

THE MILITARY FAMILY, WARRIOR MASCULINITY, AND BUREAUCRATIC
HARASSMENT: INDIVIDUAL, INTERACTIONAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SEXUAL ABUSE OF U.S. SERVICE-WOMEN

by

STEPHANIE M. BONNES

B.A., Gettysburg College 2008

M.A., Rhodes University, 2010

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Colorado in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

2018

This thesis entitled:

The Military Family, Warrior Masculinity, and Bureaucratic Harassment: Individual, Interactional, and Institutional Level Contributors to the Sexual Abuse of U.S. Service-Women

written by Stephanie M. Bonnes
has been approved for the Department of Sociology

Dr. Joanne E. Belknap, Chair

Dr. Janet L. Jacobs

Dr. Sanyu A. Mojola

Dr. Hillary A. Potter

Dr. Christina A. Sue

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards of scholarly work in the above-mentioned discipline.

IRB protocol # 13-0299

Stephanie Bonnes (Ph.D., Sociology)

The Military Family, Warrior Masculinity, and Bureaucratic Harassment: Individual, Interactional, and Institutional Level Contributors to the Sexual Abuse of U.S. Service-Women
Dissertation Directed by Dr. Joanne Belknap

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the institutional, interactional, and individual-level contributors to sexual abuse of women in the U.S. military. Drawing on 41 in-depth interviews, I privilege service-women's own voices and experiences to show how they employ various strategies to avoid, mitigate, respond to, and sometimes confront sexual harassment in the gendered military institution. I show how women's status as outsiders in the military begins when their experiences do not align with the institution's promise of family. I then explore how women attempt inclusion through various masculinity displays, managing stigmatized feminine identities, and engaging in defensive othering against other women. These interactions occur against a masculinized organizational structure where spatial arrangements and institutional expectations of caregiving, trust, and loyalty reinforce women's sexual abuse vulnerability. I outline the tactics and consequences of workplace harassment that occur through administrative channels, a phenomenon I label bureaucratic harassment. I show how the manipulation of administrative rules and regulations is made possible by the interplay between a gendered and raced organizational climate and bureaucratic features such as discretion, hierarchy, and the blending of work and personal life. I argue that in an extremely gendered and masculine institution, that sexual harassment complicates service-women's military identities. To resolve this dilemma, I argue that many service-women downplay, excuse, or even participate in sexual harassment to

protect their masculinity. I contrast this with showing how responses to harassment differ among service-women who have experienced sexual assault and service-women who have experienced combat. I argue that sexual harassment does not present an identity dilemma for these two groups of women, and therefore they confront harassment. Overall, I demonstrate how masculinity constrains responses to sexual harassment for most service-women, and also determines which service-women do confront harassment. Furthermore, I identify how social location (i.e., race, age, sexuality, military occupational specialty, and rank) shapes sexual abuse vulnerability and reporting, providing an intersectional analysis to the identity narratives and harassment experiences of U.S. service-women. Ultimately, this dissertation explores the power of masculinity in organizations and the identity struggles that women must navigate within the workplace. In doing so, this study contributes to the literature on feminist criminology, masculinity and femininity, and gender and organizations.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to all of the service-women who shared their stories with me and two in particular. Thank you for your courage.

To Chargy: Our lives have been intertwined since we were 6 years old and now our careers will be similarly entangled. I am incredibly honored that our careers are forever linked in the same way that our childhoods are. Even when I am not with you in person or seeking your insight into a particular argument I am making, you guide and support me in this process... simply through friendship.

To Idgey: You showed me friendship and sisterhood in all meanings of those words throughout the last several years. You've always been someone I have looked up to. Your wisdom, advice, and keen eye for analysis have helped me in many aspects of my life, but especially with this dissertation. Thank you for reading multiple drafts of my chapters and for your encouragement along the way.

I love you both and I hope that in reading the words I have written here, you can say "that friend speaks my mind." Continue to let your light shine.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank my dissertation advisor. Jo, thank you for shaping me as a scholar and a teacher and for setting an example as what an activist-scholar truly looks like. Thank you for all of your support in both my professional and personal life. I am so grateful you encouraged me to stick to my own analysis and terms relating to my bureaucratic harassment article. Thank you for all of your support and the care you showed me during my pregnancy and now while mothering. Thank you for all of the love and friendship you have shown me, Drew, and Eloise.

Janet, thank you for your intellectual guidance, support, encouragement and advice throughout these last several years. You have been pushing me to think deeper and in more nuanced ways from my first year in your Feminist Theory seminar through the last draft of this dissertation. Thank you for knowing when I needed to get tea or when I just needed a chat or a hug. I could not have navigated some very difficult experiences without your advice, encouragement, and friendship. I appreciate, also, that you care so much for Eloise.

Thank you to my dissertation committee. Sanyu, thank you for your intellectual guidance and your advice and mentorship on my academic career. Thank you, also, for letting me be a student “one last time” and pushing me to expand and enhance my arguments. Thanks to Christi for helping me develop my interview guide, which allowed for me to gather richer narratives. Hillary, thank you for your advice and wisdom. I will never forget when your seminar met until 10:00pm and you bought us all dinner, showing your compassion for your students.

Thanks to my writing group, Nikki Lambert, Jen Pace, Amanda Barrientez, and Kendra Hutchens for helping me develop my mess of ideas into coherent thoughts. I will miss our conversations all squeezed together on the sofa. Thanks to Vanessa Roberts and Ade Modile for your academic support and friendship. I owe a special thank you to my CO family, Adriana

Núñez and Andrew Gutierrez. Your friendship, intellectual guidance, and emotional support propelled me forward over the years. Thanks for all the HHs where all I did was complain and for working with me late night. Thank you for making me laugh and for teaching me relaxation techniques like the tree game. Graduate school was made so much better because of you.

Thanks to my three Marines for letting me talk about an aspect of your life as if I am the expert—it must be very weird to have a friend who “studies” you! Choosing this topic has allowed me to better understand you and your experiences. I cannot thank you enough for letting me get an extra glimpse into your lives. Palm-pants, thanks for inviting me to your home and work. I learned so much those few weeks, but I especially enjoyed the company and the time with my friend. It reminded me a bit of 2004.

My friends from friends and partners: Thanks for your interest in my work and the support you offered in the forms of phone conversations, group texts, Boulder visits, N&A, Halloween traditions, gossip, questionable hikes, small batch mimos, nerts, good soaks, meat pies and reading and promoting my work. You’ve been my emotional and intellectual companions since around the age of 14 and I am lucky to still have you as I complete my PhD. Thank you for encouraging me to do work I believe in. Thank you, also, for providing much needed escapes from academia in the form of friendly moons, beach weekends, keys trips, Stellenbosch Luncheons, and days at Cole’s place. A special thank you to Erin and Meredith who accompanied me into motherhood, and Abby who ushered me there. I am not sure I could have finished the PhD and had a baby in the same year without you three. The group pregnancy and now mothering text message is a sanity saver, and it is nice to know that someone else is up when it is 4:00am and I need to talk. Thanks also to Abby for always giving me perspective and for framing my decision to come to Colorado for graduate school as a “healthy risk.” I needed

the reminder that it is “the hard that makes it great” to stick it out at times and I cannot thank you enough for providing that to me.

TLOMAH: the academic commune will be a thing. Until then, I appreciate the support from the application process through the defense. I love having you to commiserate with in this weird career/life we have all chosen. Kate and Gomey: The four best friends have kept me smiling, traveling, and exploring at a time when it is very easy to sit in one place all day lost in your thoughts. Thanks for the memories from SA, Lakefest, London, Prague, and keysmoons.

Thanks to my siblings Nana and Joey for making me laugh and helping me navigate our family together. Coming home is always enhanced by seeing you two and celebrating together, which refuels me to write. Thanks to my cousins who are more like my siblings: Angie, Christine, and Sean. You have supported me in so many ways throughout these last 6 years (and the many more before that). Thanks for visiting me in CO, group messages, long phone conversations, brigantine nights, keysin, and European strolls. The memories of our cousins’ weekends have motivated me to keep working. I have leaned on all of you throughout these last few years for different reasons. Thanks to my Aunt Mary for all of your words of encouragement. Your support of my pregnancy and your love for Eloise has really eased me into motherhood. Thanks to my Aunt Clare who always supports me, is always on my side, makes me laugh, and keeps me in raviolis. Thank you for validating my perspective and listening to me vent as well as your support and love for baby Ellie. Spagnoli red was one of the highlights of my time in graduate school. Thank you, all, for being flexible with my academic schedule.

Sarah, Thanks for being a sister-friend. Our conversations help me see things through new perspectives. Your ability to grasp difficult concepts and confront inequality at such a young age gives me hope in the next generation. Keep questioning, challenging, and working hard.

Special thanks to Marina, my stepmom, who is my biggest supporter. Thank you for listening to me vent about various frustrations I had along the way. Thank you for not only coming to one of my presentations, but for engaging and asking a question! Thanks for the late-night kitchen chats around the island, making me laugh, and keeping me in Wawa coffee.

Thanks to my Dad who was the first person to encourage me to be a critical thinker, challenge assumptions, and consider perspective. Since that moment when I told you I could run faster than a plane and you said, “can you run faster than a car?” you have been encouraging me to consider different viewpoints. You also never shied away from flat out telling me I am wrong... both of which have made me a better thinker and intellectual. Thank you, also, for encouraging and nurturing my non-academic interests and hobbies. Escapes to the Keys have been the recreational fuel that motivated me to keep writing. To the Bonnes 4 (and Drew): Our winter and keys trips always gave me something to look forward to when it was snowing and I had papers to grade and papers to write. I cannot wait to explore more of the world with you all.

And now to thank those who share the home where this dissertation was written and with the academic that wrote it. Simone, thank you for not biting me EVERY time I could not play with you. Although you did bite me a lot. You are still my favorite cat. I started this dissertation before I had my baby, Eloise. Yet the most intensive writing periods were during her first few months here. Thinking about this prospect before I experienced it filled me with great doubt and fear that it could not be done. Eloise, as I look back after having done it, I realized that you came at exactly the right time. You bring me so much joy every day and bring meaning to each moment. The desire to spend more time with you makes me more efficient. I feel more balanced, accomplished, and capable after you have arrived than before. Thank you for bringing so much happiness into our household. People often ask me how do I spend so much time thinking about

difficult topics? The answer is that I have an amazing partner, Drew. I'm not alone in this. You have been intellectually, emotionally, and personally invested in this endeavor. You've literally picked me up off of the floor and encouraged me to keep writing and offered support when I couldn't (comp flashbacks). You read and gave feedback on all of my chapters before I sent them to my committee. You passionately argued with me about claims I was making, pushing me to do better and be clearer. You encouraged me to stick to my interpretation of the data. For all of these things, this PhD is partially yours. Academia is full of ups and downs as well as self-doubt. I could not have embarked on this career, let alone stick with it, if I didn't have you. You are a constant source of support when I feel inadequate and you are the first to celebrate me when I succeed. I first knew I loved learning from you in a classroom in South Africa in 2006, and I am so glad that I continue to learn from you and engage in intellectual debates with you from 2 feet away in our shared home office. Thanks, also, for the life we have built together. A life of travel, games, camping, fishing, music, squash, happy hour, communication, support, love, and where you make me coffee every morning. All of these things make me whole and a happy person who has the mindset and energy to do this work, but the last one gets me out of bed to start each day. I love you.

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Methods	34
III.	Gender and the “Military Family”	56
IV.	Stigmatized Identities and Masculine Identity Work	99
V.	Institutional Contributors to Sexual Abuse Vulnerability	138
VI.	Bureaucratic Harassment of U.S. Service-women	153
VII.	Service-women’s Responses to Sexual Harassment	176
VIII.	Conclusions	208
	REFERENCES	225
	APPENDICES	
	A. Interview Guide	249
	B. List of Textual Sources	251
	C. Tables	253

LIST OF TABLES

2.1 Sample Demographics	253
2.2 Selected Interviewee Demographic Characteristics	254
3.1 Service-women's Use of the Family Narrative	255
7.1 Service-women's Responses to Sexual Harassment	255

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

SEXUAL ABUSE IN THE U.S. MILITARY

Despite being a major employer of women, the U.S. Military continues to struggle with creating a work environment that is receptive to women. Over 360,000 women serve in the U.S. Military, comprising 17.2% of active duty and reserve forces across the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy (Department of Defense 2016). Since the 1990s, there have been several military sexual assault and harassment scandals that resulted in national media attention, such as the 1991 Navy Tailhook case, the 1996 Army Aberdeen scandal, the 2003 Air Force Academy Sexual Assault Scandal, and the 2017 Marines United Scandal (Callahan 2009; O’Neill 1998). The media attention to these cases is reinforced by quantitative research showing high levels of sexual harassment of military women (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2001; Bostock and Daley 2007; Firestone and Harris 1994; Hay and Elig 1999), as well as the high likelihood of attempted or completed rape victimizations (Bostock and Daley 2007; Sadler, Booth, Cook and Doebbeling 2003; Turchik and Wilson 2010) by other members of the military. These findings indicate that women in the U.S. military experience sexual harassment and assault from their supervisors and peers more than women in the civilian workforce. For example, Bostock and Daley (2007) found that the lifetime prevalence rate of rape among active duty women in the Air Force was 28%, compared to a lifetime prevalence rate of 17.6% among a sample of the national population (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). Additionally, Antecol and Cobb-Clark (2001) found that 70.9 percent of active duty women experienced some form of sexual harassment in the year they were surveyed. Similarly, in examining 558 service-women who served in the military during Vietnam through the early 2000s, Sadler et al. (2003) found that 79% had experienced sexual harassment,

54% had experienced unwanted sexual contact, and 30% had experienced one or more completed or attempted rapes. Examining the experiences of sexual harassment by military branch, Hay and Elig (1999) found that the Marine Corps had the highest rate of sexual harassment (86%), while the Air Force had the lowest rate of sexual harassment (74%).

While there has been growing recognition of sexual harassment and abuse of women in the U.S. military, the extant research on the topic almost exclusively involves quantitative measures. Most studies rely on data collected from Department of Defense surveys from 1988, 1995, and 2002 focusing on sexual harassment (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2001; Firestone and Harris 1994; 1999; Harned et al. 2002; Hay and Elig 1999). Other studies use a variety of sampling techniques and survey designs to collect data on the sexual assault experiences of active duty service members (Bostock and Daley 2007) and veterans seeking medical care from veteran care centers (Coyle et al. 1996; Sadler et al. 2003). The existing research provides vital data on the frequencies of abuses yet reveals little about the dynamics and aftermath for women who experience harassment or abuse. Even less is known about how service-women of color experience sexual harassment and abuse. Taking an intersectional approach, this project intends to address some of these gaps through in-depth interviews with service-women. The primary purpose of this dissertation is to use a qualitative approach to research the dynamics, aftermath, and impacts of sexual harassment and abuse on service-women in the U.S. military. The importance of understanding these dynamics is particularly timely given the decision to open military combat roles to women and the beginning of the desegregation process of many military occupational specialties (MOS) (Tilghman 2015).

