Survey on the users’ satisfaction with Centre for Military Studies

Contents:

1. Introduction

2. Summary and overall result of the survey

3. Purpose and process of the survey

4. Results of the survey
   4.1 Method and data source
   4.2 CMS’s activities are useful and of high quality
   4.3 CMS’s activities contribute to networking and with new, relevant knowledge
   4.4 CMS’s research results are seen as independent
   4.5 CMS’s current topics and activity types appear to meet the needs of the users
   4.6 Respondents’ free-text comments concerning future improvements of CMS’s work
   4.7 CMS is among the leading Danish institutions – and should develop ambitiously in the future

Annexes:

4.0.1 The Terms of Reference for the evaluation
4.0.2 Detailed description of the process, method and data source of the survey
4.0.3 The questionnaire
4.1-4.17 Tables and figures on the results computed for the total respondents group as well as the subgroups of respondents
4.18 All comments indicated by respondents in the questionnaires, in anonymised form.
4.19 Observations in connection with the survey results computed for subgroups of respondents
Survey on the users’ satisfaction with Centre for Military Studies

1. Introduction

This report presents the outcome of a survey on the users’ satisfaction with Centre for Military Studies (CMS).

The survey has been conducted as a preliminary phase to an international evaluation of Centre for Military Studies and is a part of the agreement made between the Ministry of Defence and the University of Copenhagen regarding the creation of the centre in 2010.

According to the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, the survey should “indicate whether clients, stakeholders and others involved in the work of the Centre believe that the Centre's products are of high quality, useful and independent.”

The survey was carried out from November 2012 to April 2013 by CMS in close collaboration with an independent consultant.

The survey report aims at being a descriptive, factual report which is not providing assessments or interpretations beyond the most obvious conclusions on the results of the survey – as the international evaluation will undertake the assessments of CMS and its activities, including the final assessments of the user satisfaction and users’ benefits of the activities of the Centre.

The report’s chapter 2 contains a short summary, including the main results, of the survey; while chapter 3 describes the process of the survey. Finally, chapter 4 presents the results computed on basis of the responses to all the different questions in the survey, including description of the method and data source used in the survey.
2. Summary and overall result of the survey

The questionnaire was distributed via the IT survey tool SurveyXact to the total population of CMS’s users and stakeholders, constituting a total of 738 persons. The population comprises Members of the Danish Parliament; employees at the Danish Central administration and the Danish Armed Forces; researchers from Denmark and abroad; persons from industry, NGOs and the media; students at universities and similar institutions; and a few persons from a few other occupational categories.

226 users have responded the questionnaire, i.e. 30 % of the total population; and it must be underlined that the result of the survey is not statistically representative for the opinion of the total population. However, a response rate of 30 % is quite normal for web-based user surveys such as the present. A very likely assumption is thus that the respondents are those users and stakeholders who have “something on their minds” regarding CMS and its activities; and that these respondents have an opinion because they have a high interest in, or high need for, activities and information within the fields of knowledge that CMS addresses. In addition there is a high number of comments indicated in the free-text boxes connected to the different questions, a fact which also implies a high interest of the respondents.

It is thus fair to consider the respondents as the core group of CMS’s users and stakeholders; and to consider the outcome of the survey represents a valid assessment by the core user/stakeholder group of CMS.

In the survey, the responses to the different questions have been computed not only for the total group of respondents but also for a number of subgroups of users within particular employment categories. The sections in the report presents only those subgroup results in the cases where a subgroup result deviate significantly from the responses of the total subgroup or where the responses from a particular subgroup are of particular relevance in relation to the question.

The overall result of the respondents’ assessments is that:

⇒ CMS’s activities are useful.

⇒ CMS’s activities are of high quality.

⇒ CMS’s activities are contributing with new, relevant knowledge.

⇒ CMS’s activities are contributing to users’ networking.

⇒ The research results of CMS are sufficiently independent – as they are based on good scientific conduct, and are sufficiently objective and unbiased in the view of that CMS undertakes research in subjects which are relevant for the security and defence agenda.
⇒ CMS should continue working with its current activity types and addressing the topics which it addresses today.

⇒ CMS is among the leading Danish institutions working with defence and security topics, and the Centre should develop ambitiously in the future, towards becoming comparable with some of the internationally leading organisations within this field.
3. Purpose and process of the survey

The survey has been conducted as a preliminary phase to an international evaluation of Centre for Military Studies and is a part of the agreement made between the Ministry of Defence and the University of Copenhagen regarding the creation of the centre in 2010.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference for the evaluation (annex 4.0.1), the purpose of the survey is to “indicate whether clients, stakeholders and others involved in the work of the Centre believe that the Centre's products are of high quality, useful and independent.”

The survey was planned from November 2012 to January 2013, and carried out during February 2013, by a working group consisting of the following persons:
- Director of CMS, Professor MSO Mikkel Vedby Rasmussen
- Research Assistant, M.Sc.Pol. Jacob Petersen, CMS
- Centre Administrator, B.Sc.BLC Anne Thomsen, CMS
- Student Assistant, B.Sc.Pol. Mikkel Broen Jakobsen, CMS

The survey was conducted in the online IT survey tool SurveyXact. Annex 4.0.2 describes the process of the survey in more detail.

The results of the survey were collated by CMS in close collaboration with the independent consultant, while the present report on the outcome of the survey was completed by the independent consultant.

The survey report aims at being a descriptive, factual report which is not providing assessments or interpretations beyond the most obvious conclusions on the results of the survey – as the international evaluation will undertake the assessments of CMS and its activities, including the final assessments of the user satisfaction and users' benefits of the activities of the Centre.
4. Results of the survey

This chapter presents the results of the survey on basis of the responses to the different questions.

Section 4.1 describes the method and data source used in the survey. Further information on the method and data source is provided in annex 4.0.2. Annex 4.0.3 contains the full text of the questionnaire.

Sections 4.2-4.7 present the main outcome of the responses to the different questions in the survey, including selected results of the responses from subgroups and selected free-text comments from the respondents.

All the results are indicated in the tables and figures in annexes 4.1-4.17 for the total respondents group as well as for each subgroup of respondents. Annex 4.18 contains all the free-text comments indicated in the responses. Annex 4.19 describes the most remarkable subgroup results, including further results than the subgroup results presented in the sections 4.2-4.7.
4.1 Method and data source

This section describes the method and data source used in the survey, including presentation of CMS’s total population of users; of the respondents; and of different subgroups of respondents belonging to specific employment categories. The section also presents the respondents’ relationships to CMS, i.e. in which connections the respondents know of CMS. Furthermore, the section addresses the issue of non-responses as well as the many free-text comments provided in the questionnaire by the respondents. Further information on the method and data source is provided in annex 4.0.2. Annex 4.0.3 contains the full text of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was distributed to a total population of 738 persons, constituting those CMS users and stakeholders who are included in the address lists of CMS.

