropped ordinance¹⁴, or one of our aircraft did, on Canadian forces in Afghanistan and three at least were killed. That was a bit sobering. We...supported the operation to rescue Jessica Lynch and the folks that had been captured with her, so that was,

¹⁴ Ordinance here, in context of the military, refers to military materials including weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, and equipment (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ordnance>).

that was one of the few times that we were like, 'Hey, maybe we are doing something.'

While helping save lives did not negate the trauma of the accidental killings of ally troops for Gary, it did serve as a small reconciliation as he felt that he was doing something that mattered and made a difference while in combat. For Gary, playing a role in saving Jessica Lynch and others gave him high job satisfaction – making the benefits worth the costs of war.

Nathan shares the same sense of job satisfaction in saving lives as did Gary. Nathan shares his pride in the fact that no one was injured or killed in his troop. He says,

On my first deployment, I was in charge of counter IED missions...no IEDs blew up or exploded on any of the troops that I was responsible for, so I felt a great sense of pride that no one was injured because of any IEDs. That was a lot of job satisfaction, and I think that was really important for me because of what I did, people's lives were saved.

Nathan found job satisfaction by protecting his unit and saving lives, and recognized this positive aspect of combat amidst the injury and death surrounding him and his troop. Nathan's focus on job satisfaction is quite different from other respondents' anecdotes of death and injury, illustrating the range of combat experiences and soldiers' interpretation of those experiences. From saving lives to witnessing maiming and death, combat experiences are deeply personal and varied. As respondents

have noted, when a significant experience was encountered, (death, near death or injury), it was best justified simply an outcome of war. Through a wider lens, war is framed as fighting to protect the country. However, many respondents felt disenchanted with the military or the war itself because of the needless waste of life.

Yet caring for one's country does not mean blindly agreeing or following all of the policies and actions without question. In fact, one attribute that the U.S. holds true is the freedom to criticize and speak out against policies. Thus, the idea of national sentiment and how it is exhibited becomes complex – it is not a linear expression from “more sentiment” to “less”. It ebbs and flows in waves given timeframe, rhetoric around government policies and military missions, framing of the war itself, and public support or criticism of said war. The ebbing and flowing nature of sentiment can occur time and again within the same event. Iraq and Afghanistan are good examples of this. There was relatively strong support for the Iraq War immediately following 9/11, as the prominent rhetoric was that the U.S.'s values, freedoms and beliefs were under attack. However, as the war dragged on, becoming the longest on-going war in U.S. history, racking up the war debt, body count, and injuries sustained, support for the war began to dissipate. Brian says,

The support is dying down a lot. Before, like, 2001, 2002, 3, 4, 5, I want to say all the way up to 7 probably, there was a lot of support for the military.

But now, I feel like it's dying down a lot.

Peter agrees,

I remember after 9/11 everybody was like, 'United we stand!' And then a year later, it was just kind of like the patriotism wore off on people.

When asked to further explain why he believed patriotism wore off after 9/11, Peter says,

A lot of people were really upset with 9/11, but that the same time, it was kind of a fad. You know, let's put a bumper sticker on our car. Right around 9/11, when I was in Crete, our joke outside of the office was, 'Everybody in America – united we stand, as long as you unite without me because I'm not going the army. I don't want my kids joining the army. I don't want anybody I know to join, but hey united we stand.' You know, that was like the joke: as long as you unite without me. I feel like it was just like this cliché, like everyone just got the bumper sticker on their car and 'USA! USA!' and that whole thing. After a while, it was just kind of like, 'Oh, okay, yeah.' It wore off. And, you know, until another terrorist attack happened or happens, and then everyone's all up in arms again, and, 'Let's go over there and kick butt', and it's like, well, do you want to go over there? Because what do you mean, 'Let's go over there? Who's 'us'?'

Peter's likening the patriotism that emerged immediately following 9/11 to a fad is quite interesting. Patriotism can ebb and flow, not necessarily that it is here and gone, all or nothing, but, like with many emotions, we draw it out from its recesses when needed or warranted. A war weary civilian population wishes the war to end, troops to come home, and life to return to as normal as it can. What was once supported for the "national good" shifted to be viewed as an unhelpful and unproductive war 13 years later; at the same time, a lack of support for the war can impact the mentality of the soldiers still stationed in a combat zone. It can be psychologically detrimental to know you are a fighting a war that is no longer supported at home.

5.3 REINTEGRATION

Reintegration is the third phase of shaping national sentiment in military soldiers. This section outlines the emergent categories that relate to the hypothesis of returning home post-deployment, reintegration. This hypothesis states soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources. The more connected soldiers are to resources and support networks, the easier their transition back into civilian life or stateside, non-combat military careers. Respondents who had difficulty navigating networks upon their return home, or, who did not have concrete plans for employment or school, had a more difficult time adjusting to civilian life. It stands to reason soldiers who put their lives on

the line in combat and come home to cumbersome resources can lead to feelings of isolation, regret, or abandonment by one's government.

5.3.1 Re-acclimation

Respondents cited a multitude of feelings when asked about their re-adapting issues upon their return to the U.S. post-deployment. Having a family or relationship both made for a more difficult reintegration process post-deployment and served as a source of support during reintegration. Peter talks of his parent's support, and how he did not feel alone post-deployment. He says,

I remember a month before getting out of the army asking [others in the army], like, what are you gonna do when you get out? And they would just go like, 'I don't know'. And sure enough, these guys who had a really hard time adjusting...or suffering, from like PTSD or alcoholism and stuff. But, like, I knew, I joined the army for the college money, I'm gonna go to college, I'm, you know, my parents will be there, I have a good relationship with them. I have a strong support system. I, I didn't feel like, oh my god, I'm gonna be out in the world by myself...once you've been to Iraq, everything else is easy.

While Peter says he did okay with reintegration, owing to the support he received from his parents and his plans to attend college after he got out of the army, several other

respondents discussed the ways military life negatively impacted their families or relationships. Marty's story reflects the overall feel of these respondents' stories. He says,

My wife and daughter got used to living without me. So there was always, anytime I would come back from anything, there was always this transition period where we would kind of have to work out what the basic rules were...being married is hard enough as it is and then you throw in these separations [deployments] and stresses and it make it that much more difficult.

Gary tells a very personal story of the strain being in the military had on his marriage, almost ending in divorce. He explains,

My wife and I fought a lot that summer...the windows were open, and some of the neighbors actually called the police on us once because our argument got fairly heated...Looking back on it, I thought it was just the normal thing that families with young kids that are dealing with disruptions went through. But in hindsight, I realize that a lot of it was the frustration that she had that I had been gone a lot, and the frustration that I had that maybe I was taking an alternate career path because of the obligation that I felt to my family as opposed to what would have been...I felt like I was making a lot of sacrifices, she felt like she deserved to have me home and available on nights and weekends because I had been gone

so much the previous four years...but we were, fortunately, able to get through that...we've stayed together, and a lot of those issues, fortunately, have receded into the past.

Most respondents interviewed acknowledged that the military is disruptive to family life, especially when the military member is deployed overseas for any length of time. Other respondents, upon reflecting on their time during deployment, noted that deployment changed them mentally where they gained knowledge of themselves and came face-to-face with unhappy relationships at home. Rachel, for example, credits her deployment with her discovery that she was not happy in her current relationships, resulting in an eventual divorce. She says,

Actually [being deployed] was a good thing. When I was overseas and I was miserable, I had a whole lot of time to think. And as sad as it may sound...I kind of discovered that I really was not in a situation in life that I wanted to be in. I was married, I had a daughter, she was 1½ when I left. As much as I loved my daughter, I discovered, with a lot of soul searching, that I really was not in love with my husband...when I got home a year later, I kind of explained how I was feeling...and we stuck together for about a year, and then it just, I knew that it wasn't gonna work. So I ended up getting divorced. I kind of say I got divorced because I was deployed and I figured out who I really was...I was kind of forced to

just say, hey, look, you shouldn't have gotten married in the first place, and you probably knew that then, but wouldn't admit it to yourself.

For Rachel, the time and distance she had from her husband, and the maturing she did while deployed, helped her realize she was not in a happy situation at home and eventually lead to her taking steps to better her situation, even if that resulted in a divorce. While Rachel says that she got divorced *because* she was deployed, other respondents recognize the multitude of additional factors involved with a divorce or break-up. Steven, for example, says,

When I came back from my first deployment, I had actually been engaged to be married. The woman I was engaged to be married to was unsure. She didn't know if she wanted to get married anymore...it was very difficult for me to go through at that time...eventually I ended up marrying someone else and the person that I ended up marrying thought that I was just, you know, she and I had a lot of things wrong with our relationship that weren't able to be fixed. We were married for 6 years almost, but during that time it was very clear that we had different expectations of what we wanted from each other, from our relationship, from ourselves even. And that was rough. I think [being] able to relate to people became a little bit harder to do [post-deployment].

Relationships impacted almost all of the respondents. Both Brett and Derek noticed that their life was “on pause” while they were deployed, while their friends’ and families’ lives kept moving forward. Brett explains this feeling,

Everybody else’s life kept going. And I sort of, you know, my life paused for 15 months. I was in touch with friends back home, and I knew what was going on, but you know, I left a freshman in college, and I came back a freshman in college. I had friends who were already able to graduate. I had a friend ready to go to law school. I had all these friends, you know, everybody continued to move on and I came back in, the group of friends I had developed when I first moved was still there, but there were all these new people too, who I just sort of had to accept. Like, they just kind of had to accept me and I just kind of had to accept them because my friends had made friends with them while I was gone.

Respondents also stated less obvious issues in re-adapting, including re-establishing one’s self and adapting to coming from the very structured lifestyle in the military to too much freedom post-military. Having “too much freedom” can be difficult for soldiers returning home, especially given that most are still young adults, learning how to be an “adult”. While soldiers mature quickly in the military and especially so in a combat zone, they are not always well equipped to adapt back to civilian life with abundant freedoms and individuality. James had a difficult time readapting to life back in

the U.S., using a lot of the money he earned during deployment to “blow off steam”. He describes his difficulties readapting,

The first [deployment] was tough because I had like 60 grand in my bank account and I was single, I didn't have a child. So it was strip clubs and dive clubs and all extremes. But it was accepted the first time because we went through hell, so everyone was like, and we were still young, so people weren't worried about it. I was 21 when I came back, so people weren't really worried about our future. We were just a bunch of returning vets blowing off steam. The second [deployment] I was married, I came home, I had a child, she left me within weeks of me returning...that sent me into another spiral of the same kind of shenanigans I got into the first time. So that was unfortunate. And it wasn't until, gosh, probably five or six months ago that I started to turn that stuff around, after four years. So it's tough.

Being a young soldier combined with having saved upwards of \$60,000 while deployed, and feeling the need to blow off steam and search for your identity again can all play a role in the difficulty veterans have with adapting. As previously mentioned, those who return to the U.S. and have a plan in place – college, family support, employment – often have an easier time readapting to life as a civilian than those who do not.

There is a juxtaposition of soldiers belonging within their chosen social unit – families, friends – yet at the same time remaining outside of it due to the absence that deployment brings, life moving forward while the soldiers is deployment, and the myriad of post-traumatic stressors soldiers come home with. Despite these challenges, soldiers who returned home with concrete plans – a job already lined up, plans to go to school – ultimately had an easier time transitioning back into civilian life. Not all relationships are going to survive a deployment, but not all are doomed either. While a transition period is expected upon the soldier’s immediate return home, with time, patience, and resources, the relationship – again, romantic or platonic – can thrive. And, in certain instances, even if the relationship does not survive, it is not always a negative. Soldiers recount deployment as an opportunity to think through their relationships, to take an assessment of their life and come to recognize their true feelings toward a partner, friend, or group of friends. In these circumstances, deployment can teach one a lot about oneself.

Less understood is the culmination of returning soldiers working through small, often taken-for-granted, everyday challenges. For example, a few respondents cited being overwhelmed with the amount of choices in Wal-mart; one respondent even noted having a panic attack in the store due to the overwhelming amount of choices. What is a simple, everyday task for civilians holds dramatic and potentially devastating powers over some soldiers. Joshua summarizes this when he says,

A lot of little things kind of caught me off guard. Little, silly things like rewards cards, all kinds of just weird, little tricky things floating around that I didn’t have any clue about.

Brett expounds on this, as he describes how difficult it was for him to re-acclimate:

I had to go from having spent 15 months in a very structured, sort of rigorous, simple, almost, life; simple in the fact that it was the same thing everyday. Wake up, put on your uniform, do your job, eat the same food, go to gym, go to sleep, wake up, put on uniform...And then to come back to the U.S., and come back home and you're like, I can pretty much do whatever I want. And that was, it was really sensory overload...It was like, "What am going to wear today?" I had no idea. Like, I would stare, and I would have to go to class, and I would be staring at my clothes, and not know what to wear. I could wear anything. And then I'd have to go shopping, and I'd be like, "Well, what do I need?" I could get everything or nothing. Just having so many decisions made things really, really difficult.

Respondents also cited their lack of patience with the civilian population and those small things that once bothered them pre-deployment, no longer do. Sarah says regarding her post-deployment self,

I'm more bitter, I'm more angry, I'm less tolerant of people being stupid. I don't know how to say it. I just, people irritate me. People and their pathetic problems.

Steven felt the same as Sarah, saying,

I have a lot less patience for BS and for people who complain about things, and I'm like, you have no idea! This is not a hardship, what you're going through is not a hardship. Like, ok, yeah, the Polar Vortex. There's some extra snow, there's a little bit of ice out there, the temperature's dropped, but, there's nobody shooting at you. There's no grenades going off, the car in front of you isn't about to explode...that's probably one of my main things is that now when people start complaining, I either just walk away or I get real quiet and I try to keep myself from punching them in the throat.

Both Steven and Sarah had less patience for the everyday complaints of civilians upon their return home, because of the difficult things they witnessed while deployed. Brett shares similar feelings with Steven and Sarah, but describes his patience limit with deployment as the baseline:

[Being deployed] gave me a sort of a different perspective on, sort of a comparative perspective for like how bad something can be or how

stressful or how difficult, or, even like [how] annoying a thing can be...people will, you know, complain about something, the weather or not having enough of something or having too much of something. I always sort of in my head, sometimes, even verbally, will be like, well, at least I'm not deployed, you know? It's kind of like that's my baseline, that's the thing I compare stuff to. Like, whatever this is, this is pretty important, but you know, at least it's not deployment.

James's combat experiences set a very high bar for what translated into an emergency or crisis once he returned to the U.S. James lost relationships and experienced drug abuse upon his return home because, at least in part, of that high bar combat set for him, James says,

I went through drug abuse issues, I went through a lot of stuff, failed relationships, lost friendships...I've been hospitalized five times in the VA hospitals, two for 30 days or more and a couple of times for a couple weeks. It's a struggle.

While Peter had a similar experience as Sarah, Steven, Brett, and James, he interpreted it differently. Peter says,

Nothing bothers me because, you know, I felt like, I'd come home and I remember just standing in line at the grocery store and people

complaining. And I'm like, what are you complaining about? What's the worst that can happen...nothing really bothers me because I felt like I've been through hell...I've had friends die, I've seen civilians killed...I think it was great to just have that attitude of like, yay! Life is great, I'm very optimistic and positive because of what I've been through.