The high risks of sexual abuse among U.S. military women are particularly disturbing given that only an estimated 11 percent of U.S. military sexual assault survivors (both men and

women) officially reported these crimes (Department of Defense 2012). Research-identified barriers to service-women's official reporting of sexual harassment include unknown or unclear sexual harassment reporting protocol, the problem of the-chain-of-command protocol to report to a supervisor if the supervisor is the perpetrator, fear of undermining the morale of their units, being separated from their units, and losing their jobs (Jeffreys 2007; Sadler et al. 2003). Many service-women fear professional retaliation by other military personnel if they report their sexual abuse victimizations; and ultimately, many service-women who are sexually abused end up leaving the military altogether (Sims, Drasgow and Fitzgerald 2005). While these barriers to reporting have been noted, few studies have examined the mechanisms in place that create and sustain these barriers. Whereas prior studies have named bureaucratic procedure and its associated rules and regulations as a barrier to reporting harassment (Jeffreys 2007; Sadler et al. 2003), this dissertation focuses specifically on how military bureaucracy can be used to actively harass, intimidate, and abuse service-women.

Prior research on sexual abuse in the military provides several hypotheses as to why the rates of abuse are so high in the military context. Some scholars stress that a male-dominated environment and culture of hyper-masculinity contribute to sexual harassment, and that condoning harassment on an organizational level serves to exclude women and privilege men in the traditionally male workspace (Firestone and Harris 2009; Jeffreys 2007; Miller 1997; Rosen, Knudson, and Fancher 2004; Sadler et al. 2003; Skinner et al. 2000). In other words, some men in male-dominated organizations keep women in check through gender-based harassment (Miller 1997). This has led some scholars to identify the sexist and sexualized military work environment as increasing the risk of sexual harassment, assault, and rape of service-women (Firestone and Harris 2009; Sadler et al. 2003; Pershing 2003). Moreover, token status fosters

hyper-visibility and surveillance, which in turn restricts the tokens' freedom (Cohen and Swim 1995; Kanter 1977a). Although the military is a significant employer of men and women of color, White men still dominate the United States military and its culture reflects standards of hegemonic, White, hetero-normative masculinity (Burton 2014; Moore 1991). This places individuals with hyper-visibility due to their gender and/or race at an increased risk of gender and/or racial harassment (Reskin 1988; Sanchez-Hucles 1997). Additionally, studies note that command climate and unit climate towards women and sexual harassment is related to frequencies of sexual abuse in those units (Sadler et al. 2003). For example, Sadler et al. (2003) found that higher rates of rape were reported from veterans whose commanders condoned sexual harassment in their unit by encouraging or not punishing demeaning comments or gestures towards women.

It has also been found that military socialization and training simultaneously devalues women and femininity and valorizes the use of violence, which is considered a major contributor to the high levels of sexual abuse in the military (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Callahan 2009; Hinojosa 2010). Although past studies have examined hyper-masculinity in the military and link hyper-masculinity to increased risk of sexual abuse (Firestone and Harris 2009; Sadler et al. 2003), research on how women perceive and experience hyper-masculinity in the military is sparse. Further, few studies have qualitatively explored how women perceive and describe the harassment they experience in the military, which is the focus of this dissertation.

Finally, I would like to note that I examine a variety of behaviors that constitute sexual abuse. My working definition of sexual abuse includes gender harassment, sexual harassment, verbal harassment, inappropriate sexual comments, seductive behavior, sexual bribery and coercion, unwanted touching or groping, sexual assault, and both attempted and completed rape

(Miller 1997; Till 1980). Gender harassment refers to behaviors that are not sexual in nature but that are used to put women down, enforce traditional gender roles, and punish violations of traditional gender roles, (Miller 1997). These behaviors contribute to a hostile working environment and are a part of my examination of sexual harassment and abuse. For the purposes of this dissertation, I will use the more inclusive term “sexual abuse” to include all of the actions mentioned above. I will use the term “sexual harassment” to describe behaviors that could be described as gender harassment, inappropriate comments, seductive behavior, and verbal harassment.

Women in the Military

Until 1973, women serving in the military were often members of the women corps, where they trained and served in units separate from men (Moore 1996). The women corps ended when the military moved from the draft system to an all-volunteer institution in 1973. As the largest branch of the military, the Army has the largest number of women serving within it (68,965), which comprises 14.6% of the Army (Department of Defense 2016). However, the U.S. Air Force has the highest percentage of women serving (19.4% with 60,845 service-women), followed by the U.S. Navy (18.7% with 59,964 service-women), and the U.S. Marine Corps (8.1% with 14,854 service-women) (Department of Defense 2016). All of the different branches have had different experiences with the integration of women (Butler and Schmitdtke 2010). Similarly, these branches will each likely have different experiences with the integration of women into combat positions following the lifting of the military’s ban on women serving in these roles. Indeed, this is already the case, as the Marine Corps Commandant recommended that women serving in the Marine Corps remain excluded from certain combat jobs, despite being ordered to fully open all combat positions to women (Baldor 2015).

THEORETICAL FRAMING

This dissertation examines institutional, interactional, and individual level contributors to sexual abuse as well as how these three levels shape sexual abuse reporting. Throughout this dissertation I use gendered institution and inequality regime theory (Acker 1992; 2006), identity theory (Cast 2003; Stets and Burke 2000), and the concepts of identity work (Snow and Anderson 1987; Wilkins 2012; Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996) and hegemonic and warrior masculinity (Connell 1995; 2005; Hale 2008; Hinojosa 2010; Sasson-Levy 2011b) to examine sexual harassment and abuse in the military. Throughout my analysis, I understand “gender as a social structure” that creates gendered meanings at the individual, interactional, and organizational level (Risman 2004). My dissertation contributes to three different literatures: that on feminist criminology and abuse victimization; gender and organizations; and gender identity, identity work, and masculinity.

Gender and Organizations

Total institutions

In Goffman’s (1961:xiii) work *Asylums*, he defines total institutions as “A place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life.” He argues that in total institutions “all aspects of life are conducted in the same place under the same single authority.” Callahan (2009) argues that at the United States Air Force Academy, cadets go through a serious depersonalization processes by having their heads shaved, replacing civilian clothing with a uniform, and being hazed. Similar rituals across military branches are found at basic training, boot camp, and officer candidate school. For example, upon entering officer candidate school, Marines start an intensive training program, restricted from

wearing civilian clothing, told how to wear their hair, and regulated in how they interact with other candidates, military personnel, and their own friends and family. Introduction into military institutions often involves physical and mental stress, lack of sleep, surveillance and inspection of daily activities, and the regulation of appearance and behavior. Additionally, new military personnel are introduced to the military hierarchy and indoctrinated with core military values (Rohall et al. 2006). The military hierarchy is reinforced through tight regulation and control of the work and daily life of military members. For example, the military regulates how service-members should dress, behave, and speak in both military and civilian spaces (Bryant 1979; Marine Corps Uniform Regulations). The military requires a uniform but also has a “civilian attire policy” that dictates how service-members should dress in non-military spaces and specifies clothing that is prohibited, such as frayed garments, and the expected length of skirts, dresses, and shorts (Department of the Navy). Bryant (1979) argues that controlling clothing (by enforcing a uniform) represents the broader control that the military has over the other aspects of service-members’ lives. Indeed, there are many other rules and regulations relating to both military and civilian life of service-members.

The military can be described as “part residential community, part formal organization” (Goffman 1961:12), especially when examining military bases. The military is also its own bureaucratic organization, with hierarchal power structures and a complex division of labor, rules, and regulations (Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010; Weber 1947). It has its own education system, legal system, police, lawyers, courts, and medical system that operate separate from civilian systems (Turchik and Wilson 2010). These policies and regulations are reinforced by a strict division of labor and chain of command, as well as group punishments (Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010). For these reasons, several scholars have classified the military as a total

institution or a near-total institution (Callahan 2009; Hale 2008; Hinojosa 2010). The closed environment of the military and the fact that military misconduct, including sexual abuse, is handled within the institution have implications for my study. In this dissertation, I show that sexual harassment and abuse occur at multiple sites in service-women's military lives including at work, on base in non-work spaces, in recreational spaces, and even in their places of residence (particularly for those who live on base). This means that sexual harassment can be more prevalent in the military compared to other workplaces, as perpetrators live, work, and socialize in many, if not all, of the same spaces as victims. The closed environment also has implications for how women experience and respond to harassment as its effects are heightened. Further, in a near-total institution military identities and insider status become particularly important, which has implications for women who are sexually harassed in the military. Finally, the fact that sexual abuse is handled within the institution, and that a court-martial is called by one's own unit, means that the risks for reporting are also heightened.

Bureaucracy

Weber (1947) conceptualizes bureaucracy as a system of structures, policies, and practices designed to standardize the operations of organizations and of the individuals working within them. The military as an organization has a clear hierarchy, with written rules and policies regulating recruitment, promotions, and job descriptions, and is premised on the notion of rational standardization; all key components of Weber's "ideal type" of bureaucracy. Therefore, the military context is an exemplary place to examine the ways in which individuals interact with and experience bureaucratic structures.

Prior research on inequality and bureaucracy is highly polarized, (Acker 1990; Bielby 2000; Cook and Waters 1998; Putnam and Mumby 1993; Reskin 2000). Some scholars argue

that bureaucracy promotes equality by increasing transparency in job descriptions, performance evaluations, and organizational policy (Bielby 2000; Reskin 2000). Bureaucratic practices have been attributed to reducing discrimination in the workplace through limiting subjectivity and therefore leaving less room for personal biases in recruitment, hiring, decision making, promoting, and firing. This is because bureaucracy has been understood as a system of rules and processes that standardize policies regarding employment, making criteria related to hiring, promoting, and firing seemingly objective and depersonalized. With the same criteria applying to all potential and actual employees, opportunities for marginalized groups increase in bureaucratic organizations (Bielby 2000; Guthrie and Roth 1999). Indeed, some scholars argue that discrimination and inequality are more prevalent in non-bureaucratic organizations because individuals will resort to stereotypes and biases in decision making without clear rules and regulations (Reskin 2000).

Other scholars argue that within masculine institutions, such as the military, bureaucracy often values and rewards traditionally masculine displays such as competition, control, and aggression through the hierarchal enforcement of rational logic (Ferguson 1984; Maier and Messerschmidt 1998; Martin 2001). This makes women both more likely to be harassed and less likely than men to succeed in these environments. Further, Mackinnon (1979) argues that women's roles in the workplace are entangled with unequal sexual relations, creating risk for sexual harassment. While it is individuals who enact bureaucracy and inequality, it is argued that bureaucracy is conducive to harassment because the rational logic and appearance of equality conceals power relations and power imbalances within organizations (Acker 1990; Putnam and Mumby 1993).

In general, prior research on bureaucracy either examines the way that specific procedures and policies at the organizational level are helpful or harmful to disadvantaged groups, or analyzes bureaucratic logic at the macro level as inherently helpful or harmful to disadvantaged groups. Still others suggest that bureaucracy does not automatically align with hegemonic masculinity and the subordination of women (Martin 2013), nor is it inherently gendered (Britton 2000). These scholars argue that organizations themselves shape how bureaucracy is enacted and that some bureaucracies can be nondiscriminatory. Scholars examining inequality from an intersectional perspective argue that gender, race, class, sexuality, nationality, age, and other social locations all intersect and form a “matrix of domination” and should be understood in relation to one another rather than in isolation (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1992). Women’s experiences with and perceptions of workplace harassment are shaped by both organizational context and social location (Texeira 2002; Welsh et al. 2006). Therefore, it is important to examine intersecting oppressions when exploring the workplace harassment experiences of women in a gendered and raced organization like the U.S. military (S. Welsh et al. 2006). In this dissertation, I combine gender organization theory and theories of bureaucracy to understand sexual harassment in the military and to demonstrate how women can be harassed through bureaucratic channels. While I do not argue that bureaucracy is inherently patriarchal and harmful to women, I do argue that bureaucratic policies, procedures, and structures in a gendered organization like the military are likely to produce gendered processes that facilitate sexual harassment while appearing to be equal.

Gendered Organization Theory and Gender as a Social Structure

Gendered organization theory argues that “gender is present in the processes, practices, images and ideologies, and distributions of power in the various sectors of social life” (Acker

1992, 567). Gender is not limited to the individual level but has interactional, collective, and institutional components (Martin 2004; Risman 2004). Risman (2004) conceptualizes “gender as a social structure” in itself that creates gendered processes, interactions, and meanings.

Understanding “gender as a social structure” or an “institution” demonstrates how individuals enact gender within a given context, but also how gendered contexts shape individuals (Martin 2004; Risman 2004). This conceptualization acknowledges the interplay between gendered individuals, gendered interactions, and gendered institutional practices that all reinforce and re-shape one another. My dissertation employs these theories to examine how gendered selves, gendered interactions, and gendered bureaucratic and organizational structures shape service-women’s experiences in the United States military. Examining the interplay between these three levels of gendered meanings, I show how these three levels work together to make service-women vulnerable to sexual abuse.

The military as a gendered institution

It is important to note that at military academies and during boot camp, Officer Candidate School (OCS), and basic training, individuals are subjected to a series of physical and mental tests, while simultaneously being taught core military values (Callahan 2009; Morris 1996; Kimmel 2000). These values have been noted as aggressiveness, dominance, physical strength, mental fortitude, bravery, control, and violence (Barrett 1996; Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Callahan 2009; Hale 2008; Higate 2002; Hinojosa 2010; Sasson-Levy 2003b). Not only is the military a space dominated by men and which has been associated with an increased risk of harassment (Kanter 1977; MacKinnon 1979), but Bayard de Volo and Hall (2015) state that military education is structured around devaluing femininity. For these reasons, Sasson-Levy (2011b:405) argues that the military is an “extremely gendered organization” where “the level of

gendering” is elevated. Additionally, stereotypes surrounding women of color are often used to inform workplace expectations and treatment of these women, who may already be hyper-visible because of their race and gender (Collins 2000; Texeira 2002). For example, Black women in policing feared being seen as overly aggressive and confrontational, two stereotypes of Black women, if they reported the numerous incidents of sexual harassment they experienced in the workplace; thereby remaining silent to keep their jobs (Texeira 2002). Attitudes about race and gender become embedded in the military’s organizational and interactional structure (Acker 2006; Risman 2004). The current study examines how the gendered and raced context of the military shapes the ways in which the military bureaucracy is implemented and the ways in which military identities are invoked.

Identity Theory

Identity theory has roots in early symbolic interactionist work that argues that individuals are comprised of selves that are created in social interaction (Cooley 1902; Mead 1934). Individuals are able to view themselves as objects that are both able to act and be acted on (Mead 1934; Stets and Burke 2000). In doing so, individuals are able to use the social context and social interactions to make meaning out of actions and to predict the expected reactions in various social situations (Mead 1934). Importantly, when individuals view the self as an object, they often take on the “role of the other” or view themselves the way that others in the social situation are viewing them to help them determine how to act. Individuals receive feedback from others in the social context and use this feedback to evaluate their behavior as appropriate or inappropriate for the situation and the role they are taking on. Identity theory builds on these understandings of the self by acknowledging that individuals have a variety of identities that they might draw on or invoke and use in different social situations, contexts and interactions, which in turn helps them

shape their behavior in these situations (Stets and Burke 2000; Stryker 1980). Identity theory examines how the social structure shapes an individual's identity and behavior in a given social situation because it acknowledges that society shapes the norms, interactions and expectations of different identities or roles that an individual can take on (Stryker and Burke 2000; Stryker 1980). In turn, the individual helps to reinforce and influence society, and the behaviors of others, by invoking identities and interacting with others through these identities while simultaneously deriving meaning from fulfilling these roles.

