



Seattle Pacific University
Digital Commons @ SPU

Honors Projects

University Scholars

Fall December 1st, 2012

United States Military Cohesion after the Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”

Stephanie E.V. Brown
Seattle Pacific University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.spu.edu/honorsprojects>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brown, Stephanie E.V., "United States Military Cohesion after the Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”" (2012). *Honors Projects*. 37.
<https://digitalcommons.spu.edu/honorsprojects/37>

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by the University Scholars at Digital Commons @ SPU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ SPU.

United States Military Cohesion after the Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”

Stephanie E.V. Brown

Seattle Pacific University

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Margaret Brown

Second Reader: Dr. Dana Kendall

A project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the University Scholars Program

Approved _____

Date _____

Abstract

The repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” was projected by politicians and military personnel alike to have a negative impact on unit cohesion. The findings of this study indicated that overall military cohesion was high, and that many military members found that the repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” had no impact on task or social cohesion. However, using the Chi Square test, there were two noted significant associations when observing participant pay grade and perceptions of how the repeal of DADT has affected a unit’s ability to work together to complete tasks get the job done ($\chi^2 (5) = 13.37, p = .020$), and when observing participant pay grade and how the repeal of DADT has affected how much service members in the immediate unit care about each other ($\chi^2 (5) = 12.92, p = .024$). When an impact on cohesion was noted, the repeal had a positive or very positive effect.

United States Military Cohesion after the Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”

The 2010 repeal of the military policy of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT) was monumental for gay and lesbian soldiers serving in the military. For the first time since World War II, gay and lesbian service members were allowed to serve openly in the US Military. For many politicians, citizen, and military members, the repeal of DADT was cause for concern: what effect would the repeal of this policy have on the force readiness of the military as a whole? One aspect of readiness is cohesion measured at the unit level. This paper examines the effect of the DADT repeal on unit cohesion.

Unit cohesion has both social and task-focused components. Task cohesion is likely to have a greater direct impact on force readiness. However, a 2010 Department of Defense (DoD) study indicated that social cohesion was at risk to decrease after the repeal. Social cohesion plays an important role in whether or not military members feel as though they are part of a group which they can trust in times of war, which could, in turn, affect task cohesion.

Task and Social Cohesion

Task and social cohesion are the two major types of cohesion (Friedkin, 2004). The working definition of task cohesion is a shared commitment among group members to work together in order to achieve the goal that has been set before them (Griffith, 2002). Social cohesion, on the other hand, depends on the relationship between group members, specifically, whether or not they spend their free time together, like each other, or feel an emotional bond with their fellow members (Friedkin, 2004).

While current literature suggests that task cohesion is a stronger predictor of performance than social cohesion, it is noted (e.g., Friedkin, 2004; Griffith, 2002) that social cohesion is measured quite often at the individual level and not the group level, as it deals with an

individual's perception of how well they relate and interact with their group. Task cohesion is often measured at the group level because task cohesion has a more direct impact on group performance than social cohesion (Griffith, 2002). Social cohesion, on the other hand, is indirectly related to group performance, in that it has a direct effect on whether or not group members stay in a particular unit (Griffith, 2002). Friedkin (2004) states that groups are most cohesive when there are strong membership attractions and attachments. The interpersonal interactions between group members lead to a maintenance or disintegration of group level conditions.

History of DADT

Beginning in 1941, during the Second World War, soldiers drafted into the military were given a psychological evaluation (Sinclair, 2009). While sodomy had been declared a felony according to the War Articles of 1919, this was the first time that soldiers were specifically asked about their sexuality (RAND, 2010). At this time, homosexuality was considered to be a sexual psychopathy by the American Psychological Association under the criteria outlined in their Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM), and military members who admitted to being homosexual were given military discharges (Sinclair, 2009). The reason for their discharge was placed on their discharge record, and when they went to seek employment they were often turned down for being sexual deviants (Sinclair, 2009).

Those who did choose to serve, however, were forced to lie about their orientation while enlisting, and then were forced to keep quiet about their sexuality. If they were found out while in the service, they were given an immediate discharge (Sinclair, 2009). However, in 1993 President Bill Clinton signed DADT into law. DADT stated quite simply that a person in the military could not ask about the sexual orientation of a fellow military member, and that a

military member could not reveal his or her sexual orientation to fellow servicemembers. If servicemembers violated this rule, and either asked or told, they would be subject to punishment under the section 654 of Title 10 of the United States Code. If a person was, in fact, determined to be gay or lesbian, they could be dismissed from military service, often in the form of a dishonorable discharge (Sinclair, 2009). The Department of Defense Directive 1332.14 declared that people who "demonstrated a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts...would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion that are the essence of military capability."

Twenty years later, due to the shifting public perception of gays and lesbians in the military, President Barack Obama and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike G. Mullin called for a Department of Defense (DoD) study to determine the risk factors associated with gay and lesbian service members serving openly. Up until September 2011, the month of the repeal, information on the impact of gays and lesbians serving openly in the United States military was purely hypothetical, as gay and lesbian service members were not allowed to serve openly in the military. While information promoting openness in the military was available from nations with openly gay and lesbian soldiers (including Israel, the Netherlands, and Canada), many still believed that the sudden change in policy would wreak havoc on the US military. Burks (2011) noted that under the climate of fear created by DADT, very little research was conducted on the actual effect of gays serving either closeted or outed in the military due to the lack of willing participants. Even the 2010 official DoD survey was unable to ask participants about their personal sexual orientation, and relied on speculative questions such as "Do you currently serve with a male or female Service member you *believe* [emphasis added] to be homosexual" (p. 180, U.S Department of Defense [DoD], 2010).

After a survey of over 115,000 troops, the task force concluded that the risk of allowing gays and lesbians to serve in the military would be low overall, with the exception of task and social cohesion, which they determined would be impacted at the “moderate” level, in that while task cohesion would remain relatively untouched, social cohesion might decrease slightly based on survey and discussion group results (DoD, 2010). Social cohesion remained the major problem associated with DADT. The DoD (2010) noticed that many male military members voiced concerns about privacy (e.g, showering with gay men, sharing living quarters with gay men, etc.), which prompted the government to study factors such as recruitment and retention. In the 2010 RAND Corporation survey, 10% of surveyed active military personnel declared that if DADT was repealed, they would be likely to leave the military earlier than they would have had DADT remain in effect. In these instances, it is clear that social cohesion also plays a role in military readiness and effectiveness, which was a major concern for servicemembers and politicians alike (RAND, 2010).