In contrast to other respondents, Peter took what could have been a short-tempered, impatient experience and instead interpreted as a lesson on gratitude and optimism: he accepted the difficult combat encounters he experienced and framed them in a constructive narrative to ease the reintegration process. Peter does note he had a strong support system in his parents and family that helped him readapt to civilian life, as well as concrete plans to attend college. Peter's constructive narrative is also observed in his discussion on finding employment once he returned home. For a lot of veterans, they can feel overwhelmed at the daunting task of finding civilian employment, especially so if the unemployment rate is high. Thus, some veterans can have a difficult time finding work, or finding work they are over-qualified for. Peter speaks to this point when he says that he is not, in fact, entitled to any particular job just because he was in the military. He says,

I didn't have this ego of, 'Well, I was in the army, I demand a good job.'...I got out [of the military] and I got a horrible \$8 an hour paying job in a stock room of a Bed, Bath and Beyond. There's nothing worse than that...Yeah, it sucks because I'm working side by side with 19 year olds,

this isn't how I imagined my life. But I didn't have any delusions that I'm just gonna get out of the army, businesses are just gonna hire me for no reason. I knew, I have to do this for a couple of years while I'm at school, and there's a light at the end of the tunnel. And sure enough, there was, but a lot of my friends, they just had a really hard time with that...Just because you're not getting hired for a job doesn't mean that the world is against you. I mean, at the end of the day, they want people with a college degree, and it's hard to translate military experiences on a resume, and I know that. I think not having that ego and just thinking, like, hey, it's gonna suck for a few more years, but there's a light at the end of the tunnel.

Peter describes how his views on employment and the type of job he “should” get once he returns from deployment is quite different than his friends. In the military, soldiers are often responsible for millions of dollars of equipment and people's lives. Returning home to mundane, minimum-wage jobs is a devastating blow to the ego and experiences of combat veterans. Peter acknowledges this: that military and life experience is difficult to translate and put on a resume so that potential employers can fully grasp the level of proficiency and capability a soldier has. In fact, there is a current nationwide initiative, Hire Our Heroes, started in March 2011 that encourages employers to hire veterans and military spouses based on their experiences (see <https://www.uschamberfoundation.org/hiring-our-heroes> for further information).

But not all veterans had the same optimistic outlook at Peter. Shawn, for example, describes his difficulty in getting a job after he returned home from deployment. He says,

We just sort of slipped back into the shadows when we returned...I had issues getting a job with PTSD stigma. The police department was hesitant to hire me...They did [hire me] eventually, but it was after someone who had no college degree and wasn't in the military. They hired him first, but he didn't work out, so they hired me.

Derek also had a very difficult time in finding work he felt was on par with his experience in the military. He says,

Integration...was a lot harder for me. I personally was a little bit disgruntled and I definitely had issues. I felt like all the jobs I could get right out of the army were beneath me. Maybe not skill-wise, but as far as responsibility. At the time I got out [of the army], I was a sergeant. I was in charge of millions of dollars of equipment, people's lives, planning, all this stuff, you know? And I get out of the army and the first job I got was like working at a steel plant driving a forklift. I had a real chip on my shoulder about that for a long time.

Derek felt that the experiences he had in the military prepared him for a job with more responsibility than the job he was able to get once he returned home. Feeling

undervalued in one's work can have negative psychological impacts on their overall wellbeing, especially for soldiers who have returned home having experienced trauma during deployment. Research suggests that 10-18% of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan will have some type of PTSD, up to a quarter of returning veterans will be diagnosed with depression, and other concerns over conflicts and excessive use of tobacco and alcohol (Litz and Schlenger 2009). These negative mental health concerns make it difficult for veterans to acclimate. Coming from living in a war zone for several months, some in charge of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of military equipment, some in charge of the lives of their unit, finding comparable work in the civilian sector is difficult at a minimum. The mental toll of being under-employed can take on a soldier should not be overlooked.

5.3.2 Moral injury

It is important to emphasize that it is not only the large, obvious, post-traumatic stressors that make readapting difficult, but also the small, everyday challenges that snowball into larger issues over time. One respondent, Steven, referred to this as “moral injury”, that is, the injuries that we cannot see, but still plague returning soldiers. Steven used the term “moral injury” in describing his involvement in the Veterans of Peace, an organization that promotes peace and tries to keep the U.S. out of war whenever possible. Steven noted that his post-deployment involvement with Veterans of Peace and another organization, the Disabled American Veterans (DAV), worked to inform others “of the things that soldiers go through during and after combat”. Steven describes his experience

as “typical”, meaning, his work helping civilians understand that when soldiers “come back, they are broken in some ways”. He continues,

And what’s called ‘moral injury’, that’s a real thing, and it’s something that’s still, you know, a challenge to get that kind of thing recognized by the powers that be, because they’re afraid everyone will say, ‘Oh, I’ve been morally injured.’ Well, you know, a lot of people go through war and come back with their body intact but not necessarily their mind, not necessarily their heart. And it can move into your mind, into your heart, into your soul...that’s something that needs to be addressed at some point, in some way by the people who are responsible for sending young boys and older boys, men, to war. But there’s no accountability on that level because they just say, ‘Well, you signed up to go to war.’ Well, you know, yeah, sure, we signed up to go to war, but it didn’t mean we signed up for, you know, everything that goes along with that when you return from war. And unfortunately that’s the reality of it.

In his work through DAV and Veterans for Peace, Steven strives to bring awareness to issues facing returning soldiers, working to gain help and resources for the soldiers who need it, while holding accountable government officials. For Steven, if young boys and men are sent into war, there is the expectation they will be cared for upon their return. Similarly, Sarah also advocates for finding help for soldiers upon their return home from combat. She says,

I try and advocate for veterans because, you know, we get out of the military and we just kind of get tossed aside. It's not fair. I see the things people go through. I've lost more people in my unit after they got out of the military than the one person we [lost] when we were in...I don't know. I just think that to help people in your country or to do something for your country, you could be a good citizen, a good person, and help your fellow man...because who are we if we don't have our humanity anymore?

It is important to call attention to the fact that moral injury, along with negative mental health outcomes, is largely invisible. A passer-by on the street may not be able to distinguish between a civilian and ex-military combat soldier. They cannot visibly see the struggles and difficulties the veteran is experiencing inside his or her head; they cannot see the recounting of combat zone experiences. Several respondents reported being overly alert once they came home, as they were so used to being wary of items on the side of the road while in combat. Rachel best summarizes these respondents' feelings when she says,

I would be driving here back in the States, if there was any kind of debris, any kind of litter on the road, I would swerve to get out of its way, because when you're driving in Iraq, and they've got IEDs all over the place, anything that looks not like a normal, worn down road, you avoid like the devil...like in Pennsylvania, you'd see a whole lot of dead deer on the side

of the road. And for a while, that was another one of those things, like, oh, because that's what they hid IEDs in, that kind of stuff...and that's the kind of stuff you had to avoid. So yeah, I had to do some retraining of the brain there.

Another type of moral injury is loss of identity and can also have a negative psychological impact on returning soldiers. James describes this as feeling "empty", and deployment as almost an addiction to "get that feeling back again". He says,

You're in a restaurant and you order a drink and then, you're in the military because you use [military ID] as your ID, and they buy your food for you, and that's always nice, although awkward sometimes because it feels like a handout and that kind of sucks. And then when you first go to the VA and they're pretty excited that you're a returning vet and they give you a lot of accommodations and a lot of things, that's pretty cool. After a while, just like anything one does in their life, eventually people stop acknowledging it, or stop having it be the focal point of you when they talk about it. And then you're left feeling a little kind of empty, and like, you don't know if you screwed something up, or if you're going to go do it again so you can get that feeling back again. Honestly, a lot of people deploy two or three times; monetarily it's nice, but also because anything you screwed up is kind of washed away when you come back, at least for

the first little while. It's kind of like a purgatory of sorts – you're in good graces again for a little while, and that's something that's really enticing.

The way James describes his loss of identity after the “fanfare” of his return to the U.S. wore down is reminiscent of an addict: doing the very thing over again to get that same “high” before it wore off. Struggling to find one's place among the civilian population after experiencing combat, particularly at a young and impressionable age, it is evident why reintegration is so difficult for some, and why having access to necessary resources is so important. Additionally, available resources help ease the transition from the combat zone to civilian life. James's suggestion that deployment is akin to purgatory feeds the process of voluntary redeployment. To have one's offenses be forgiven, they wash away their transgressions by serving another deployment. James notes some service members redeploy multiple times, feeding the “high” in the focal point of others' good graces and attention.

Reintegration, as the third step in the shaping of national sentiment process, aims to help returning soldiers assimilate with their home culture post deployment. A common debate among politicians and government leaders in the U.S. are resources for veterans, to what extent those resources are developed, for how much, and for how long. As seen in the respondent narratives, some veterans feel like they “slipped back into the shadows”. Those that go without seeking help or medical attention have a much more difficult time readapting. Thus, the question from a national sentiment observation becomes, to what end is the country responsible for the care of returning soldiers? What

is in the U.S.'s national rhetoric that speaks to that responsibility and how is it understood collectively?

We have already established that from the individual agency perspective, national sentiment varies from person to person, culminating to form a system of values and beliefs loosely shared by many within the boundaries of the country. The varied nuances of national sentiment are in and of itself representative of U.S. values – that is, the U.S. values the individual and independent thought and, therefore, a varied understanding of national sentiment. However, citizens act within an already established and acceptable framework of overarching values, integrated into our cultural toolkit: an at-the-ready understanding of symbols, social interactions, and constructs that are encountered daily (Swidler 1986). This framework is set over time deciphering the values and beliefs of the country. As individuals we work to inculcate these values as we see fit, focusing on those principles of most importance at the individual and familial level, as well as community level.

Using combat soldiers as an example, soldiers who enlist represent the U.S. values of service through their military actions. While there may be seemingly self-interested reasons soldiers enlist (college tuition, hazard pay), even these reasons can be reframed to represent collective values: life-long learning, teamwork, service, hard work, dedication and commitment. When one form of service ends (i.e., military service), soldiers continue inculcating the values of the U.S. in other ways (employment, starting a business, going to school, volunteering to help other soldiers returning with physical or mental health concerns).

5.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter explored three key structural factors that shape national sentiment for combat soldiers: recruitment, combat, and reintegration. Recruitment represented the micro level of social structure, to understand why soldiers joined the military on an individual level. I explored reasons respondents enlisted in the military, finding that contrary to my initial hypothesis, the 9/11 terrorist attacks were not a major factor for those who joined after 9/11. Rather, soldiers' propensity for service was an important reason for joining. Of course, soldiers enlisted for a range of reasons, distinguished here as commitment to service and cultural. Reasons for enlisting were not mutually exclusive.

Combat serves as a macro structural example of nationalism, and this section identified that the narrative frameworks of soldiers did not center on national sentiment as much as on the experiencing the true costs of war. All respondents reported witnessing some type of injury or death while they were deployed, and bearing witness to these traumatic events was rationalized as a cost of war. The aftermath of war was also difficult to cope with, resulting in angry outbursts, PTSD, trouble sleeping, or even suicide.

Reintegration is the third phase of shaping national sentiment in military soldiers. This section outlined the emergent categories that relate to the hypothesis of returning home post-deployment, reintegration. This hypothesis states soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources. Support for the stated hypothesis was identified. Having a support network indeed was vital to soldiers' reintegration into

civilian life; though those with families and children sometimes had a more difficult time readapting to civilian life stateside. Similarly, respondents who had difficulty navigating networks upon their return home, or, who did not have concrete plans for employment or school, had a more difficult time adjusting to civilian life. It stands to reason soldiers who put their lives on the line in combat and come home to cumbersome resources can lead to feelings of isolation, regret, or abandonment by one's government.

6.0 LOYALTY

This chapter explores the concept of loyalty as it pertains to structural factors of understanding national sentiment in soldiers. While no hypothesis was formulated in regards to loyalty prior to conducting this research, preliminary ideas suggested there was a place for loyalty – to country, to government, to one’s military unit, or to all three – in soldiers’ narratives connecting their combat experiences and national sentiment. Loyalty is understood here as a deep-seated devoted attachment and feeling of allegiance to a person, a group of people, or an entity (a government or country). Loyalty to government is external to the citizenry, encompassing rules and policies, whereas loyalty to country represents a faithful adherence to the people, values, and beliefs. While loyalty is a deeply regarded U.S. national belief, what it means “to be loyal” and how that loyalty is expressed varies on an individual level. At the national level, and in the military, loyalty is understood beyond a subjective, cherished value. There are legal actions invoked when laws are broken, or when military orders are ignored or dishonored. For example, if a soldier deserts his or her unit, especially during war, with no intent to return to the unit, the soldier can be court martialed, tried for treason, and, if found guilty, in the most extreme case (albeit rare and unlikely) be sentenced to death or life in prison. Military demotions, confinement, and dishonorable discharges are lesser, more likely punishments

for desertion. The seriousness of penalties for desertion speaks to the high regard of loyalty to one's military unit.

The case of Edward Snowden is highlighted in this study as an example of national sentiment and loyalty. What made this case controversial is the very question of whether Snowden, who disclosed classified information of top-secret U.S. programs to the press, was committing an act of treason or one of national heroism and bravery. Respondents in this study were split on whether Snowden was a traitor or hero. The decision came down to whether respondents valued more the information that was released over the way it was released, or the fact that it was released at all. I use the Snowden case in this study as it shows the nuance of understanding a country's values: do citizens have a right to government transparency in all arenas, even information that is considered classified? At what risk does the right to transparency come? Herein we see the complexities in interpretation when focusing on individual agency in national sentiment. Snowden is but one example, and while most everyday citizens will not divulge classified government documents, nor be faced with the opportunity to do so, the crux of the controversy around Snowden is the interpretation of ingrained cultural values and beliefs. The same controversy is implicit in anti-war protesters, also discussed in this chapter.

The findings on loyalty are divided into three main sections. The first, loyalty in military leadership, explores how poor leadership can have a major impact on soldiers' morale and overall sentiments toward the military and their service, and resulting in a negative, even detrimental, impact on an entire military unit. The second, loyalty in country versus government, explores the difference in meaning of loyalty to country and

that of government, and if a country being at war matters in terms of loyalty. The third section, loyalty in individuals, examines respondents' views on actions that show one's loyalty or disloyalty using the Snowden case and anti-war protesters as examples.

6.1 LOYALTY IN MILITARY LEADERSHIP

The military organizational form is traditional in that it has a clear delineation of power across hierarchical levels, and clearly defined instructions on how leaders and subordinates are to interact (Wong, Bliese and McGurk 2003). The military has clear “surface-level structures”, such as the use of rank insignia that allows military personnel to quickly and easily identify one another, and “deep structures”, or codes of behavior, which define military power arrangements. Military leadership is highly valued and acquired through formal education, operational assignments, and self development (Gordon 2002; Wong, Bliese and McGurk 2003).