Identity theory accounts for the fact that individuals have a variety of identities that they can invoke or occupy because they have many different *roles* to fulfill in society and in interaction (Stryker 1980). Once individuals take on identities, such as parent, teacher, leader, or well-mannered person, they invoke these identities in social situations and seek to have them verified in interaction to confirm them (Burke 1991; Cast 2003; Stets and Burke 2000). Feedback and interaction help individuals evaluate and guide their behaviors to be in line with the identity that they are trying to invoke (Burke 1991; Cast 2003; Stets and Burke 2005). Often, identities or social roles work in conjunction with counter or complimentary roles in the social setting. For example, the role of teacher takes on meaning when connected with the role of student or principal or another teacher. Therefore, in trying to invoke and confirm a particular identity, individuals might place other people in the social situation into "supporting identities" (Cast 2003). In order to maintain a specific identity, such as leader, an individual has to impose the identity of follower on others in the situation. Other individuals in the social situation can either confirm the identity cast upon them (and therefore confirm the identity of the person imposing the identity on them) or they can reject it and call into question the identity of the imposer (Cast 2003). As individuals try to control the meanings in social situations, there is often a mixture of

identity confirmation and resistance that occurs in such interactions requiring negotiation of identities and roles (Stets and Burke 2000). Identity theorists argue that power in the social structure or power within a specific relationship often translates to power to control the interaction and social situation and power to have their own identities verified (Cast 2003; Stets and Burke 2005). This means that the social structure and the power structure often shape which individuals have the power and ability to better confirm their own identities, place others into identities to help confirm their own identities and resist the identities others try to place them in (Cast 2003). Additionally, it is important to note that race, gender, and class are social categorizations that shape the roles and identities available to individuals in society and also shape the interactions that individuals might have in different social contexts (Stets 2005; West and Fenstermaker 1995). For example, men's greater power over women in society often translates to more respect for men over women in interactions and the ability to define "what kind of woman" she is (Stets and Burke 2005). Similarly, men who occupy particular racial/class statuses are in a position to either affirm or deny another's identity as masculine which will be discussed further below. Therefore, higher social status in terms of racial, gender, class privilege, and greater control over resources often confers power over interactions and thus more power to have one's identity verified (Stets and Burke 2005).

Identity standards and salience

Identity standards and norms around identities shape the ways in which individuals in those identities act and how people respond to individuals in those identities (Collett et al. 2015; Stets 2005). Identity standards vary across social contexts. For example, Collett et al. (2015) found that identity standards for fatherhood varies and men in couples where the fatherhood identity was well defined through specific expectations were more likely to take on behaviors

that fulfilled those expectations and had more positive emotions around their roles. However, fathers with a less-defined fatherhood identity standards displayed a larger variety of behaviors and expressed less satisfaction in these identities.

Identity theory considers that individuals have a variety of identities they can invoke. For example, the same individual might have a mother identity, a daughter identity, a student identity and a worker identity. However, not all of these identities hold the same weight and relevance for individuals in how they conceptualize themselves and in how they would like others to view them. Therefore, identity theory argues that identities with more salience are more likely to be invoked and used as the basis for social action in a variety of social situations (Burke 1991; Stryker and Burke 2000). For example, if the identity of parent is more salient than the identity of worker for one individual, this might shape this person's decision to not work on the weekend. Similarly, if the motherhood identity is a salient identity a mother might be more likely to make sacrifices for her child (Nuttbrock and Freudiger 1991). However, a different individual with the same identities but with a more salient worker identity might decide to work over the weekend and forgo time with family. Essentially, the more salient identities of an individual will shape their behavior in more situations (Stets and Burke 2005; Stryker and Burke 2000). In this way, identity salience is not solely defined by the specific context in which an actor finds herself/himself in but is also shaped by the sum of one's experiences which bolster certain roles/identities more than others. Identity theory argues that identity salience can depend on several factors, such as the number of individuals one interacts with that supports a particular identity, or the number of positive interactions and evaluations one has in a particular identity (Stryker and Burke 2000; Stryker 1980; Stets 2005). Additionally, the salience of an identity can be shaped by social context and interaction. For example, while the identity of parent might be

more salient than the identity of worker, within the work context the worker identity might be invoked more, and the parent identity invoked less. Finally, while race, gender, and class often play a role in which identities are more salient for individuals, the salience of an identity can change over time (Stryker and Burke 2000). In this dissertation, I examine the salience and importance of military identities in a near-total institution.

Identity work

Scholarship relating to identity work suggests that individuals construct, confirm, use, and change their identities in interaction (Cast 2003; Goffman 1959; Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996). Individuals must support and affirm identity signs and claims made by others for those identities to be achieved. Much of the research on identity has examined identity work and performances, or the processes that individuals or groups use to construct, confirm, deny, or repair identities of themselves or others (Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996; Snow and Anderson 1987). Identity work involves the purposeful use of signifiers, strategies, labels, and definitions to evoke meanings about the identity of the self and others, and to confirm or deny self-conceptions (Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996).

One form of identity work is identity talk and stories (Snow and Anderson 1987; Wilkins 2012; Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996). Individuals tell stories about themselves and others to create and negotiate representations of the self (Ezzell 2012; Snow and Anderson 1987; Wilkins 2012). For example, Snow and Anderson (1987) state that homeless individuals use “associational distancing” as a way to verbally express themselves as different from, and better than, other homeless people. As noted above, one way to convey identity is based on the individuals that someone associates with or is seen with. Snow and Anderson (1987) argue that, despite being seen with other homeless people, by verbally denigrating them some homeless

individuals can claim a different identity. Identity talk can also be used to repair identities and representations of the self (Cromwell and Thurman 2003; Scully and Marolla 1984). For example, Scully and Marolla (1984) found that convicted rapists use excuses and justifications to distance themselves from behaviors that are not consistent with an identity they are trying to achieve. Through invoking the rape myth that women are seductresses, convicted rapists justify the rape attempt to distance themselves from the negative and deviant identity associated with rapists. While identities are not always performed, sometimes invoking a specific identity hinges on an identity performance.

Identity dilemmas

Identity dilemmas occur when maintaining one identity is complicated by lived experiences that call that identity into question or impose a contradictory or unwanted identity on an individual, or when individuals adopt two or more seemingly contradictory identities (Charmaz 1994; Dunn and Creek 2015; Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996). Goffman's (1963) work on stigma and identity management demonstrates how the reactions and interactions with others create meaning about the self. Individuals who can be cast into undesired or discredited identities by others must find ways to manage these identities that allow them to distance themselves from negative feelings and consequences associated with these stigmatized identities (Goffman 1963). Often identity dilemmas are produced by power structures and inequality because individuals in positions of power can impose identities on or reject the identities of those with less power (Cast 2003; Schwalbe et al. 2000). Because of this inequality, resolving the dilemma can also be damaging in some way as it does not resolve the underlying inequality (Dunn and Creek 2015). Strategies to resolve identity dilemmas include deflecting stigma onto others (Armstrong et al. 2014; Ezell 2009; Pyke and Dang 2003; Payne 2010; Schwalbe et al.

2000), prioritizing one identity over another, and reconciling two seemingly contradictory identities through the creation of a third, more inclusive identity (Dunn 2005; 2010). In Dunn's (2010) study of domestic violence victims, individuals are presented with a dilemma of reconciling the assumption that victims lack agency while simultaneously expecting victims to account for their own victimization. She argues that victims resolve this dilemma by claiming a "survivor" status that recognizes both their status as a victim as well as their agency (Dunn 2010).

GENDER IDENTITY

Turning again to the concept of identity as a system of meanings that are communicated through interactions (Schrock and Schwlabe 2009; West and Zimmerman 1987), it is important to note that gender is inherent in all of our social processes, practices, and interactions, as well as in our social organizations and institutions (Acker 1992; Lorber 1998). Individuals "do gender" by learning and conveying practices, talk, and actions that signal to people that they are men or women (West and Zimmerman 1987). Indeed, individuals learn how to take on a gender identity and how to do gender from socialization at all stages in life. While the separation of sex and gender is recognized, gender socialization is often based on biological sex. For example, having male body parts results in gender socialization as a boy/man while having female body parts results in gender socialization as a girl/woman. Scholars have claimed that gender socialization occurs throughout an individual's lifetime starting at an early age. In early life, gender socialization based on sex is found in the home (Kane 2006), in schools (Cahill 1986; Martin 1998), and even in the games children play amongst themselves (Lever 1976). For example, Cahill (1986) argues that children's first association with "growing up" is connected with gender; which is based on their sex. For example, young children learn that being called a baby

is stigmatizing and an identity they should avoid as they get older. The identity that is contrasted to that of “baby” is either “big boy” or “big girl” and being “grown up” becomes linked to masculinity and femininity at a young age.

Children also learn that they can signal their gender through the use of gender appropriate props, gender appropriate dress, and gender appropriate interests (Kane 2006; Martin 1998). For example, Martin (1998) examines gender socialization in pre-schools, arguing that the ways in which teachers interact with their students encourages different uses of space and different behaviors from boys and girls. Martin (1998) finds that girls are discouraged and corrected more often than boys for yelling or displaying “relaxed behaviors” such as calling out or slouching. She argues that this teaches girls to take up less space, to be more polite, and to control their voices while simultaneously teaching boys that they are allowed more access to space and that they are allowed to be heard even if they are loud or rude (Martin 1998). Similarly, Kane (2006) found that parents had negative responses to their sons wearing pink or wearing dresses. Martin (1998) found that in her 8 months of fieldwork in preschools she never saw a boy wear pink. If students fail to learn the dress, activities, and interests that signify gender from their parents, these lessons are also taught in schools by teachers and peers who call attention to gender non-conformity (Cahill 1987; Martin 1998).

This research demonstrates that gender is taught to and ingrained in individuals based on their biological sex in a variety of ways from numerous agents of socialization (family, peers, institutions, media). This reveals that gender differences are not natural occurrences based on sex but are socially constructed. It is important to note that even though gender socialization occurs at an early age, the interactional approach to gender suggests that these identities are not fixed. Individuals learn to “do gender” in a variety of ways and in a variety of contexts, demonstrating

the fluidness and adaptability of gender and gender identity. Scholars argue that context shapes how gender can and will be invoked (Connell 1995). Additionally, these socialization processes surrounding gender demonstrate the ways in which gender expectations and processes influence the other identities individuals can take on, the ways in which they can invoke those identities, and identity salience. For example, gender socialization processes might influence more women than men to take on a “polite person” identity or a “nurturing identity” or in some cases, might make a “worker identity” more salient for a man than a woman.

Hegemonic Masculinity

Premised on the idea that gender identity is created and maintained in interaction, Connell (2005; 1995) defines *hegemonic masculinity* as a set of dominant ideas that dictate what it means to be a “real man.” Hegemonic masculinity is comprised of behaviors, practices, and processes that serve to privilege a specific kind of masculinity by constructing it in contrast to, and as better than, femininity and subordinated masculinities (Connell 1995; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Pascoe 2005; Schippers 2007). The notion of hegemonic masculinity illuminates the existence of a hierarchy of masculinities and the dominance of masculinity over femininity with power reserved for those who can display hegemonic masculinity. While Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue that hegemonic masculinity is not static and has the potential to be a site of equality instead of inequality, current and traditional displays of hegemonic masculinity include aggression, violence, control over emotions, risk-taking, and heterosexuality (Hinojosa 2010; Kaufman 2001; Schrock and Schwalbe 2009). Schippers (2007:95) argues that when women try to enact these traits they are cast into stigmatized identities that she labels “pariah femininities.” She argues that when markers of hegemonic masculinity are expressed by women it threatens men’s claims to hegemonic masculinity and the

dominance they access through this identity. Therefore, these traits become re-framed as a representation of problematic femininity to preserve male domination of women (Schipper 2007).

Connell (2005:238) explains that hegemonic masculinities are those that are given the most “patriarchal dividends.” Patriarchal dividends refer to societal benefits, such as wealth, power, prestige, and ability to have one’s masculine identity confirmed by others, that derive from the “overall subordination of women.” Those with the most social privilege (heterosexual, wealthy, white men), are best able to achieve hegemonic masculinity (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Hegemonic masculinity is difficult to achieve for most men (Kimmel 2011). Men’s access to full “patriarchal dividends” is constrained by other social locations such as race, sexuality, class, and age (Connell 2005) because these identities intersect with gender in ways that create a hierarchy of privilege within masculinity (Collins 2004). The result is that masculinities invoked by men of color, homosexual men, and working-class men are perceived as subordinate to heterosexual, white, and wealthy masculinities (Connell 2005). Subordinated masculinities are often exploited and controlled by those with more dominant masculinities (Connell 1995). Marginalized masculinities are identities that are neither dominant nor subordinated but they receive less patriarchal dividends than more dominant forms. For example, Pyke (1996) states that the gendered and classed division of labor means that lower class men fulfill more physical labor positions than other groups. She argues that while physical labor is considered masculine because it is seen as dangerous, rugged, and a display of strength, all men benefit from lower class men performing this work because it is a display of strength for men in general. Additionally, she argues that higher class men benefit from lower class men performing this work because they use their masculine display of physical labor to reinforce stereotypes that

lower class men are untamed, brutish, and unintelligent. Therefore, despite lower class men participating in physical labor professions which are often considered masculine, their display of masculinity can be used to marginalize them in other ways.

Military masculinity

Several scholars have examined the construction of masculinity in the military. As mentioned above, the military has been categorized as a gendered institution that encourages a warrior masculinity that pushes service-members to demonstrate aggressiveness, dominance, physical strength, mental fortitude, bravery, control, and violence (Barrett 1996; Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Callahan 2009; Hale 2008; Hinojosa 2010; Sasson-Levy 2003b). The military devalues characteristics such as physical weakness, fear, and displaying emotions, which are problematically associated with women (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Enloe 1993; Higate 2003; Hutchings 2008; Kimmel 2000). Within this military context, where violence is an essential part of training and enacting violence is a key part of a being a service-member, service-men might be more likely to enact violence as a part of their identities (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015). At the same time, women in the military pose a threat to the conceptualization of the military as a masculine profession (Kimmel 1999). This means that service-men might target service-women with violence to both display their own masculinity as well as reclaim the workspace as masculine. As mentioned above, quantitative research findings indicate that women in the military experience sexual abuse at rates far higher than those found among women in the civilian workforce. Understanding that some men invoke a masculine identity in masculine workspaces like the military by devaluing women, sexually objectifying women, and enacting violence against them might explain why sexual abuse in the military is so high.