Problems with DADT

Since social cohesion affects the everyday working of the military, it is important to note the negative effects that DADT had on gay and lesbian military members and on the military as a whole. Many of the problems with DADT stemmed from the fact that the policy was ineffective in its attempt to lower discharges and harassment related to homosexuality. Discharges related to homosexuality increased from 1993 onward, then decreased dramatically after the terror attacks on September 11, 2001 (RAND, 2010). During a long period of war with an all-volunteer military, commanders may be reluctant to give up good personnel (RAND 2010). In an evaluation done by the Office of the Inspector General (2000), it was noted that harassment based on perceived sexual orientation was very high, as was the extent to which that behavior

was tolerated. Overall, 80 percent of the respondents replied that they had heard offensive speech, derogatory names, jokes, or remarks about homosexuals in the last 12 months. Eighty-five percent of respondents believed that the hate speech was tolerated, and five percent believed that physical harassment based on perceived homosexuality was tolerated by their chain of command as well. Of the respondents, 37 percent had witnessed such a physical event, which only 78 percent felt free or encouraged to report to a commanding officer. Approximately half of the participants said that the DADT policy was not effective.

A study of conditions under a Canadian law similar to DADT noted that lesbians who hid their orientation could often not risk the chance of having a romantic relationship with another female, which left many feeling lonely (Poulin, Gouliquer, & Moore, 2009). Many expressed fears of losing social supports systems like family members and coworkers if they had been discovered. Herek (1996) also noted that gay and lesbian service members who hide their homosexuality risk harming the relationships and bonds with their coworkers, as a core tenant of every branch's honor code is being truthful. Military personnel who came out were seen as flaunting their sexuality (Herek, 1996).

The oppressive climate of the military under the policy of DADT led to an increase in lesbian, gay, and bisexual victimization and discharge. According to a 2011 study by Burks, victims of harassment who were actually gay, lesbian, bisexual, or perceived as such, felt less able to report their harassers because many felt as though reporting the bullying would confirm their sexual orientation to their chain of command. If this were to happen, they would be subject to removal from their jobs. The Palm Center (2006) estimated that the DADT policy has resulted in the discharge of 14,346 soldiers since its inception. Furthermore, the cost to the U.S. government has been substantial as well, totaling almost \$363.8 million due to the personnel who

were removed and those who had to be retrained (Palm Center, 2006). Many military jobs are very specialized (e.g., pilots, intelligence personnel, and Arabic language translators), and the cost to train the personnel in the first place is substantial, let alone training their replacements.

Because of the pressure of living a double life, gays and lesbians in the military have been at higher risk of stress, depression, and negative views of self (Herek, 1996). While this might be remedied by trips to a mental health provider, many gay and lesbian servicemembers would not seek help. This constant occupational stress on the individual has proven to show an increase in sick days, accidents, and a decrease in productivity at the group (or unit) level (Tucker, Sinclair, & Thomas, 2005). Even if a gay or lesbian service member were to seek out professional help, the military was ill-equipped to deal with physical health issues relating to homosexuality. In a 2008 article on male military personnel at a gay clinic in San Diego, Smith reported that military doctors are, in fact, not subject to regular doctor patient confidentiality laws so that they may report information to the military for military readiness purposes. As such, many gay personnel reported to off-base clinics for treatment of sexually-transmitted diseases which, if reported to military medical doctors, would have confirmed their sexual orientation. Furthermore, if a patient perceived discrimination from their healthcare provider, they were less likely to disclose their sexual orientation (Smith, 2008). Information on sexual orientation could provide a healthcare provider with a better idea of how to treat the individual patient, impacting the level of care that veterans receive.

Adequate medical and psychological care is important in maintaining a strong fighting force. With the rise of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has become more important to help prevent and treat this trauma. Cohesion is shown to be significant in protecting unit members against PTSD. A 2009 study by Brailey,

Vasterling, Proctor, Constans, and Friedman, found that even when controlled against stressful life factors and age, high unit cohesion is associated with decreases in PTSD checklist scores. The PTSD Checklist is a 17 question self-report assessment which measures distress associated with each PTSD symptom listed in the DSM. Furthermore, higher levels of unit cohesion haven been proven to be beneficial to those who have experienced significant stress before their military careers (Brailey et al., 2009). Because certain groups deploy at more frequent rates than others, it is important that those units have strong unit cohesion, as they are more frequently exposed to dangerous and stressful combat situations.

Because of the impact of DADT on gay and lesbian military personnel, researchers studied the impact of forced silence on workplace performance. In one study, researchers demonstrated that gays and lesbians' performance is higher when they are open about their sexual orientation than when they are forced to be silent. One of the few ways that has been proven to increase performance between LGB and straight coworkers has been to be open about one's sexual orientation. A 2012 study by Everly, Shih, and Ho showed that participants perform better on cognitive and sensory-motor tasks if they know the sexual orientation of the person they are working with than if the sexual orientation of a partner is ambiguous. In cases where the sexual orientation of the confederate is ambiguous, experiment participants were constantly monitoring their own behavior to make sure it was "appropriate", expending valuable energy which could have been used on completing the given tasks. Sexual orientation can be presented very ambiguously, because it can be made up of how someone talks, dresses, styles their hair, or presents other nonverbal cues; it is never really certain unless someone says otherwise. However, when one encounters people in military uniform all day, the cues can be very limited. Furthermore, when a person was asked to hide their sexual orientation, they performed worse on

the cognitive tasks as well as they were intent on portraying a neutral sexuality, or even a sexual orientation which was not natural to them (Everly et al., 2012). Disclosure of sexual orientation made the cognitive and spatial tests less demanding on both participants.