Formal leadership refers those in the military with visible, titled positions (Herda-Rapp 1998). One of the primary tasks of leaders is to make sense of the context in which the group finds itself. Leaders are looked to in order to determine meaning where there is none (Smircich and Morgan 1982). Pescosolido (2001) argues that at the beginning of a group's time together, individuals have the least amount of information about one another's abilities or the task at hand. Over time, information is received, clarifying individual strengths as well as the task (Smircich and Morgan 1982; Tuckman 1965). Army leadership is defined in its doctrinal manual as “the process of influencing people

by providing purpose, direction, and motivation while operation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization” (Sewell 2009: 93). The Field Manual (FM) 6-22 identifies an Army leader as anyone who “inspires and influences people to accomplish organizational goals” (Sewell 2009: 94). The FM 6-22 further defines and outlines the leadership requirements and competencies required for successful leaders. These include attributes of what a leader *is* (character) and what a leader *does* (competencies). Specific attributes include: character (encompassing Army values, empathy, and warrior ethos), presence (physically fit, military bearing, composed, confident, resilient), and intellect (mental agility, sound judgment, innovation, interpersonal tact, domain knowledge). Competencies include: leads (leads others, extends influence beyond chain of command, leads by example, communicates), develops (positive environment, prepares self, develops others), and achieves (gets results) (Sewell 2009). The definition and competencies required for Army leadership are fairly vague simply because the Army recognizes that every one has the ability and potential to be a leader (Sewell 2009). The idea that anyone can be a leader is not confined to titled, visible roles. Informal leadership consists of “behind the scenes” work, with its leaders coming from within and chosen by the group (Herda-Rapp 1998; Pescosolido 2001). Research indicates that informal leaders can have a major impact on the group’s processes, norms and outcomes (see Pescosolido 2001 for the literature on this subject), but little is known about the informal leaders’ behaviors. Pescosolido (2001) argues that informal group leaders have great influence at the beginning of a group where there is the most amount of ambiguity because group members gather their own insights over time, needing to rely less on the informal leader.

Respondents in this study note that military officers played a big role in their overall sentiments toward their military careers. Loyalty within a military unit is vital to the group and function. When disharmony is present, vigilance is compromised and injuries or death become more probable. It is this very reason the military strives to create a cohesive unit, mentally and physically, among soldiers during basic training: to emphasize the importance of the unit working together as one and remaining loyal to each other. Leadership is important to promote a sense of harmony within the unit, but when it does not, when leadership fails to create a unified environment, the outcomes can be dire, as we will see in the respondent narratives outlined in this chapter.

It stands to reason that, as with any occupation, if employees trust their boss is making sound decisions to protect and move the company forward in a positive direction and meet its goals, employees are more likely to be loyal to that boss and the company. It is much more complex, however, than simply being “loyal” or “disloyal”. How loyalty is interpreted at the individual level matters. Take, for example, the soldier who is ordered to bomb a town by their commanding officer, but feels it morally wrong for fear of killing or injuring civilians. The soldier experiences tension in loyalty to leadership versus his or her moral compass. If the soldier decides to carry out the commanding officer’s orders, it does not mean they blindly adhere to those orders; there may well be internal, private reservations, voiced reservations to fellow service members, or voiced reservations to military leadership. But making a point of what matters most – loyalty in action or voiced loyalty is quite complex. One of the most deeply held U.S. values is freedom of speech. In this regard, the soldier can vocalize his or her disagreement with bombing the town, but as a subordinate in the military organization, is obligated to carry

out the orders regardless. The soldier is then left to grapple with his or her moral compass and, quite likely, the negative mental health conditions that will follow. This example illustrates loyalty in action – the soldier carried through with the orders to bomb the town, though they were morally opposed. If the reverse took place – the soldier refused to drop the bomb, they would face significant punishment (range and severity varies), leading to possible dishonorable discharge or court martial. While the soldier’s moral compass remains intact, their military career likely is over.

Lack of cohesion within a military unit and mistrust between commanding officers and soldiers can lead to dire outcomes in a combat zone. Soldiers reported that poor leadership was more traumatic than the deployment itself, leaving the unit feeling vulnerable, angry, or afraid. Peter describes the risk and price that came with “doing missions for the sake of missions” in the following anecdote,

My roommate was killed...We had a road in our operations that nobody had driven on, nobody had used...and they literally just called us one day and said ‘Hey, you're gonna drive down this route.’ And we're like, ‘It dead-ends, why would you want us to drive it? It doesn't go anywhere.’ ‘Well yeah, but we just need to have a, what they call presence patrol. We need to have a presence there.’ And so we said, ‘There's a reason nobody's been on this road.’ One is that it dead-ends to nowhere. Two, it's not cement. It's just dirt...Which makes it easier to put roadside bombs in...And third...we're just doing it because you have to say you drove, you sent troops down this road that dead ends. I can't get over that. And so,

before we go out, we talk to the EOD, which is the bomb disposal guys, and they say, 'Hey, just to let you guys know, that road hasn't been cleared by bomb disposal in over a year now.'...And so, I remember looking at my roommate and I was just like, 'Dude, this is, this is what Iraq has become. Doing missions just for the sake of doing them, because we have nothing else to do.'...30 minutes later, we drive down, we get hit by a roadside bomb, he's killed...So, my roommate just died for a one hundred percent useless mission.

Peter notes how senseless the mission that took his roommate was. He holds the leadership of his unit responsible for the decision to clear an unused road, despite warnings from the bomb disposal team. This was not the only instance of poor leadership in Peter's unit, however. The snowball effect of inadequate command had infiltrated throughout the brigade, resulting in an unmanageable unit. Peter describes this later in the interview:

My brigade ended up being so bad, honestly, there was a book written about it, uh, some war crimes ended up happening. NY Times bestselling book was written about our brigade...we had horrible leadership, and, we all like to say...the ones who made it out of there, made it in spite of those guys, not because of them. Like we made it even though they tried, at every turn, to get us killed. We ended up making it in spite of them...I hate to say this, but I feel justified in the fact that this book was written

and now the book is actually required reading at West Point and a lot of ROTC programs, because it just outlines the failures of my brigade's leadership and how it was such a horrible command climate and such a hostile workplace environment, if you can get more hostile than Iraq...[the book] also talks about a couple guys in my battalion ended up raping and murdering a 14 year old Iraqi girl and trying to say [the] Iraqis did it. And then afterwards, a couple of them confessed to it. And they basically had just snapped because their, their battalion command was so bad. They had lost so many guys and they were just exhausted. Not that it excuses it by any means what they did, but it basically, later on, psychologists were like, these guys were just beyond the point of battle fatigue, PTSD, whatever you want to call it, that they could justify raping a 14-year-old girl and then killing her and killing the entire family and trying to cover it up.

Peter's experience is unique, even among the very personal combat zone experiences of respondents. The rape and murder of the Iraqi girl was excused due to the war climate and PTSD. Previously, we have discussed the impact decreased vigilance can have on a soldier in the combat zone and how this can lead to physical injury or death; but it can also lead to negative mental health concerns. Living in a hostile environment for an extended period of time, without reprieve, can confuse the messages of who, or what, is an actual threat versus a perceived one. Further, not having formal leadership that will debrief or check-in on the well-being of their troops can exacerbate the issue.

While well-being check-ins may not be an explicit requirement of military leadership, best practices presumes some type of mental wellness check, however informal it may be.

There are many questions to consider here. I have already presumed in the case of the Iraqi girl that check-ins did not occur for the soldiers (although check-ins alone would likely not have prevented her rape and murder), but if a debrief did take place, it is not a requirement for the commanding officer to be equipped with the appropriate knowledge or educational background to work through crises that may arise with their troops. This is the work of psychologists, and, while some military psychologists do travel with troops going into combat, it is not, seemingly, common practice (see, for example, <http://careersinpsychology.org/become-a-military-psychologist/> where it states, “Groups of military psychologists *might* also travel with troops overseas during wartime” (emphasis added) under the “Where Do Military Psychologists Work?” headline). In addition, if resources were available to soldiers in the field, combat missions likely take precedence. It is not as though a soldier at war can be reprieved of their duties for a therapy appointment like a stateside soldier or civilian can. The demand of war takes precedence in the immediate term.

Further, if soldiers had access to mental health resources during combat, there is social stigma in admitting one needs help. Soldiers may anticipate negative consequences from fellow soldiers or commanding officers and therefore avoid seeking help (Britt, Greene-Shortridge and Castro 2007). While the VA system in the U.S. is ready to receive combat soldiers when they return home, how are soldiers in crisis helped while in the field? Does a later assessment of PTSD exonerate these soldiers from their actions?

We should also examine the context of formal and informal leadership in the case of the Iraqi girl. If the formal leadership was lacking in this case, how was there no development of informal leadership? Were there certain structural factors that inhibited this development? Were other service members unaware of the depths of duress of the soldiers? Did not feel it their place to intervene? Did others also suffer from PTSD and were thus incapable of empathizing, reacting to it, or unable to develop informal leadership? Further, whose responsibility is it to do so, and what will those who witnessed it, or were around it, carry home with them?

Inadequate leadership in the military can manifest itself in a variety of ways – not all of which are as overt as Peter’s case. Rachel relates an instance of unsupportive military leadership when she found out she would be deployed. She recalls,

I was scared, I guess that would be the biggest thing, because we didn’t really know anything. We knew we were being deployed, but that was all they told us...we didn’t know where we were going, we didn’t know when we were going, we didn’t know how long we would be gone and we had a commander that we didn’t particularly care for because he said things like, “Some of you will not be coming back with us.” So yeah, great commander, right? So, pretty much I was terrified.

Rachel’s fear to deploy was not alleviated by her commander. He did not show empathy, interpersonal skills, nor did he create a positive environment for her or her fellow service soldiers. The Army seeks these basic attributes and characteristics in their

leaders (Sewell 2009). While Rachel's commander could not control the where, when, how long of the mobilization process, Rachel wished he had shown more sensitivity and compassion for his soldiers. Not having compassion could make his soldiers feel more vulnerable while in a combat zone, and perhaps less trusting of his decisions and orders. While the soldiers are still obligated to comply with the commander's orders, lacking a sense of trust between commander and soldiers can lead to mistakes in the field and conflict among the soldiers, a contrast to the strong, family-like unit the military strives to create.

The impact of inadequate leadership – at any level – can be enough to mar the overall military experiences of soldiers. Gary, for example, notes the confusion and frustration in his deployment as to why they were transferred to Iraq when they were doing so well in Afghanistan. Gary says,

We felt like we had the terrorists on the run and then we got re-deployed home and no one could understand that, because we felt like we were doing really good work in Afghanistan. Of course now it's painfully obvious that the administration had pretty much already decided that we were going to invade Iraq at that point and so they needed to build up the base in order to support those operations. So that was frustrating for me, watching how OIF played out. The initial campaign went very well, but it became more and more apparent that there was absolutely no plan to follow on, just the stupid things that we were doing, the stupid things that administrators...were doing. I got very frustrated very quickly...[It] was

pretty much useless in Iraq in the first three weeks. So all we were doing was we would fly at 30,000 feet for 14 hours at a time, relay calls for med evac from the convoys that were being hit from down below us. Everyday, it was nothing really that we did that changed that, unfortunately, and so, for me, that became incredibly frustrating. So as I saw sort of the mismanagement, started questioning my leadership, especially leading up to the '04 election, really, really soured on the political leadership that we were operating under...I think the deployment, had I not deployed, I probably would have remained much more enthusiastic about the military and military service. But that experience really soured me on it, to the point where I was trying to finish out a career.

Gary's experience during deployment exemplifies the many layers of authority at work in a military deployment. While we have heard from respondents who were frustrated with their direct commanding officers, Gary notes his frustration with government officials making military decisions. There is a sense of disenchantment Gary expresses with the lack of transparency in decision-making, and his inability to do anything about it. This experience left him frustrated, feeling disconnected, disengaged, and wanting to end a successful and lengthy 15-year military career. For Gary, the poor leadership he experienced at all levels of authority served as a sign that his values and beliefs were no longer in line with that of the military. This does not mean that one's loyalty is fickle, but rather represents the process of questioning what is asked of us and holding our government to the standards we expect. As things change within a combat

zone, soldiers are faced to ask themselves: does this war/deployment/mission still coincide with my beliefs and values? Conflict, confusion, and frustration arise when the answer to that question becomes “no”, especially as soldiers are bound by contract to fulfill their obligations – whether they agree with the commands or whether the overall duties change mid-deployment.

6.2 LOYALTY TO COUNTRY VERSUS GOVERNMENT

Thus far I have discussed loyalty in military leadership, which can be deconstructed in two ways: first, referring to the individual relationship between a commander and soldier or unit. Second, referring to the institutional relationship between soldiers and the organization of the military. A key difference in these levels of loyalty and relationships is the level of personal sentiment. That is, whether a soldier feels loyal to the commander or not, the relationship on a micro scale is intimate and personal. The commander knows the soldier’s name, and likely background and health information. Contrast this with loyalty between a soldier and the military organization. This connection becomes less intimate due to scale and the impersonality of a structured organization. While the soldier may be known by some members of the organization, certainly not known by all members, and less likely known by the top level members. Loyalty to government and loyalty to country are distinguished by the power structure the government represents. Most respondents felt elected politicians did not convey the values of their constituents, but rather were out for themselves. Respondents viewed the government as out of touch

with citizens and almost a non-human entity: government was not like the citizens of the country in that it did not uphold the beliefs and values of the citizens. Nathan explains why government officials are seen as out of touch with the population and how politicians are some of the least trusted people in the United States,

You see surveys on what's the most trusted profession. Right now, the most trusted profession is military officers. You look at the bottom level spectrum of who's the least trusted individuals, [they] are gonna be politicians. Politicians are the government. So you look at who's not trusted very much, that's gonna be your government. You look at those who protect the country, that's gonna be your military...I think those that betray their country are those that betray those that they trust the most, which is gonna be your military and those people that are in it. Those that betray their government are those that betray politicians of which aren't trusted, so it's more accepted that you're gonna betray politicians.

For Nathan, there is a lack of trust for politicians, and, because of this wide-ranging lack of trust, it is "okay" to betray the government, made up of politicians. Overall, several respondents shared Nathan's views that government is made up of politicians. Loyalty to country, however, represented being loyal to the citizens and the principles the country was founded on. Peter makes the distinction between loyalty to the country and loyalty to government when he says,

Loyalty just means okay, if you're willing to stand up for the overall, for the people and the way of life, not for the government. I never once thought I was willing to die because of defending the government of America. I thought, at the end of the day, it's the people, it's your freedoms, your friends and family. That's what you're really here for, and not because a bunch of Congress and Senators voted to send you here.

Respondents like Peter felt a sense of loyalty toward the country, but not toward the government, while others stated it is the citizens' responsibility to hold government accountable for their actions. Of this, Michael says,

It's the responsibility of the citizen to challenge the government when they're doing wrong...if you're gonna be loyal to your country, you have the duty to stand up and speak out against the government.

Michael calls on citizens to question and challenge the government; it is in this way citizens can show their loyalty to the country. Michael sees interconnectedness between country and government – they work in tandem to keep the country running. But several other respondents saw the government as disengaged from the country; these respondents commented they were loyal to the country, its people, and the ideals the country embodies, but were not loyal to the government or its politicians. For example, Sarah says,

I've heard people say, 'Oh, well, you need to support the president.' I don't need to support the president to be patriotic. I care about my country, I care about the people that live in my country. I've stood up and voluntarily joined the military for it.

Sarah distinguishes between being patriotic and supporting the president. For her, she can disagree with the president and still be patriotic because she is feels loyal to her country – the people of the United States. Nina echoes this sentiment when she says, "I'm committed to the people of the United States, not necessarily the government." Marty also shares the same opinion, "I don't have much loyalty to a government. I just have a loyalty to the ideals we're supposed to stand for as Americans." Brett succinctly describes his loyalty to country over government when he says, "There's sort of a higher calling to country than to government." Rachel also shares these sentiments, saying,

I don't particularly care for a whole lot of things that our government is doing right now. But I consider myself very loyal to my country...will I do something to betray my government? No. Do I always have to agree with them? Absolutely not.