However, prior research suggests that this narrow and monolithic view of military masculinity is problematic (Barrett 1996; Sasson-Levy 2003b; 2011; Wasserman et al. 2018). These studies explore how race, class, and military occupational specialty shape how service-men do masculinity. These studies explore contesting military masculinities that do not strictly align with the characteristics associated with the warrior masculinity and demonstrate the ability for power to be derived from a range of masculinity displays. My dissertation adds to this literature by examining women's gender performances and exploring the effect that the military's construction of warrior masculinity has had on the identities of service-women. The flexibility of masculinity for *some* men in the military suggests space for a variety of gender performances, and I examine what this means for service-women.

Scholars note that some women in traditionally masculine activities perform a “feminine apologetic” when they feminize their participation in a masculine activity or job (through clothing, feminine props, or talk) to decrease the saliency of their gender transgression (Cohn 2000; Rabe-Hemp 2009; Silva 2008; Yoder and Berendsen 2003). Silva (2008), who studied men and women in an ROTC program, found that some women emphasized feminine aspects of their personalities and, in doing so, reproduced the gendered assumptions of the military in their talk. She also found that some cadets emphasized stereotypically feminine applications of attributes typically associated with the military, such as how being devoted and making sacrifices is motherly. My study specifically explores how women do masculinity and how women navigate the importance of warrior masculinity in the military while simultaneously being constructed as antithetical to this identity.

Prior research has found that women in masculine spaces often identify with the dominant group in the space and engage in “defensive othering” that reinforces the dominant

groups' values and status (Ezzell 2009; Sasson-Levy 2003a; Schwalbe et al. 2000). For example, examining women rugby players, Ezell (2009) notes that some women reify men's assumptions about women rugby players by labeling other women "butch lesbians" while highlighting that they themselves are not. In this way, women rugby players position themselves as exceptions to the stereotype, which serves to reify the stereotype and maintain the dominance of men over women in the sport. Similarly, Sasson-Levy (2003a) finds that women in the Israeli army distance themselves from identities they believe are "traditionally feminine." Some women devalue things associated with femininity in general, such as being concerned with appearances, while others mock service-women who display traditional femininity (Sasson-Levy 2003a). She also argues that women try to display masculinity through mimicking the discursive and bodily practices of men, such as speaking in a lower voice, swearing, and wearing dirty clothes. In this way, some service-women identify with the dominant group (men) and join them in devaluing femininity and propping up hegemonic masculinity. Importantly, while women are often performing masculinity, their masculine identities are not always validated. Identity theorists argue that power in the social structure or power within a specific relationship often translates to power to control the interaction and social situation, and power to have their own identities verified (Cast 2003; Stets and Burke 2005). This means that the social structure and the power structure often shape which individuals have the power and ability to better confirm their own identities, place others into identities to help confirm their own identities and can better resist the identities in which they are placed by others (Cast 2003).

Finally, it has been stated that to be a female service-member is a contradiction because being a good service-member is constructed in opposition to being a woman, feminine, or female (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Kimmel 2000; Sasson-Levy 2003). In the military context,

surrounded by so many service-members, a military identity is likely to be salient for a service-woman (Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010). However, applying Cast's (2003) theory of power and identity affirmation, it can be argued that due to more power in the military institution, men are able to deny women's identity as service-members. It is important to consider how this treatment might affect women's identities as service-members. Since identity is often achieved or denied through interactions, negative interactions such as sexual objectification, harassment, or assault serve to deny women's identity as a military peer, often causing an identity disruption for service-women. Some women in the military who are sexually harassed or abused are put in a position of conflict with their military masculine identities because just being a victim may be feminizing—an identity many of the women are seeking to distance themselves from in order to be seen as masculine and, therefore, a full service-member. In the military, where violence is an essential part of training, and enacting violence is a key part of a being a service-member (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015), being the victim of violence might be associated with a non-military identity. Prior research on sexual assault has noted that some victims might try to reject a victim identity by emphasizing their physical resistance of the attack to distance themselves from meanings implied by being a victim—that they are helpless and vulnerable (Peterson and Muehlenhard 2010; Weiss 2011).

This dissertation draws on identity theory and gender performance literature to examine how women understand and display their identities as service-members, and to understand the relationship between sexual abuse and service-women's military identities. In particular, I examine how service-women make sense of their sexual abuse experiences while at the same time trying to cultivate and invoke a military identity. Importantly, in this dissertation I do not take a monolithic view of masculinity and femininity in the U.S. military (Barret 1996; Sasson-

Levy 2011); rather, I take an intersectional approach to data analysis in order to understand gender dynamics, identities, and experiences with harassment in the military.

INTERSECTIONAL APPROACH AND GENDERED SEXUAL ABUSE

Notably, my dissertation takes an intersectional approach to data analysis.

Intersectionality as a perspective examines how different systems of domination are linked and mutually reinforcing. Intersectionality examines the ways in which gender, race, class, sexuality, nationality, age, mental and physical ability, and other social locations all intersect to produce experiences based on context and social location (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1991; Potter 2015).

This scholarship recognizes that race, class, gender, and sexuality stratification systems form a “matrix of domination” and should therefore be studied in relation to one another rather than in isolation (Collins 2000). Studying inequality should not isolate and privilege one social location over another, nor should it treat social identities as additive (Crenshaw 1991; Potter 2015). This is to say that a Black woman’s experience with inequality is not simply the experience of a White woman and a Black man combined (Wing 1997). The intersectional perspective supports examining how classism, racism, homophobia, and sexism, among other forms of oppression, work together and reinforce one another (Collins 1998; Crenshaw 1991; Potter 2015).

The origins of intersectionality are rooted in the Black feminist movement; specifically, the invisibility of Black women within a feminist movement that universalized the experiences and concerns of White, middle class women as representative of all women (Crenshaw 1991; Potter 2015). Historically, women of color’s experiences have been marginalized in both the feminist literature on gender oppression and the race literature on racial oppression (Crenshaw 1991). The dangers of privileging one form of oppression over another can be highlighted in an example brought up by Davis (1981) when discussing the myth of the Black male rapist. The

construction of Black men as typical rapists is premised on the image of Black people as unable to control their sexuality (Collins 2004; Davis 1981; Tillman et al. 2010). Indeed, Davis (1981:191) states that the existence of “mythical rapists implies the mythical whore.” The controlling image of the Jezebel suggests that Black women are hyper-sexual and always willing to consent to sex (Buchanan et al. 2008; Collins 2004). This particular image was developed in order to portray Black women as sexual deviants who could not possibly be raped, therefore silencing the sexual abuse of Black women under slavery and thereafter (Collins 2004; West 2006). The controlling image of the Jezebel continues today, as Black women are over-sexualized in the media and portrayed as not in control of their reproduction (Buchanan et al. 2008; Bryant-Davis et al. 2009; Collins 2004; Tillman et al. 2010). These images, combined with the under-representation of Black victims of rape in the media (Crenshaw 1991) and the assumption that women of color are less in need of protection and are less innocent than White women (Razack 1994), work together to trivialize Black women’s sexual victimizations.

Thus, prior research that privileges gender over all other social locations has had the effect of maintaining harmful stereotypes about race that serve to perpetuate inequality for both men and women of color. Through the example of the myth of the Black male rapist, Davis (1981) demonstrates the need to examine both racism and sexism in order to understand sexual violence. This is one example of how an intersectional perspective reveals the inter-related systems of oppression.

Intersectionality and the Military

Although some scholars have used intersectionality to examine sexual harassment and abuse (Crenshaw 1989; 1992; Ontiveros 1993), few studies have taken an intersectional approach to examining sexual abuse in the United States military (with the exception of

quantitative studies conducted by Buchanan et al. 2008 and Moore 1991).¹ Indeed, Burton (2014) and Hall (1999) argue that intersectionality needs to be applied to military populations and the experiences of service-women of color. Men who harass women in the military are similar to men outside of the military in that they often exhibit racism and sexism in conjunction with one another (Potter and Thomas 2012). Often, the specific words they say and the actions they take are based on their victims' intersecting social identities. Thus, research on the sexual harassment of service-women should consider intersecting identities and oppressions and qualitatively explore these experiences. This is one of the guiding techniques of my dissertation.

Women are underrepresented in the military. This means that they are hyper-visible, placed under extreme scrutiny, and yet isolated and marginalized at the same time (Archer 2012; Miller 1997; Moore and Webb 1998; Rosen and Martin 1997; Sanchez-Hucles 1997; Silva 2008). Within the officer corps, people of color as well as women are also notably underrepresented (Burk and Espinoza 2012). In 2016, there was one woman and 85 men in ranks O7-O10, 321 women and 6,070 men in ranks O4-O6, and 1,079 women and 11,077 men in ranks O1-O3 in the Marine Corps (Department of Defense 2016). Further, the military does not provide data in their demographics report that shows paygrade and representation by race. Rather, they collapse all racial groups (Black, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Native American and Alaska Native) and compare them to White service-members by branch and paygrade. Among top officer positions (paygrades O7-O10), 82.8% of the Army, 89.4% of the Navy, 88.4% of the Marine Corps, and 92.6% of the Air Force are White. The military considers Latino/as an ethnicity and does not include them as a separate category in their race demographics and does not have a similar table that outlines paygrade and branch by ethnicity.

¹ Sasson-Levy (2003b) has conducted intersectional research on the Israeli Military, examining intersecting social identities and military occupational specialties/assignments and constructions of masculinity.

However, they do estimate that 13.5% of the entire military force is Latino/a (Department of Defense 2016). Older data also suggests that representation of people of color in the officer corps is low. Among top officer positions, Blacks comprise less than 4 percent of these positions, Latino/as comprise less than 3 percent, and women in total comprise less than 9 percent (Quester and Gilroy 2002). Statistics on women of color at high ranks are unavailable in the Department of Defense statistics, reinforcing the invisibility of women of color in the military. However, it is safe to assume that there are few women of color in top military ranks. By comparison, 53% of the Navy's female enlisted population, and 52% of the army's female enlisted population, are women of color, indicating a disproportionate representation of women of color in the enlisted ranks relative to their representation in top military ranks (and the U.S. as a whole) (Burton 2014). Therefore, the majority of women of color in the military are being commanded by White men (who are overrepresented in the officer corps, specifically at the highest officer ranks). One of the three existing studies that examine intersections of gender, race, and rank finds that Black enlisted service-members report more sexual coercion than White enlisted service-members, and that enlisted service-members report more than officers (Buchanan et al. 2008). Thus, an intersectional perspective can illuminate how social identities such as race and gender interact with each other within different military contexts.

Controlling images surrounding women of color are often used to inform treatment and expectations of these women in the workplace, who are already hyper-visible due to their race and gender (Buchanan 2005; García-López 2008; Kupenda 2012). For example, Latina women are thought of as sexual commodities who are quick to anger and lack intelligence (Lugo-Lugo 2012). Similarly, the images of the mammy and the jezebel are salient for Black women in the workplace (Adams 1997; Buchanan 2005; Collins 2000). The controlling image of the mammy

leads to Black women being expected to do what peers and superiors ask them to, even if those things do not typically fall in line with their job descriptions. Due to this expectation, Black women are reprimanded more than individuals from other groups when they do not do what peers and superiors ask of them at work (Kupenda 2012). Overall, racialized gender discrimination makes women of color feel undervalued, marginalized, and isolated in the workplace. Prior research has found that sexual harassment differs by race due to racial stereotypes. Buchanan et al. (2008) argue that due to race-based gender assumptions (such as Black women being expected to work and White women being expected to stay in the home), White women face more resistance from men in the workplace who harass them by questioning their ability to do their jobs and by questioning their presence in the military. While Black women face less gender harassment than White women in their study, Buchanan et al. (2008) argue that Black women experience more unwanted sexual advances than White women due to the controlling image of the jezebel. Indeed, while some men expect access to women's bodies, they have historically been allowed unrestricted access to the bodies of women of color with institutional backing (i.e. slavery) (Davis 1981; Smith 2005). Therefore, women of color in the military are more likely than White women to experience sexual objectification and unwanted sexual advances from men in the military.

Using an intersectional approach can also highlight different ways that women within the same group can be at risk of or experience sexual abuse based on context. Indeed, specific factors related to the military, such as an individual's rank or their status as an officer or enlisted service member, can place them at more or less risk for sexual abuse. For example, a study of sexual abuse in the Navy found that 33% of women officers and 44% of enlisted women had been sexually harassed in the previous year (Culbertson and Rosenfeld, 1994). Similarly, a study

using data from the Department of Defense's survey of active duty men and women found that those with fewer years of active duty service and those in lower ranks are more likely to be harassed (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2001). Specifically, they found that of women in the lowest pay grades (E1-E3) one half of them reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention and one fifth of them reported being subject to sexual coercion in the last year. By comparison, 2.4% of women in top pay grades reported experiencing sexual coercion in the last year (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2001). Therefore, factors within the military make some service-women more vulnerable to sexual abuse than others. My dissertation adds military occupational specialty and experience with combat as additional military factors that can shape sexual abuse experiences.

The value of an intersectional approach also applies to research on barriers to reporting, disclosure, and the effects of sexual abuse on victims. For example, Moore (2002) reports that, women of color are more likely than White women to stay in the military for a longer period of time. She attributes this to their more compromised social location in society, resulting in fewer employment opportunities outside of the military. Exacerbating this issue is the fact that, among service-women, women of color tend to be placed in lesser skilled jobs than White women, which disproportionately reduces their employability when they leave the service, and which may contribute to their disproportionate longevity in the military (Moore 1991). In this context, the threat of a disciplinary action including reduction in rank (and therefore pay), or a potential discharge from the military may affect women of color more than White women when it comes to the possible backlashes for reporting sexual harassment. A dishonorable discharge results in an individual losing their job as well as any veteran benefits (such as the G.I. bill, healthcare, and mortgage assistance). Additionally, there are higher rates of single motherhood among Black women compared to White women (Moore 2008), an additional vulnerability that makes some

Black women need to rely on their military jobs more than White service-women. Therefore, women of color might be less likely to report sexual harassment than White women because they might have a larger financial dependency on the military (Moore 1991).

Aside from the three studies noted here, much of the existing research on sexual harassment and abuse in the military takes a race-neutral approach to sexual harassment. This can lead to those studies missing or glossing over important findings related to the different forms of racialized sexual harassment that women of color experience. Therefore, my research uses an intersectional approach to data collection and analysis to address this concern. In this dissertation I show how age, rank, race, and MOS are all factors that determine who is harassed, when they are harassed, and how victims respond to this treatment.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Chapter Two describes the study design, data collection, and analysis. It includes my positionality, methodological challenges, and ethical considerations. I also discuss my sampling design, recruitment strategies, and data sources and analysis. Chapter Three explores how the military as an institution creates the idea that the military is a family. Specifically, recruitment and training provide access to the military family, which is portrayed as an important benefit of military membership and is reinforced by the military's expectations around caregiving. This chapter addresses the highly gendered "military family" roles, particularly when it comes to sexual abuse. Chapter Four describes how the military family is a brotherhood that denies access to most women such that service-women try to invoke masculinity and downplay femininity to gain access. The military is a male-dominated and masculine space where femininity is denigrated. In an attempt to fit in, service-women make masculinity claims and engage in defensive othering by posturing against other women, gay service-men, and straight service-men.