Similar research notes the effect that emotional exhaustion has on organizational functioning. Wright and Cropanzano (1998) found that emotional exhaustion correlates with decreased performance and increased job turnover. Emotional exhaustion can stem from a variety of job hassles, including harassment in the workplace. The effects of a stressful personal life, (e.g., hiding one's sexual orientation) can also lead to emotional exhaustion, which carries over into the workplace.

In relation to DADT, some gay and lesbian military personnel had to go several hours out of their way in order to meet up with same-sex partner, had to hide (or even make up) a personal life with a façade of heterosexuality, and had problems functioning inside the work social environment (e.g., no dates for military balls, no family for the family picnic, etc.). The repeal of DADT allows people to be open about their sexuality, and lessens the energy that people spend guessing whether or not a fellow soldier is gay or lesbian, allowing more energy to be allotted toward completing tasks which are beneficial to the military.

Based on the literature for this study, it was predicted that the repeal of DADT would not have a negative impact on overall unit cohesion in the military. However, among people who would perceive a change, it was hypothesized that there would be a positive impact on overall cohesion. This is based on the literature that people are less stressed when they are not hiding their sexuality, and that people are more comfortable working with those whose sexual orientations are known.

Method

Participants

One hundred thirty-seven military members from all military branches accessed the website link to participate in the online study, though only 98 completely filled out the survey. Surveys which were not completed all the way through were not counted because they lacked sufficient data. Of the 98 participants, 44.9% were Army, 35.7% were Air Force, 7.1% were Navy, 6.1% were Coast Guard, with another 6.1% in the Marine Corps. The survey respondents included Active Duty (68.4%), Reserve (8.2%), and National Guard (23.5) members. In terms of gender, 72.4% of participants identified as male and 27.6% identified as female. In regard to sexual orientation, 86.7% identified as straight, 9.2% identified as gay or lesbian, 3.1% identified as other, and 1% of the population preferred not to answer. Ages were reported in the following ranges: 18-24 (22.4%), 25-31(33.7%), 32-38 (13.3%), 39-45 (17.3%), 45-52 (8.2%), 53-59 (4.1%), and 60 or older (1.0%). With regard to the present pay grade of enlisted military personnel, 6.1% reported as E1-E3, 8.2% were E4, 31.6% were E5-E6, and 14.3% were E7-E9. With regard to the present pay grade of commissioned officers, 26.5% of overall participants were O1-O3, 10.2% were O4 or above, and 3.1% were W1-W5. Approximately 84% of participants identified as White, 4% as African American or Black, 6% as Spanish/Hispanic/Latino, 3% as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native, 7% as Asian-American, Asian-Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or other Southeast Asian, and 0% as Native Hawaiian, Samoan, Guamanian, Chamorro, or other Pacific Islander.

Measures and Procedure

The survey was similar to the original “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” survey administered by the Department of Defense in 2010, adjusting the language to reflect a post-repeal scenario (See Appendix A). The survey consisted of 27 questions and seven demographic questions, and took approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey exclusively assessed task and unit cohesion, and both were measured at the individual level. The first eight questions were averaged into a composite of overall cohesion, as these questions were measured on a similar scale and were thus grouped accordingly. Questions nine through 24 were examined separately due to the different scales that they were measured on.

The survey was administered via an online survey website (SurveyMonkey.com), and a recruitment invitation (See Appendix B), was posted on official military Facebook pages. Approximately 640 military Facebook pages were contacted both in the continental United States and abroad, to include official base Facebook pages and official Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) Facebook pages. Participants who saw the link were able to choose whether or not to contact the researcher via Facebook to receive the link, or to click on the link provided in the Facebook posting. Those who participated in the survey were given the option to enter their email address at the end of the survey in order to enter a raffle. From that pool of participants, three participants were randomly chosen to receive Visa gift cards with values of \$75, \$50, or \$25.

Results

Preliminary Analyses: Overall Perceptions of Unit Cohesion

The first eight questions capturing unit cohesion were reverse-coded so that numbers were more intuitive, with the higher number suggesting higher cohesion. An average of the items was created ($N = 98$, $M = 2.916$, $SD = .726$) to determine the average level of cohesion perceived

among all participants (see Table 1). An independent-sample *t*-test was used to determine if participants' gender had an influence on their perception of unit cohesion. Data was analyzed using an alpha level of .05. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between males and females, $t(96) = -1.818, p = .072$, though women ($M = 3.130, SD = .696$) had higher ratings than men ($M = 2.835, SD = .726$) for perceptions of unit cohesion (see Table 2). A similar independent-sample *t*-test was performed to test for a significant difference between gay and straight participants in perceptions of unit cohesion. Statistics revealed no differences in perceptions of overall unit cohesion by participants who identified as straight ($M = 2.918, SD = .732$) compared to those who identified as gay ($M = 2.944, SD = .801, t(92) = -.104, p = .918$). There was also no difference in perceptions of cohesion when participants who identified as Other ($N = 3$) were combined with those who identified as gay ($N = 9$) to form a larger category to compare against those who identified as straight, $t(95) = -.142, p = .887$ (see Table 3).

Preliminary Analyses: Perceptions of Cohesion under Gay or Lesbian Leaders, Coworkers and Subordinates

Eighteen participants responded to questions in the section on gay and lesbian leadership. Of those participants, 10 of 18 indicated that all or most of the unit was aware of the leader's sexual orientation, and only 1 indicated that no one knew (see Table 4). Of these 18 participants, 77.8% indicated that their unit had a good or very good ability to work together (see Table 5), and 61.1% indicated that the knowledge that their leader was gay or lesbian had no effect on the unit's ability to work together (see Table 6).

Forty-eight participants responded to questions in the section on gay and lesbian coworkers. Of those participants, 25 of 48 indicated that all or most of the unit was aware of the coworker's sexual orientation, and only four indicated that no one knew (see Table 7). Of these

48 participants, 89.6% indicated that their unit had a good or very good ability to work together (see Table 8), and 75% indicated that the knowledge that their leader was gay or lesbian had no effect on the unit's ability to work together (see Table 9).

Thirty participants responded to questions in the section on gay and lesbian subordinates. Of those participants, 19 of 30 indicated that all or most of the unit was aware of the subordinate's sexual orientation, and only 1 indicated that no one knew (see Table 10). Of these 30 participants, 83.3% indicated that their unit had a good or very good ability to work together (see Table 11), and 73.3% indicated that the knowledge that their subordinate was gay or lesbian had no effect on the unit's ability to work together (see Table 12).