226 users have responded the questionnaire, i.e. 30 % of the total population; and it must be underlined that the result of the survey is not statistically representative for the opinion of the total population.

However, a response rate of 30 % is quite normal for web-based user surveys such as the present. A very likely assumption is thus that the respondents are those users and stakeholders who have “something on their minds” regarding CMS and its activities; and that these respondents have an opinion because they have a high interest in, or high need for, activities and information within the fields of knowledge that CMS addresses. In addition there is a high number of comments indicated in the free-text boxes connected to the different questions, a fact which also implies a high interest of the respondents.

It is thus fair to consider the respondents as the core group of CMS’s users and stakeholders; and to consider the outcome of the survey represents a valid assessment by the core users/stakeholders of CMS.

In the survey, the responses to the different questions have been computed not only for the total group of respondents but also for a number of subgroups of users within particular employment categories. The two following sub-sections present the subgroups.

Several subgroups of CMS users

The total population, i.e. the 738 people connected to CMS, comprise, among others, Politicians (i.e. members of the Danish Parliament), employees at the Danish Central Administration and at the Danish Armed Forces. The population also comprises researchers from Denmark and abroad; actors from industry; specialist journalists in the field of defence and security; students; NGOs and a few actors from further occupational categories.

Students attending CMS’s educational activities at civil and military educational institutions have not been included in the population. They have been excluded here because CMS’s educational activities are being evaluated regularly under the auspices of the educational institutions.
Moreover, educational activities at educational institutions are one of the smaller tasks of CMS: CMS allocates far most of its resources to meet its main purpose, which is to conduct research and provide research based public sector services to the parties of the Defence Agreement of the Danish Parliament and to the Danish Ministry of Defence.

Thus, the students included in the survey are those who have made use of one or more of CMS’s “non-educational” activities such as e.g. publications or events. It has not been possible for CMS to identify who are students in the address list of the total population, but 14 respondents indicate that they are under education at a university or similar civil higher educational institution.

Table 4.1.1 shows the distribution (in numbers and percent) of the 738 actors among the different employment categories, where NGOs, the 14 students and further smaller categories are included in the “others” category. Similarly, the table shows the distribution (in numbers and percent) of the respondents among these employment subgroups. Finally the table shows the frequency (percent) for each employment category and totally.

As seen, the total response rate is 30 % – with journalists, industry and Central Administration and Armed Forces employees responding most frequently.

### Table 4.1.1 Distribution among employment categories of CMS’s total user group and of the total respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total user group</th>
<th>Central Administration &amp; Armed Forces</th>
<th>Industry/Private sector</th>
<th>Politicians</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Respondents      | Frequency | 83        | 37         | 10         | 17         | 29     | 47    | 223   |
|                  | Percentage| 37        | 17         | 4          | 8          | 13     | 21    | 100   |
| Response rate of subgroup | 35,9 | 42,5 | 32,3 | 44,7 | 23,4 | 20,7 | 30,2 |

1) Including industrial associations

Note: There are 3 non-responses to the question on occupation of respondents. These are not included in the table.

The distribution among the employment categories of the total population and the respondents respectively is also shown in figure 4.1.1 below. As seen, the distribution of the respondents is fairly similar to the distribution of the total population, except for the “others” group. The difference for the “others” group is not surprising, since this group consists of many small different employment categories including students, NGOs and retirees. The similarity between the two distributions supports the assumption that the responses are valid for the opinions of the users, especially the core users, of CMS.

It should be noted that the distribution of the total population among the different employment categories is completed by CMS on basis of the data in the address list, while the distribution of the respondents is based on the respondents’ own indication, in the survey, of their occupation. This should be taken into consideration as a possible source of bias when interpreting the data.
Figure 4.1.1. Distribution among employment categories of CMS’s total user group and of the respondents group. Percentages.

NOTE: The left, blue columns show the distribution among employment categories of the total user group of CMS, i.e. of the total population who have received the questionnaire. The right, red columns show the distribution among employment categories of the respondents. The distributions are shown in percentages of the total population (n=738) respectively of the total number of respondents to this question (n=223). The non-responses (3) are not included in the figure, and thus not in the percentages.

**Subgroups for who results have been computed**

Additional to the computed results of the responses from the total respondent group to the survey’s different questions, the answers to the different questions have been computed for each of the different employment subgroups indicated in table 4.1.1 and figure 4.1.1., i.e.:

- Central Administration & Armed Forces
- Industry
- Politicians
- Journalists
- Scholars.

As implied earlier, the “others” subgroup cannot be considered a homogenous group in the same way that the above subgroups can. Therefore, results have not been computed for the “others” group. Instead, results have been computed for the students from this group.

The subgroups Politicians (n=10), Journalists (n=17) and Students (n=14) are so small that just one respondent in the group represents 7-10 percentage points. In other words, the reader should be aware of the small absolute numbers when studying the resulting percentages from these subgroup responses. Despite the small numbers conclusions can be drawn with some caution, in cases where several indicators by the same (small) group point in same direction. Therefore, the results for these three small groups have been computed for all the questions.
Sections 4.2-4.7 present only those subgroup results in the cases where a subgroup result deviate significantly from the responses of the total subgroup or where the responses from a particular subgroup are of particular relevance in relation to the question.

All the results computed for the subgroups are shown in the sub-sheets in annexes 4.1-4.17, and further comments to the subgroup results are provided in annex 4.19.

Non-responses are excluded in the report presentations but shown in the annexes

As could be expected, there is some amount of non-response to each of the questions in the survey. Thus, several of the 226 respondents have not answered all the questions in the survey. In addition, there are a number of “do not know” responses to those (several) questions, in which the “do not know” option is available. Also the “do not know” responses are considered as non-responses.

The non-responses to the questionnaire are excluded from the figures in the report’s presentation of the results, as they do not bring any significant explanatory value to the observations and conclusions of the report. However, the numbers of both types of non-responses are indicated in the tables for each question in the annexes to the report.

In order to ensure as high response rate as possible for each individual question, the survey was organised such that any question could be responded without conditionality on responding any other questions.

The consequence has been that for several of the questions the non-responses constitute a significant part of the total number of respondents (n=226). It is assessed, however, that the high non-response rates do neither reflect that any of the questions have been incomprehensible, or irrelevant for the respondents group as a whole; only that individual questions have been irrelevant for a number of individual respondents.