Rachel makes sure to point out that just because she does not agree with the government, does not mean she will betray it. Each of these respondents maintains a greater connection and devotion to their country over the government, indicating a distinct separation between the two. This is interesting to note, particularly coming from

military members, as while it is the country its citizens, and ideals they are protecting, it is those in government who dictates where they go, when, and how long they stay. Loyalty between government and country discussions took an “us” versus “them” sentiment: citizens/military/ideals versus politicians/government. Despite this distinction, we still operate on a day-to-day basis within the framework elected leaders, over time, have outlined. This is not to say that there is no individual agency within our day-to-day activities, but rather that even our agency is based on a framework of already established criterion that we operate within. For example, several respondents mentioned complying with military orders and doing what was asked of them because doing so was a part of their job, even if they did not agree with the mission itself. Respondents said military members signs up to be loyal. Joshua explains,

The way I look at it, we actually signed up to be loyal. Even if we don't agree with the situation that we're put in sometimes, they may bring into question your loyalty to the country [if you do not comply].

Joshua's thoughts on signing up to be loyal, even if one does not agree with what they are asked to do, echoes other respondents who, throughout the interview, mentioned “following orders”, regardless of their views on the war. Many respondents viewed their time in the military as a job – soldiers perform the job they are asked to do, even if they do not necessarily agree with it. This, in some ways, detaches the individual soldier from the responsibility of going to war. To frame military engagement as a way that protects the American way of life, individual freedom, and so forth, one finds it difficult to argue

against military action. Further, we cannot blame the individual soldier for simply following orders – instead, we hold accountable the government officials who make the decisions about war and other military tactics. The conventional way of holding government officials accountable is through voting – if citizens are unhappy with the decisions Congress makes, citizens have the right to vote officials out of office. Derek shares this view, suggesting that if civilians are unhappy with the choices made by government, they have the ability to oust individuals from their appointed government position, and replace them with others. Derek says,

We have voted for the people and the laws we have in office. So if you don't support a war that most of these people have gotten us involved in, you need to change that with your voting.

Derek encourages citizens to use the power of voting to vote into office individuals who are more in-line with the beliefs and values of the populace. Yet citizens are often not complacent to wait for the next election, and will make their voices heard through protests, online petitions, email and phone bank campaigns, and the like. This lets Congress know the issues and concerns of the citizenry before they are voted out of office; with a chance to correct action and better understand the voices Congress was voted to represent.

However, being in the military means sometimes having to carry out orders you may not necessarily agree with because, as Brett mentions, enlisting in the military means you are signing up to be loyal. He says,

When you enlist, or when you swear your oath of officership, the first thing that you sort of swear to uphold is the constitution. And then after that, it's the President and the leaders, your leadership and officers appointed above you. So I think loyalty to your country is also loyalty to your government, but loyalty to sort of the every man and citizenry.

For Brett, enlisted soldiers' loyalty follows the hierarchical order of the military organization. Loyalty to government and country is intertwined; enlisting in the military is an agreement to be loyalty to both government (following orders) and country (citizens). James agrees with this point, suggesting that government and country are linked together and if one is betrayed, so is the other, especially for government employees. He says,

When you work for the government, you kind of have to tie the two together, otherwise, it's essentially, you'd have a coup or something. You can't really idolize one and hate the other one and work for the government. You don't have to like the government, but you have to at least accept it for what it is and work within the confines of it. I don't think you can be radically against the government and still have love for your country, because [the government] is what your country has developed.

James does not distinguish between loyalty for government and that for country – the two are connected. He makes a point to note that government employees in particular should be loyal to the government. Gary disagrees, however, and feels that even an enlisted soldier can disagree with administration policies and decisions. He says,

Sometimes dissent is the highest form of patriotism. So that certainly could be construed as loyalty to buck the trend or go against the flow. Generally supporting the policies when the policies are in place. Even though I disagreed with a lot of the policies of the administration from 2000 to 2008, I still supported them by willingly going and completing the deployments and attempting to uphold the policies as best I could. So loyalty, I guess, sometimes means following a bad policy, even if you disagree with it, either working to have the policy changed or you know, expressing your dissent, being told that your opposition has been noted and then either, you know, resigning or carrying out the policy. I guess that's probably the strongest test of loyalty right there.

Gary echoes the earlier example of the soldier grappling with the commander's orders to bomb a town: if put in the position, one must decide to be loyal to one's conscious and not engaging in a disagreeable action; or vocalizing the disagreement but carrying out the orders regardless. Gary notes the soldier's options: carry out the policy or resign. But resigning should not be misconstrued to mean disloyal; Gary points out that dissent can be a form of patriotism. One can show their loyalty by holding the

country and government to higher standards, demanding action from to government to right whatever perceived wrongs have been identified. Steven also recognizes that sometimes dissent shows loyalty to one's country, especially if actions being asked of someone may harm the country. It is at this point when the soldier is faced with a moral dilemma: doing what you are told to do, even at the risk of harm to the country, or doing what your conscious tells you is right. Steven explains,

[My parents] told me, always go with the dictates of your conscience. Because there are gonna be times when you know what the right thing to do is, and everything that you've been taught or trained to do, is the exact opposite, and you have to make a decision...whatever choice you make, you have to live with the consequences...the whole concept of civil disobedience means that being loyal to your country sometimes means you have to go against the very laws that are written because those laws are unjust, or whatever. Martin Luther King talked about that quite a bit, preached about it in his sermons and such. So there is room for that, but I think the whole thing is you have to think about, you have to weigh the pros and cons. Will I hurt my country in trying to do this thing that I'm doing? And what is the benefit to my country for doing what I'm doing?

For Steven, being loyal to the country does not necessarily mean following the rule of law; there are times when one's conscious weighs superior. Yet, he cautions, we must consider what the benefit is to the country if the law is broken, not the benefit to the

individual. While we must decide individually on a daily basis the right thing to do, we must ensure that breaking the law will help the greater good. Following one's conscious does pose an interesting question of, "by whose standards?" While the U.S. values independence and individuality, for every person who deems a law worthy of breaking, will be someone who disagrees, creating tensions around why laws exist in the first place and individuals' rights to break such laws.

As discussed in the previous chapter outlining overt versus covert national sentiment, so can the argument be made for loyalty to country versus government. The expressions of national sentiment toward country are more overt: respondents are willing to openly and freely discuss sentiments for their fellow citizens and the freedoms the country holds as its values, than that toward the government. While respondents' views do not show the same loyalty to government as to their country, respondents' actions (enlisting in the military, following orders) represent a sense of loyalty to the government, albeit less overt than their dedication to country.

Some respondents point out that loyalty is not something that can be turned "on or off" – they argue someone is loyal or they are not, without any in-between. Nina summarizes this point of view:

I don't think that loyalty should be something they turn on or off, or depending on the situation. Either you're loyal to the government or the country, or you're not. I mean, it's not, 'This is something that proves my loyalty, this is something that doesn't.' Either you are loyal to the country or you're not.

Loyalty, however, does not occur in a vacuum. There are often extenuating circumstances, like war, that can make one question whether their government is making proper decisions. Citizens strive for policies that benefit the country, in doing so, must hold the government accountable. Tension arises when citizens disagree either with the government policies or with one another. Yet, one can disagree with the decisions the government makes, and still feel loyal, but not actively working against the country. James makes this distinction when he says,

I don't think they're obligated to be loyal to [the country], but I think they ought not be disloyal to it. You don't have to actively work in its best interest, but any action that is the opposite, I think, should be severely punished. Just because it's arrogant to think you can live in a country that's under war and do things to sabotage it and not have any kind of retribution. That doesn't make sense. But you don't have to buy war bonds and trade in your used car for bombs or whatever.

James's depiction of loyalty shows personal agency – you need not agree and support the war, but you also should not work against it, either. This statement brings up an interesting discussion regarding anti-war protesters. Are anti-war protesters engaging in actions to stop the war? In many cases, yes, or, if not to stop the war, at least to have their opinions and voices heard. Does this, then, make anti-war protesters disloyal to the country? Are they traitors or committing treason, especially taking account of James's

definitely of loyalty? In short, anti-war protesters show their loyalty to the country and government by holding politicians accountable for their decision to go to war. As noted, there are many ways in which people show their loyalty and pride in the nation; for anti-war protesters, it is shown through their actions to speak out against war. The case of anti-war protesters will be discussed later in the chapter.

Yet whether we are obligated to be loyal to our country during times of war can be difficult to discern. Peter acknowledges the complexities between support for war and intelligence monitoring of civilians and our everyday freedoms when he says:

People who stood up during the Iraq invasion and said, ‘We shouldn’t, I don’t want to invade Iraq’ – they were chastised for it. [The] ‘Oh, you’re either with us or you’re with them’ type mentality. There’s a lot of senators and congressmen made a good point of invading Iraq and now, looking back, a lot of them were proven right. Same thing with the Patriot Act. I remember how many senators, I think Bernie Sanders from Vermont was one of the guys from the start said, ‘Actually, no, this is going to be much worse’ and he was getting crushed by every news station there is. ‘Oh, you don’t think our intelligence agencies [can] catch criminals and catch terrorists.’ And again, now it’s like, ‘Oh my God, I can’t believe the NSA might be listening.’ And it’s like, well, people were warned about this 10 years ago, but in 2003, if you said anything against what we were doing with the war or our intelligence capabilities, again, it was either you’re with us or against us.

Peter's response points to the pivotal moments in history when the 9/11 attacks occurred, an event that elicited a strong sense of patriotism from many civilians. The 9/11 attacks were jarring for the U.S., but served as prime moment of bonding for the country, coming together, and standing up for the U.S.'s freedoms and rights. This is evidenced in Peter's response that if anyone questioned limits and scrutiny put in place by the government in 2003, it came across as not only unpatriotic, but accusations of being a terrorist.

Loyalty to country and government do not stop at the borders of the U.S. Though this research focuses on the U.S. specifically, it is important to address loyalty and national sentiment of the U.S. within the global context, but also bearing in mind that one's sense of loyalty to home may even be heightened when one is outside the country. Surrounded by the unfamiliar, one craves a sense of home and comfort, creating a "safe space" in their thoughts and mind. Respondent Steven shares a global perspective on loyalty to country, specifically during times of war. He suggests that the U.S. operates within a global system, and, regardless of the state of war, we must acknowledge our role in the global community. Steven says,

And we are global citizens...global citizenship is what we should aspire to. Sometimes that means the interests of America aren't necessarily the best interests of the world. But on the world stage, we are still adaptable. I do believe that. So I think we have to be careful about what we say is good for America and what we say is good for the world and try and figure out

how we can do a little bit of both. Now, I'm an American citizen, and I'm an American veteran. I live and breathe for America and I would die for America, and that's the oath that I took, and I take that very seriously. But at the same time, I also recognize that politicians will sometimes, for their own interests, use patriotism as a thin veil to achieve their own objects.

For Steven, global citizenship is important. He recognizes that while his allegiance lies with the U.S. and he is willing to die for his country, he has an obligation to act within the global system as a global citizen. While this may seem somewhat counter-intuitive due to the conflicting nature of allegiance to one's country but also the world, Steven is the respondent who, earlier, discussed first and foremost being loyal to one's conscience, above loyalty to country or government. He continues, "There is a hard time when the interests of your nation might not be in the best interests of the world." Steven points out the conflict between conscientiousness, loyalty to country, and acting within the framework of global citizenry. For Steven, even given his oath of commitment to die for his country, believes that contemplating actions with the global context and remaining loyal to one's conscious is of the utmost importance.

Respondents perceive a difference between loyalty to country and government, and most feel no obligation to be loyal to the government, but do so to the country. This difference is respondents equate government to politics, with which many voters are disenchanted. Loyalty to country, however, is indicative of loyalty to the freedoms and ideals that serve as the basis for the country.

6.3 LOYALTY IN INDIVIDUALS: EDWARD SNOWDEN

The last two sections of this chapter examine respondents' understanding of the agency in loyalty, citing two specific events as examples: the Edward Snowden controversy and anti-war protesters. In the Edward Snowden case, discussed first, respondents were asked their thoughts on him and, since he is a U.S. citizen, if he acted in a patriotic manner. Most respondents were very vocal and had definite feelings – on either side – of the Snowden case.

In brief, Snowden disclosed classified information of top-secret U.S. programs to the press to expose government surveillance of civilians. Supporters of Snowden suggest that revealing top-secret information was pertinent to the U.S. citizenry. Others, however, see Snowden as a traitor and, because of the release of classified information, the country's security was threatened, exposing the country, its people, and its resources to a vulnerable state.

Michael agrees with Snowden releasing the classified documents, and views Snowden's actions as patriotic because Snowden did not expect any type of reparation for releasing the information. In other words, Snowden likely knew he would not be making money from releasing the information, and even possibly knew he could be imprisoned for a long time if he was caught. From this perspective, the cost-benefit analysis for Snowden made releasing the documents more beneficial than the risk. On the release of the documents, Michael says,

Yes, I do [think Snowden was acting patriotically] because he had no expectation of any type of compensation. He wasn't getting paid, he wasn't looking for some kind of notoriety, or anything like that. He was doing it because he felt that it was, he was following his specific duty.

Michael's mention of Snowden fulfilling his "specific duty" illustrates the view that Snowden was acting patriotically when he released the classified documents. Using the definitions outlined above on loyalty to country, Snowden's framing of his actions certainly fit: commitment to the citizens of one's country and its values and beliefs are exemplified in this frame – Snowden released the documents so the public would be aware of what the government was doing. Transparency, then, serves as a value important to the U.S. population.

Many of the respondents commented that Snowden was admirable because the government has too much power, and there should be greater transparency in what the government is doing. Marty best summarizes the view that government has too much power and secrecy. He says,

I just look at how everything is over-classified. It's absolutely ridiculous. And frankly, I don't know if those Wikileaks did any damage at all, but what they did expose was a bloated and corrupt system that is willing to subvert the Constitution, which what we're supposed to be fighting for anyways.

Marty believes there is too much secrecy and corruption in the government, and that what Snowden did exposed much of this secrecy and corruption. Though some respondents felt that government secrets were in place to protect the American people and viewed Snowden as a traitor. They believed he was working against the U.S., and his reveal of classified documents was for personal gain. Nathan in particular believes Snowden knew exactly what he was doing, and knew precisely that what he was doing was immoral. Nathan explains his sentiment that Snowden is a criminal and should go to jail if captured,

I think he's a traitor that needs to be captured and put into jail. I think what he's done is significant harm to the U.S. I think that he's trying to justify his actions by putting a big ribbon on it. He understood what he was going into. Every single time you have a high security clearance...you understand what you are reading. You understand what you are responsible for. You understand that there are certain procedures on how to handle that information. And if there is something or a way that you don't agree [with], there's also ways for you to report that and handle that. So, as a matter of fact, what he's done is quite egregious in that. I don't think there's any room for celebration for what he's done...and if he ever steps foot on U.S. soil, I hope he gets in prison for a long time.

Several respondents agreed with Nathan's stance that there were other ways Snowden could have brought his concerns forward rather than revealing them online,

working through the proper channels to bring to light any misdeeds of practices. The respondents felt strongly that it was important to go through the proper channels to report any perceived offenses instead of exposing government or intelligence secrets online, potentially placing public safety in harm's way, even if Snowden believed he was doing what was best for the people of the country.