Primary Analyses: Perceptions of Unit Cohesion Post-DADT

Fifty-seven participants responded to questions regarding unit cohesion after the repeal of DADT. When asked how the repeal of DADT has affected how service members in their immediate unit work together to get the job done, 52% of respondents noted no effect, while 19.3% of respondents believed the effect was positive or very positive (see Table 13). When asked how the repeal affected how unit members pull together as a team, 50.9% noted no effect, while 21.1% noted a positive or very positive change (see Table 14). When asked about the effect that the repeal had on how much unit members trust and care for each other, 50.9% noted no effect regarding trust, and 49.1% noted no effect for how much unit members care for each other. Concerning trust, 19.3% noted that the repeal of DADT had a positive or very positive effect on trust levels and on how much unit members care for each other (see Tables 15 and 16).

Since the repeal of DADT, 50.9% of the 57 participants believed that repeal of DADT has had no effect on whether or not service members can get help from their leaders on personal problems, while 21.1% of participants believed there has been a positive effect following the

repeal (see Table 17). Similarly, 47.4% of the 57 participants believed that the repeal of DADT has had no effect on whether or not leaders trust their unit members, while 19.3% believe there has been a positive or very positive effect (see Table 18). When asked if the repeal had an effect on the perception of whether leaders in the immediate unit have the skills and abilities to lead unit members into combat, 52.6% reported no effect while 22.8% reported a positive or very positive effect (see Table 19). When asked how the repeal of DADT has affected the extent to which leaders in the immediate unit care about their service members, 49.1% noted no effect, while 26.3% noted a positive effect (see Table 20).

Post-hoc Analyses:

Finally, while there were differences noted between gender perceptions of cohesion since the repeal of DADT, they failed to reach statistical significance using the Chi Square test ($p = .268$). There were also no statistically significant differences between gay and straight individuals in perceptions of cohesion since DADT using the Chi Square test ($p = .695$). However, there were two noted significant associations when observing participant pay grade and perceptions of how the repeal of DADT has affected a unit's ability to get the job done ($\chi^2 (5) = 13.37, p = .020$), and when observing participant pay grade and how the repeal of DADT has affected how much service members in the immediate unit care about each other ($\chi^2 (5) = 12.92, p = .024$) (See Tables 21 and 22).

Discussion

The second half of the study focused on unit members perceptions of unit cohesion after the repeal. Overall, the majority of respondents answered that the repeal of DADT had no effect on either task or social cohesion under the given circumstances. Whether it was a coworker, subordinate, or leader who was gay, over 60% of all participants said that the knowledge of a

person's homosexuality had no effect on how well the participant perceived the unit worked together. Again, though there are a variety of opinions on the morality of homosexuality, these ideas would not have a direct impact on social cohesion. Since there is no direct correlation between social cohesion and task cohesion (Beal et al., 2003) especially in military settings (RAND, 2010), the difference of opinions between group members would not have impacted the perception of how well unit members work together to complete a task. The RAND Institute notes that groups are able to function well even if some of the members are strangers to one another (2010). The important element is that each group member believes in the overarching group goal, not whether or not they necessarily like or agree with all group members (Beal et al., 2003).

When asked how the repeal of DADT has affected how service members in their immediate unit work together to get the job done, the majority of respondents noted no effect, while close to a fifth of respondents believed the effect was positive or very positive, and when asked how the repeal effected how unit members pull together as a team, the majority again noted no effect, while nearly a quarter of those surveyed noted a positive or very positive change. This could be a possible byproduct of the research done by Everly et al. (2012) and Wright et al. (1998), supporting the idea that the knowledge of a partner's sexual orientation would lead to increased productivity due to an increase in emotional energy available to funnel into tasks.

Furthermore, since the repeal around 19% of participants believed that having the restrictions of the DADT policy removed had a positive or very positive impact on levels of trust within the unit. The same number was reported for those who believed that the repeal of DADT had a positive impact on how much unit members care for each other. Under DADT, many people felt victimized. Even if the victim was straight, they could be targeted if they seemed gay

(Burks, 2011). If there is no longer a need to hide sexuality, a victim could stand up for their rights without being discharged. Additionally, those who are gay and lesbian can create real relationships with coworkers. Poulin, Gouliquer, and Moore (2009) found that lesbian veterans in the Canadian military were less likely to have work-related friends than their straight counterparts because of the stress related to trying to maintain a straight persona. If the removal of DADT has decreased the need to act straight, then gay and lesbian service members are able to make friends with people who appreciate them and truly care for them. Herek (1999) noted that gays and lesbians who hid their orientation while in the military often suffered from stress, depression, and negative views of self.

Effective leadership has also seen an increase under the removal of DADT. While the majority of participants responded that the repeal of DADT has not affected whether or not service members can get help from their leaders regarding personal problems, most of those who did see a change noted a positive one. Over a quarter of participants also noted a positive effect in the level of trust a leader had in their unit. Military leaders who know the orientation of their subordinates can direct them to the appropriate resources. Resources available to gay and lesbian service members, even outside their direct chain of command, have improved greatly. While a military member might have been hesitant to seek medical attention for certain orientation-specific medical concerns at one time (Herek, 1996), the removal of DADT allows all patients equal access to the military medical systems and its benefits. While the system is far from perfect, gay and lesbian soldiers are seeing an increase in social support systems, from advocacy groups and inclusion in base-wide family functions, to relationship counseling by an on-base provider and inclusion in spouse clubs for those with partners (RAND 2010).

As a whole, officers had a more negative view on the repeal of DADT than the enlisted personnel. At the time, there is no literature to suggest why this is so. In fact, Wallenberg, Anspach, and Leon, (2011) found that students who had completed at least a bachelor level education were more likely to have positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians in the military. As every military officer is required to have a bachelor's degree before commissioning (as opposed to enlisted personnel who must have a high school diploma or GED), it would make sense that the repeal would have been more favored among officers. However, officers were also in charge of preparing and presenting briefings on how to integrate the repeal of DADT into their various units. This process took both a large amount of time and training in order to ensure everyone in the unit understood their rights and responsibilities after the repeal. Furthermore, if anyone had requested room change assignments or wished to file a harassment complaint against another unit member, the commanding officer would have been in charge of dealing with any negative fallout associated with the transition.