In particular there are very high non-response rates, 31-34 %, for the questions on the qualities of the activity “teaching and lectures” (i.e. usefulness, quality, and contributions to new knowledge and to networking of “teaching and lectures”). A plausible explanation for the high non-response rates here is that a large part of the respondents might have perceived questions on teaching and lectures as exclusively concerning education at educational institutions such as universities and military academies; and not as lectures at CMS seminars and similar “non-education events” – combined with the fact that the very large majority of the respondents (as well as of the total population of the survey) are not students at educational institutions. The majority of the respondents, still, have responded the questions on “teaching and lectures”, assumingly because they have perceived the activity as meant, namely teaching and lectures at various events which can be characterised as vocational training and information rather that education. This explanation is supported by the fact that 47 % of the respondents indicate to have attended a
lecture by a CMS researcher, and that at the same time relatively few respondents (14 %) indicate to know CMS from their education (see figure 4.1.2).

As regards the usefulness and quality questions on the other three activity types (publications, events and research), the non-response rates are lower than for teaching and lectures, although still significant (14-26 %). In addition there are significant non-response rates on the questions regarding additional indicators for usefulness and quality of CMS activity (27-35 %). A plausible explanation for these high non-response rates is in line with the explanation on the teaching and lectures non-responses: The large majority of CMS users use a selection, not all, of the activity types offered by CMS; and they have thus exclusively knowledge about those types of activities that they use.

As regards the two questions on which activity types and topics CMS should undertake in the future, both non-response rates are 9 %, which is considered a “normal” non-response rate not needing explanation.

Moreover, the non-response rate is very high for the two questions on the institution(s) with which CMS is comparable today and with which the Centre should be comparable in the future. Only 151 of the total 226 respondents have answered the “today” question, while only 109 respondents have answered the “future” question; and only 102 persons have answered both questions. Thus, the resulting non-response rate is as high as 55 % when regarding both questions. This may be partly explained by the fact that, typically, fewer people respond the last questions than the first. An additional explanation can be that several respondents have refrained from answering due to lack of knowledge of the suggested institutions. As a matter of fact several respondents have indicated that they have limited, or no, knowledge to the institutions in the free-text boxes connected to the two questions.

Thus, despite the high non-response rates on most of the questions, it is considered that the individual questions have been responded by those persons who find them relevant. The results of the responses are therefore considered valid for all questions.

Finally, some rather high non-response rates occur in some cases of subgroup responses. These are briefly indicated in the report in those few cases where they occur in subgroup results that are presented in the report.

*Individuals’ free-text comments may provide supplementary inspiration for CMS’s future development*

As mentioned previously, there is a high number of comments indicated in the free-text boxes connected to the different questions in the survey. Some of these many comments have been conveyed in the sections 4.2-4.7, and all the comments from the questionnaire have been copied into annex 4.18.
In this connection it must be strongly emphasised that each comment is indicated by one single person, and the comments are therefore not in any way decisive for the results of the survey. The main results of the survey must be based on the collective answers from the total group of respondents, i.e. the results shown in the figures in the coming sections. However, the free-text comments, which include suggestions as well as commendations and criticism, can be considered as supplementary inspiration for CMS’s future development.

**The relationships between the respondents and CMS**

Figure 4.1.2 shows the relationships between CMS and the respondents, i.e. the connections in which the respondents know the Centre. Each bar shows the percentage of the responses in relation to the total number of respondents (n=225). Obviously, all of the possible relationships are indicated by several respondents, and many respondents have more than one relationship to CMS. In average, a respondent has indicated 4 relationships.

Most respondents indicate to have participated in CMS events such as seminars, conferences or workshops (77 %) and/or have read CMS publications (64 %). The relationship to CMS via the respondents’ education is the least frequent (14 %). As mentioned earlier only 14 students have responded the questionnaire, i.e. only 6 % of the total respondents group. The further 8 % who have ticked the education relationship must thus be respondents who know CMS from their education but who are no longer under education. Annex 4.11 shows the numbers of responses for each category, including non-responses.

**Figure 4.1.2. The relationships to CMS of the total group of respondents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In which connection the respondents know CMS. All respondents (n=225).</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Done business with CMS</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read CMS publications</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read scientific articles published by CMS researchers</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in CMS events</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a CMS network</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a lecture by a CMS researcher</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of CMS in the media</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some CMS quoted in other publications</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the CMS website</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the respondents education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The figure shows the responses, as percentages of the total number of responses to this question (n=225), for each of the indicated relationships between users and CMS. A respondent could select any number of the possible relationships. The single non-response is not included in the figure, and thus not in the percentages, but is indicated in annex 4.11 together with the numbers of indications of relationships.
Respondents’ free-text comments to relationships to CMS

As seen in the figure, 9% of the respondents indicate “other relationships”. In the free-text box connected to this response option, several respondents indicate that they know CMS via networking, either via a specific, established network or via a direct work connection to CMS. In addition, a number of respondents have indicated that they have used CMS as an information source.

Moreover, the respondents could write additional comments/suggestions to the question on relationships to the Centre in a free-text box. 19 of the respondents did so; 7 of these just noted that they had no further comments (regarding relationships to CMS). The remaining 11 respondents mainly commended the centre in general or for specific efforts, and/or provided suggestions for development of the centre. (E.g. “Interesting research based knowledge” or “It is excellent with the open debate meetings, latest on helicopters in Mali”; or “.. a lot of the knowledge produced by CMS could with high interest be applied at Danish high schools (gymnasier) ..”) 1.

All the free-text comments of the respondents are listed in annex 4.18 in anonymised form.

---

1 Most of the free-text comments are in Danish. The examples indicated here are translated from Danish to English by the author of the report.
4.2 CMS’s activities are useful and of high quality

As demonstrated in this section, large majorities of the respondents find that each of the following four types of CMS activities are useful as well as of high quality:

- CMS’s publications
- CMS’s events (e.g. seminars, conferences and workshops)
- CMS’s research
- CMS’s teaching and lecturing

**CMS’s activities are useful in general**

As seen in figure 4.2.1, a large majority of the respondents have found that CMS’s activities in general are either useful to some extent (43-50 %) or useful to a large extent (42-54%). As seen, all the four activity types score highly and almost equally.

Thus, between 90 and 97 % of the respondents have used the two highest response categories for usefulness in general of the four activity types.

**Figure 4.2.1. The extent to which CMS activities in general are regarded useful. Percentages.**

NOTE: The figure shows the percentages of responses for each of the four types of activities and for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.1 together with the numbers for each of the four types of activity and for each of the response categories.
Only few respondents have chosen the other three – the three lowest – response options. Thus, 4-10% have assessed CMS’s four types of activities to be *useful neither to a large nor small extent*. Very few (1-2%) have assessed the activities to be *useful only to a small extent*; and none have assessed any activity to be *not at all useful*. All the numbers of the different response categories are indicated in tables in annex 4.1.

