

ANNEX II: WORKING GROUP QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATION

4.1 Introduction

The Security Sector Reform Working Group of the PfP-Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes initiated a stocktaking study in the field of expert formation in the security sector. This was achieved by the distribution of a questionnaire to all members of the PfP-Consortium. The goals of this project are threefold.

First, it aims to provide a much needed overview of existing programmes of security expert formation. It will be one of the first studies, if not the first, to provide a global overview of courses offered in this field. In our understanding it is crucial for institutes organising courses to be accurately informed on the offer provided by other organisations or institutions. This is necessary in order to minimise duplications or omissions and in doing so to maximise the payoff of the courses or trainings. On the other hand, such an overview is also very useful for potential participants so as to be comprehensively informed of the offers in this field.

Secondly, after assessing the offers, this project aims to assess the demand and need in field security expert formation in Southeast Europe. We try to find out what is needed to guarantee effective democratic oversight of the security sector. This includes the consideration of which groups do not yet receive sufficient training in these matters, as well as the question of whether the courses offered address societies' needs.

The third aim of this project is to assess what has been omitted, after having assessed the offer and demand. This implies making concrete recommendations and proposals to what kind of training courses should be offered to which groups. We think that today this offers very timely

and much needed guidance to the further development of security expert formation, instead of proliferating programmes which are very similar and which do not really address the specific needs of societies to democratise the security sector or to keep the security sector democratic.

This chapter is structured according to the goals delineated above, i.e. first we discuss the various training courses on offer in the field of security expert formation, and then in the final section of this chapter we look at the demand side to assess what is missing.

4.2 Evaluation of the Questionnaires

We received roughly a hundred evaluations and descriptions of different training courses from participants as well as organisers. The largest proportion of those completing the questionnaires were either members of the armed forces (mostly staff officers or commanding officers), or persons working in government ministries or research institutes. The large majority of them had finished higher education and were in possession of a Masters or PhD. Their average age was between 30 and 40.

4.2.1 Offer of Educational and Training Courses

In the following we are going to describe what courses are available in Southeast Europe as well as those courses accessible to participants from European countries. In the annex to this chapter you can find a complete list of all the institutes and organisations mentioned in the questionnaires.

In today's globalised world it would hamper the accuracy of the findings if we included only the courses taking place in Southeast Europe, because the geographical location is becoming less and less important. A course or training offered in a region other than Southeast Europe can be as useful as one offered in this region for participants from Southeast Europe. This fact is even more evident, when taking into account the

increasing possibilities of distance learning, where the geographical location of students does not matter at all.

We break down the description of the offer into two main sections: first we describe the external or administrative aspects and in the second part we concentrate on the content and participants of the training courses.

(a) *External and Administrative Aspects*

Based on the evaluation of the questionnaires, it can be said that the offer of courses in civil-military relations, security sector reform, and democratic control of armed forces appears to be quite stable. This is because (i) the large majority of the courses mentioned in the questionnaires are offered very regularly, mostly on a yearly basis; and (ii) almost all courses have existed already for more than five years and there was no drastic increase in such courses in the last five years. Neither do the answers provided suggest that there will be a drastic increase in training courses in the near future.

Another very interesting observation concerns the language in which the training courses are taught. Many programmes are either taught only in English, or bilingually, i.e. in English and another language (often Russian). This clear predominance of the English language can be understood as an indicator for the importance of regional and international cooperation in security sector expert formation. Course providers are not mainly focusing on the national participants, but on the contrary they try to attract international participants.

Another trend that can be seen is that the large majority of courses are offered as part of an undergraduate or postgraduate programme, and approaching the topic forms an academic and theoretical perspective. Most of the audience in these courses are students still in school. Those courses are broadly unsuitable for experts working in the security field for different reasons: they are mostly part of a full-time educational programme that extends over several years and are not accessible to people outside of such programmes; they cannot really be followed by anybody who is working more than 50 per cent. Additionally, such

courses are normally stretched over a minimal timeframe of several months, which is too long a time to take off from a job. Only a very small proportion of all available courses, e.g. the courses of the Partnership for Peace, are intended and suitable in their format for experts and practitioners.

Almost all courses are taught as residential courses, meaning in a conventional setting of a teacher or professor lecturing on the topic in front of a smaller or larger group of students. Most of the described courses have had between 10 and 30 participants.

Very few courses use elements of new information technologies in their teaching. The institutes and academies generally seem to refrain from using new ways and possibilities of education and training, as tools such as the Internet, computers and even videos are rarely employed. Given this background, it does not come as a surprise that fully fledged distance learning courses are even rarer in this field. Only two institutions were mentioned in our study giving leeway in this direction, those were the George C. Marshall European Centre for Security Studies in Germany and the International Relations and Security Network in Switzerland.

A last point can be made regarding the external aspects of the courses. Normally, the costs are not paid by the participants themselves, but in most cases the institution they are working for or the governmental administration covers the costs for their participation. It is also quite common that the hosting institution covers at least a part of the costs.