When these strategies do not gain them access, women turn to managing their femininity through controlling emotional displays. Despite women's masculine identity work, they are cast into stigmatized feminine identities by other service-members, such as being labeled "bitches," "sluts," and "dykes;" all identities incompatible with brotherhood. Chapter Five is an institutional analysis of how organizational factors, including ones that create the idea that "the military is a family," can create vulnerability for sexual violence. I argue that the military's spatial arrangements and expectations around caregiving, trust, and loyalty can be exploited to cause harm. In Chapter Six, I define bureaucratic harassment as a specific subtype of workplace harassment, where bureaucracy is both the source of power and protection of the perpetrator *and* the tool that they use to harass co-workers or subordinates. I discuss the tactics used to achieve bureaucratic harassment and I demonstrate how bureaucratic harassment is used to enact sexual and racial harassment or to prevent reporting of sexual violence. Chapter Seven identifies and discusses service-women's responses to sexual harassment, including their coping strategies and the impact of sexual harassment victimization (it is important to note that I include responses from participants who experienced sexual assault, as opposed to sexual harassment in the absence of sexual assault, in chapter 3, 5, and 7 as it relates to the analysis of those chapters). The final chapter, Chapter Eight, is the conclusion of this dissertation and places my findings in the context of extant research, outlines policy implications and directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

This chapter provides an overview of the design for my research on service-women's experiences, with a focus on sexual abuse victimization. To conduct this study, it was necessary to draw on numerous data sources; primarily, forty-one qualitative in-depth interviews with service-women. This chapter also discusses some of the challenges I faced in conducting this research, particularly given my own non-military status.

RECRUITMENT AND SAMPLING FOR ONE-ON-ONE INTERVIEWS

The selection of U.S. service-women arose out of my personal connections to three current and former service-members who were in the United States Marine Corps. These three friends each had different duty stations and different military occupational specialties, which meant that they were connected to different networks of service-members through their own military careers. Initially, these three sources acted as gatekeepers, introducing me to service-women who were interested in participating in my study. Through these initial contacts, I used snowball sampling (Berg 2001). After an interview, I continued snowball sampling by asking participants to pass along information about my study to anyone they knew who might have been interested in participating.

Using theoretical sampling techniques, I also included individuals from theoretically important categories (Glaser and Strauss 1967). I sought participants across military branches (service-women in the Air Force, Army, Navy and Marine Corps), across ranks (officers and enlisted service-women), and from different classes and races (See table 2.1 and 2.2 in Appendix C for sample demographics). Finally, to ensure that the stories and experiences included in my study reflect current military policies, issues, and experiences, only women who served in the

U.S. military after the year 2000 were included in the sample. This year was chosen because it allowed me to include service-women that worked for the military right before and after major policy changes in the organization. For example, 2005 was the first year that women were *officially* deployed into combat situations through various military programs designed to circumvent the combat exclusion policy, which was repealed in 2013. Additionally, Don't Ask Don't Tell, the policy where homosexuals in the military were not allowed to openly declare or discuss their sexuality at risk of being discharged, was repealed in 2010. Limiting my data collection to service-women serving from the year 2000 through 2017 allowed me to include women who served before, during, and after these major military policy changes. It is important to note that all three of my initial contacts in the military were White Marine Corps Officers from the middle class. To enhance recruitment of service-women of color, service-women in other branches, and in the enlisted ranks, I placed information about my study on online communities and forums such as Facebook groups for service-women and Craigslist, and then I continued to use snowball sampling methods with service-women recruited this way. I continued to collect data and recruit participants until I reached theoretical saturation where I was hearing the same experiences and stories across multiple interviews (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Lofland et al. 2006). Overall, I collected 41 interviews with service-women who were enlisted (N=24) or serving as officers (N=17) in the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps (See Table 2.1 and 2.2 for sample demographics).

Access

Gaining access to the U.S. Military and its members can be difficult. While some military settings could be considered a “quasi-public setting” (Lofland et al. 2006), most restrict access to military personal or those with permission to be on a base, military academy, or training area.

Due to the restrictive nature of the military and limited access to bases, the best method for data collection was interviews with service-women. In order to gain access to service-members, I relied on my established relationship with three individuals that I already knew in the military.

One of the reasons I used snowball sampling from my existing contacts in the military is out of concern that the hierarchy and structure of the military could complicate my ability to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of my participants. If I had been introduced to participants through the military directly, I could not have guaranteed that participation in my study could be kept confidential, which is essential when conducting research, especially on sensitive subjects. My initial contacts served both as gatekeepers and key informants (Berg 2001). They introduced me to other service-members and vouched for me and my research. Additionally, I am close with these three individuals and often relied on them to explain any military processes, roles, or jargon that I did not initially understand. These three individuals all knew one another prior to their military careers, and the four of us have met together to discuss my research and their experiences in the military. Throughout the research process I was able to speak with them over the phone or in person with any questions I had. Between 2013-2018, I spoke with these three individuals over thirty times each about their experiences, military rules and regulations, and policy changes within the military. The knowledge that they shared with me also allowed me to demonstrate to participants that I was familiar with the military's processes, routines, and procedures in a way that might facilitate trust (Berg 2001). Therefore, these relationships assisted me in gaining entrée and establishing rapport with other service-members.

DATA COLLECTION

I triangulated my data collection by collecting and analyzing a variety of data sources, although in-depth interviews with service-women were the bulk of the data used in this

dissertation. The other data sources included textual sources, such as documents outlining military policies, procedures and guidelines, and observation of courts-martial relating to military sexual assault.

One-on-One Interviews

I chose to conduct qualitative one-on-one interviews, which allows for more nuanced, in-depth, and complex analysis of responses from participants (Rubin and Rubin 2012). Additionally, in-depth interviews are recommended for trying to understand sensitive issues as well as learning about what is important to the individuals being studied (Rubin and Rubin 2012). In-depth interviews are much like “guided conversations” (Fontana and Frey 1994; Rubin and Rubin 2012). I developed an interview guide that allowed conversation between myself and the participant. I did not ask questions that could be answered simply by a “yes” or “no,” or through one-word answers. I created an interview guide that allowed me to be flexible in the conversation, and to allow the participants to privilege what they thought was important. Flexible interview guides are simply a list of issues, topics, and items to be covered throughout the interview, not a strict set of questions to be asked in the same order or manner to each participant (Lofland et al. 2006). While the interviews aimed to cover experiences with sexual harassment and abuse, they were not limited to these issues. The interview guide was intentionally general to allow participants to raise issues they deemed important (Strauss and Corbin 1998). I asked about why they joined the military, their transition to military life, and the role the military has in their futures. Additionally, I sought to ask questions that encouraged vividness in my participants’ descriptions (Rubin and Rubin 2012). For example, I asked about participants most prominent memories, to walk me through their most recent day at work, a time that was especially frustrating for them at work, a time that was especially rewarding for them at work,

and to tell me about a most/least favorite colleague (See Appendix A for a complete list of questions asked). Asking about a specific memory or experience is likely to bring about a more vivid, detailed account than asking about their military experiences in the abstract.

I did not directly ask the participants about harassment experiences until the end of the interview, and only if harassment was not brought up in conversation up to that point. I did this, in part, to allow service-women to direct the conversation towards the issues they found important. I also started with more general questions because Schwerdtfeger (2009) recommends this as a strategy for establishing rapport with participants who have been sexually abused as it creates a safe space to then later ask about sexual abuse.

In line with feminist methodology, my research design allowed women to use their own words and voices to identify what they believe is important about their experiences in the military. This is particularly important given women's underrepresented and often silenced position within the military. Situated knowledge of women as oppressed individuals in this context can reveal important social relations and processes (Collins 2000; Haraway 1988.) A major strength of qualitative methods comes from the ability to privilege participants' experiences and stories in their own voices and narratives (Fine et al. 2000). In using women's own words to document their experiences with sexual harassment and abuse, I focused not on investigating the specific details or nuances recounted to me, but rather on understanding how women remember, interpret, and recall their military experiences. The participants' own construction and understanding of their experiences illuminates the gendered dynamics of the military and women's position within it.

Face-to-face interviews and phone interviews

In this section I outline the advantages and disadvantages of conducting one-on-one interviews in person and over the phone, as I used both in this dissertation. While phone interviews were convenient for me as a researcher who wanted to interview service-women living all over the country and abroad, it was also important for participants. Prior research examining victims of violence has suggested that the method of data collection can shape whether or not victims participate in studies (Reddy et al. 2006; Rosenbaum et al. 2006). Rosenbaum et al. (2006) found higher participation rates in studies examining sensitive information, such as questions about physical and sexual violence, when telephone interviews were used. Interview methods can also have an impact on what is disclosed in the interview. Some argue that more anonymous methods of data collection, such as a phone interview or an automatized phone survey, make individuals discussing sensitive topics more comfortable due to the assurance of confidentiality (Reddy et al. 2006; Rosenbaum et al. 2006). However, others state that face to face interviews create a better environment for eliciting responses to sensitive questions (Campbell et al. 2009; Rubin and Rubin 2012). Participants may feel more comfortable speaking about sexual harassment and abuse in person, as face-to-face interviews allow for more trust and rapport to develop between the researcher and the participant and they have more space for discussion and support (Campbell and Adams 2009; Rubin and Rubin 2012).

Overall, research suggests that participant comfort is important when researching sensitive subjects such as sexual harassment and abuse (Campbell 2002; Schwerdtfeger 2009). More specifically, recalling experiences with sexual abuse can be emotional and painful and victims of sexual abuse might have different concerns about participating and disclosing their experiences in a given study. Scholarship examining the reasons individuals participate in

trauma research have found that sexual abuse survivors often mention altruism or the desire “to help other survivors” as a motivation (e.g., Campbell and Adams, 2009; Pessin et al., 2008; Schwerdtfeger 2009; Schwerdtfeger and Goff 2008). Several evaluations of participants’ reactions after taking part in trauma-related research suggest that such participants found it to be a cathartic experience and noted therapeutic benefits such as that it may help them to heal and feel less isolated (e.g., Campbell and Adams, 2009; McClain et al. 2007; McCoyd and Shdaimah 2007; Pessin et al. 2008; Schwerdtfeger and Goff 2008). These studies also suggest that benefits may be enhanced when researchers and participants meet in person. Therefore, I designed my study to allow women to participate through in-person or phone interviews based on their preferences, comfort, and availability.

Interview process

From 2013-2018, I conducted forty-one semi-structured in-depth interviews with U.S. service-women. The interviews range in length between forty-seven minutes and two hours and fifty-three minutes. After an individual contacted me about the study. I responded and thanked her for her interest, provided her with my research summary, and asked her if she had any questions. I responded as quickly as possible to not only capitalize on the opportunity to interview a new participant, but to respond to and validate the participant’s interest in my research. In my initial response, I also asked the individual if they would like to schedule an interview, and if they prefer to conduct the interview over the phone, over Skype/Facetime, or in person. If they responded, I usually scheduled an interview and shared with them my consent form, which they signed before we spoke. I informed each participant of anonymity and confidentiality and asked for their permission to record the conversation. Confidentiality is important when sensitive issues such as sexual abuse might be discussed. To further mitigate any

fears, I told participants that they could tell me if they wanted to exclude a story, quote, or other factor that they shared with me during an interview. This was especially important for confidentiality in the context of the military, where a service-woman might be the only woman in her unit or at her base.

I usually started the interview by introducing myself and describing my study, typically using this time to establish rapport and trust by explaining my interest in the topic of women in the military. During this initial contact, I also explained my friendship with my key informants and how I gained participants through word of mouth. I also explained that I was a PhD student, which invoked my “learner” role in the first few minutes of the interview (Lofland et al. 2006). I began the conversation by asking them what they did before they joined the military. Each interview consisted of the same main questions, but different follow-up questions and probes, which allowed me to focus on what each participant revealed (Rubin and Rubin 2012). For example, if the participant disclosed a sexual abuse incident to me during the interview, I made sure to end that sequence of questions on an empowering note. Each interview was also different in the language that I used when discussing sensitive topics with participants. Schwerdtfeger (2009) notes that incorporating participants’ own language surrounding sexual abuse is important to both establish rapport and avoid the participant feeling shame, judgment, and re-victimization during the interview. Finally, Scheirs and Nuytiens (2013) argue that it is important to acknowledge the role of emotion in qualitative work, stating that often emotions help researchers establish rapport and trust with participants. Therefore, whenever the interview covered emotional material, I was sure to be engaged and supportive to both comfort the participant and establish trust. Finally, I compiled a list of sexual trauma resources available to current and former military women that I passed along if they said they were interested.

I used the same interview guide for in-person and phone interviews and started every interview in the same way. Since each participant might have had their own reasons for and concerns about participating in my study, I gave them the option of an in-person interview or a telephone interview. I collected 14 in-person interviews and 27 phone interviews. In terms of data collection, face-to-face interviews enhanced my coding ability, as I could code for emotions, facial expressions, and gestures, all of which could be important information that I was unable to collect while conducting interviews over the phone.

Finally, when conducting research on sensitive subjects such as sexual harassment and assault it is important to be aware of the respondent's feelings and emotions throughout the interview. Indeed, victims of sexual harassment and assault are often re-victimized when they disclose their victimization to friends, family members, police officers, doctors, nurses, and lawyers (Campbell 2002; Schwerdtfeger 2009; Ullman 2010). Re-victimization occurs when a victim discloses sexual abuse and they are questioned in a manner that indicates disbelief, blames the victim, or expresses sympathy for the perpetrator. It was important for me as a researcher of sexual harassment and assault to be mindful of the potential for re-victimization when asking questions and probing during an interview (Campbell 2002; Schwerdtfeger 2009). Therefore, I left my interview guide vague enough so that if they were comfortable disclosing sexual harassment or abuse they could do so on their own. If they did not bring up sexual harassment or abuse during the more general questions in the interview, I introduced the topic into the interview by asking about the issue in general. I then asked, "Can you tell me about a time where you saw or heard about sexual harassment or abuse in the military?" When discussing issues of sexual harassment or assault I was mindful of when and how it is appropriate

to probe, follow-up, and ask for more information based on the potential for re-victimization and a reading of the participant's emotions (Campbell 2002).

Fieldnotes

During each interview, I took notes on my interview guide. These notes included the topics covered and important phrases or experiences that I wanted to probe. In person, I jotted less and took fewer notes than when I was on the phone because I did not want to distract the participant. Additionally, as per Lofland et al.'s (2006) recommendation, immediately after each interview I took extensive field notes on the interview itself. I made sure to note what happened in the interview, analytic thoughts and connections, my personal feelings and emotions, and my reflections on participant feelings/emotions and comments (Lofland et al. 2006; Scheirs and Nuytiens 2013). I noted my own emotions because these had the potential to help me better understand and gain insight into the experiences of my participants as well as my positionality (Emerson et al. 1995). Additionally, Campbell (2002:107) argues that "academic texts on sexual assault can appear distant and devoid of emotion, and as such, they may not be capturing the reality of rape from survivor's perspectives." She argues that when researchers do not consider participant and researcher emotions, that data and meanings important to participants are lost. With this in mind, I took note of and incorporated emotions into my data collection and analysis.