It can thus be concluded that a significant majority of the respondents find CMS’s activities useful in general.

**CMS’s activities are useful for the respondents’ own work**

As seen in figure 4.2.2 below, between 65 and 81% of the respondents have used the two highest response categories for the four activity types as regards *usefulness of CMS’s activities for the respondents’ own work*. The two activity types *events* and *publications* are most frequently found useful for own work (81 and 75% respectively); while 70% find *research*, and 65% find *teaching and lectures*, useful for own work. The higher usefulness of events and publications for own work is not surprising, since these two activity types can be considered the most visible and frequent CMS activities for the users.

**Figure 4.2.2. The extent to which respondents regard CMS activities useful in their own work. Percentages.**

*NOTE:* The figure shows the percentages of responses for each of the four types of activities and for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.4 together with the numbers for each of the four types of activity and for each of the response categories.
49-58% of the respondents have found that CMS’s activities are useful to some extent for their own work; while 16-18% find the activities useful to a large extent for their own work.

A minority of respondents have chosen the other three – the three lowest – response options. (10-21% have assessed CMS’s four types of activities to be useful neither to a large nor small extent for their own work. Very few (2-5%) have assessed the activities to be useful for their own work only to a small extent; and 6-11% have assessed the activities to be not at all useful for their own work.)

It can thus be concluded that a significant majority of the respondents find CMS’s activities useful for their own work.

As regards the question on “usefulness for own work”, a score in the three lowest response categories may mean that a respondent has not utilised the activity in question – it does not necessarily reflect that the respondent finds the activity less or not useful in general.

Subgroups’ assessments of usefulness
It is worth noticing that among the subgroups of respondents (see annex 4.1, sheets 4 and 7), politicians as well as students score in the highest response category (i.e. “to a large extent”) much more frequently than the total respondents group. For example 8 of 9 politicians (i.e. 78%. 1 non-response) indicate that events as well as research are useful in general to a large extent, while the “large extent” scores of the total respondents group are 54% respectively 42% for these two activities. 75%, 70% and 70% of the students score to a large extent for usefulness in general of respectively publications, events and research.

In addition 9 of 9 politicians (i.e. 100%. 1 non-response) score in the two highest response categories for the questions on usefulness of events and publications for own work. (Respectively 81% and 75% of the total respondents group score in the two highest response categories for these two questions).

It must be strongly emphasised, though, that the respondent subgroups of politicians and students comprise only 10, respectively 14, persons, i.e. numbers too small for making firm conclusions about the differences among the subgroups.

High quality of CMS’s activities
As seen in figure 4.2.3, a very large majority of the respondents have found that CMS’s activities are of high or very high quality.

All the four activity types score highly, and almost similar: Between 79 and 85% of the respondents have used the two highest response categories: of high quality or of very high quality.

14-20% of the respondents have chosen the middle response category, i.e. neither of high or low quality. For the four activity types, only 0-1% have used the next lowest response option, i.e. of low quality, and none have chosen the of very low quality response.
Subgroups’ assessments of quality
The politicians score higher on quality than the total respondents group. 7 to 9 of the 10 politicians score each of the four types of activities to be of very high or high quality. (Frequencies for very high or high quality of politicians’ responses: 100 %, 100 %, 89 % and 87 % – non-responses 1, 1, 1 and 2. Total respondents group’s corresponding frequencies: 82 %, 85 %, 79 % and 82 %).

Figure 4.2.3. The respondents’ view on the quality of CMS’s activities. Percentages.

NOTE: The figure shows the percentages of responses regarding quality for each of the four types of activities and for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.2 together with the numbers for each of the four types of activity and for each of the response categories.

CMS’s website is both user-friendly and useful, and CMS’s research is clearly formulated

As seen in figure 4.2.4, a large majority of the respondents (78 %) find CMS’s website user-friendly to some or to a large extent.

A similar large majority of the respondents (78 %) find CMS’s website useful to some or to a large extent.

An even larger majority of the respondents (81 %) find CMS’s research clearly formulated and easy to comprehend to some or to a large extent.
The above results as regards CMS’s website and research are additional indicators on the users’ positive assessments of the usefulness and quality of CMS’s dissemination activities.

Figure 4.2.4. Additional indicators: The extent to which respondents regard CMS’s website useful and CMS research clearly formulated. Percentages.

NOTE: The figure shows the percentages of responses in the five response categories for the three questions indicated in the figure. The total number of responses for each of the three questions is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.7 together with the numbers for each of the four types of activity and for each of the response categories.

Subgroups’ assessments of CMS’s website and presentation of research
100 % of the politicians 95 % of the scholars find CMS’s website user friendly, i.e. by scoring in one of the two highest response categories (versus 78 % of the total respondents group).

Moreover 100 % of the politicians find CMS’s website useful – again versus 78 % of the total respondents group.

However, it must be emphasised that the two above frequencies of 100 % each are based on 5 politicians, while the 5 other politicians have answered “do not know” to the two questions.

100 % of the students and 93 % of the journalists find CMS’s research clearly formulated and easy to comprehend (versus 81 % of total respondents group). (Sum of scores in the two highest response categories). Also these two frequencies are based on low numbers, namely: 9 of 9 students and 5 student non-responses; and: 13 of 14 journalists and 3 journalist non-responses).

Thus, again here, the small groups: politicians, journalists and students indicate positive assessments. This supports a conclusion on that these three groups are positive above average. Only 68 % of the industry respondents find CMS’s research clearly formulated and easy to comprehend (versus 81 % of total respondents group). The remaining 32 % industry actors score in the middle category “neither nor”. (The two percentages are of 28 responses. The total industry respondents group counts 37, and there is thus 9 non-responses to the question).
4.3 CMS’s activities contribute to networking and with new, relevant knowledge

As demonstrated in this section, a large majority of the respondents find that CMS’s activities are both:
- contributing with new, relevant knowledge; and:
- contributing to users’ networking

The users have indicated these two assessments for each of the following four types of CMS activities:
- CMS’s publications
- CMS’s events (e.g. seminars, conferences and workshops)
- CMS’s research
- CMS’s teaching and lecturing

**CMS activities contribute with new, relevant knowledge**

As seen in figures 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, a very large majority of the respondents have found that CMS’s activities contribute with new relevant knowledge – both in general and for the individual respondents themselves.