Expressing national sentiment is acculturated to “look” a particular way – flying the American flag, working hard, reciting the Pledge of Allegiance. These expressions of nationalism are acculturated into everyday lives such that they are difficult to unravel from the national rhetoric so ingrained in every aspect of citizens’ lives. These expressions do not always represent as overt national rhetoric, thus, they are difficult to discern as such. Yet, when national sentiment takes on a different form – one that does not at all “look” like what we expect to see, it is easy to question that expression as anti: anti-country, anti-national, or traitor. The threat of different forms of national expression comes from a fear of the unfamiliar. If I understand how nationalism is “supposed to” look, and something different challenges that knowledge, it may feel threatening to my own national beliefs and how they are expressed. Because I know what it means to be a good U.S. citizen – this is taught in almost all realms of the socialization process – but do not understand those who express it differently to be “good citizens”. This is true despite a deeply-held value of the U.S. is acceptance for all views – it is true in theory, but so often, much controversy comes from expressing opposing views. When someone like Snowden comes into the conversation, it is certain to cause controversy. Yes, Snowden signed paperwork stating he understood the information he would be working with was strictly confidential and top-secret. Given that instance, Snowden did indeed break his

contract and the law when he released that information. Yet sometimes our own beliefs – or our own interpretation of national beliefs – take precedence over contracts or the law. This too is why the law even is subject to interpretation – why we have the court system we do, as the very adage of “against the law” is subject to interpretation.

6.4 LOYALTY IN INDIVIDUALS: ANTI-WAR PROTESTERS

As in the Edward Snowden case, some respondents’ viewed anti-war activists as traitors, understood it is the activists’ right to protest, even if they did not agree with the sentiment. Still others said they agreed with the activists and, after being deployed and experiencing combat first-hand, were anti-war themselves. Activists show their loyalty to the country and to the soldiers by framing their national sentiment as caring very deeply about the country and soldiers’ lives, thus why they are against sending young men and women into combat zones.

The soldiers who favored the anti-war protesters agreed with the protesters’ anti-war stance and believed the protesters were acting in a way that was patriotic. Michael genuinely felt a connection with the protesters. He says,

When it comes to anti-war protesters, I feel a sense of camaraderie. You know, they’re my people. You know, we’re trying to get the same message across.

Michael, who was in the military for eight years and achieved the rank of Petty Officer 2nd Class (E-5, navy), says he feels a sense of camaraderie with the anti-war protesters because they question and confront government policies. As a member of Iraq Veterans Against the War, Michael feels that when government officials gain too much power, they continue to seek more power, taking it away from the very citizens they are supposed to represent, even using it to suppress the public. For Michael anti-war protesters are those trying to work against this system of suppression and power.

Another respondent, Steven, is also a member of an anti-war organization, Veterans for Peace. Steven draws on his personal experiences in combat to work toward helping veterans when they return home from combat and keep the United States out of future wars. While Steven is anti-war, he also believes that some government information is confidential to safeguard strategies and plans. For Steven, citizens are not always privy to government information; a government cannot run effectively if there is complete transparency. Yet Steven also recognizes the non-sustainability of war,

I don't believe that war is sustainable. I don't believe that we should be trying to get into wars, and so I probably would support the position in some cases, and in a lot of cases, for anti-war initiatives.

Steven and Michael are both vocally anti-war, shown by their membership in respective anti-war organizations. While neither specifically stated that their own combat experiences led them to their anti-war views, neither believes that war is sustainable. Not all respondents felt they could be as openly against the war as Michael and Steven were.

These respondents identified as anti-war, but found it difficult to be outspoken because of the implications it may have on their, or a loved one's, military careers. Sarah, for example, says,

I would be totally vocal against this war. I bite my tongue more or less now only because anything I say or do can be traced back to my husband and he's done far too much and accomplished so much in the past 10 years, that I don't want to put that into jeopardy for him. I speak my mind, but I play the game of being tactful.

Sarah became anti-war after seeing the corruption of war, the desensitization of people dying, and concluding that soldiers were no longer needed in the combat zone. She also maintained that anti-war activists were patriotic because they are doing and expressing what they believe is a better option than war. Despite her anti-war beliefs, however, Sarah is cautious not to interfere with her husband's military career. In this remark, Sarah is showing her loyalty to her husband and his career over her anti-war sentiment. However, her comment elicits the contradictions of between freedom of speech and one's position within the organization. Organizations of all types are becoming more strict about employees who make disparaging comments on social media sites and while we may not think too much of the random news story, we do hold the government to a higher standard. Government (that is, the elected politician and other political leaders) exists for the citizens: to create and implement laws and rights that maintain a sense of meaning and order in the everyday. The government is under especially close scrutiny because the rules they create impact the entire country. Thus,

Sarah exhibited a critical disposition by maintaining her anti-war sentiment verbally, but respecting her husband's military career by not engaging in action.

Not all respondents shared the same view that anti-war protesters were patriotic. Some reported feeling upset in seeing them on TV or in person. James feels that while some anti-war protesters can be patriotic, many are anti-authority, do not have jobs by choice, and have gauged ears and tattoos. He says,

Some of them I think are, some of them I think are just anarchists and don't give a shit and just want to stick it to the man, whoever that is. And [they] don't realize it's because they didn't graduate from high school and don't want to work and have gauged ears and tattoos. If they're not employed, it's not because of some big evil government or corporation.

Rachel shares the same sentiment as James, suggesting that anti-war protesters are protesting war instead of working at their 9-5 jobs. She says,

I don't have a problem with people who don't like war. I mean, I don't like war. War is ugly. It's a horrible thing...but I feel like if you are protesting, that's fine...but there are as many people who could be out there in support of war as there are out there protesting, and instead we're all doing our job because we work 9-5, and we don't, we aren't independently wealthy.

Brian got very upset when asked if hearing or seeing anti-war protesters evoked any particular feelings within him. He says,

It does, it does, piss me off...half those people don't have the um, I want to say kahunas, the balls, to join the military. You can say whatever you want from the outside looking in, but until you actually go over to Afghanistan or Iraq, or go where ever there's a war, and you actually serve, then, you know.

Sharing Brian's view, other respondents noted that anti-war protesters either were not looking at the big picture or did not know the whole story about why we were at war, and thus maintained a very one-sided view of their protest. Derek points out that anti-war protesters "don't understand the way, in my opinion, the world works in that war is always gonna be going on and it's, it always has been, always will be." These four respondents (James, Rachel, Brian, and Derek) share a pride in the work they do and in their military service. Each respondent, in their own way, put space between themselves and the anti-war protesters, creating a narrative of "us" versus "them" that we saw earlier in this chapter. By creating this space between "military" and "anti-war protesters", the respondents are able to distinguish themselves and preserve their pride in their service. Although, many anti-war protesters would argue they are not, in fact, criticizing the soldiers specifically, but rather the organizational establishment of the government, including those that create and vote on policies to send troops into war.

To express national sentiment as an anti-war protester is to hold the government officials making decisions about war accountable. While there is a range of views within

the anti-war movement (i.e., those who believe war is wrong under any circumstances to those who oppose a particular war for specific reasons), they believe that anti-war is indeed an expression of national sentiment. It should be noted that national sentiment is not a singular concept that operates within a vacuum. The military combat soldier who returns from deployment as anti-war is a fitting example. While beliefs and values can change and shift, they can also overlap. That is, military enlistment is but one expression of national sentiment, as are anti-war protests. Expressions of national sentiment need not be mutually exclusive – one can both have joined the military and be anti-war. Thus, it is important to think of a range of expressions when considering national sentiment, and understanding that when individual agency plays into the discussion, it is more complex and layered than a binary representation.

We operate within the frames already set, but also are constantly pushing against the edges of those frames; pushing them to be more inclusive of a range of views and understandings. Anti-war activists are a perfect example of pushing the boundaries of nationalist frames; they may not represent the most popular national sentiment, but still care deeply for the country and what it stands for. It is through this constant pushing against boundaries for a more inclusive society which, over time, change the fabric of national sentiment. Being loyal means wanting what is best for the country and its people. How that is manifested, how we express it, is what is, at time, contentious.

6.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter explored the concept of loyalty as it pertains to structural factors of understanding national sentiment in soldiers. Findings were divided into three sections. The first, loyalty in military leadership, examined how poor leadership had a major impact on soldiers' morale, sentiments toward the military, and the detrimental impact it had on an entire military unit. Poor leadership was said to be more traumatic than the deployment itself, leaving the unit feeling vulnerable, angry, and afraid. Further, lack of transparency within military leadership can lead to a sense of disenchantment with one's military service.

The second section explored the difference in meaning between loyalty to country and that of government. Respondents noted a sharp distinction between the two: government does not convey the values and beliefs of its constituents and politicians are seen to be out for themselves. The government is considered to be out of touch with citizens, making loyalty to government difficult. Yet those who felt no loyalty to government stated they would not betray the government either. Respondents did feel a sense of duty to hold government officials accountable for their decisions and policies. For example, military personnel are bound to follow orders put forth by military leadership, regardless if they agree with those orders or not. The justification for complying with orders is framed as "doing my job" and lacking agency to object to the orders. Loyalty to country, on the other hand, pertains to the citizenry and the founding principles of the country. Citizens are responsible for holding government officials accountable, or, if this is not possible, to vote them out of office. Dissent can sometimes

be the most patriotic action a citizen can do, leading to the last two sections of this chapter which outlined the Snowden case and anti-war protesters as examples of dissent as an expression of national sentiment.

Snowden and anti-war protesters were used as examples of agency of individual loyalty. Snowden proved controversial because of the top-secret nature of the documents he released, potentially implicating national classified information and intelligence. Respondents were split on whether Snowden's actions were patriotic or disloyal. Respondents were also split on whether civilians have a right to government transparency, or if some information is kept confidential to protect the populace. Anti-war protesters were less controversial, many respondents citing their right to free speech, even if they disagreed with the anti-war sentiment. Supporters of the anti-war protesters recognized their expressions of national sentiment and upholding their duty to hold government actions accountable, while detractors felt anti-war protesters were reacting without having all the information and without a clear understanding of the war on a larger scale.

7.0 CONCLUSION

This dissertation set out to show that combat experiences help explain a soldier's critical, nationalistic, or mixed attitude toward the U.S. I explored which structural factors maintained a positive or negative impact on the individual attitude toward country and government, and how large-scale messages surrounding national unity, sacrifice, and patriotism are interpreted and incorporated into the everyday lives of military and ex-military personnel.

These questions are conceptualized by focusing on three key areas of soldiers' combat experiences: 1) Recruitment: Soldiers who enlisted because of 9/11 will view their combat experiences with a more nationalistic view than those who enlisted prior to 9/11. Findings showed that 9/11 was not as important of a factor as initially thought, but rather that soldiers are committed to service in general; 2) Combat: Soldiers who served in a combat zone will rationalize significant experiences in a more nationalistic view than those who report no experience of significant or difficult events. Findings suggest that soldiers did not overtly make a connection with their significant experiences using national rhetoric, but they do maintain ideals rooted in the values and beliefs of the country; 3) Reintegration: Soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more

nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources. Findings suggest that social networks made for both an ease of transition to civilian life, but also complicated it in terms of strained family dynamics.

Chapter 1, Introduction, outlined the main questions addressed in this study. I discussed the theoretical framework used to engage and analyze the study's data, as well as the methodological approach.

Chapter 2, Literature Review, outlined the various understandings of nationalism in the literature along with critiques and theories of nationalism, how scholars understand the differences between nationalism and patriotism, how nationalism and patriotism pertain specifically to the United States, and how these terms are applied in the dissertation. Next, the literature on ideology and hegemony was explored, along with how these concepts relate to nationalism and war. The differences between state-framed and counter-state understandings of nationalism and war was explained, and gaps in the literature that call for in-depth exploration on how military experiences re-shape discourses of nationalism and war were identified.

Chapter 3, Methods, discussed the research design and questions of this study, as well as identified the primary research goal, outlined key concepts, and explained the data collection, population studied, and methodology of analysis. This study used a mixed methods approach to collect and analyze two data sets: 1) a quantitative survey on nationalistic attitudes of soldiers, and 2) in-depth, semi-structured interviews with U.S. soldiers who served in combat zones of the Iraq or Afghanistan Wars. The methodological approach of the survey was simple statistical frequencies and descriptives, the purpose of which was to illustrate background information of survey

respondents (not statistical strength). The in-depth interviews were analyzed using thematic narrative analysis, which refers to texts in a “storied form”, placing emphasis on *what* is said rather than *how* it is said.

Chapter 4 presented a statistical analysis of survey data, including an overview of the five branches of the military, each branch’s rankings, and demographic and population statistics. This precursory information adds context to understanding the survey and interview population of this study. Statistical descriptives of survey respondents were analyzed, identifying relevant demographic background information of respondents. Last in Chapter 4, I analyzed a multiple regression of nationalism and background demographic information.

Chapter 5 offered an in-depth examination of the key findings of this study as they pertained to each of three hypotheses: 1) recruitment, 2) combat, and 3) reintegration. The first section, Recruitment, examined soldiers’ commitment to service, how soldiers’ socioeconomic status played a role in enlisting in the military, and the importance of soldiers’ acculturating and learning how to “be” military. The next section, Combat, suggested that soldiers who served in the combat zone would rationalize significant experiences in a more nationalistic view than those who report no experience of significant or difficult events. To investigate this hypothesis, data was drawn from respondents’ experiences during deployment and in combat. This examination encompassed dangers of war, leadership in war, corruption in war and in the military, life and death during war, and soldiers’ overall impressions of deployment. Next, Reintegration anticipated soldiers who return home to widely accessible resources and support networks will have a more favorable view of their military experience and a more

nationalistic narrative than soldiers who return home to limited or difficult to navigate resources. In considering this hypothesis, the reintegration process of interview respondents post-deployment was examined. This included soldiers' re-acclimation to civilian life, re-establishing a civilian persona, struggles with post-deployment employment, and grappling with moral injury.

Chapter 6, Loyalty, examined the findings on loyalty. While no hypothesis was formulated in regards to loyalty prior to conducting the research, preliminary ideas suggested there was a place for loyalty – to country, to government, to one's military unit, or to all three – in soldiers' narratives connecting their combat experiences and national sentiment. The findings on loyalty were divided into four main sections. The first, Loyalty in Military Leadership, explored the structures of the military organization and distinguishes between formal and informal leadership. Second, Loyalty to Country versus Government, looked at the difference in meaning of loyalty to country and that of government, and if a country being at war matters in terms of loyalty. Third, Loyalty in Individuals: The Edward Snowden Case examined the actions that show one's loyalty or disloyalty to the U.S., and used Edward Snowden as an exemplar. Last, Loyalty in Individuals: Anti-War Protesters, took a similar approach to the Edward Snowden Case, but used anti-war protesters as its case.

Military combat experiences did play an important role for combat soldiers. Soldiers who experienced poor or corrupt leadership while in the combat zone had a much more negative overall experience – they mistrusted military leaders and felt as though their time in combat was not for the greater good. In a cost-benefit analysis of military service in a combat zone, these soldiers made a great sacrifice with little reward,

thus, were left feeling disenchanting with their experiences. Further complicating the matter was whether a soldier had a support network in place once they returned home from deployment, and whether they had concrete plans to help aid the reintegration process (i.e., a civilian job lined up, school). Those who did not have a support network or solid plans were more wayward, feeling more greatly the impacts of reverse culture shock and re-adaptation into civilian life. Future work should further expand on these key insights in military by asking about the connection between soldiers' experiences and poor military leadership, as well as soldiers' support network upon reintegrating into civilian life.