Textual Sources

Documents and textual sources often provide insight into the nature and structure of an organization (Noaks and Wincup 2004) and can serve as important points of observation of social phenomenon (Zussman 2004). Since this is a study of women in the U.S. Military, it is important to understand the policies, rules, and regulations that are central to the operation of the military institution. Including military documents in my data analysis allowed me to understand

the rules governing my participants' daily lives and careers. I analyzed documents outlining the dress codes for each military branch, housing policies, performance review forms, sexual assault program overviews, and military orders relating to sexual assault such as the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Order, and the Family Advocacy Program Order. The documents outlining military policies, procedures, and expectations that I analyzed were found on the internet or shared with me with one of my key informants who is a military lawyer. A complete list of the documents analyzed for this dissertation can be found in Appendix B.

Observation of Courts-Martial

I used participant observation to supplement my interview data (Lofland et al. 2006). Participant observation allows for researchers to explore important interactions between participants and a better understanding of the social setting under study. However, the military is a relatively closed institution where access as an observer is difficult to obtain. Therefore, even though Becker and Geer (1960) argue that both interviews and participant observation are preferred to best uncover unexpected data, it was not in my original data collection plan due to restrictions on access. However, while conducting interviews and establishing relationships with my participants, I was invited by one of my gate-keepers to observe courts-martial proceedings relating to sexual assault.

In the spring of 2016, I observed two trials over the course of eight days. I observed all trial proceedings for each case, including jury selection, the court-martial itself, as well as the sentencing hearing. For each of the eight days, I arrived with my base-sponsor, a victim legal counselor, at 7:00am and stayed through the proceedings which usually ended around 5:00pm.

I also observed interactions that occurred before and after these hearings, both inside and outside of the courtroom. These observations gave me access to the backstage realm of court

interactions. Observing outside of the courtroom both before and after trial proceedings gave me access to information, conversations, and interactions between service-members and their lawyers, friends, and family members. Often these conversations were about the case, but other times it was small talk about things like weather, children, or jobs. Additionally, I had lunch and dinner with my base sponsor every day, often on base. In these informal settings, we often discussed the case and his strategy for advocating for his client (the victim). Finally, I was invited to a luncheon for the legal unit that I observed. This luncheon took place on base and was a celebration of those rotating out of the unit, including my base sponsor. At this luncheon, I observed interactions between service-members, and participated in military traditions in giving awards and celebrating unit service. At this luncheon, I engaged in several informal conversations with defense lawyers, prosecutors, and service-members who worked in supportive positions for each office. These experiences allowed me to observe on-base interactions in both formal and informal settings.

While observing court hearings, I relied on jotting in order to help me recall important scenes, actions, and dialogue when writing up fieldnotes (Emerson et. al. 1995). I also made sure to jot emotions and feelings I observed or felt in the field (Lofland et. al. 2006). For example, while jotting dialogue, if the speaker started to cry or an individual's voice started trembling, I jotted this down next to the dialogue. Jotting while in the field helped me remember more specific pieces of dialogue and more detailed and vivid descriptions (Emerson et. al. 1995; Lofland et. al. 2006). It has been advised to not jot conspicuously while in the field (Lofland et. al 2006). I was able to jot inconspicuously and without much detection due to the nature of the courtroom setting. While the courtroom is an intimate space where writing in a notebook could be noticed, many people in the setting have papers and documents with them. Therefore, the

presence of a notebook is not an irregularity in the setting. In informal settings such as the commissary and on-base restaurants, I did not jot. In these spaces, I took notes on my cell phone about interactions, experiences, and setting details that I noticed.

While in military courtrooms I noted dialogue, interactions (verbal and nonverbal), silences, eye contact, and spatial arrangement. However, because I was unable to tape record the hearings, most of my fieldnotes consist of dialogue that occurred in the courtroom. Not being able to tape record hearings meant that I was mainly jotting dialogue. This was a limitation, particularly in the beginning where I had a hard time focusing on interactions other than spoken words. As time went on I started to jot less dialogue and only key phrases, words or utterances while taking more note of nonverbal interactions and the use of space. Fieldnotes were developed based on jottings, with special attention to reproducing dialogue, key nonverbal interactions, emotions, and events. While it is important to consider that I could have made some participants uncomfortable and more vulnerable in the courtroom, the fact that courtrooms are open to public access (and therefore observation) decreases the participants' expectation of privacy in this setting (Lofland et. al. 2006). Even though the courtrooms are accessible to anyone, one needs a sponsor to get on military bases. Further, most individuals in the setting were wearing military uniforms, meaning that in my civilian work attire I was unable to fit in and seem like another member of the setting as recommended by Emerson (2001). Because of my clothing, it was often assumed I was a friend or family member of one of the service-members involved in the courts-martial I attended, as these individuals are often the only civilians in the court-room who are not directly involved with trial proceedings.

Although my observations were limited to two courts-martial, this did help me become more familiar with military settings, traditions, and legal proceedings. The use of limited

participant observation combined with in-depth interviews allowed me to better identify, understand, and describe service-members' perceptions (Emerson 2001).

DATA ANALYSIS

After collecting and transcribing the interviews, I read and re-read my transcripts and fieldnotes looking for themes linking together previously disconnected observations (Emerson et al. 1995). The themes that guided my dissertation emerged inductively from the data generated by interview transcripts (Charmaz 2000; Coffey and Atkinson 1996; Emerson et al. 1995). I coded the transcripts and fieldnotes line by line to identify patterns and themes. After I identified initial codes, I went back through my transcripts and fieldnotes to identify nuances within themes. I then wrote analytic and integrative memos based on patterns that emerged from interview transcripts to better develop themes for analysis (Charmaz 2006; Emerson et al. 1995; Esterberg 2002; Kleinman 2007; Lofland et al. 2006).

When analyzing the transcripts and fieldnotes, I noted that participants often referenced specific military policies and rules. To better understand the lived reality of my participants, I also analyzed military documents outlining rules, policies, and regulations. I read these documents throughout my data analysis and writing process and reference them in this dissertation to better explain my participants' experiences, frustrations, and points of confusion. For example, if participants shared frustrations with confusing rules around reporting sexual assault, I would read the policies outlining reporting. During this process I found that not only do reporting guidelines frequently change, but that depending on the victim-offender relationship a victim should report one of two different programs. Thus, analyzing these documents allowed me to give further context and depth to participants' experiences.

RESEARCHER ROLE AND RELATIONSHIPS

Prior research has explored how researchers' membership to groups they study can shape the relationship between researchers and participants, as well as aspects of the research process including participation, interpretation, and analysis. The researcher's status as an insider or outsider can be based on the her/his demographic classifications (gender, race, class), or the researcher's membership to a community, group, organization or institution (Deutsch 2004; Lofland et al. 2006; Merton 1972; Zavella 1993; Zinn 1979). Feminist scholarship has argued that researcher roles and positionality are important to consider and that the insider and outsider roles each carry advantages and disadvantages (Deutsch 2004; Zavella 1993).

The military's status as a near-total institution enhanced my role as an outsider throughout this research process because as an institution it cultivates a sense of "insiderness" among service-members as distinctive and separate from civilians (Woodward and Jenkins 2011). The "military vs. civilian" or "us vs. them" dichotomy affects access to individuals in the military and it frames the interactions that an interviewer may have with a military participant (Higate and Cameron 2006). For example, being a military outsider, I was not able to rely on shared knowledge of the military to build rapport or to direct questions (Higate and Cameron 2006). Military insiders sometimes mistrust civilians, particularly those studying sensitive issues within the institution, which have shaped participation. For example, in the process of setting up an interview with one of my participants she wrote to me and said, "I will not bash men," demonstrating how she thought my research might be framed. She agreed to participate after I assured her that I was not seeking specific comments; rather, the interview would be a chance for her to share her experiences however she wanted to talk about them.

To build rapport that might have been lost due to my role as a military outsider, I employed a variety of techniques to reduce distance (Lofland et al. 2006). Throughout the recruitment and interview process, I tried to establish a mutual, non-hierarchical relationship where I not only answered questions about my own identity but also acknowledged similarities and differences between myself and participants (Letherby 2003). Lofland et al. (2006:23) argue that researchers must assess their “ascriptive categories” and how these relate to the population being researched. They argue that categories such as gender, race, and age can shape the richness of the data that is shared by a participant. Further, “matching” respondents with certain characteristics or emphasizing similarities can be a way to bridge differences due to outsider status (Zavella 1993). Being a woman who understands and studies sexual abuse allowed me to connect with service-women who have experienced these things. Campbell and Adams (2009) note that sexual assault survivors often participate in research to help other survivors, to advance research in the area, and to help themselves. Knowing that they are speaking with someone who is committed to researching and understanding sexual abuse might have allowed them to feel more comfortable (Campbell and Adams 2009). In my interviews, I tried to present in a “non-threatening demeanor,” meaning that I was supportive, sympathetic, and a good listener throughout the interview. This is especially true when discussing sensitive topics such as sexual harassment and rape (Campbell 2002).

I also invoked a “selective competence” role to minimize the differences between participants and myself that originated due to my outsider status (Letherby 2003; Lofland et al. 2006). For example, using military jargon allowed service-members to see that I was familiar with the military, even if I was not a member myself, which might have made them feel more comfortable sharing certain experiences. Additionally, showing some understanding of military

ranks, procedures, and concepts allowed me to probe deeper in the interviews, as participants did not have to spend time explaining basic military structures to me. I also emphasized my relationship with my three gatekeepers to demonstrate my commitment and interest in the lives of service-women to establish trust (Zavella 1993). Finally, showing that I had some knowledge of and interest in the military facilitated continued relationships with my participants. Many service-women emailed me after the interview to share online articles about women in the military, or to share an experience with me that they forgot to mention in the interview. For example, after the ban on women in combat roles was lifted in 2015, five of my participants contacted me to discuss what this meant for women in the military. After my article “The Bureaucratic Harassment of U.S. Service-women” came out in *Gender & Society* I posted a link on my Facebook page. This link was shared on Facebook by one of my key informants as well as one of my participants. The participant posted the article and stated “She was very easy to talk to and I felt it was worth it. It’s interesting to see how she applied my experience.” Another participant reached out to say: “Interestingly enough, I read your article and thought ‘the exact same thing happened to me!’ And then I realized it was me. I thought it was really interesting that you were able to connect stories and circumstances together into one defining theme. It felt cathartic reading it, so thanks for taking the time to share!”

While my outsidership did not allow me to build on shared knowledge during interviews, and hindered my ability to build rapport based on shared experiences, it did have some benefits. Because I was a military outsider, I was able to use the role of “acceptable incompetent” to probe and ask questions that military insiders probably could not ask (Lofland et al. 2006:29). Due to shared norms and expectations, military insiders are often unable to ask questions that other service-members may already expect them to know. As an outsider, I was able to ask questions

about aspects of military service that are taken for granted, or taboo issues such as sexual harassment (Deutsch 2004; Emerson 2001). In this role, I allowed participants to “teach” me about the military during the interview. For example, I could ask someone to explain to me what a deployment was like, to explain what they did at boot camp, and to expand on military protocols and rules that an insider would be expected to know. Additionally, my outsider role allowed me to avoid issues that might come with outranking or being outranked by my participants, such as awkwardness, feeling forced to answer questions, and glossing (Higate and Cameron 2006).

METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

Ethical Considerations

Protecting my participants from harm was a major ethical consideration for this dissertation. Acknowledging the potential risks to my participants was a key part of designing my study. For example, it is possible that some participants were uncomfortable talking about their experiences in the U.S. Military, especially if they had been sexually harassed or assaulted during their service. There may have been some risk to these women’s reputations, privacy, and employability if their participation in this study was known to their military supervisors and/or colleagues. There is also the potential for retaliation and further harassment if they are revealed or identified as participants in my study. Therefore, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity was key to protecting my participants from harm.

One of the considerations that qualitative scholars make when writing their analysis is how to represent the participants in their study (Fine et al 2000; Van Maanen 1988). During qualitative analysis it is not only important to think about how participants’ words are framed, but also about which participants are given voice and which ones are not (Fine et al. 2000).

Entrenched in these discussions about representation and giving voice is the question of researcher accountability to their participants. I considered this point alongside the need for me to protect my participants from harm, which led me to give participants the authority to tell me not to include an experience, quote, or any demographic information that they believe might lead to them being identified. Giving participants the ability to share information with me but not have it be a part of any written material that results from this study helped ease fears about sharing difficult and sensitive information. Only four service-women asked for specific information not to be shared in writing. One service-member asked that I not reveal the specific geographical location/base where she was located when she was raped, nor the location to which she was transferred. She said that I could share the distance between the two bases, but not specific locations. Another service-woman did not want me to reveal her military occupational specialty (MOS) if I was also revealing her base. Another participant told a story very specific to her commander and deployment and asked me not to share it in written material. Due to the sensitive nature of my research, I tried to check in with my participants throughout the interview to remind them that they could choose to not have certain information shared in my analysis.

To help mitigate the risks to participants, I emphasized that they could stop the interview at any time without any consequence. Additionally, I told participants that they could contact me at any time to discuss my research, their experiences, or to ask me questions. Finally, to protect participant confidentiality I am careful when sharing demographic information. Some of my participants were the only women in their unit, the only woman of color in a certain program, the only woman at a certain rank in her unit, or were a part of very small deployments. To ensure anonymity I do not reveal more than a person's race, rank, and branch of service unless I had permission to do so. It is for this reason that I present my participants in a table that shares only

their pseudonym and limited demographic information (race, branch of service, and officer or enlisted status). To identify individuals by more than branch, personnel status and race would be a risk to their anonymity.

Validity

The notion of research validity and reliability is most associated with quantitative methods and positivist epistemology (Denzin and Lincoln 1994). Qualitative methods are usually evaluated based on validity, rigor, truthfulness, and integrity (Corbin and Strauss 2008). Validity in qualitative methods refers to the richness/thickness of the descriptions or the ability of the researcher to represent and describe the populations being studied as completely as possible (Becker 1996). The notion of truthfulness is important to discuss when considering validity. In qualitative research, statements made by participants can be taken as truth or can be questioned as not being true. When a participant lies, it does not mean that the data is meaningless, as the researcher can then ask why they lied, what was the meaning of the lie, and what does the lie tell me about the participant (Becker and Geer 1960). I examined participants' comments as creating meaning for their own experiences and reflective of their conceptions and understandings of their military experiences. With this in mind, it is important to note that throughout data collection and analysis I tried to understand the meanings and words of my participants from their own perspective, trying to not impose my own meanings and notions on their statements (Lofland et al. 2006). Additionally, by acknowledging my subjectivity and remaining reflexive throughout data collection and analysis, I also addressed the role that I had in observing, collecting, and interpreting the data (Becker 1996; Rubin and Rubin 2012; Van Maanen 1988).

Finally, collecting data by combining information from a variety of sources can increase validity (Berg 2009). Collecting data through interviews, textual sources, and participant

observation allowed me to analyze different kinds of data at the same time, enhancing the validity of my findings (Becker and Geer 1960).