**Figure 4.3.1. The extent to which respondents regard CMS activities contributing to new, relevant knowledge in general. Percentages.**

![Graph showing the extent to which respondents regard CMS activities contributing to new, relevant knowledge in general.](image)

**NOTE:** The figure shows the percentages of responses regarding contribution to new, relevant knowledge in general for each of the four types of activities and for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.3 together with the numbers for each of the four types of activity and for each of the response categories.
The numbers of responses for "general" and for "individual" are specified in respectively annex 4.3 and 4.5, including the non-responses.

All the four activity types score very highly: Between 86 and 92% of the respondents have used the two highest response categories as regards contribution to new relevant knowledge in general, while between 74 and 83% of the respondents indicate that they have obtained new, relevant knowledge from the four different CMS activities.

As seen in figures 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, CMS’s publications and events contribute slightly more often with new relevant knowledge than the two other activity types, research and teaching and lectures, but as mentioned all four activity types score highly.

As regards the question on “new, relevant knowledge for own work”, a score in the three lowest response categories may mean that a respondent has not utilised the activity in question – it does not necessarily reflect that the respondent finds the activity less, or not, contributing to new, relevant knowledge in general.

Figure 4.3.2. The extent to which respondents have obtained new, relevant knowledge from CMS activities. Percentages.

NOTE: The figure shows the percentages of responses regarding the respondents’ obtainment of new, relevant knowledge from each of the four types of CMS activities and for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.5 together with the numbers for each of the four types of activity and for each of the response categories.

Respondents’ free-text comments
In the free-text box connected to the questions on contribution to new knowledge, respondents wrote additional comments, mainly commending remarks, suggestions to development and
criticism. E.g. “Some publications and lectures should preferably be more empirically concrete”; “CMS should seek to spread out its activities to the further parts of the country (til det øvrige land)”; “Important with research based knowledge to members of political parties. Facts+graphs+main points etc. might be provided for high school level (gymnasieniveau), our coming decision makers”; “CMS researchers should be careful about how “media-hungry” they are for being quoted…Researchers should think twice before they make statements (udtaler sig) headlessly”; “What you can is in my opinion to illuminate practices at a higher level than the general media picture. Try not to go too much in the academic direction”; “Telephonic contact to CMS could be improved”.

All the free-text indications of the respondents are listed in annex 4.19 in anonymised form.

Subgroups’ assessments of CMS’s contribution to new, relevant knowledge
79 % of the scholars indicate that they have obtained new, relevant knowledge from CMS research to some or to a large extent. This is not a significant deviation from the corresponding 74 % of the total respondents group. However it is interesting in the sense that it entails that 15 of the 19 scholars who have responded this question have scored to some or to a large extent here, which may reflect that CMS’s research contributes with new relevant knowledge to the scientific community within the field of defence and security policy.

The scholars score lower than average for the three other activity types as regards obtainment of new, relevant knowledge; remarkably for teaching and lectures where the scholars score in the two highest categories is 63 % versus the corresponding 74 % of the total population. However the non-response rate to the latter question is very high: Only 11 of the total 29 scholar respondents have answered this question, and thus the 63 % is based on 7 of 11 responses.

CMS activities contribute to users’ networking
As seen in figures 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 on next page, a large majority of the respondents find that CMS has contributed to their networking. The numbers of all the different responses shown in the two figures are specified in annex 6, including the non-responses.

Figure 4.3.3 shows that 70 % of the respondents find that their participation in a CMS activity has contributed to some or to a large extent to expansion of their network; and 77 % have told others about CMS to some or to a large extent.

As seen in figure 4.3.4, 66 % of the respondents have made references to works of CMS to a large or to some extent; while 69 % know of someone who has made reference to works of CMS or in other ways used the work of CMS, to a large or to some extent.

---

2 Most of the free-text comments are in Danish. The examples indicated here are translated from Danish to English by the author of the report.
**Figure 4.3.3. The extent to which CMS contributes to respondents’ network. Percentages.**

![Graph showing the extent to which CMS contributes to respondents’ network.]

**NOTE:** The figure shows the percentages of responses to two questions regarding CMS’s contribution to the respondents’ network for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.6 together with the numbers for each of the two questions and for each of the response categories.

**Figure 4.3.4. The extent to which the respondents have made references to works of CMS. Percentages.**

![Graph showing the extent to which respondents refer to the works of CMS.]

**NOTE:** The figure shows the percentages of responses to two questions regarding respondents’ referencing to work of CMS for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.6 together with the numbers for each of the two questions and for each of the response categories.
Subgroups’ assessments of CMS’s contribution to users’ networking

A lower percentage of the politicians, than of the total group of respondents, find that CMS contributes to their networking. For example, 6 of the 10 politicians (i.e. 60 %, 0 non-responses) find that their participation in a CMS activity has contributed to some or to a large extent to expansion of their network, while the corresponding frequency for the total respondents group is 70 %. A plausible explanation here may be that politicians already have large networks, including several stakeholders, within their working fields. The politicians might thus be assumed to attend the CMS meeting for obtaining new information (from CMS and from stakeholders who they already know in advance) rather than for expanding their networks.

However, the politicians indicate more frequently than the total respondent group that they network on knowledge obtained from CMS – 8 of the 10 politicians (i.e. 80 %, 0 non-responses) have for example referred to works of CMS to a large or to some extent, while only 66 % of the total respondent group has done so.

In addition, 100 % of the students and 85 % of the scholars have told others about CMS to some or to a large extent while 77 % of all the respondents indicate to have done so. (The two percentages are computed on basis of: 10 of 10 students, 4 non-responses; and: 17 of 20 scholars, 9 non-responses). The Scholars also have a high frequency of addressing knowledge obtained from CMS in their networking activities, a fact which supports an assumption mentioned earlier in the section, namely that CMS contributes to the scientific community in the field. Thus, e.g. 76 % of the scholars (i.e. 16 of the 21 scholars who have answered this question) have referred to works of CMS to a large or to some extent, while only 66 % of all respondents have done so.

It should also be noted that 81 % of the industry respondents find that their participation in a CMS activity has contributed to some or to a large extent to expanding their network (i.e. 25 of the 31 industry respondents who have answered this question); while the corresponding frequency of all respondents is 70 %. However, fewer private sector respondents than the total group of respondents use knowledge obtained from CMS in their networking activities. For example only 51 % of the private sector respondents have made references to works of CMS to a large or to some extent (i.e. 17 of the 33 industry respondents who have answered this question), while 66 % of all respondents have done so.
4.4 CMS’s research results are seen as independent

As seen in figure 4.4.1, a large majority of the respondents find that CMS’s research results are independent, in the view of that “CMS undertakes research in subjects which are current, relevant and contribute to develop the security and defence agenda. Within these subjects it is the Centre’s task to carry out research projects and research-based public sector services for the Ministry of Defence that are based on good scientific conduct, the results of which are objective and unbiased.”