(b) *Content and Participants*

In this section we are going to evaluate the parts of the questionnaire providing information related to the two questions; what subjects are taught in the courses and who are the students?

Most of the courses offered address the field of civil-military relations in a very broad way. No more than a third of the courses focused on more specific aspects, such as security sector reform and democratic control of

the security sector. Even more focused programmes, such as courses on the specific role of an actor or institution of the security sector or its role in respect to the security sector, are almost entirely lacking.

Almost three-quarters of the courses are largely attended by military staff, mostly officers. The participation of other groups of the society, such as civil servants, parliamentarians, politicians, non-governmental organisations, civil society, is very restricted. This is mostly due to the fact that more than half of the courses are exclusively for military personnel, excluding the participation of other interested persons. Few programmes are open to the participation of civil servants and members of the national ministries. Rarely are any courses on the subject of good governance of the security sector accessible for civil society actors, such as the general public and non-governmental organisations. However, we can conclude that the members of the armed forces have broadest access to courses on these subjects. This implies that they are often better informed and trained than their civilian counterparts and the civil society on principles, mechanisms and tools governing this field.

The question of how the participants of the courses are selected provides important information on the composition of the classes. In this context we can observe, first of all, that in almost half of the courses it was not the participants themselves who chose the training course. Often their participation is dependent on a superior's recommendation, a ministry's choice, educational background, military rank or professional experience. This shows that in most cases participation is based on criteria different from the interest and/or willingness of participants themselves.

Almost all persons answered that the courses have been beneficial for their careers. This indicates that knowledge on the issues related to civil-military relations seems to be an important factor when hiring new personnel.

4.2.2 Demands and Needs of South East European Countries in Security Expert Formation

(a) *What Training Courses are Needed?*

Training courses and trainings appropriate for experts should not be longer than a month, preferably only one week. Experts working in the armed forces or civil servants are generally not interested in following entire academic programmes, as they have already finished their education. They rather wish to update their knowledge on certain subjects besides their work, e.g. civil-military relations. As we have seen above in the part describing the offer, such courses are very rare, because most courses addressing civil-military issues are part of an academic programme, which are certainly much longer than a month. However, we can indicate a clear need for shorter courses and training specifically addressing the needs of experts.

As we have seen above, most courses have between 20 and 30 participants. Some persons filling our questionnaires estimated that this number is too high and that more courses would be needed with fewer participants in order to allow more extensive discussions and greater exchange of knowledge and experiences among the participants.

The traditional method of instruction, residential courses, is estimated as most appropriate by many persons completing the questionnaire. The interaction between teachers and students and maybe even more importantly among students is perceived as a crucial element of the learning process. Many of the persons completing the questionnaire felt that it is difficult to create an equally fruitful learning environment in a computer-based or web-based training, as in a residential course. Therefore, we can say that courses and trainings should at least partly be taught as a residential course.

On the other hand, a large percentage of those answering the questionnaire thought that residential courses could be much more effective, when combined and enriched with web- or computer-based training and learning elements. The different new multimedia methods

should be used much more, as they can be a very good tool to enhance and increase the sustainability of the learning process of participants.

(b) *What Should Be Taught?*

Regarding the content the most burning need is, according to the answers in our questionnaire, to have more specialised courses, focusing on certain actors or mechanisms of the security sector. These programmes should provide profound analysis and not only basic knowledge on civil-military relations. Not only the general theory should be taught, but also the latest changes and updates in civil-military relations should be presented and discussed. The following topics were suggested as topics for more specific courses: democratic control of armed forces, defence budgeting, requirements of defence policy, civil-military relations in transitional societies, new threats and their impact on civil-military relations. Few of the persons completing the questionnaire thought that more general or introductory courses on civil-military relations were needed.

It was repeatedly suggested that the training courses should not only focus on the theoretical aspects of civil-military relations, but should also include practical applications and case studies, as for example discussing examples from Western countries' crisis management training. The courses should consist of a combination of formal education, experience and demonstrated accomplishment in the field. Many persons estimated that this would enhance the efficiency of the learning process.

Generally speaking, courses and trainings should not only focus on the armed forces, but also on other parts of the security sector, including police, boarder guards, internal troops, intelligence services, private security actors etc. Not only was a broadening of the understanding of the security sector suggested, but also the inclusion of discussions in the programmes presenting the connections between civil-military relations and economic and/or social processes in order to achieve a comprehensive view and understanding of the topic and interlinkages was mentioned.

(c) *Who Should Be Taught?*

According to our study there seems to be a great need for more civilian security experts. In order to achieve efficient and effective democratic oversight of the security sector the civilian counterpart, including parliament, government, media, civil society etc., must know what their role is, what tools and rights they have, as well as understanding the processes and mechanisms regarding the security sector. Parliamentarians and parliamentary staffers were mentioned most often as being in need of more and profounder knowledge on the security sector, shortly followed by the media and the staff of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the civil society in large. Another civilian group largely in need of more and better expertise on civil-military issues are civil servants in the ministries of defence and the ministries of foreign affairs. Generally speaking, there seems to be a great need to increase and promote the efficiency of civilian control and oversight mechanisms, including parliamentary overseers and other watchdogs, such as civil society actors.