LIMITATIONS

This project started out as exploratory, seeking to privilege the voices of service-women in describing their own military experiences. My interview guide was purposefully flexible and broad to allow women to tell me what they thought was important about their experiences. While this was a benefit in many ways, it was a limitation in that I did not ask some questions that could have better informed the themes in this dissertation. For example, I never asked participants about the bureaucratic nature of their harassment. Rather, this theme emerged organically in women's harassment narratives. If I had asked directly about this phenomenon, I may have been able to uncover more tactics, motivations, and consequences of this type of workplace harassment. Additionally, I did not specifically ask women about their sexuality until after my proposal defense. While some disclosed their sexuality in other ways, I still only have data on sexuality for a little over half of my participants. I could have done more analysis relating to sexuality if I had collected this data for each participant. Furthermore, I did not ask about the demographics of perpetrators (other than rank), meaning I could not offer analysis that highlighted the race or class of perpetrators of sexual abuse.

While this dissertation focuses on the experiences of service-women, to make a case about how gender operates within a specific organization it would also be helpful to also study men. Without including men in my sample, the claims I am making about gender are informed only by women's experiences.

Participant observation in a near-total institution could reveal more complexity about service-women's experiences, identity work, and masculinity displays. I was unable to observe

women in a variety of contexts to see how they “did gender” at work, on base social spaces, and in and around the barracks. Further, I did not see women experiencing harassment nor how they responded. Participant observation of military interactions is extremely difficult due to the closed nature of the organization. In fact, I was invited to a military base on Parris Island during my data collection only to have the offer rescinded after my contact checked with her commander to clear my visit. However, a larger participant observation component could have revealed more about how experiences with harassment, identities, and gender displays change over time.

CHAPTER 3

GENDER AND THE MILITARY FAMILY

This chapter explores how the military as an institution utilizes the concept of the “military as a family” to create meaning for military identities and experiences. The notion that service-members gain access to a military family is often portrayed as one of the greatest benefits of military service. As an institution, the military promises membership in this family to those who successfully pass military training and demonstrate that they have been socialized under core military values, which are distinctly different from civilian values. The service-women in my sample often spoke about themselves as both different from civilians and different from their civilian selves. The military purposefully facilitates family-like interactions among service members and encourages family-like bonding to serve its own institutional goals. In this chapter, I explore how the military facilitates family-like interactions by emphasizing access to the military family in recruitment and through expectations of caregiving with an emphasis on trust and loyalty.

Next, I explore how service-women understand and orient themselves to the idea that the military is a family. I show how service-women used the family narrative in their *talk* about the military in general, and to explain camaraderie they experienced, but when explaining their *interactions* with other service-members, they spoke about the “military as family” concept in more limited terms. While service-women described how the military family is active in the lives of *service-men* in a variety of ways, in most of their own experiences they did not describe themselves as being cared for by the military family. I argue that through their interactions with other service-members, service-women realize that the military family often excludes them. Service-women learn to tell the narrative about a military family because it is repeated and

encouraged by the institution, but it does not align with their lived experiences of exclusion. I then demonstrate how service-women navigate this tension.

I argue that service-women do not feel like civilians, yet their limited access to the military family makes them feel like outsiders to the military institution. Some women try to gain inclusion by acting as fictive caregivers, yet this role does not gain them acceptance on the same level as men. I also discuss service-women who have been sexually assaulted and show how they either do not invoke the “military as family” narrative, or they invoke this narrative in negative terms. Notably, the majority of service-women who do describe being recipients of family-like caregiving are those who have experienced markers of masculine, warrior, achievement. Ultimately, these distinctions suggest that the military actually functions as a more masculinized type of family – a brotherhood.

THE FAMILY NARRATIVE

The term “family” can be used to describe the bonds between relatives as well as the functions that they perform and provide for one another. Family functions include providing both material and social care for members and privileging family relationships over others (Cherlin 2002; Muraco 2006). However, several features of families such as trust, loyalty, care-giving, and intimacy have also been found outside of family settings (Stack 1974; Weston 1991; Wilmot and Shellen 1990). Prior research has found that fictive kinship networks can be built by replicating these functions among non-related individuals (Ebaugh and Curry 2000; Muraco 2006; Stack 1974). Previous scholarship has focused on “chosen” families or “fictive kin,” particularly in the absence of relational families where non-related individuals perform family-like functions for one another such as caregiving, and social and material support (Muraco 2006; Stack 1974; Weston 1991).

Holstein and Gubrium (1995a; 1999) argue that the family is socially constructed and is an interactional accomplishment. Similar to how individuals “do gender” through talk and interaction (West and Zimmerman 1987), individuals can discursively construct family, and family meanings can be deployed in a variety of social settings (Holstein and Gubrium 1999). The constructivist approach sees family as a set of ideas, words, images, and interactions used to accomplish a particular social bond rather than a fixed definition tied to a specific location. For example, an individual can invoke the concept of family outside of formal kinship designations by using vocabulary that calls on aspects usually associated with family. For example, Stack (1974) found that Black women defined family through the display of commitment and care rather than formal relative distinctions.

Fictive kinship networks have been found to help disadvantaged groups, such as Blacks in the United States, navigate inequality (Stack 1974). Fictive kin have also been documented as providing material resources and social resources such as protection and emotional support among those who are separated geographically from their relatives, such as immigrants in the United States (Ebaugh and Curry 2000). When an individual does not have an intimate family unit, they often seek out fictive kinships to achieve these social bonds. While group memberships exist in many forms, family ties are often prioritized over others regardless of how those family ties are constructed (Muraco 2006). In the U.S. military, service-members are often geographically separated from their families while at their duty-stations, during training, and while on deployment. In the context of geographical separation from relatives and being isolated with one another in military spaces, service-members are well-situated to form fictive family ties. Furthermore, the military encourages service-members to think of one another as family and to prioritize these relationships over others.

While previous scholarship has explored how individuals form fictive kin relationships in the absence of blood relatives (Ebaugh and Curry 2000) and has examined how institutional practices and society can shape meanings around family (Cherlin 2002; Holstein and Gubrium 1995a), my research explores how an institution (the military) uses family discourse to create meaning and encourage fictive kinship among its members to serve its own institutional goals. The family discourse espoused by the military is repeated throughout recruitment and training and reinforced in a variety of ways throughout service-members' careers, leading them to think about their experiences in reference to the idea that the military is a family. While institutions and local context can supply vocabulary and notions of family for individuals to use, it does not pre-determine or dictate how individuals will construct meanings (Holstein and Gubrium 1995a; 1999). Meanings around family are also shaped by interactional experiences within a given context. In this chapter, I argue that the service-women in my sample learn the family narrative and use it to explain their experiences with the military in general. However, in trying to "do family" many service-women realize that the military is a brotherhood to which they are denied access and, in many ways, the military's concept of family does not apply to them.

Goffman (1961:11) argues that total institutions are incompatible with families, stating: "For those who eat and sleep at work, with a group of fellow workers, can hardly sustain a meaningful domestic existence." While total institutions are not compatible with traditional family ties, they can be places where fictive kinships develop. Additionally, as a near-total institution, the military has parental-like reach into the lives of its members. The military controls where service-members live, what they are permitted to wear both at work and out of the office, holiday schedules, work transfers, deployment schedules, and access to medical services. The military has programs to help military families adjust to new bases, prepare for

deployments, and to work through marriage issues. It has an office specifically designed to address family violence, titled “the family advocacy program.” This reach into service-members’ personal family life is in addition to the military’s control of service-members’ military work life. Therefore, service-members are isolated, living together under the same rules set by the institution. Thus, the military’s blending of personal, family, and work life produces expectations of family-like ties and caregiving among service-members and normalizes the idea that military identity encompasses private, personal matters including those typically found within families. In the next section, I show how service-members are taught the “military as family” narrative during recruitment and training and how it is reinforced through the military’s expectations of caregiving.

The Family Narrative in Recruitment

The military uses broad familial language and vocabulary around caring, obligation, and bonding, as well as more narrow brotherhood discourse, to invoke the idea that the military is a family and to set up family-like expectations for service-members. For example, websites, flyers, and recruitment pamphlets list access to the military family alongside more tangible benefits such as healthcare, education benefits, and tax-free housing. An online article giving an overview of military benefits lists “being a part of a larger family with a proud history—the military tradition” (military.com 2018b). Similarly, an article on the benefits of the Marine Corps states “The advantages of becoming a Marine far exceed the benefits that come with it. Being a Marine gives you the equipment and knowledge that allows you to be a leader within your family, your community, and our Country. You become part of a brotherhood that exists in and out of uniform” (militaryspot.com 2018). This article claims that membership in the military brotherhood is more important than the tangible benefits that come with joining. As shown by

these two examples, the military often uses the words “family” and “brotherhood” interchangeably. Similarly, recruiters often discuss unity, brotherhood, and family as a benefit of joining. June who was a member of both the Air Force and the Marine Corps stated:

They offered me the college fund and the job I wanted so it was a guaranteed draw and ... obviously the MC [Marine Corps] has the best pitch, best uniforms, they [recruiters] tell you they're the few, the proud. You feel like you're joining this awesome elite group of people. (Air Force and Marine Corps, Enlisted, Asian-American).

June found that the tangible benefits of joining the Marine Corps, such as education funding, were made even more appealing by the idea of working alongside an exclusive and accomplished group of individuals. This idea was presented to her by her recruiter when discussing the benefits of Marine Corps membership. Similarly, a recruiter told Carol “you’re getting a career and a family” when she was in the process of joining. For some recruits, the draw of joining such an admirable and tight-knit community is particularly important.

Escaping Family

The idea of the military family might be especially appealing to individuals who join the military to escape their own negative family situations. Prospective service-members whose relationships with parents, siblings, and extended family are not supportive and nurturing might seek to fill this void through the promise of a military family. Sandra, who enlisted in the Air Force, stated “I came from a home with a father that was a drug addict, and it was just a rough childhood, growing up.” Later in the interview she circled back to her abusive father when explaining why many people join the military. She stated, “Like I said before, that stability I didn't have growing up, it really entices people in that community [the military], because everyone wants that belonging, that's part of it, you really want that belonging.” Sandra explained that the military’s promise of a family is particularly appealing to those who do not

have familial support in the first place. Similarly, Jennifer, a Marine who worked with recruits entering training, stated that:

A lot of female recruits come here with emotional baggage. They're trying to escape something. They were you know, assaulted as a kid, abused as a kid, had a poor father figure they're trying to escape. So, they typically come here with a lot of issues. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Jennifer explained that it is important to know the population that she is in charge of training, and that a lot of young, new, enlisted Marines are escaping a negative home-life. For example, Mallory enlisted in the Army because:

I was like, 'I need to get out' and then I was given this opportunity, and I was so thankful that I'm not in that place. If I still lived in [Southern state], I would probably be doing drugs right now. I would probably be an alcoholic. If I never joined the military and got out, I would probably be in a very bad place right now. I'm so grateful that I did join the Army. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

Mallory joined the Army to escape her hometown and a negative family situation. She had limited family support, which was stressful for her during training, but would "have been... more... way worse if I stayed [home]." Some service-women state that they joined because they did not have anywhere else to go, as Erin explained:

I ended up dropping out of school, and I stayed with my sister for a while, and she came home one random day and kicked me out. And I went home to my parents' house, and I was there for like a day or two before my mom kicked me out. And I didn't have anywhere to go, so I went back to my friends. And they said I could stay with them for a while, but last minute they decided to take a trip to...[city], and I literally had no place to go. And I was living out of my truck for ... I don't know how long. I don't remember how I got there, but I was sitting in a chair staring at some tiles on a desk. And when I started to look around, I realized I was in a recruiting office. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American)

Erin goes on to say that she joined the Marine Corps because "it was an unconscious decision to save my life. And what I wanted to do is have a place to live for the next couple of years, have a job, and then establish myself so I could take my brother and give him a better life." With nowhere to live and no family to support her, the military was seemingly the only option for

Erin. This demonstrates how the military provides material resources such as a place to live, money, and healthcare; resources that are usually provided by families. In this way, the military acts as a total institution as it takes on a family-like provider role for its members.

Erin explained that military training was not difficult for her because “they always talk about how the Marines have to break you down first, I was already broken.” Similarly, Melanie stated “I came from an upbringing where I was like yelled at and talked down to all the time so I kind of already had a thick skin about stuff like that. So, boot camp was pretty... It was pretty easy in that respect.” (Army, Enlisted, White). The lack of emotional family support is another reason Erin joined the military. She explained that part of the reason she joined was to show her family that she could do it and to “prove them wrong.” The day before Erin left for training:

My dad showed up. I wasn't welcome at my parents' house anymore, I was staying with my aunt and my grandma, and he actually showed up at the house drunk off his ass, and he cussed me out, told me that I was a loser and that he would see me in a few days, because he didn't think that I would make it (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American).

Thus, the military is often an attractive option for individuals seeking to escape negative home-life or family situations. This finding is confirmed in the quantitative literature. For example, Bostock and Daly (2007) found that 16.9% of women who join the Air Force have experience with childhood sexual assault, which is higher than the percentage of childhood victimization among their civilian counterparts. Similarly, Sadler et al. (2003) found that 39% of service-women in their sample had experienced sexual violence prior to their military service. They also found that service-women who experienced childhood sexual violence were twice as likely to be raped during their military service (Sadler et al. 2003). This is consistent with studies of civilian populations that suggest that childhood sexual victimization is a risk factor for adult sexual assault (Arata and Lindman 2002; Boney-McCoy and Finkelhor 1996; Desai et al. 2002; McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008; Noll et al. 2003; Russell 1984) and that childhood

physical abuse is linked to future sexual victimization (Arata and Lindman 2002; Desai et al. 2002). For example, Desai et al. (2002) found that women who had experienced physical abuse as children were three times more likely to be victims of adult sexual abuse and women who had experience sexual abuse as children were twice as likely to be victims of adult sexual abuse. Therefore, service-women's childhood experiences with neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse make them more vulnerable to future victimization. The risk is increased when considering factors relating to the military as a near-total institution that increase risk for sexual violence such as men's access to service-women's homes and frequent night and early morning interactions (Sadler et al. 2003). Against a background of abuse, some service-women may be particularly susceptible to the military's promises of stability, support, and family-like caregiving, even though other military features might increase their vulnerability to future sexual victimization.

The military's use of familial and brotherhood vocabulary in its recruitment process is an effective tool for presenting access to the military family as a benefit of membership. While some prospective service-members learn the military as family discourse from recruiters, others purposefully seek out military service because of this perceived benefit. Regardless, service-members learn to think about the military as a family in a variety of ways while in the process of joining the organization. Once service-members are in the military, the family narrative is further established in training by encouraging service-members to think of themselves as different from civilians and similar to one another.