The above conclusion on independency is based on the following two response results, which both were asked, in the questionnaire, in the view of the above description of CMS’s work:

- 79 % find CMS’s research results sufficiently objective and unbiased (left columns)
- 89 % find that CMS’s research results are based on good scientific conduct (right columns).

It is commonly agreed in the scientific community that good scientific conduct entails independent, objective and unbiased research. In this case the independency is underlined by the responses to the separate question on objectivity and un-bias.

Figure 4.4.1. The extent to which the respondents find CMS’s research results independent. Percentages.

NOTE: The figure shows the percentages of responses to two questions which relate to the degree of independency of CMS’s research for each of five response options. The total number of responses for each of the four types of activities is indicated in the figure text (n), each “n” corresponding to 100% of the shown responses for an activity. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-numbers or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.8 together with the numbers for each of the two questions and for each of the response categories.
Subgroups’ assessments of the independency of CMS
88% of the politicians and 100% of the students find CMS research results sufficiently objective and unbiased to a large or to some extent, while 79% of all respondents do so. (The two percentages are computed of: Politicians: 8 of 9, and 1 non-response. Students: 9 of 9, and 5 non-responses).

In addition, 100% of students find CMS research results based on good scientific conduct to a large or to some extent, while 89% of all respondents do so. (Students: 9 of 9, and 5 non-responses).

Respondents’ free-text comments concerning independency
In the free-text box connected to the questions on independency, respondents’ express that independency of CMS is important. There are a few expressions of trust on the independency of CMS, but several remarks convey that CMS lacks independency. (E.g. “CMS is dependent of the mercy of the Government and this perhaps shines through a little in the research results”; “Independency can only be reached if financed by an independent foundation.” “CMS is financed by the ministry. Am therefore concerned that CMS research is adapted to political standpoints, so not to lose financing”; “...A model should be found where CMS is freed from any binding to the Ministry of Defence and placed directly under the University of Copenhagen”; “... it would make sense to place CMS under the Parliament so that it became independent of the Ministry of Defence...the affiliation with and location at the University of Copenhagen should be maintained.”)³

All the free-text indications of the respondents are listed in annex 4.18 in anonymised form.

³ Most of the free-text comments are in Danish. The examples indicated here are translated from Danish to English by the author of the report.
4.5 CMS’s current topics and activity types appear to meet the needs of the users

In the survey the respondents have also provided their views on which activity types CMS should undertake in the future; and which topics CMS should address in its work.

Activities

As seen in figure 4.5.1, CMS’s events and reports are the most popular activity types, but there also significant parts of the respondents who express need for teaching and lectures as well as research publications other than reports (i.e. books, anthologies or articles). Furthermore, a significant part of the respondents have indicated that CMS should work with “Open source”, which in the questionnaire were defined as: “Involvement of civil society in the Ministry of Defence’s policy development”, thus being an interdisciplinary activity that can be integrated in any of the other mentioned activities.

All the above-mentioned activities are already, so far, the activities that CMS has focused on performing, and it can be concluded that CMS’s current activity types appear to meet the needs of the users, and that CMS should continue undertaking the activities that it already conducts today.

Based on the questionnaire, it is difficult to conclude anything on whether CMS should alter its present weighing of focus on the different activity types. CMS already organises events continuously and very frequently. Furthermore, CMS produces publications continuously, and has produced several publications so far. Thus, CMS already places strong focus today on the activities most and second-most popular in the survey, i.e. events and publications. In addition, as mentioned, CMS has also significant focus on the other indicated activities.
Figure 4.5.1. Respondents’ preferences for future CMS activities. Percentages.

NOTE: The figure shows the responses, as percentages of the total number of responses to this question (205), for each of the indicated activity types. Any respondent could select as many activities as wished. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-number or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.9 together with the numbers for each of the indicated types of activity.

Only 2% have ticked “Other activities” — a fact that supports the conclusion on that the activities preferred by the users are those which CMS already undertakes today. The average number of activities indicated by a respondent is 2.7 out of the question’s total of 6 activities, including “other activities”. This average is high and implies that several respondents participate in a fairly broad selection of CMS activities.

The numbers of the different responses are specified in annex 4.9.

Subgroups’ assessments of CMS activities
Several of the subgroups’ needs for specific CMS activities deviate from the needs expressed by the total respondents group:

For example, 94% of the industry respondents express need for events, while the total group’s need for events is 83%. In addition, 54% of industry respondents express need for open source activities (involvement of civil society), while the total group’s need for open source is 38%. (35 of the 37 industry respondents have answered the activity question).

Furthermore, scholars express significantly more need than the total group for other research publications (65% (of the 23 scholars who have answered the activity question) – versus the 29% of the total respondents group).

Journalists express significantly less need than the total respondents group for other research publications, teaching and lectures, and open source (journalists: 18%, 12%, 29% versus the total: 34%, 42%, 38%. All the 17 journalist respondents have answered the activity question).
Topics

As seen in figure 4.5.2 below, the total group of respondents expresses preference for several topics on which CMS should focus. The most demanded topics are The Arctic, Future challenges for Danish security policy, Future security challenges and Military interventions, all of which are preferred by majorities of the respondents (58 - 68 %). In addition, the other indicated topics are preferred by significant parts of the respondents. Conscription is the topic preferred by the fewest, namely 23 respondents.

CMS already works with the topics indicated as response options, and it can be concluded that CMS’s present addressing of topics appears to meet the needs of the users, and that CMS should continue addressing these topics.

Based on the questionnaire responses alone, it is difficult to conclude anything on whether CMS should alter its weighing of focus on the different topics, because already today CMS has significant focus on the most popular topics, such as The Arctic and various future challenges for security policy.

Also the “other topics” responses (6 %) must be taken into consideration. In the free-text box connected to “other topics”, respondents suggest a number of broad and narrow topics. The suggestions include, among other topics, the following: UN, Africa, Nordic defence collaboration, large purchases/acquisitions, military sociology studies, future energy policy in relation to security policy, use of military means of power for achievement of political goals, the role of small states in the security of the future, Space strategy for Danish Defence, support capacity building in other countries and organisations, and: “Important that CMS contributes with knowledge within those fields that are un-developed or are too controversial for others to working with them”4.