Of the 98 participants, the average perception of unit cohesion was high overall ($M = 2.92$). Overall, both gender and sexual orientation had no statistically significant bearing on whether or not a person viewed their unit as cohesive. Military units in general tend to be highly cohesive in regards to task cohesion, which determines perceptions of overall cohesion even more so than social cohesion (RAND, 2010). Even if military personnel differ in their opinions on the morality of homosexuality that would not significantly impact social cohesion. Beal et al. (2003) found that social cohesion did not correlate to group performance, which is the main factor that group members take into consideration when rating overall unit cohesion. Therefore, while a variety of political, religious, or moral opinions may be present in a group, those factors

will not be observed in measures of overall cohesion as those opinions do not directly affect task cohesion.

Limitations and Future Areas of Study

This study was limited by a variety of factors. Variables such as housing arrangements, location, education level, unit personnel structure, or mission performed by the immediate unit might have impacted the responses, and were not tested. Past research (DoD 2010; RAND, 2010) indicated that there were difference in responses depending on mission type and service branch, although there were no indications as to whether or not the differences were statistically significant. Other limitations regarding the survey results include the following. Facebook, a social networking site popular among younger generations, was used to disseminate information. As such, information regarding older military personnel or personnel who do not wish to have a Facebook could not be collected, which may have impacted the results. There was also a very small sample of self-identified gay, lesbian, or “other” personnel. As such, any statistical analysis comparing perceptions based off of sexual orientation were influenced by the small number of gay, lesbian, and “other” service members.

The commissioning source of the military officers could have impacted the results of the survey. Enlisted personnel come from a variety of backgrounds and are all funneled through the same basic training program. While the program’s layout varies between branches, all enlisted personnel are required to go through such training. Officers, however, have three different ways to achieve a commission. The first way to commission is to attend a military academy. The academy students are in a constant training environment. Many first year students are not even allowed to leave the grounds unless for specific military-approved events. Because they are subject to all military law during their four years at the academy, these students lived under the

rules of DADT, and became officers in an environment where no one was openly out. In contrast, college students who commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) are mixed in with the varied college crowd. While they are held to the same military standards, they take classes with civilian college students who have a variety of opinions on homosexuality and the military in general. However, most ROTC groups are required to hold physical training sessions, laboratories, and military science classes on a weekly basis. Even if a student is at a civilian college, they are associating with students who want to be in the military and are held to the military laws. Even more starkly contrasted are the officers who pursued a commission through Officer Training School/Officer Candidate School (OTS/OCS). In order to attend OTS/OCS, one must have received a bachelors degree. While in college, OTS/OCS graduates did not need to adhere to specific military law. Furthermore, they were not required to attend physical training sessions or specific military-related classes in order to graduate like the ROTC student would have to. Therefore, the people they associated with could be more varied, and a variety of ideas could be exchanged, potentially making them more open towards gays and lesbians serving openly. The ideas and values engrained within each group of officers through their unique environments may have had an impact on their perceptions of the repeal of DADT, similar to a person who grew up in a small, conservative town versus a big, liberal city. As such, it is suggested that examining the impact a commissioning source has on the post-DADT perceptions of an officer be studied in the future.

Furthermore, it should be noted that while the repeal of DADT has positively impacted the gay and lesbian military community, there is still a group of people who are not protected by military law. Transgender soldiers are still at risk of discharge should they decide to be open about who they are (Kerrigan, 2012). At the current time there is a gap in the literature regarding

the medical and psychological damage done to transgendered soldiers who are forced to serve in silence. Not only does the issue of transgender persons in the military need to be addressed, but there needs to be additional training with military members on addressing stereotypes of homosexuality in general. While research in this area may be limited, just as research on gay and lesbian soldiers was limited pre-DADT, it is recommended that research be conducted on the effect that the closeting of transgender persons in the military has on military effectiveness.

While more research is necessary, the fact that the repeal of DADT has had little impact on cohesion or effectiveness in the military is promising for further parity regarding gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT) individuals. Additionally, researchers should take advantage of the new opportunity to study issues surrounding GLBT soldiers. As this group has been traditionally inaccessible, it is important to study this population in order to strive to understand the unique workplace issues which exists for these individuals, and to help ensure the best workplace environment for all soldiers.

References

- Ahronson, A., & Cameron, J.E. (2007). The nature and consequences of group cohesion in a military sample. *Military Psychology, 19*, 9-25. doi:10.1080/08995600701323277
- Beal, D.J., Cohen, R.R., Burke, M.J., & McLendon C.L. (2003). Cohesion and performance in groups: A meta-analytic clarification of construct relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 989-1004. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.6.989
- Brailey, K., Vasterling, J.J., Proctor, S.P., Constans, J.I., & Friedman, M.J. (2007). PTSD symptoms, life events, and unit cohesion in U.S. soldiers: Baseline findings from the neurocognition deployment health study. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20*, 495-503. doi:10.1002/jts.20234
- Burks, D. J. (2011). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual victimization in the military: An unintended consequence of “Don't Ask, Don't Tell”? *American Psychologist, 66*, 604-613. doi:10.1037/a0024609
- Dickstein, B.D, McLean, C.P., Mintz, J., Conoscenti, L.M., Steencamp, M.M., Benson, T.A.,...Litz, B.T. (2010). Unit cohesion and PTSD symptom severity in air force medical personnel. *Military Medicine, 175*, 482-486. doi:10.1037/t05026-000
- Estrada, A. X. (2002). A preliminary scale for assessing attitudes towards homosexuals in the military. *Psychological Reports, 90*, 583-592. doi:10.1080/08995600802565751
- Estrada, A. X., & Laurence, J. H. (2009). Examining the impact of training on the homosexual conduct policy for military personnel. *Military Psychology, 21*, 62-80. doi:10.1080/08995600802565751
- Evans, C. (1991). Christian scholarship. *Christians & Scholarship, 2*, 3-7.