Future work should also focus on the antecedent of one's predisposition for service within their community coupled with their propensity for military service. While it is not surprising that those who are engaged and feel a connection to their community would be more likely and willing to serve in the military, it was unexpected that 9/11 – a seemingly traumatic event that all respondents were alive for – did not have a great impact on soldiers' reasons to join the military. An expanded respondent pool may result in different findings, and further exploration would advance this topic.

In terms of views on nationalism at the individual level, respondents made very clear the distinction between country and government and where their loyalties lie. All respondents reported feeling loyal to the country – that is, the citizens of the U.S. and the beliefs, values, and ideals the country was founded on. Many, though not all, respondents noted their distaste for the government – seeing it as external to what the country stands for, and made up of corrupt leaders and politicians. This makes sense when we acknowledge the passivity of the country and its population: that is, most of the country's

population is not in the dominant group that makes decisions on military and war strategy. Thus, loyalty to the population is much easier to impart, while loyalty toward the decision makers (i.e., government) is more tenuous. Loyalty proved to be an important concept at every level – including loyalty and trust between and within the military unit. When this loyalty was perceived as absent, morale quickly fell. Future work can expand on the concept of loyalty specifically, at each level (societal, group, individual), and in terms of military life and nationalistic attitudes toward the U.S. These additional studies will expand on the findings presented here, and continue the dialogue of incorporating individual agency within scholarly discussions on nationalism.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY GUIDE

Thank you for your interest in filling out this survey! I am seeking retired military service men and women who served between 1995-2005. Your thoughts and opinions are very important to me. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability, and please know there are no right or wrong answers; I am interested in your story and views.

The first two questions require an answer for screening purposes. After that, you may skip any question you'd like, but it helps the results if you answer as many questions as possible. Most questions allow one response only, unless you see "select all that apply". This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Page 1: Military Background

1. *How did you learn about this survey? Select all that apply.
 - a. A friend forwarded it to me

b. Craigslist - please list city:

c. Twitter

d. Facebook

e. Veteran's organization – please list organization:

f. Other:

2. *During what years were you on active military service?

3. Please identify what branch of the United States military you served in:

4. How old were you when you joined the military?

5. What month and year did you join the military?

6. What month and year did you complete your military service?

7. What was the highest rank you achieved in the military?

Page 2: Military Background

1. How many times were you deployed to a conflict zone outside of the U.S.?

2. If you were deployed to a conflict zone outside of the United States, where and when were you deployed? Please enter each deployment on a separate line.

Where: _____ When: _____

Where: _____ When: _____

Where: _____ When: _____

Where: _____ When: _____

Where: _____ When: _____

3. What were the names of the conflicts in which you served?

4. Which of the following types of situations did you experience during your service? Select all that apply.

- a. Trained other soldiers in specific skills.
- b. Used a computer to track the enemy.
- c. Participated in humanitarian aid mission(s), either in the U.S. or abroad.
- d. Piloted an aircraft (airplane, helicopter, drone, etc.), either directly or remotely.
- e. Drove, commanded, or were transported in an armored vehicle through an area that was off-limits or that you were not authorized to enter.
- f. Witnessed an explosion in training that was close by.
- g. Witnessed an explosion in training that was distant.
- h. Witnessed an explosion in combat that was close by.
- i. Witnessed an explosion in combat that was distant.
- j. Disarmed an explosive device in training.
- k. Disarmed an explosive device in combat.
- l. Engaged in direct weapons combat with the enemy.

Page 3: Social Activities

1. Please mark whether or not you were involved in the following social activities before your military service:
- a. Church group: Yes/No
 - b. Political party (or parties): Yes/No

- c. Political interest group(s): Yes/No
- d. Social or sports club(s): Yes/No
- e. Service organization(s): Yes/No
- f. Parent/teacher organization(s): Yes/No
- g. Other groups you were involved in *before* service:

2. Please mark whether or not you were involved in the following social activities *after* your military service:

- a. Church group: Yes/No
- b. Political party (or parties): Yes/No
- c. Political interest group(s): Yes/No
- d. Social or sports club(s): Yes/No
- e. Service organization(s): Yes/No
- f. Parent/teacher organization(s): Yes/No
- g. Other groups you were involved in *after* service:

3. Have you ever been elected to office in a club, community organization, or political position?

- a. Yes
- b. No

4. If you have ever been elected to office, please list the position you were elected for and the timeframe you served in the elected position:

5. Have you ever participated in social movement activities, such as a rally or demonstration?

- a. Yes
- b. No

6. If you have ever participated in social movement activities, such as a rally or demonstration what was it for?

Page 4: Personal Information

1. What year were you born?

2. What is your current marital status?

- a. Single
- b. Partnered
- c. Married
- d. Separated
- e. Divorced
- f. Widowed
- g. Other – please explain:

3. What is your race?

4. What state do you currently live in?

5. What size of town or city do you currently live in?

- a. Rural
- b. Suburban
- c. Small city
- d. Mid-sized city
- e. Large city

6. What is your current household income level?

- a. Under \$10,000
- b. \$10,000 to \$34,999
- c. \$35,000 to \$59,999
- d. \$60,000 to \$84,999
- e. \$85,000 to \$109,999
- f. \$110,000 to \$139,999
- g. \$140,000 or more

Page 5: Personal Information

1. What is your highest level of education completed?
 - a) Less than high school
 - b) High school diploma or GED
 - c) Some college, no degree
 - d) Associate's degree (or other technical certification)
 - e) Bachelor's degree
 - f) Some graduate school, no degree
 - g) Master's degree
 - h) Some post-graduate school (doctoral or professional level, no degree)
 - i) Post-graduate degree (doctoral or professional level)
 - j) Don't know/don't remember
 - k) Prefer not to answer

Page 6: Personal Information

1. What is your current religious affiliation?
 - a. Catholic
 - b. Protestant

- c. Other Christian
 - d. Jewish
 - e. Muslim
 - f. Other:
-

2. Please answer the following question using the scale below, where “5” is “regularly” and “1” is “never”. How often do you attend religious services?

5 4 3 2 1

3. What is your current political affiliation?

- a. Republican
 - b. Democratic
 - c. Independent
 - d. Other:
-

4. Please choose answer the following question using the scale below, where “5” is “regularly” and “1” is “never”. How often do you vote in local or national elections?

5 4 3 2 1

Page 7: Views on the U.S. and Its People

Please choose how much you agree or disagree with the following statements, where “5” is “strongly agree” and “1” is “strongly disagree”. Please remember there are no right or wrong answers.

	Strongly Agree 5	Somewhat Agree 4	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Somewhat Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1
--	------------------------	------------------------	--	---------------------------	---------------------------

The fact that I am an American is an important part of my identity.					
Although at times I may not agree with the government, my commitment to the U.S. always remains strong.					
We should have complete freedom of speech, even for those who criticize the country.					
It is O.K. to criticize the government.					
A person who believes in socialism could still be a good American.					
A person who does not believe in God could still be a good American.					
A person who prefers jail to serving in the U.S. army could still be a good American.					
People who do not want to fight for America should live somewhere else.					

Page 8: Issues of Importance

1. Please rank the following issues in order of most to least importance to you, where “1” is the most important and “5” is the least important.
 - a. To serve America through military service.
 - b. To attend church regularly.

- c. To actively participate in local and national elections.
 - d. To attend or participate in rallies or demonstrations for causes I believe in.
 - e. To actively participate in community activities.
2. Please rank the following issues in order of most to least importance in your life, where “1” is the most important and “5” is the least important.
- a. Patriotism
 - b. Nationalism
 - c. Education
 - d. Religion
 - e. Politics

*Those are all my questions – thank you very much for participating in this survey!
Your views are important and valuable to my research.*

I am also conducting interviews with a select number of participants. Interviews will be completed over the telephone and recorded. I expect interviews to take between 60-90 minutes, and your responses will be kept completely confidential.

If you are interested in being contacted for an interview, please fill in the following information:

First name only: _____

To see if you qualify and to set up an interview, do you prefer I contact you:

- a. By telephone
- b. By email

Phone number/email at which you can be reached: _____

What time zone are you in?

- a. Eastern
- b. Central
- c. Mountain

d. Western

e. Other: _____

Please list the best days and times to contact you via telephone (if that is your preference): _____

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Thank you for agreeing to talk to me today. I really appreciate your time and willingness to share your insights and your story.

As a reminder, there are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your stories, thoughts, and experiences.

You do not have to answer any question you do not feel comfortable answering, and you may stop the interview at any time.

I am about to turn on the recorder. I am only recording this interview so I can remember everything you share with me today. Any information gathered in connection with this study that can be linked to you or identify you will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used in any written report. Audio files of the recorded interview will be kept on a password-protected computer, as will the transcribed word documents. The computer will be kept in a secure location at all times.

Do you have any questions before we begin? [*Answer any of the participant's questions*]

Okay, let's begin. I am now turning on the recorder.

[*Turn on the recorder*]

Recruitment

First, I'd like to begin by asking you some questions about how you became interested in joining the military.

1. When did you first decide that joining the military might be of interest to you?

[*PROBES*]:

Did you join before 9/11 or after?

[If after] Did 9/11 have anything to do with your decision? If so, what?

2. How did you come to the decision to join the military?

[*PROBES*]:

Do you or did you have family members who are in the military?

Were there recruiters at your high school that talked to you?

Did you see a movie, show, or ad on tv that interested you?

3. Can you share your experiences of joining the military with me?

[*PROBES*]:

What year/month was it?

How did you feel when you made the decision to enlist?

Can you walk me through what happened the day you signed the paperwork? What were you feeling/thinking that day? What was required of you?

4. How did the people in your life react upon learning of your decision to join the military?

Basic Training and Deployment

Now, I'd like to ask you some questions about being deployed.

5. Can you walk me through your experiences in basic training?
6. How long was basic training?
7. Where were you stationed during basic training?
8. What was the hardest part of basic training?
9. Were you able to connect (form friendships) with the people you went through basic training with?
10. Were you deployed to a conflict zone outside of the United States during your time in the military?

[If no, skip to Activities and Social Networks section]

11. Where and when were you deployed?
12. How did you feel when you found out you were going to be deployed?
13. What were your family and friends' reactions to the news of your deployment?
14. How do you think being deployed changed you, as a person?
[PROBES]:
How would you describe yourself before being deployed? After?
What do you think is the reason behind this change?
15. What deployment experience or event would you describe as the most significant for you?
16. What made this experience or event significant for you?
[PROBES]:
How did this experience change you, if at all?

Return to the U.S.

Now I'd like to talk briefly about your experiences returning to the U.S.

16. When you returned from your deployment, did you face any type of re-adapting issues? If so, can you share those experiences with me?

17. Can you share any positive encounters you had with people upon your return to the U.S.?

[PROBES]:

Did your hometown have a parade or any type of event honoring returning soldiers?

Did anyone meet you at the airport to welcome you home?

Did anyone (people you don't know) say anything to you when they saw you in your military uniform (i.e., traveling through the airport)?

18. Can you share any negative encounters you had with people upon your return to the U.S.?

[PROBES]:

Did anyone (people you don't know) say anything to you when they saw you in your military uniform (i.e., traveling through the airport)?

Activities and Social Networks

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about your social networks and the activities you are involved in.

1. Do you live with anyone? If so, with whom?
2. Who do you spend your time with?
3. What social activities are you involved with?

[PROBES]:

Church group, political interest group, social or sports club, service organization, parent/teacher organization

4. Have you ever participated in social movement activities, such as a rally or demonstration? If so, what was it for?
5. How often do you spend time with other people who served in the military?

[PROBES]:

Where do you connect with other people who served? Coffee shops, the VFW, organizations?

What sorts of things do you do together? Talk and share stories or experiences? Sports (watching or playing)?

6. Are you still in contact with anyone you went through basic training with?
7. Are you still in contact with anyone you were deployed with?
8. If you are still in contact with people you went to basic training or were deployed with, how often do you talk to or see them?
9. If you are not still in contact with people you went to basic training or were deployed with, why not?
10. When you meet someone new, do you mention your military service?
11. Are you currently working?
12. If you are currently working, what do you do?
13. If you are not currently working, are you looking for work?

14. If you are not currently working, how long have you been out of work?

Current Events

Now I'd like to ask you some questions regarding recent events you may have heard about in the news.

1. What do you think about Edward Snowden, the guy who disclosed classified information of top-secret U.S. programs to the press to expose government surveillance of civilians?
2. What do you think about Wikileaks, the website that publishes secret information from anonymous sources to make sure the public is informed of what the government and military are doing?
3. What do you think of whistleblowers in general?
4. Do you think Snowden was being patriotic?
5. What do you think is the difference between one's loyalty to his or her country and their loyalty to their government?
[PROBES]:
Can you have one without the other?
Is the lack of one type of loyalty more or less impactful than the other, or are they about the same?
6. Do you think one is obligated to be loyal to our country in times of war? Why or why not?
7. Does it matter what the war is about or for?
8. Do you think there is more than one way to serve one's country? If so, in what ways?

9. What does “loyalty” mean to you in terms of being “loyal” to one’s country?

10. In your opinion, how can you tell if someone is “loyal” to their government?

[PROBES]:

Is it if they say or do certain things? Like what?

11. In your opinion, how can you tell if someone is “loyal” to their country?

[PROBES]:

Is it if they say or do certain things? Like what?

Politics

Now we’ll move into the last section of the interview. I’d like to take a moment and check in with you here – are you doing ok? We are almost done, just a few more questions. I really appreciate everything you’ve shared with me this far.

1. What political party do you belong to?

2. When was the last time you voted?

3. Are you involved in politics in any other ways besides voting?

[PROBES]:

Do you belong to any political organizations? If so, which ones?

What sorts of activities do these organizations do?

Do you or have you ever gone door-to-door for a particular candidate or cause? If so, what candidate or cause?

*Have you ever attended a political rally or demonstration? If so,
what was it for?*

4. What do you think about presidential politics?

[PROBES]:

What do you think about the current president?

What do you think about past presidents?

Do you think the presidential office is doing its job?

5. What do you think when you see or hear about anti-war protestors?

[PROBES]:

Does it evoke any particular feelings in you when you see anti-war protestors or an anti-war rally or demonstration? If so, can you share those feelings with me?

6. Do you think anti-war protestors can be patriotic? Why or why not?
7. Do you think anti-war protestors can be loyal to their country? Why or why not?
8. Do you think anti-war protesters can be loyal to their government? Why or why not?

Those are all the questions I have for you. Do you have anything else you'd like to add or share that maybe I didn't ask you about?

Thank you so much for participating in this interview. Your stories and experiences are really helpful to this study. If you have any questions after we hang up, please do not hesitate to contact me. Do you have my email or phone number? I can give it to you if you don't have it.

APPENDIX C

FACEBOOK RECRUITMENT

Initial Post (January 1, 2014):

Friends – I am seeking military veterans who began their service between 1995-2005 to participate in an online survey about their experiences. This is part of my dissertation research in Sociology at the University of Pittsburgh. Survey should take about 15 minutes to complete. Simply follow the link here:

https://qtrial.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5pUr3T7ljKVfrh3. Feel free to share with anyone you may know who qualifies. Thank you so much for your help!

Follow-up Post (January 5, 2014):

I am overwhelmed and humbled by the amazing response to my dissertation survey in such a brief amount of time! You are all amazing! There's still time to fill out the survey or share it with others you may know - survey is still open!