4 Most of the free-text comments are in Danish. The examples indicated here are translated from Danish to English by the author of the report.
Figure 4.5.2. Respondents’ preferences for future CMS topics. Percentages.

| Topics respondents would like CMS to focus on in the future. All respondents (n=205) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|
|                                 |                              | Valid percentage | 0   | 10   | 20   | 30   | 40   | 50   | 60   | 70   | 80   |
| Military interventions          |                              |                 | 0   | 10   | 20   | 30   | 40   | 50   | 60   | 70   | 80   |
| The Arctic                     |                              |                 | 68  | 39   | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Cyber Network Operations (CNO) |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Defence Planning               |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Comprehensive Approach         |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| NATO                           |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Sovereignty                    |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Piracy                         |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Human resources of the Armed Forces |                        |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Defence economics              |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Conscription                   |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Future security challenges     |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Civil-military relations       |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Strategy                       |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Europæisk forsvars- og sikkerhedspolitik |                        |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Future challenges for Danish security policy |                        |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |
| Other                          |                              |                 | 39  | 35   | 37   | 40   | 66   | 66   | 66   | 66   |

NOTE: The figure shows the responses, as percentages of the total number of responses to this question (205), for each of the indicated activity types. Any respondent could select as many activities as wished. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-number or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.9 together with the numbers for each of the indicated types of activity.

Furthermore, a free text box was connected to the collected set of topics responses. Here, several respondents have indicated causes for his/her choice of topics. Clearly, and as many respondents indicate, the choices of topics are mainly based on the interests and work topics of the respondent. It has not been within the framework of this report to study the results at the level of the individual responses coupled with the individual free-text comments. However, it might be of interest for CMS to further study the individual respondents’ causes for his/her selection of topics. The average number of topics indicated by a respondent is 6.6.

The numbers of the different responses on topics are specified in annex 9, and all the free-text indications of the respondents are listed in annex 4.19 in anonymised form.

**Subgroups’ assessments of CMS topics**

Several of the subgroups’ needs for specific CMS topics deviate from the needs expressed by the total respondents group:

For example, industry respondents express significantly more need than all respondents for Comprehensive Approach and for Piracy; while they express significantly less need than all respondents for some of the defence/armed forces targeted strategic topics. (35 of the 37 industry respondents have answered the topics question).
Journalists express significantly more need for several of the topics, namely military interventions, The Arctic, CNO, and some of the topics on security challenges. Journalists express significantly less need than average for Strategy. (All the 17 journalist respondents have answered the topics question).

Scholars express significantly more need for the two topics on security policy. (22 of the 29 scholar respondents have answered the topics question).

Students express significantly more need for a number of topics Defence planning, Piracy, Conscription, Civil-military relations, Strategy, and the two topics on security policy. (11 of the 14 student respondents have answered the topics question).

Several of the subgroups score differently in the “other topics” category than the 6 % of the total respondents. Thus, no journalists or industry tick the “other topics” category, while 7 persons (9 %) from the Central Administration and Armed Forces group, tick the “other topics” category. (The percentages are also 9-10 % for politicians, students and scholars. However, these are constituted by very small numbers: 1 politician, 1 student and 2 scholars).

As mentioned further above, the different respondents suggest a number of topics in the free-text box connected with the “other topics” category. Several of those suggested topics are indicated further above.
4.6 Respondents’ free-text comments concerning future improvements of CMS’s work

In connection with the questions on future activities and topics the survey included a free-text box for respondents to indicate how CMS might improve its work, in their opinion.

Again, here, it must be emphasised that each comment does not represent an opinion of a significant part of the respondents, but an opinion of a single respondent.

In this box, the respondents have indicated several suggestions to CMS improve its work, including positive as well as negative statements on the centre. The free-text suggestions include, among other things:

– “Apart from the summer school, CMS could consider creating a Master (120 ECTS) within its field.”
– “Perhaps a bit more oriented towards the interests of the Danish business sector
– “Perhaps by creating feedback groups from the already existing networks for confidential feedback on reports and research before they are published (if possible) – I am thinking officials, other researchers, civilian think tanks and private companies etc.”
– “By daring to put forward more controversial research”
– “There is far too large a tendency to disseminate knowledge from NATO uncritically instead of addressing reality. The agenda surrounding smart defence is an example hereof. ... ... It would be useful if CMS once in a while had the courage to challenge the ill thought through savings that has been imposed on the Danish Armed Forces. In this case an independent scientific voice is needed instead of a voice working to legitimize the defence cuts with references to more efficiency...”
– “Speak more openly about the war on Muhammedanism”
– “CMS could consider how it wishes to appear in the eyes of the public ... I value the work of CMS very much and the written products are of the highest quality, but I think there is a slight tendency that CMS takes a more polemic stance, rather than a academic one, in regards to current issues in the press/media.”
– “General dissemination, especially seminars, could be expanded to other areas of Denmark than inner-Copenhagen and Bornholm in the summer.”
– “doing a great job”
– “How much does it cost to keep you alive. I wonder if it is worth the money?”
– “Perhaps working with researchers from other countries and hereby doing more multinational and comparative work”
– “…a better job could be done by disseminating information on seminars more broadly. Currently the information seems to be stranded in the higher levels of the organization”
– “By continuing to widen narrow topics into broader academic terms”
– “China”

5 Most of the free-text comments are in Danish. The examples indicated here are translated from Danish to English by CMS in collaboration with the author of the report.
“E.g. examine why the broad public attitude in the Western societies towards foreign, defence and security politics is the way it is currently”

”... A stronger profile would be good”

“CMS could create “fact papers” of about 4 pages which could be used in high school (gymnasiet) and among members of political parties”

Research on activism

All the free-text indications of the respondents are listed in annex 4.18 in anonymised form.
4.7 CMS is among the leading Danish organisations – and should develop ambitiously in the future

This section presents the results of the two last questions in the questionnaire. These concerned which institutions CMS can be compared with today, and with which institutions CMS should be comparable in the future.

As seen in figure 4.7.1 below, most respondents compare CMS today to some of the leading Danish institutions within the Defence and Security sector, namely:
- Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (52 %),
- The Defence Academy (FAK) (43 %), and
- Centre for War Studies at the University of Southern Denmark (31 %).

Thus it can be concluded that significant parts of the respondents consider CMS to be among the leading Danish organisations in the field, tending to be also comparable with some of the world-leading organisations.

Significant parts of the respondents also find CMS comparable with some of the leading organisations outside Denmark, particularly:
- International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (25 %),
- Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies (IFS) (25 %), and
- Chatham House (23 %).

The respondents’ view on the institutions to which CMS should be comparable in the future differs significantly from the today-comparison for some of the above-mentioned institutions. Thus, for the four following institutions, much fewer find that CMS should be comparable to them in the future:
- DIIS (25 %),
- FAK (22 %),
- Centre for War Studies (12 %), and
- IFS (14 %).