- Everly, B.A., Shih, M.J., & Ho, G.C. (2012). Don't ask, don't tell? Does disclosure of gay identity affect partner performance? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 407-410. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.08.005
- Friedkin, N.E., (2004). Social cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 409-425. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110625
- Gonzenbach, W. J., King, C., & Jablonski, P. (1999). Homosexuals and the military: An analysis of the spiral of silence. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 10, 281-296. doi:10.1080/106461799246762
- Griffith, J. (2002). Multilevel analysis of cohesion's relation to stress, well-being, identification, disintegration, and perceived combat readiness. *Military Psychology*, 14, 217-239. doi:10.1207/S15327876MP1403_3
- Hirschfeld, R.R., Jordan, M.H., Thomas, C.H., & Feild, H.S. (2008). Observed leadership potential of personnel in a team setting: Big five traits and proximal factors as predictors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16, 385-402. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2008.00443.x
- U.S. Department of Defense, Comprehensive Review Working Group. (2010). *Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office
- Kaplan, D., & Ben-Ari, E. (2000). Brothers and others in arms: Managing gay identity in combat units of the Israeli army. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28, 396-432. doi:10.1177/089124100129023954
- Kerrigan, M.F. (2012). Transgender discrimination in the military: The new don't ask, don't tell. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 18, 500-518. doi:10.1037/a0025771

Klassen, N., & Zimmermann, J. (2006). *The passionate intellect*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Moreno, K. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2001). Intergroup affect and social judgment: Feelings as inadmissible information. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 4, 21-29.

doi:10.1177/1368430201041002

Moradi, B. (2009). Sexual orientation disclosure, concealment, harassment, and military cohesion: Perceptions of LGBT veterans. *Military Psychology*, 21, 513-533.

doi:10.1080/08995600903206453

Nusbaum, M. H., Frasier, P. Y., Rojas, F., Trotter, K., & Tudor, G. (2008). Sexual orientation and sexual health care needs: A comparison of women beneficiaries in outpatient military health care settings. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 54, 259-276.

doi:10.1080/00918360801982165

Office of the Inspector General, Department of Defense. (2000). *Military environment with respect to the homosexual conduct policy* (Report No. D-2000-101). Retrieved from <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA375213>

Palm Center, Blue Ribbon Commission. (2006). *Financial analysis of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell": How much does the gay ban cost?* Retrieved from

<http://www.palmcenter.org/files/active/0/2006-FebBlueRibbonFinalRpt.pdf>

Plantinga, C. (1998). *Intellectual Love*. Retrieved from

<https://www.calvin.edu/convocation/1998/>

Poulin, C., Gouliquer, L., & Moore, J. (2009). Discharged for homosexuality from the Canadian military: Health implications for lesbians. *Feminism & Psychology*, 19, 496-516.

doi:10.1177/0959353509342772

- RAND Corporation. (2010). *Sexual orientation and U.S. military personnel policy: An update of RAND's 1993 policy*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG1056.pdf
- Rich, C., Schutten, J.K., & Rogers, R.A. (2012). "Don't drop the soap": Organizing sexuality in the repeal of the US military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. *Communication Monographs*, 79, 269-291. doi:10.1080/03637751.2012.697633
- Shamir, B., Brainin, E., Zakay, E. & Popper, M. (2000). Perceived combat readiness as collective efficacy: Individual-and group-level analysis. *Military Psychology*, 12, 105-119. doi:10.1207/S15327876MP1202_2
- Sinclair, D.G. (2009). Homosexuality and the military: A review of the literature. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 56, 701-718. doi:10.1080/00918360903054137
- Smith, D. M. (2008). Active duty military personnel presenting for care at a gay men's health clinic. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 54, 277-279. doi:10.1080/00918360801982173
- Tucker, J.S., Sinclair, R.R., & Thomas, J.L. (2005). The multilevel effects of occupational stressors on soldiers' well-being, organizational attachment, and readiness. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 276-299. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.3.276
- Wallenberg, J., Anspach, A., & Leon, A. M. (2011). Student degree program and attitudes toward gays and lesbians in the military: Is there a connection? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58, 476-496. doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.555668
- Wright, T.A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 486-493. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.3.486

Appendix A
Survey

Survey on Unit Cohesion after the Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell

**The following questions will be asked of all respondents
and will be used to measure unit cohesion.**

1. Service members in my immediate unit work together to get the job done.
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
2. Service members in my immediate unit pull together to perform as a team
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
3. Service members in my immediate unit trust each other
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
4. Service members in my immediate unit really care about each other
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
5. Service members in my immediate unit can get help from their leaders on personal problems
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
6. Leaders in my immediate unit trust their unit members
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
7. Leaders in my immediate unit have the skills and abilities to lead unit members into combat
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
8. Leaders in my immediate unit care about their Service members
(1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
9. Do you currently serve with a male or female Service member you know to be homosexual?
Yes No

**The following questions will be asked only to those who answered "Yes" to question 9.
All other respondents will be directed to the General Information section.**

10. Do you currently work in a unit with a leader you know to be gay or lesbian?
Yes No
11. Do you currently work in a unit with a coworker you know to be gay or lesbian?
Yes No
12. Do you currently work in a unit with a subordinate you know to be gay or lesbian?
Yes No

The following questions will be asked only to those who answered “Yes” on question 10.

14. In the unit where you have a leader you know to be gay or lesbian, about how many other unit members also know the leader is gay or lesbian?

- 1) All or most 2)Some 3)A few 4)None 5)Don't know

15. How would you rate the unit's ability to work together?

- 1) Very good 2)Good 3)Neither good nor poor 4)Poor 5)Very poor

16. Among all the factors that affect how well a unit works together, how much does the unit members' knowledge that this leader is gay or lesbian affect the unit's ability to work together?

- 1) A lot 2) Some 3)A little 4)Not at all 5)No basis to judge

17. Is the effect on the unit's ability to work together...

- 1) Mostly positive 2)Mostly negative 3>About equally positive and negative

The following questions will be asked only to those who answered “Yes” on question 11.

18. In the unit where you have a coworker you know to be gay or lesbian, about how many other unit members also know the leader is gay or lesbian?