Seeking military service women and men who started service between 1995-2005 to participate in an online survey about their experiences. This is part of my dissertation research in Sociology through the University of Pittsburgh. Survey should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Simply follow the link here:

https://qtrial.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5pUr3T7ljKVfrh3.

Follow-up Post (July 13, 2014):

Friends – Once again I am seeking military veterans who served 1995-2005 to participate in an online survey about their experiences. This is part of my dissertation research in Sociology at the University of Pittsburgh. Survey should take about 15 minutes to complete (this is the same survey I sent out in early January, so if you've already taken it, thank you!). Simply follow the link below. Feel free to share with anyone you may know who served between 1995-2005. Thank you so much for your help!

APPENDIX D

CRAIGSLIST RECRUITMENT

Subject: Military Veterans (1995-2005) Dissertation Study

I am seeking military veterans who served 1995-2005 to participate in an online survey about their experiences. This is part of my dissertation research in Sociology at the University of Pittsburgh. Survey should take 10-15 minutes to complete. Simply follow the link here: https://qtrial2013.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5pUr3T7ljKVfrh3. Feel free to share with anyone you may know who served between 1995-2005. Thank you so much for your help!

Posted in: Community/General Community

Ads stay posted for 45 days, then are automatically deactivated

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW INITIAL CONTACT

Subject: Military Dissertation Study

Hello!

Thank you very much for recently filling out an online survey for military veterans who started their service between 1995-2005, and for agreeing to speak further with me about your experiences in the military.

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Carolyn Zook, Department of Sociology, University of Pittsburgh in Pittsburgh, PA. The study aims to understand how your military experiences and background shaped your national identity. The study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree and is under the supervision of Professor Rachel Kutz-Flamenbaum.

You were selected for this study because of your military experience. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to take part in answering a series of questions, ranging from your military history to your religious and political affiliations, to your opinions on current events. The interview will be conducted over the telephone, will last approximately 45-60 minutes and will be recorded via an online digital recorder. During your participation in this study, it is possible that you may feel some mild stress. However, this risk is minimal and you may discontinue the interview at any time.

You will not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this study, but your participation will increase knowledge about how a veteran's experiences in the military shape their views of nationalism.

Any information obtained in connection with this study that can be linked to you or identify you will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used in any written report. Audio files of the recorded interview will be kept on a password-protected computer, as

will the transcribed word documents. The computer will be kept in a secure location at all times.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time during the interview without penalty.

If at any point you have any questions about the study, you can leave a message for me at [\(503\) 388-6177](tel:5033886177) or zook717@gmail.com.

Please respond to this email and let me know if any of the following dates/times work for our 45-60 minute telephone interview. If none of the times work, please let me know and we can find a time that does.

Available interview dates and times (all times Pacific, time zones listed in parentheses):
Friday, Feb. 20

- 8:00 am Pacific (9:00 am Mountain/10:00 am Central/11:00 am Eastern)
- 9:30 am Pacific (10:30 am Mountain/11:30 am Central/12:30 pm Eastern)
- 11:00 am Pacific (12:00 pm Mountain/1:00 pm Central/2:00 pm Eastern)
- 12:30 pm Pacific (1:30 pm Mountain/2:30 pm Central/3:30 pm Eastern)
- 2:00 pm Pacific (3:00 pm Mountain/4:00 pm Central/5:00 pm Eastern)
- 3:30 pm Pacific (4:30 pm Mountain/5:30 pm Central/6:30 pm Eastern)

Saturday, Feb. 21

- 8:00 am Pacific (9:00 am Mountain/10:00 am Central/11:00 am Eastern)
- 9:30 am Pacific (10:30 am Mountain/11:30 am Central/12:30 pm Eastern)
- 11:00 am Pacific (12:00 pm Mountain/1:00 pm Central/2:00 pm Eastern)

Sunday, Feb. 22

- 8:00 am Pacific (9:00 am Mountain/10:00 am Central/11:00 am Eastern)
- 9:30 am Pacific (10:30 am Mountain/11:30 am Central/12:30 pm Eastern)
- 11:00 am Pacific (12:00 pm Mountain/1:00 pm Central/2:00 pm Eastern)
- 12:30 pm Pacific (1:30 pm Mountain/2:30 pm Central/3:30 pm Eastern)
- 2:00 pm Pacific (3:00 pm Mountain/4:00 pm Central/5:00 pm Eastern)
- 3:30 pm Pacific (4:30 pm Mountain/5:30 pm Central/6:30 pm Eastern)
- 5:00 pm Pacific (6:00 pm Mountain/7:00 pm Central/8:00 pm Eastern)

I look forward to hearing from you, and again want to thank you very much for your participation.

Best,

Carolyn Zook, PhD Candidate

Department of Sociology
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA
Phone: [\(503\) 388-6177](tel:(503)388-6177)
Email: Zook717@gmail.com

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW FOLLOW-UP

Subject: Military Veterans Dissertation Interview

Hi NAME,

I am writing to follow up on scheduling a phone interview with you about your experiences in the military. As a reminder, you took an online survey regarding military service women and men who started service between 1995-2005.

The survey and interviews are part of my dissertation research in Sociology through the University of Pittsburgh. The interview should take 45-60 minutes.

I am available any time this coming weekend – Saturday, 2/28, Sunday, 3/1, or Monday, 3/2.

Please let me know if you are still interested, and if any of these dates work for you.

Thank you very much and I look forward to hearing your story!

Best,

Carolyn Zook

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW CODEBOOK

Recruitment

3. When did you first decide that joining the military might be of interest to you?
 - a. Service
 - i. 9/11
 - ii. Give back
 - iii. Serve country
 - iv. If no one else did, who would?
 - b. Financial
 - c. School
 - i. Lost after high school
 - ii. ROTC
 - d. Macho
 - e. Structure/Order
 - f. Get out of abusive environment
 - g. Family history
 - h. Class
 - i. Hadn't thought it through
4. How did you come to the decision to join the military?
 - a. Service
 - i. 9/11
 - ii. Give back
 - iii. Serve country
 - iv. If no one else did, who would?
 - b. Financial
 - c. School
 - i. Lost after high school
 - ii. ROTC

- d. Macho
 - e. Structure/Order
 - f. Get out of abusive environment
 - g. Family history
 - h. Class
 - i. Hadn't thought it through
3. Can you share your experiences of joining the military with me?
- a. Parents hesitant
 - b. Presentation of recruiters
 - c. Joined on own terms
 - d. Had to lose weight to join
 - e. Scared to join
4. How did the people in your life react upon learning of your decision to join the military?
- a. Parents hesitant
 - b. Parents supportive
 - c. One parent supportive, the other not

Basic Training and Deployment

5. Can you walk me through your experiences in basic training?
- a. Disorientation
 - b. Physicality of basic training
 - c. Psychology of basic training
 - i. Brain washing
 - ii. Recruiters trained me to get through basic training
 - iii. Not that hard
 - d. Conditions of basic training living quarters
 - i. Sub-par
6. How long was basic training?
- a. 1 week
 - b. 8-10 weeks
 - c. 11-13 weeks
 - d. 14-16 weeks
 - e. 17-20 weeks
7. Where were you stationed during basic training?
- a. Ft. Benning
 - b. Ft. Maccallum
 - c. Ft. Jackson
 - d. Parris Island
 - e. Great Lakes

- f. Ft. Lennerwood
- g. Ft. Campbell
- h. Naval Training Center Orlando
- i. Ft. Devins
- j. Medina Annex

8. What was the hardest part of basic training?
 - a. Loss of freedoms
 - b. Mistake to join
 - c. Away from home

9. Were you able to connect (form friendships) with the people you went through basic training with?
 - a. Yes, while in basic training only
 - b. Yes, and still friends with some
 - c. No

10. Were you deployed to a conflict zone outside of the United States during your time in the military?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

[If no, skip to Activities and Social Networks section]

11. Where and when were you deployed?
 - a. Fill in the blank: _____

12. How did you feel when you found out you were going to be deployed?
 - a. Train to deploy
 - b. Want to deploy
 - c. Save money
 - d. International experience
 - e. Excited/enjoyed it
 - f. Bad attitude/immature
 - g. Motivation for war
 - h. Surprised to be deployed
 - i. Nervous/anxious
 - i. Did not know where going/how long
 - j. Deployed with people didn't know
 - k. Living conditions while deployed
 - l. Material conditions while deployed
 - m. Leadership
 - i. Poor leadership

13. What were your family and friends' reactions to the news of your deployment?
- a. Supportive
 - b. Indifferent
 - c. Not surprised/expected it
 - d. Not supportive/worried/scared
14. How do you think being deployed changed you, as a person?
- a. Physically
 - b. Maturity
 - c. Gained knowledge
 - d. Best/worst of times
 - e. How to respond in certain situations
 - f. Living conditions while deployed
 - g. Corruption
 - i. In war
 - ii. Who to trust
15. What deployment experience or event would you describe as the most significant for you?
- a. Saved lives
 - i. Job satisfaction
 - b. Staying alive in war
 - c. Death/injury in war
 - d. War as a waste of life
 - e. De-sensitized to killings
 - f. Dangers of war
 - i. Serving in infantry
 - ii. Mistakes made by others
 - g. Leadership
 - i. Missions for the sake of missions
 - ii. Poor leadership

Return to the U.S.

16. When you returned from your deployment, did you face any type of re-adapting issues? If so, can you share those experiences with me?
- a. Reintegration
 - i. Feelings
 1. Apathetic
 2. Impatience/hostility
 3. Overly alert
 4. Things not a big deal
 5. Re-adapting to little things
 - ii. Relationships

1. Life on pause
2. Harder for those with family/kids
3. Life disruption
4. Impact on family/relationships
- iii. Knowing what I wanted to do helped with process of reintegrating
- b. Self-reflection on being in the military
 - i. Bitter
 - ii. Motivated to get out of military
 - iii. Made me not like the military
 - iv. Optimistic and positive because of going through war
 - v. Shaped my personality
- c. Politics/Corruption
 - i. Military as corrupt/wasteful
 - ii. Aggravating
- d. Moral injury
 - i. Mental struggles post-deployment
 - ii. Lack of help for soldiers post-deployment
 - iii. Dwindling support for Iraq/Afghanistan
- e. Post-Deployment employment
 - i. Not entitled to good job because in military
 - ii. Jobs I could get were beneath me
 - iii. Trouble finding work
- f. Re-establishing self post-deployment
 - i. Slipped into shadows
 - ii. Blew off steam
 - iii. Too much freedom after military

17. Can you share any positive encounters you had with people upon your return to the U.S.?

- a. Fill in the blank: _____

18. Can you share any negative encounters you had with people upon your return to the U.S.?

- a. Fill in the blank: _____

Activities and Social Networks

19. Do you live with anyone? If so, with whom?

- a. Wife/husband/significant other
- b. Children
- c. Parents
- d. Roommate/friend

- e. Live alone

20. Who do you spend your time with?

- a. Family
- b. Parents
- c. Friends
- d. Co-workers
- e. Classmates
- f. Self

21. What social activities are you involved with?

- a. Community
- b. Peace/Anti-War Organization
- c. Veteran's Organization
- d. Marriage Equality
- e. University of Associated Students group
- f. Non-profit
- g. Political
- h. Community band
- i. Sports

22. Have you ever participated in social movement activities, such as a rally or demonstration? If so, what was it for?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. If yes, fill in the blank: _____

23. How often do you spend time with other people who served in the military?

- a. Almost every day (work, partner, etc)
- b. Every once in a while (approximately once a month or every other month)
- c. Infrequently (once a year or less)
- d. Never

24. Are you still in contact with anyone you went through basic training with?

- a. Yes, close contact
- b. Yes, Facebook contact
- c. No, not in contact

25. Are you still in contact with anyone you were deployed with?

- d. Yes, close contact
- e. Yes, Facebook contact
- f. No, not in contact

26. If you are still in contact with people you went to basic training or were deployed with, how often do you talk to or see them?
- Almost every day (work, partner, etc)
 - Every once in a while (approximately once a month or every other month)
 - Infrequently (once a year or less)
 - Never
27. When you meet someone new, do you mention your military service?
- Yes
 - Occasionally
 - If it comes up
 - No
28. Are you currently working?
- Yes
 - No
29. If you are currently working, what do you do?
- Fill in the blank: _____
30. If you are not currently working, are you looking for work?
- Yes
 - No
31. If you are not currently working, how long have you been out of work?
- Recently (with the past few months)
 - Moderate amount of time (approximately 3-5 months)
 - Extended amount of time (approximately 6 months or longer)

Current Events

32. What do you think about Edward Snowden, the guy who disclosed classified information of top-secret U.S. programs to the press to expose government surveillance of civilians?
- Against country
 - Opportunist/personal gain
 - Low regard for country
 - Trying to hurt/embarrass country

- iv. Criminal/not patriotic
- v. Government transparency/power
 - 1. Secrets are secret for a reason
- b. Agree with Snowden
 - i. Was patriotic
 - ii. Admire what he did, but risky
 - iii. Government transparency/power
 - 1. Those with power will abuse it
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - i. Don't know/won't say/won't judge
 - ii. Things exposed already on internet

33. What do you think about Wikileaks, the website that publishes secret information from anonymous sources to make sure the public is informed of what the government and military are doing?