In contrast the “future” scores for the following institutions are 6-7 percentage points higher than the “today” scores:
- IISS (31 %), and
- Chatham House (30 %).

Moreover, there are much higher, and significant, “future” scores than “today” scores for the following institutions:
- Kings College London (12 % “today” and 29 % “future”),
- Rand Cooperation (15 % “today” and 25 % “future”), and
- Brookings Institute (5 % “today” and 20 % “future”).
Thus, while mainly comparing CMS today to leading Danish organisations in the field, the respondents find to a higher degree that CMS should be comparable with some of the world-leading institutions in the future.

In view of the high user satisfaction shown in the previous sections, the result on comparison with other organisations is considered to reflect that a significant part of the respondents are ambitious for the development of CMS, in the sense that the respondents would like to see CMS develop to become comparable with some of the internationally leading organisations in the field of security and defence matters.

**Figure 4.7.1. Institutions to which respondents compare CMS today, and to which CMS should be comparable in the future. Percentages.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Today</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brookings Institute</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centre for Strategic and International Assessments (CSIA)</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centre for War Studies</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chatham House</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Danish National Centre for Social Research (DNC)</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danish Economic Council</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Institute for Security Studies (EISS)</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danish Defence Academy (FAD)</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German Institute for International Studies (GSI)</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Institute for Strategic Studies (IIS)</strong>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute for Strategic Studies</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute Français de Relations Internationales (IFRI)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King’s College London</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies (NIDS)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norwegian Institute for International Affairs (NIIA)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rand Corporation</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Royal United Services Institute, London (RUSI)</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockholm International Peace Institute (SIPRI)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The figure shows the responses, as percentages of the total number of responses to both the two questions (n=102), for each of the indicated institutions. Any respondent could select as many institutions as wished. The left, blue columns show the percentages of respondents who compare CMS with the indicated institutions today. The right, red columns show the percentages of respondents who find that CMS should become comparable with the indicated institutions in the future. The non-responses, including the “do not know” answers, are not included in the n-number or in the percentages, but they are indicated in the tables in annex 4.10 together with the numbers for each of the indicated institutions.
It should be noted that Rand and IISS are think tanks, while Brookings, Chatham and Kings College are research institutions or/and higher educational institution. It is thus unclear to which extent the respondents would like CMS to developing towards a think tank character, or to maintain its character as a research institution disseminating research based knowledge and providing research based consultancy. However, according to the free-text comments connected to the two questions on institutional comparability (see furthest below in this section and in annex 4.19), there does not appear any significant wish from the collected individual comments for developing more towards a think tank function.

In the free-text boxes connected to the two questions on comparability with other institutions, several respondents have indicated that he/she has too limited, or no, knowledge on the institutions. This limited knowledge on the institutions is assumed to the overall reason for that relatively few have answered the two questions: 151 of the total 226 respondents have answered the “today” question, while only 109 respondents have answered the “future” question; and only 102 persons have answered both questions.

In order to ensure the methodological correctness in the computation of the results, the results presented here in the report are exclusively based on the responses from the 102 respondents who have answered both questions. It should be added, though, that the difference is insignificant between the result computed for the 102 responses and the result computed for all the responses to the two questions (n=151 and n=109).

All numbers on the different indicated institutions for the two questions are specified in tables annex 4.10, including the non-responses. The table and figure computed for the 102 responses is shown in annex 4.10, sheet 9, while the results for all the responses (n=151 and n=109) are shown in table and figure in sheet 1.

4 % of the respondents have ticked the “other institutions” response for institutions to which CMS is comparable today. In the free-text box connected to the “other” response, respondents have indicated the following texts: “CIC NYU”, “Defence Command and ministerial disseminator”, “DCAF, Switzerland”, “FE” and “CMS resembles a little on the large side the University of Copenhagen in an overall, broad sense. Beware!”

5 % of have ticked the “other institutions” response for institutions to which CMS should be comparable in the future. These respondents have indicated the following free-texts: “Yourselves”, “The Defence High School” (Försvarshögskolan); “Congressional Research Service in USA”; “CIC NYU”; “Abolished”.

*Further free-text connected with the two questions on institutional comparability*

As mentioned further above, the free-texts on respondents’ comments on their responses to the two questions include several indications of respondents having too limited, or no, knowledge on the institutions.

The free-text also comprise a number of critical statements, e.g.: “The mentioned institutions have far larger independency in relation to the Ministry of Defence than CMS, and
therefore comparison does not make sense”; “Yes, abolish”; “CMS is not qualitatively at level with the main part of the indicated institutions”.

In accordance with the overall positive result of the survey, there are also many positive statements and suggestions, including: “It takes a bit more to become an IISS – but keep up”; “CMS should maintain its distinctive character without copying other existing” (“existing” is assumed to mean “existing institutions”); “You have a good model now”; “Maintain affiliation to university with contacts to military community”; “CMS is not peace studies/research – but good if there is networking (also preferably Nordic) with these institutions, but also with hardcore military strategy institutions”; “…focus must lie on military studies – and not yet another think tank in relation to IP, strategy etc. .. Finally, political objectivity is decisive for the trustworthiness of CMS”\(^6\).

All the free-text indications of the respondents are listed in annex 4.19 in anonymised form.

**Subgroups’ responses on which institutions CMS should become comparable with in the future**

The patterns of politicians and industry respondents differ from the average pattern as regards the institutions with which CMS should be comparable in the future. The two groups have for example a higher favouring, than for all respondents, of CMS becoming comparable with Chatham House in the future (politicians: 60%, industry: 47 %, total respondents group: 30 %).

Another example is that industry favours Brookings Institute higher than the average does (29 % versus 20 %).

Also journalists’ and scholars’ patterns deviate from the average, for the future: For example 40 % journalists have a favour for future comparability to Brookings Institute as well as IISS and Rand Cooperation (versus the 20, 31 and 25 % of the total respondents group). 40 % of the scholars indicate Chatham House (versus the total’s 30 %).

It must be noted that each of the above subgroup results are based on all the “future” responses from the subgroup, regardless whether they have also answered the “today” question or not. If the result should be fully methodological correct, the subgroup results should have been computed for only those subgroup members who have answered both questions – since the “future” results from the total respondents group are from only those (102) respondents who have answered both comparison questions (i.e. both the future and the “today” question).

However, the result of the total of 109 responses to the “future” question is highly similar to the 102 “future” responses where the 102 respondents have answered both questions; and the total difference between the two number is only 7 responses. This implies that the above subgroup results would also deviate from the result of the total respondents group, if computed only for those subgroup respondents who have answered both comparison questions.

---

\(^6\) Most of the free-text comments are in Danish. The examples indicated here are translated from Danish to English by the author of the report.