- 1) All or most 2)Some 3)A few 4)None 5)Don't know

19. How would you rate the unit's ability to work together?

- 1) Very good 2)Good 3)Neither good nor poor 4)Poor 5)Very poor

20. Among all the factors that affect how well a unit works together, how much does the unit members' knowledge that this coworker is gay or lesbian affect the unit's ability to work together?

- 1) A lot 2) Some 3)A little 4)Not at all 5)No basis to judge

21. Is the effect on the unit's ability to work together...

- 1) Mostly positive 2)Mostly negative 3>About equally positive and negative

The following questions will be asked only to those who answered “Yes” on question 12.

22. In the unit where you have a subordinate you know to be gay or lesbian, about how many other unit members also know the leader is gay or lesbian?

- 1) All or most 2)Some 3)A few 4)None 5)Don't know

23. How would you rate that unit's ability to work together?

- 1) Very good 2)Good 3)Neither good nor poor 4)Poor 5)Very poor

24. Among all the factors that affect how well a unit works together, how much does the unit members' knowledge that this subordinate is gay or lesbian affect the unit's ability to work together?

1) A lot 2) Some 3) A little 4) Not at all 5) No basis to judge

25. Is the effect on the unit's ability to work together...

1) Mostly positive 2) Mostly negative 3) About equally positive and negative

**The following questions will be asked of all respondents
and will be used to measure unit cohesion.**

26. Since the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, if a Service member in your immediate unit has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, has it affected...

- a) How Service members in your immediate unit work together to get the job done?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect
- b) How Service members in your immediate unit pull together to perform as a team?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect
- c) How Service members in your immediate unit trust each other?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect
- d) How much Service members in your immediate unit care about each other?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect

27. Since the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, if a Service member in your immediate unit has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, has it affected the extent to which...

- a) Service members in your immediate unit can get help from their leaders on personal problems?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect
- b) Leaders in your immediate unit trust their unit members?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect
- c) Leaders in your immediate unit have the skills and abilities to lead unit members into combat?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect
- d) Leaders in your immediate unit care about their Service members?
1) Very positively 2) Positively 3) Equally as positively as negatively 4) Negatively
5) Very negatively 6) No effect

Demographic Questions

Are you male or female?

Male Female

What is your sexual orientation?

Straight Gay/Lesbian Other Prefer not to answer

What is your ethnicity?

- White
- Black or African American
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian-American, Asian-Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or other Southeast Asian
- Native Hawaiian, Samoan, Guamanian, Chamorro, or other Pacific Islander

What is your current age?

18-24 25-31 32-38 39-45 45-52 53-59 60 or older

What is your present pay grade?

E1-E3 E4 E5-E6 E7-E9 W1-W5 O1-O3 O4 or above

Current Service Affiliation

Air Force Army Marine Corps Navy Coast Guard

Active or Reserve duty?

Active Reserve

Appendix B
Recruitment Speech

Hello. I'm Stephanie Vis, an undergraduate honors student majoring in psychology at Seattle Pacific University. As part of my honors research project, I am surveying military personnel (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard) to look at unit cohesion after the repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." If you are a member of the U.S. Armed Forces--Active, National Guard, or Reserve--please message me through Facebook and I will send you the survey, or you can take the survey online by clicking on this link:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/DADTunitcohesion>. The survey does NOT ask for your name.

At the end of the survey (if you wish) you can provide your email address to be entered into a raffle drawing for a \$25, \$50, or \$75 Visa gift card. Your email will be kept separate from your survey answers and will be destroyed after the raffle takes place.

Table 1

Overall Cohesion

	<i>N</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall Cohesion	98	1.00	4.00	2.9158	.72638

Table 2

Gender Differences in Perception of Unit Cohesion

	Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>
Overall Cohesion	Male	71	2.8345	.72573	.08613
	Female	27	3.1296	.69639	.13402
			<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
Overall Cohesion	Equal variances assumed		-1.818	96	.072

Table 3

Sexual Orientation Differences in Perceptions of Unit Cohesion

	Orientation	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>
Overall Cohesion	Straight	85	2.9176	.73232	.07943
	Gay	9	2.9444	.80066	.26689
			<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Overall Cohesion	Equal variances assumed		-.104	92	.918

	Orientation	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>
Overall Cohesion	Straight	85	2.9176	.73232	.07943
	Gay or Other	12	2.8854	.74326	.21456
			<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Overall Cohesion	Equal variances assumed		.142	95	.887

Table 4

Q14 - In the Unit Where You Have a Leader you Know to be Gay or Lesbian, About How Many Other Unit Members Also Know the Leader is Gay or Lesbian?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All or Most	10	10.2	55.6	55.6
	Some	4	4.1	22.2	77.8
	A Few	3	3.1	16.7	94.4
	None	1	1.0	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	18.4	100.0	
Missing	System	80	81.6		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 5

Q15 – How Would You Rate That Unit's Ability to Work Together

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Good	11	11.2	61.1	61.1
	Good	3	3.1	16.7	77.8
	Neither Good nor Poor	1	1.0	5.6	83.3
	Poor	2	2.0	11.1	94.4
	Very Poor	1	1.0	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	18.4	100.0	
Missing	System	80	81.6		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 6

Q16 - Among All the Factors that Affect How Well a Unit Works Together, How Much Does the Unit Members' Knowledge That This Leader is Gay or Lesbian Affect the Unit's Ability to Work Together?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A Lot	1	1.0	5.6	5.6
	Some	3	3.1	16.7	22.2
	A Little	2	2.0	11.1	33.3
	Not At All	11	11.2	61.1	94.4
	No Basis to Judge	1	1.0	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	18.4	100.0	
Missing	System	80	81.6		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 7

Q18 – In the Unite Where You Have a Coworker You Know to be Gay or Lesbian, About How Many Other Unit Members Also Know the Leader is Gay or Lesbian?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All or Most	25	25.5	52.1	52.1
	Some	10	10.2	20.8	72.9
	A Few	8	8.2	16.7	89.6
	None	1	1.0	2.1	91.7
	Don't Know	4	4.1	8.3	100.0
	Total	48	49.0	100.0	
Missing	System	50	51.0		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 8