In order to achieve better information and training of the civilian counterparts on the principles and mechanisms of good governance of the security sector, tailor-made courses and trainings should be offered addressing their needs and informing them about the importance of their respective roles. By offering specific courses for civil society this important actor will be more involved in civil–military issues. It was mentioned repeatedly that it might be fruitful for certain types of training courses on civil-military relations to have a mixed audience of civilian and military participants. Such a setting could increase mutual understanding and trust and improve contacts among those two groups.

Turning towards the security sector itself and its needs for security experts, our study provides for different groups which are in need of more specific expertise. Many persons completing the questionnaire stated that it is crucial that not only officers participate in training courses, but also lower ranks in the hierarchy be targeted. As described above in the section on what educational and training courses are offered, today's courses mostly concentrate on the higher levels of the

military hierarchy. Additionally, it was frequently stated that it is crucial that better training be given to most of those elements of the security sector (including lower military ranks) who are dealing directly with civilians and civilian issues, such as paramilitary forces, militia, police, security services. Also, military staff preparing to go on missions or on peace support operations should be trained, for example, in human rights and humanitarian law.

Regarding the selection criteria for participation in security training courses, it was often mentioned that selection for the courses should not exclusively be based on military rank or on superiors' recommendation. Other criteria such as the participant's interests and motivation, his or her professional background and language abilities, should be included. As described above in the section on the offer of courses, we have seen that the large majority of courses are not taught in national languages; therefore, evidently, language criteria is and should remain crucial for participation.

4.3 Assessment and Recommendations

The evaluation of the questionnaire made quite clear that in most countries in Southeast Europe a basic level of knowledge on democratic civil-military relations has already been achieved. Now, in order to promote and stabilise the democratic structures in respect of the security sector, a next step has to be taken. It seems to be crucial to increase or create the offer of security courses and trainings focusing on specific aspects of democratic civil-military relations or on the role of certain actors. Such courses could eventually be provided in the framework of the PfP-Consortium, as it has been acknowledged that international cooperation and coordination is generally very fruitful and beneficial in this area. Courses including Western and Eastern European participants can help to create new contacts for future cooperation and developments.

We have seen that generally the armed forces have more possibilities and chances to participate in training courses on civil-military relations than their civilian counterparts. This unbalanced situation can hamper the process of democratisation and eventually even reverse it. A basic

rule of democracy and good governance is the democratic oversight of the security sector, but if neither politicians nor civilians in the ministries have the necessary knowledge and training to perform their role appropriately this basic democratic principle is endangered. An example of a possible reversal of democratisation is the dangerous remilitarisation of many ministries of defence in some countries in Southeast Europe due to the lack of qualified civilian security experts. From this point of view it is crucial to rebalance the security experts' repartition by offering more possibilities to civilians to increase their knowledge on crucial issues of civil-military relations, democratic control of the security sector, security sector reform and to become qualified experts in this field.

The problem mentioned in the previous paragraph is emphasised by the fact that a further watchdog of democratic oversight, civil society, which should normally contribute to the scrutiny of the security sector, is largely absent in many parts of Southeast Europe. This is due to the fact that civil society is often not very well informed, and is generally uninterested with respect to security sector processes and rules. Therefore, it is very important to better inform civil society on civil-military relations, for example by organising courses on these topics for the media or by training staff from NGOs.

As we have seen, the interest and willingness of participants is only a minor criterion for participation in security trainings and courses. More often participation depends on military rank, which excludes all civilians from the beginning. This is problematic, even more so when taking into account the fact that many persons filling in our questionnaires thought it beneficial for both sides to have mixed courses including military and civilians participants. Therefore, the courses already offered should, whenever possible, be opened to civilian participation.

Another critical point regarding participation is that superiors have such an important say in who will participate in the courses. This can possibly lead to a situation where only those who please their superiors have a chance to participate in courses and trainings that help to enlarge their knowledge on civil-military relations. It could be the case that those who have new, provocative views and opinions, differing from the

perspectives of their superiors are inhibited from participation in those formation courses. This would in turn crystallise certain ways of thinking and certain practices in civil-military relations, which could be harmful in the context of security sector reforms. In this process organisations of the security sectors and ministries have to adapt their ways of thinking to new realities in order to be able to overcome their natural organisational inertia.

4.4 Conclusions

Due to drastic changes in the security environment and the modifications of the security strategies and policies that have taken place during the last decades, there exists a great need for continued security expert (re)formation. As we have seen, there seems to be an enormous need for more courses in these subjects, otherwise the achievements of democratisation and good governance are endangered.

There not only needs to be more courses but the offer would need to be more balanced in two ways. First, there needs to be more general instruction for civilians in about their roles, rights and the functioning of the security sector. Secondly, the training courses need to be more focused, i.e. addressing specific roles of certain actors or target specific aspects of civil-military relations.

Only a society with enough civilian and military security experts can respond to today's security threats without endangering its democratic structure and the respect of human rights.