- a. Against country
 - i. Opportunist/personal gain
 - ii. Low regard for country
 - iii. Trying to hurt/embarrass country
 - iv. Criminal/not patriotic
 - v. Government transparency/power
 - 1. Secrets are secret for a reason
- b. Agree with Wikileaks
 - i. Was patriotic
 - ii. Admire what he did, but risky
 - iii. Government transparency/power
 - 1. Those with power will abuse it
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - i. Don't know/won't say/won't judge
 - ii. Things exposed already on internet

34. What do you think of whistleblowers in general?

- a. Go through proper channels

35. Do you think Snowden was being patriotic?

- a. Against country
 - i. Opportunist/personal gain
 - ii. Low regard for country
 - iii. Trying to hurt/embarrass country
 - iv. Criminal/not patriotic
 - v. Government transparency/power
 - 1. Secrets are secret for a reason

- b. Agree with Snowden
 - i. Was patriotic
 - ii. Admire what he did, but risky
 - iii. Government transparency/power
 - 1. Those with power will abuse it
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - i. Don't know/won't say/won't judge
 - ii. Things exposed already on internet
36. What do you think is the difference between one's loyalty to his or her country and their loyalty to their government?
- a. Government = internal policies/organization; Country = external protections/country and its people
 - b. Government = politicians = low trust; Country = military = high trust
 - c. If loyal to one, cannot be loyal to the other
 - d. Loyalty for both can intermingle
 - e. Loyalty to each not the same thing
 - f. If betray one, betray the other
 - g. Freedom of speech
 - h. Loyal to the country, not government
37. Do you think one is obligated to be loyal to our country in times of war? Why or why not?
- a. Loyal to conscience
 - b. Loyal to U.S.
 - c. Go/vote elsewhere if unhappy
 - d. Freedom of speech/personal choice/do not always have to agree
 - e. Obligated to be loyal
 - i. Obligated only if in military (as long as not illegal)
 - f. Cannot actively work against country
 - g. Loyalty should not be turned on or off
 - h. Global citizens
38. Does it matter what the war is about or for?
- a. Loyal to conscience
 - b. Loyal to U.S.
 - c. Vote for someone else if unhappy
 - d. Freedom of speech/personal choice/do not always have to agree
 - e. Obligated to be loyal
 - i. Obligated only if in military (as long as not illegal)
 - f. Cannot actively work against country
 - g. Loyalty should not be turned on or off
 - h. Global citizens

39. What does “loyalty” mean to you in terms of being “loyal” to one’s country?
- a. Values/beliefs
 - i. Protecting American way of life/principles/foundations country was established on
 - ii. In military, sign up to be loyal
 - iii. Following orders
 - b. Dissent
 - i. Patriotism can be dissent
 - ii. Civil disobedience
 - c. Blind loyalty is problematic
40. In your opinion, how can you tell if someone is “loyal” to their government?
- a. Most in government trying to do what is right
 - b. Responsibility of citizens to hold government accountable
 - c. Loyal to political parties
 - i. Betrayal of government okay because politicians are untrustworthy
 - d. Following orders
 - i. Supporting every decision
 - e. Trust
 - i. Difficult to be loyal to government
 - ii. Not trusted much
41. In your opinion, how can you tell if someone is “loyal” to their country?
- a. Values/beliefs
 - i. Protecting American way of life/principles/foundations country was established on
 - ii. In military, sign up to be loyal
 - iii. Following orders
 - b. Dissent
 - i. Patriotism can be dissent
 - ii. Civil disobedience
 - c. Blind loyalty is problematic

Politics

42. What political party do you belong to?
- a. None
 - b. Democratic
 - c. Republican
 - d. Other: _____

43. When was the last time you voted?
- Recently/regularly
 - Been a while, but try (within the past couple years)
 - Extended time (more than 2 years ago)
 - Never vote
44. Are you involved in politics in any other ways besides voting?
- Yes, worked on campaigns
 - Yes, interned at congress office
 - Yes, in clubs in college
 - No, cannot because work for government/military
 - No, respect all opinion
 - No, doesn't matter where I live
 - No/Not interested/Don't have time
45. What do you think about presidential politics?
- Liked G. Bush but not GW Bush
 - Disappointed in how centrist Obama has become
 - Pleased with the current state of the presidency
 - Presidential office doing their job
 - Won't answer because not allowed to say any disparaging comments about the President
46. What do you think when you see or hear about anti-war protestors?
- Upsetting
 - Not brave enough to join military
 - We're working, not protesting
 - One-sided view
 - There will always be war
 - Camaraderie
 - Non-sustainability of war
 - Military personnel as anti-war
 - Scared to be outspoken against war because in military
 - Military member of peace organization
 - Freedom of speech
 - Corruption
 - In war
 - Who to trust
47. Do you think anti-war protestors can be patriotic? Why or why not?
- Protesters are patriotic/camaraderie
 - Patriotic only to an extent
 - Protesters don't understand the full story

d. Anti-government/country

48. Do you think anti-war protesters can be loyal to their country? Why or why not?

- a. To a certain extent (9)
- b. Yes, because they are anti-government (18)
- c. Anti-war doesn't mean anti-country/anti-government (19, 29)

49. Do you think anti-war protesters can be loyal to their government? Why or why not?

- a. To a certain extent (9)
- d. No, cannot be loyal to both country and government (18)
- e. Anti-war doesn't mean anti-country/anti-government (19, 29)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Active. 2006. "Active Duty Servicewomen by Branch of Service and Rank 2006 and 2010." Pearson Education, publishing as Infoplease.
- Alter, Peter. 1985. *Nationalism*. New York: Edward Arnold.
- Anderson, B. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Aronson, J. 1995. "A Pragmatic View of Thematic Analysis " *The Qualitative Report* 2(1):1-3.
- Asch, B., M. Kilburn, and J. Klerman. 1999. *Attracting College-Bound Youth into the Military: Toward the Development of New Recruiting Policy Options*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Babbie, E. 2005. *The Basics of Social Research* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Use of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(3):531-65.
- Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Brashears, M. 2005. "The Structure of Dissent: A Prolegomenon for Framework Theory." in *American Sociological Society*. Philadelphia, PA.
- Britt, T., T. Greene-Shortridge, and C. Castro. 2007. "The Stigma of Mental Health Programs in the Military." *Military Medicine* 172(2):157-61.

- Brubaker, R. 1998. "Myths and Misconceptions in the Study of Nationalism." in *The State of the Nation*, edited by John Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Calhoun, Craig. 1997. *Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Campbell, D.T. 1973. "Various Social Attitudes Scales." in *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*, edited by J. Robinson and D. Shaver. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Science Research.
- Casanova, J. 2011. "Cosmopolitanism, the Clash of Civilizations and Multiple Modernities." *Current Sociology* 59(2):252-67.
- Chambers, J.W. 1987. *To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America*. New York: Free Press.
- Comrey, A., and J. Newmeyer. 1965. "Measurement of Radicalism-Conservatism." *Journal of Social Psychology* 67:357-69.
- Connor, W. 1993. "Beyond Reason: The Nature of the Ethnonational Bond." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16(3):373-89.
- Corbin, J., and A. Strauss. 2008. *Basics of Qualitative Research* Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- DeBenedetti, C. 1980. *The Peace Reform in American History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Defense, Department of. 2013. "Demographics Profile of the Military Community".
- DeLamater, J., D. Katz, and H.C. Kelman. 1969. "On the Nature of National Involvement: A Preliminary Study." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 13:320-57.
- DiMaggio, P., and B. Bonikowski. 2008. "Varieties of Popular American Nationalism." Princeton University.

Duty, Active. 2006. "Active Duty Servicewomen by Branch of Service and Rank 2006 and 2010." Pearson Education, publishing as Infoplease.

Factory, Military. N.D. "Military Factory."

Falk, R. 2010. "Defining a Just War." in *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*, edited by D.P. Barah. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, L.W. 1942. "The Isolation and Measurement of Nationalism." *Journal of Social Psychology* 16:215-28.

Field, A. 2005. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Firmin, M. 2008. "Structured Interview." Pp. 838-39 in *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, edited by L. Given. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc. .

Floersch, J., J.L. Longhofer, D. Kranke, and L. Townsend. 2010. "Integrating Thematic, Grounded Theory, and Narrative Analysis: A Case Study of Adolescent Psychotropic Treatment." *Qualitative Social Work* 9(3):407-25.

Frisch, M. 1989. "American History and the Structures of Collective Memory: A Modest Exercise in Empirical Iconography." *The Journal of American History* 75(4):1130-55.

Galan, I., F. Rodriguez-Artalejo, and B. Zorrilla. 2004. "Telephone Versus Face-to-Face Household Interviews in the Assessment of Health Behaviors and Preventive Practices." *Gaceta Sanitaria* 18(6):440-50.

Gamson, W. 1991. "Commitment and Agency in Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 6(1):27-50.

—. 2004. "Bystanders, Public Opinion, and the Media." in *Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. Snow, S. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Gamson, W., D. Croteau, W. Hoynes, and T. Sasson. 1992. "Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality." *Annual Review of Sociology* 18:373-93.
- Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gillis, J.R. 1994. "Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship." in *The Politics of National Identity*, edited by J.R. Gillis. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, R. 2002. "Conceptualizing Leadership with Respect to Historical-Contextual Antecedents to Power." *Leadership Quarterly* 13:151-67.
- Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers.
- Griffith, Jr., R. 1982. *Men Wanted for the U.S. Army: America's Experience with an All-Volunteer Army Between the World Wars*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Grosby, Steve. 2005. *Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guba, E., and Y.S. Lincoln. 2008. "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences." in *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*, edited by N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Hall, Stuart. 1986. "The Problem of Ideology - Marxism without Guarantees." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10(28):28-44.
- Haller, W., and V. Roudometof. 2010. "The Cosmopolitan-Local Continuum in Cross-National Perspective." *Journal of Sociology* 46(3):277-97.
- Hannerz, U. 1990. "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture." Pp. 237-52 in *Global Culture*, edited by M. Featherstone. London, U.K.: Sage.

- Herda-Rapp, A. 1998. "The Power of Informal Leadership: Women Leaders in the Civil Rights Movement." *Sociological Focus* 31(4):341-55.
- Hinchman, L.P., and S.K. Hinchman. 1997. *Memory, Identity, Community: The Idea of Narrative in the Human Sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of NY Press.
- Hinojosa, R., and M. Hinojosa. 2011. "Using Military Friendships to Optimize Postdeployment Reintegration for Male Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom Veterans." *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development* 48(10):1145-58.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janowitz, M. 1976. "Military Institutions and Citizenship in Western Societies " *Armed Forces and Society* 2(2):185-204.
- . 1983. *The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kedourie, E. 1960. *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson.
- . 1994. "Nationalism and Self-Determination." Pp. 49-55 in *Nationalism*, edited by J. Hutchinson and A.D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klandermans, B. 1993. "A Theoretical Framework for Comparisons of Social Movement Participation." *Sociological Forum* 8(3):383-401.
- Kleykamp, M. 2006. "College, Jobs, or the Military? Enlistment During a Time of War." *Social Science Quarterly* 87(2):272-90.
- Kutz-Flamenbaum, R., and B. Duncan. 2015. "Contested Cosmopolitanisms: Global Meetings and Local Mobilizations." *Sociological Forum* 30(1):188-208.
- Lentz, T.F. 1976. *Humatriotism*. St. Louis, MO: The Futures Press.

- Leoussi, A. 2007. "Nationalism." in *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by G. Ritzer: Blackwell Publishing.
- Levinson, D.J. 1957. "Authoritarian Personality and Foreign Policy." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 1:37-47.
- Li, Q., and M. Brewer. 2004. "What Does It Mean to Be an American? Patriotism, Nationalism, and American Identity After 9/11." *Political Psychology* 25(5):727-39.
- Little, D. n.d. "False Consciousness." Dearborn: University of Michigan.
- Litz, B., and W. Schlenger. 2009. "PTSD in Service Members and New Veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan War: A Bibliography and Critique." *PTSD Research Quarterly* 20(1):1-8.
- Loh, W.D. 1975. "Nationalist Attitudes in Quebec and Belgium." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 19:217-49.
- Markoff, J. 1996. *Waves of Democracy: Social Movements and Political Change*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Marshall, C., and G. Rossman. 2006. *Designing Qualitative Research* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Marx, K. 1978. "The German Ideology: Part I." Pp. 146-200 in *The Marx-Engles Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- McAdam, D. 1989. "The Biographical Consequences of Activism." *American Sociological Review* 54(5):744-60.
- McAdam, D., and R. Paulsen. 1993. "Specifying the Relationship between Social Ties and Activism." *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3):640-67.
- McCleary, D., M. Nalls, and R. Williams. 2009. "Types of Patriotism as Primary Predictors of Continuing Support for the Iraq War." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 37(1):77-94.

- Melucci, A. 1989. *Nomads of the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Midanik, L.T., and T.K. Greenfield. 2003. "Telephone Versus In-Person Interviews for Alcohol Use: Results of the 2000 National Alcohol Survey." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 72(3):209-14.
- N.A. 2013. "Center on Budget and Policy Priorities."
- Neal, A.G. 1998. *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Major Events in the American Century*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Oegema, D., and B. Klandermans. 1994. "Why Social Movement Sympathizers Don't Participate: Erosion and Nonconversion of Support." *American Sociological Review* 59(5):703-22.
- Oliner, P. 2004. *Saving the Forsaken*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Oliner, S., and P. Oliner. 1988. *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free Press.
- Pei, M. 2003. "The Paradoxes of American Nationalism." *Foreign Policy* 136(May-June):30-37.
- Perkins, H. W. 1993. "Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32(1):83-84.
- Pescosolido, A. 2001. "Informal Leaders in the Development of Group Efficacy." *Small Group Research* 32(1):74-93.
- Posen, B.R. 1993. "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power." *International Security* 18(2):80-124.
- Riessman, C.K. 2003. "Narrative Analysis." in *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*, edited by M.S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, and T.F. Liao. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Roudometof, V. 2005. "Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism, and Globalisation." *Current Sociology* 53(1):113-35.
- Sampson, D.L., and H.P. Smith. 1957. "A Scale to Measure World-Minded Attitudes." *Journal of Social Psychology* 45:99-106.
- Schildkraut, D. 2002. "The More Things Change...American Identity and Mass and Elite Responses to 9/11." *Political Psychology* 23(3):511-35.
- Sewell, G. 2009. "Emotional Intelligence and the Army Leadership Requirements Model." *Military Review* November-December:93-98.
- Sewell, W. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(1):1-29.
- Sharp, G. 1973. *The Politics of Non-Violent Action: Part I: Power and Struggle*. Boston: Sargent (Porter).
- Shaw, L., D. Batson, and R. M. Todd. 1994. "Empathy Avoidance: Forestalling Feeling for Another in Order to Escape the Motivational Consequences " *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67(5):879-87.
- Slovic, P. 2007. "If I Look at the Mass, I will Never Act: Psychi Numbing and Genocide." *Judgment and Decision Making* 2(2):79-95.
- Smircich, L., and G. Morgan. 1982. "Leadership: The Management of Meaning." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 18:257-73.
- Smith, J. 2011. "Personal Communication." edited by Author. Pittsburgh.
- Snow, D.A., Jr. E.B. Rochford, S.K. Worden, and R.D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micro-Mobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464-81.
- Snyder, Louis. 1976. *Varieties of Nationalism: A Comparative Study*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.

- Stagner, R. 1940. "A Correlational Analysis of Nationalistic Opinions." *Journal of Social Psychology* 12:197-212.
- Steuter, E., and D. Wills. 2010. "'The Vermin Have Struck Again': Dehumanizing the Enemy in Post 9/11 Media Representations." *Media, War, & Conflict* 3(2):152-67.
- Strauss, A. , and J. Corbin. 1994. "Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview." in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by A. Strauss and J. Corbin.
- Sweet, S. A., and K. Grace-Martin. 2003. *Data Analysis with SPSS: A First Course in Applied Statistics*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Swidler, A. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51(2):273-86.
- Taylor, Charles. 1999. "Nationalism and Modernity." Pp. 219-46 in *Theorizing Nationalism*, edited by R. Beiner. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Tilly, C. 1992. *Coercion, Capital, and European States AD 990-1992*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- . 1994. "States and Nationalism in Europe 1492-1992." *Theory and Society* 23(1):131-46.
- . 2004. *Social Movements, 1768-2004*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, LLC.
- Treasury, United States Department of the. n.d. "Financial Crimes Enforcement Network."
- Tuckman, B. 1965. "Developmental Sequence in Small Groups." *Psychological Bulletin* 63:384-99.
- van Evera, S. 1994. "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War." *International Security* 18(4):5-39.

- van Wijck, E.E., J.L. Bosch, and M.G. Hunink. 1998. "Time-Tradeoff Values and Standard-Gamble Utilities Assessed During Telephone Interviews Versus Face-to-Face Interviews." *Medical Decision Making* 18(4):400-05.
- Varese, F., and M. Yarish. 2005. "Resolute Heroes: The Rescue of Jews During the Nazi Occupation of Europe." *European Journal of Sociology* 46(1):153-68.
- Williams, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woehrle, L., P. Coy, and G. Maney. 2009. *Contesting Patriotism: Culture, Power, and Strategy in the Peace Movement*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Wolcott, H.F. 2009. *Writing Up Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wong, L., P. Bliese, and D. McGurk. 2003. "Military Leadership: A Context Specific Review." *The Leadership Quarterly* 14:657-92.
- Wuthnow, R. 1991. *Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Zickmund, Susan. 2013, October 8. "Personal Communication ". Portland, OR.