Q19 – How Would You Rate the Unit's Ability to Work Together?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Good	31	31.6	64.6	64.6
	Good	12	12.2	25.0	89.6
	Neither Good nor Poor	3	3.1	6.2	95.8
	Poor	1	1.0	2.1	97.9
	Very Poor	1	1.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	48	49.0	100.0	
Missing	System	50	51.0		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 9

Q20 – Among all the Factors That Affect How Well a Unit Works Together, How Much Does the Unit Members' Knowledge that This Coworker is Gay or Lesbian Affect the Unit's Ability to Work Together?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A Lot	3	3.1	6.2	6.2
	Some	2	2.0	4.2	10.4
	A Little	7	7.1	14.6	25.0
	Not At All	36	36.7	75.0	100.0
	Total	48	49.0	100.0	
Missing	System	50	51.0		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 10

Q22 – In the Unit Where You Have a Subordinate You Know to be Gay or Lesbian, About How Many Other Unit Members Also Know the Leader is Gay or Lesbian?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All or Most	19	19.4	63.3	63.3
	Some	5	5.1	16.7	80.0
	A Few	5	5.1	16.7	96.7
	Don't Know	1	1.0	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	30.6	100.0	
Missing	System	68	69.4		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 11

Q23 – How Would You Rate That Unit's Ability to Work Together?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Good	17	17.3	56.7	56.7
	Good	8	8.2	26.7	83.3
	Neither Good nor Poor	4	4.1	13.3	96.7
	Very Poor	1	1.0	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	30.6	100.0	
Missing	System	68	69.4		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 12

Q24 – Among All the Factors That Affect How Well a Unit Works Together, How Much Does the Unit Members' Knowledge That This Subordinate is Gay or Lesbian Affect the Unit's Ability to Work Together?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A Lot	2	2.0	6.7	6.7
	Some	2	2.0	6.7	13.3
	A Little	4	4.1	13.3	26.7
	Not At All	22	22.4	73.3	100.0
	Total	30	30.6	100.0	
Missing	System	68	69.4		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 13

Q26a – How, if at All, Has the Repeal of DADT Affected How Service Members In Your Immediate Unit Work Together to Get the Job Done?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	6	6.1	10.5	10.5
	Positively	5	5.1	8.8	19.3
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	11	11.2	19.3	38.6
	Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	43.9
	Very Negatively	2	2.0	3.5	47.4
	No Effect	30	30.6	52.6	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 14

Q28b – How, if at all, has the Repeal of DADT Affect How Service Members in Your Immediate Unit Pull Together to Perform as a Team?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	7	7.1	12.3	12.3
	Positively	5	5.1	8.8	21.1
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	10	10.2	17.5	38.6
	Negatively	5	5.1	8.8	47.4
	Very Negatively	1	1.0	1.8	49.1
	No Effect	29	29.6	50.9	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 15

Q26c – How, if at All, Has the Repeal of DADT Affected How Service Members in Your Immediate Unit Trust Each Other?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	6	6.1	10.5	10.5
	Positively	5	5.1	8.8	19.3
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	10	10.2	17.5	36.8
	Negatively	6	6.1	10.5	47.4
	Very Negatively	1	1.0	1.8	49.1
	No Effect	29	29.6	50.9	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 16

Q26d – How, if at All, Has the Repeal of DADT Affected How Much Service Members in your Immediate Unit Care About Each Other?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	8	8.2	14.0	14.0
	Positively	3	3.1	5.3	19.3
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	13	13.3	22.8	42.1
	Negatively	2	2.0	3.5	45.6
	Very Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	50.9
	No Effect	28	28.6	49.1	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 17

Q27a – How, if at All, Has the Repeal of DADT Affected the Extent to Which Service Members in Your Immediate Unit Can Get Help from Their Leaders on Personal Problems?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	6	6.1	10.5	10.5
	Positively	6	6.1	10.5	21.1
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	11	11.2	19.3	40.4
	Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	45.6
	Very Negatively	2	2.0	3.5	49.1
	No Effect	29	29.6	50.9	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 18

Q27b – Since the Repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, if a Service Member in Your Immediate Unit has Said He or She is Gay or Lesbian, How, if at All, Has it Affected the Extent to Which Leaders in Your Immediate Unit Trust Their Unit Members?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	5	5.1	8.8	8.8
	Positively	6	6.1	10.5	19.3
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	13	13.3	22.8	42.1
	Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	47.4
	Very Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	52.6
	No Effect	27	27.6	47.4	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 19

Q27c – Since the Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, if a Service Member in Your Immediate Unit has Said He or She is Gay or Lesbian, How, if at All, Has it Affected the Extent to Which Leaders in Your Immediate Unit Have the Skills and Abilities to Lead Unit Members into Combat?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	5	5.1	8.8	8.8
	Positively	8	8.2	14.0	22.8
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	7	7.1	12.3	35.1
	Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	40.4
	Very Negatively	4	4.1	7.0	47.4
	No Effect	30	30.6	52.6	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 20

Q27d - Since the Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, if a Service Member in Your Immediate Unit has Said He or She is Gay or Lesbian, How, if at All, Has it Affected the Extent to Which Leaders in Your Immediate Unit Care About Their Service Members?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Positively	6	6.1	10.5	10.5
	Positively	9	9.2	15.8	26.3
	Equally as Positively as Negatively	9	9.2	15.8	42.1
	Negatively	3	3.1	5.3	47.4
	Very Negatively	2	2.0	3.5	50.9
	No Effect	28	28.6	49.1	100.0
	Total	57	58.2	100.0	
Missing	System	41	41.8		
Total		98	100.0		

Table 21

Perceptions of the Effect of the Repeal of DADT on Job Performance Between Officers and Enlisted Personnel

	<u>Chi-Square Tests</u>		Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
	Value	<i>df</i>	
Pearson Chi-Square	13.369 ^a	5	.020
N of Valid Cases	57		

Table 22

Perceptions of the Effect of the Repeal of DADT on Unit Trust Between Officers and Enlisted Personnel

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	<i>df</i>	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.915 ^a	5	.024
N of Valid Cases	57		