Civilian vs. Military Identities

The first step after recruitment that the military uses to create the idea that the military is a family is to establish that service-members are unique and different from civilians. The U. S.

military is a near-total institution with its own education, legal, police, medical, and bureaucratic systems. U.S. military rules, laws, policies, and regulations operate outside of and separate from the civilian world. Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) argue that this creates an “us vs. them” mentality for individuals who join the military. Additionally, the military socialization process involves re-socializing individuals through rigorous physical and mental testing and through extreme surveillance (Koeszegi et al. 2014; Morris 1996). At military academies and during boot camp, Officer Candidate School (OCS), and basic training, individuals are subjected to a series of physical and mental tests, while simultaneously being taught core military values (Morris 1996; Kimmel 2000). The struggle to complete training is painted as rite of passage, enacting a symbolic boundary between service-members and civilians. The narrative that not everyone can make it through this experience fosters a sense of exclusivity and uniqueness among service members (Hale 2012; Koeszegi et al. 2014). By completing the physical and mental transformations necessary to survive boot-camp, service-members begin to develop a military identity that is distinctly different from their former civilian selves (Hall 2017; Koeszegi et al. 2014). The women in my sample made comments that denoted their separation from civilians. For example, Vivian stated that after Officer Candidate School (OCS):

I started to view people outside of the military as undisciplined and nasty. Like their hair, men with long hair started to look weird to me. The way people talked and stood all seemed improper. The Marine Corps is very polite, ‘Please’ and ‘Thank you’ and all of that. You might think you are a polite person, but no civilian is as polite as a Marine. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Here, Vivian emphasizes the undesirable traits of civilians as opposite to traits of military members, including herself. She further described how civilians cannot recognize the difference between themselves and service-members and frames this as a weakness because these differences are obvious to Marines. Similarly, Margaret claimed that individuals who join the

military, and the Marine Corps in particular, are unique and different from other people: “Some of the people you meet in the military are just - you know, we’re different. I don’t know how to explain other than that. I used to tell people, ‘You know it takes a special kind of crazy to joining the Marine Corps.’ And it’s true.” (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White). It is clear to Margaret that she and other members of the military understand and recognize their uniqueness in ways that civilians cannot. Similarly, Olivia stated:

I can recognize a Marine anywhere. Like the way they carry themselves and how they talk and stuff, you know maybe what they wear. You just know. I could walk into any bar and just point out the Marines. It’s just something...you just, you know. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Some of my participants stressed that civilians and service-members are so different that they can no longer relate to civilians. One captain in the Army, Anna, stated “Most Army moms...they get out of active duty because you know we all find an army husband mainly because you can’t relate to a civilian man...you can’t... you can’t do it anymore.” (Army, Officer, Latina). Anna’s use of the word “anymore” shows a distinction between her previous civilian self—one that could relate to and date civilian men, and her military self—one who can only relate to and date service-men. The idea that service-members are different from civilians is encouraged by the military as an organization (Redmond et al., 2015). Additionally, the military encourages camaraderie among service-members through boundary work that stresses how only service-members can understand and appreciate military experience. To accentuate the importance of this transformation, once service members have passed institutional tests (boot camp, officer candidate school, basic training, etc.), they are granted special privileges (Koeszegi et al. 2014). Privileges include being officially called an “airman,” “marine,” “sailor” or “solider” rather than a trainee or recruit and access to previously restricted freedoms. Another special privilege is access to the military family, which is initially promised to service-members

during recruitment. The symbolic commemoration of those who achieve membership into the military family is a key marker of military identity. This is emphasized through the narrative of an earned uniqueness which sets them apart from civilians and will continue to bond service-members together, not just through the remainder of their service, but through their entire lives (Harrison 2003; Woodward and Jenkins 2011).

Thus, the construction of the military family begins when service-members are repeatedly told during recruitment that joining the military gains them a family. Then, during training service-members learn to think about themselves as different from civilians. They are reminded throughout training that the collective experience of struggling through training bonds them with one another in unique ways. Family relationships are understood as unique, exclusive bonds that take precedence over other relationships (Muraco 2006). The military encourages similar bonds by stressing the difference between civilians and service-members and through emphasizing exclusive membership built through collective struggles, experiences, and expectations. Additionally, the military stresses the unique qualities of membership to the family at important moments of institutional membership such as recruitment, training, and training completion. Thus, the idea that the military is a family is embedded in institutional traditions and rituals. In the next section, I outline how the military continues to cultivate the family narrative through organizational expectations of caregiving.

Military Expectations of Caregiving

Though institutional structures can help shape how individuals think about family, familial relationships take shape through interaction (Holstein and Gubrium 1995a), and the military creates institutional expectations that help facilitate family-like interactions. The military uses family vocabulary and invokes notions of family-like caregiving in slogans such as

“Don’t leave a battle buddy behind,” which are repeated at formal military trainings, printed on pamphlets and posters, and discussed in informal conversations. For example, Deborah, an officer in the Air Force, claims that “The Air Force preaches wingmanship, wingmanship, wingmanship, wingmanship.” Similarly, an enlisted woman in the Army, Cristina, stated that “When we were in basic training—it’s the initial transition to becoming a soldier—throughout basic training, you’re always taught you know pick up...pick up a soldier and we never leave anyone behind and look out for your brothers and sisters.” Cristina uses the words brothers and sisters, demonstrating that this care-giving expectation emerges from a family-like bond. Additionally, she explained how the military encourages care-giving during training while individuals are in the process of learning core military values. The emphasis on caretaking continues after training as well. One of the most salient examples of the caregiving expectation is in how the military teaches service-members to recognize distress and to prevent suicide. Nadia stated:

Well, the military is big on PT (physical training) and suicide prevention. Those are the two things that have really I guess you could say honed their skills in on, and I'm very, very thankful that they have because there's a lot of soldiers that don't really like to do PT, that really can't do PT, and it's there to help them, and then you have a lot of soldiers who are not getting the help that they need and ignoring them or they're overlooking their symptoms and their signs and their calls for help, and that's why the suicide prevention was put into place by us, why it has been enhanced, why there's more people now looking out for more soldiers due to the fact that the suicide rate has went up. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

The family serves as an emotional support system (Cherlin 2002; Muraco 2006; Weston 1991). Looking for signs of distress are normative in many forms of family, however, the military’s insistence on these things from the top down demonstrates the entanglement of institutional goals and expectations around service-member interactions. In this way, caregiving becomes a way to demonstrate institutional loyalty. This is evident in Nadia’s statement that places the military’s

focus on suicide prevention at a similar level and intensity as its focus on physical training. Thus, the expectation for service-members look for suicide warning signs and assist service-members who might be depressed is an institutional priority. The military creates “feeling rules” surrounding how service-members should treat one another (Hochschild 1979). Service-members are expected to care for one another and they are expected to manage their emotions to demonstrate this care. The military’s focus on caregiving is so entrenched that it can result in feelings of guilt if a suicide occurs. For example, Nadia goes on to describe how she feels responsible for the suicide of a friend:

I was like, ‘If I could have done something, if I could have ... ‘ I didn't even hear or see the signs while talking to him. I just, I didn't, and I blame myself because I'm like, ‘I wasn't paying attention.’ I was so wrapped up in what I was doing and my life that I wasn't paying attention to him. I wasn't giving him the attention he needed for what he was going through. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

Feelings of guilt and self-blame are commonly experienced by family and friends of individuals who commit suicide (Bartik et al. 2013; Sands and Tennant 2010; Shields, Kavanagh, Russo 2017; Tzeng et al. 2010). In the military, service-members who are trained to recognize suicide signs and prioritize suicide prevention might feel like they failed the institution as well as the individual. June demonstrates this when she stated: “I guess this marine just committed suicide at Miramar or Camp Pendleton ... and the reaction from the unit is we have to take care of the institution, we have to take care of the Marine Corps, we have to take care of the mission,” (Marine Corps and Air Force, Enlisted, Asian-American). June described how a suicide is not just something that affects individuals but also the unit and institution. This demonstrates that caregiving and loyalty are expected for both the institution as well as those serving within it. The expectation that service-members care for one another is so important that they are sometimes

reprimanded if they fail to do so. For example, Katherine explained that a man with her same rank was drunk at a party while they were deployed. She stated:

And the lieutenant colonel had come in that morning and told my colonel, 'Oh by the way, I found one of your captains incredibly intoxicated walking down the middle of the road.' And so, he's like, so my colonel starts lecturing me on you know, 'We need to be good wingmen, we need to watch out for each other.' And he can't believe I would allow one of my peers to just wander off like that. (Air Force, Officer, White).

Part of the colonel's discontent is that a drunk captain in his unit reflects poorly on the military and is therefore a negative reflection on him and his leadership. Reprimanding Katherine to watch out for and stop such behavior demonstrates a top-down caregiving expectation, where service-members are encouraged at every level to address behavior that could reflect negatively on the military. Interestingly, while Katherine's colonel lectured her on the need to support and care for her military peers, she believes she was the only one to be spoken to about this particular incident, despite being one of many captains at the party. Notably, she was one of the only women in her unit, highlighting that women might be expected to take on caregiving roles more than men. Service-members are often told that self-sacrifice for the team is sometimes necessary.

For example, Nadia stated:

It gets a little sticky because then the NCO is like, 'Well, if you see that person not doing it, why not you do it? If you're not doing anything, you could do it. There's no problem with you helping out so-and-so or such-and-such. If you're not doing anything, you can help them out.' A lot of people get stretched thin doing that. I was one of the ones that got stretched thin trying to pull what I was doing and what somebody else was supposed to do. But it's not about them or me. It's about us as a team because...it's about the team as a unit, not just an individual person. If I can do my job and do yours and make us look good, then I'm going to do it. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

Nadia's willingness to cover for an underperforming colleague if it will benefit her unit is similar to how individuals are socialized to prioritize familial relationships over relationships with non-family members and over the self (Muraco 2006). She went on to say:

It all comes back to us being a family and all of us looking out for each other regardless of how you feel about a certain person. If you see them and you notice that they're not how they are, you notice something different in them, you're going to take the necessary action to see what's going on with them. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

Nadia explained that sometimes service-members stop doing well at their jobs because they are depressed or stressed. She emphasized that it is not only her job to cover for other service-members but to also approach that individual to help them work through their issues. This demonstrates how the military entangles notions of family, self-sacrifice, caregiving, and prioritizing the group over the individual. Finally, the idea that the team, unit, and organization are more important than the individual demonstrates the importance of loyalty and trust in the military as an institution.

In summary, the military builds the family narrative through the use of family discourse during recruitment and intensive training and reinforces the idea of the military as family through expectations of caregiving. The military as an institution uses family language to describe the expected bonds among organizational members. It also outlines social benefits of membership such as caregiving, which have been found to be important markers of fictive kin in other spaces such as among African-Americans and immigrant communities in the United States (Ebaugh and Curry 2000; Stack 1974). Service-women learn this narrative and invoke the military as family in their talk about the organization. However, service-women are not passive recipients of the institution's construction of family, or "organizational dopes" who simply repeat institutional narratives (Douglas 1986). Rather, service-women interpret institutional constructions of family alongside interacting with other service-members and other institutional meanings (such as those around gender, masculinity, and other workplace expectations). As will be shown in the remainder of this chapter, service-women's experiences shape how they understand and apply the military as family narrative to their own experiences. While the military defines family

broadly and produces expectations around care-giving for all service-members—it is experienced narrowly and is constrained by gender, age, rank, and combat experience.

SERVICE-WOMEN’S USE OF THE FAMILY NARRATIVE

In this section, I show how most service-women’s experiences are not in line with the military’s construction of family, nor with how they see the military family at work in the lives of service-men; particularly, in relation to caregiving. I argue that women invoke the “military as family” narrative when speaking about the institution in general, or to explain camaraderie. However, most service-women do not invoke the “military as family” narrative when recounting their experiences with care-giving in the military, and some actively note their exclusion from this component of the military family. Though some service-women attempt to gain inclusion by acting as fictive caregivers, they still do not describe themselves as recipients of caregiving. I also note active disruptions to the idea that the military is a family, including exploring the different ways that service-women who have been sexually assaulted during their service speak about the military as a family. Finally, I demonstrate how service-women who have experienced combat describe being both care givers as well as recipients of care (refer to Table 3.1 in Appendix C to see how women invoke the family narrative). These examples show how, in interaction with other service-members, the military family is often constructed as a brotherhood with limited roles for women.

Camaraderie/Family in General

The “military family” is a narrative that many service-women learn and then rely on to explain and make sense of some of their military experiences. The service-women I interviewed used the military as family narrative to explain why they joined, what they valued about the military, and what they missed about the military once they left. Many of the women in my

sample (n=22) spoke about the military family in general terms, and often used the word “family” to explain camaraderie. For example, like many of the service-women in my sample, Lisa stated that she joined the military to access a family. Before she joined the Air Force Officer Corps, Lisa worked as a military entertainer and was flown out to different international bases to perform for military personnel on deployment. She stated that, “I loved the camaraderie of the military; like a family. I got to see that as an entertainer and it’s one of the reasons I joined. I loved that.” The camaraderie of the military family is something that many of my participants said they missed after completing their service. Ayanna stated:

I really miss the camaraderie with people. I miss going somewhere—being deployed—and um you know it’s like where are you from? I’m from here. What base are you from or what unit are you from? And just finding that you have something in common with a stranger. I think because I didn’t join a sorority, or I didn’t do those clubs in school, that was kinda like my...my...my brotherhood if...if you will. (Air Force, Officer, Black)

The military tries to cultivate the image that service-members are bonded like family. Ayanna and Lisa both use the word family to express general feelings of camaraderie they experienced while in the military. While many women in my sample invoked the military as family narrative when discussing why they joined, or what they liked and missed about the military, most of them spoke about it in general terms. In other words, they seemed to rely on the camaraderie they shared with colleagues as proof of the greater “military as family” concept but did not cite more substantive experiences of family caregiving that the military provided them personally. For example, Rita, an enlisted Marine, stated that when she was deployed “there was like 25 of us all together so that was like a big family. I mean, we did stuff all the time outside of work and then we would go to work together.” Similarly, Carol, an enlisted Marine mechanic, stated: “Even if I don’t know a Marine or they don’t know me, you know if you’re out in town and you see a Marine somewhere like, you’re gonna have each other’s back.” These quotes show how the

structural realities of the military being a near-total institution often encourage a family-like environment, leading service-members to feel that they have the protection and support of other service-members, even outside of work. Both Rita and Carol invoked the military as family concept and a feeling of camaraderie as benefits of being in the military. However, when probed, these service-women did not provide examples of deep caregiving, and only invoked the feeling of family and camaraderie in general.

One service-member, Cristina, gave a specific example of camaraderie stating:

I got to my unit—my first duty station—around um... around the last week of November. And I came in on a Monday. And my birthday was the following day, the Tuesday. And I didn't know this but everyone around my office was secretly passing around a little birthday card and they were signing it. And they were saying you know little affectionate things like welcome to the family, and we hope you enjoy your stay. (Army, Enlisted, Latina)

Cristina's experience demonstrates how individuals in the military also stress the idea that service-members are bonded like family. Therefore, service-members learn the military as family narrative from one another in social interactions as well as from the institution. While Cristina's example is specific, it is still representative of camaraderie rather than an example of deep caregiving that service-women reported seeing at work in the lives of service-men. Deep caregiving was described by service-women as active in the lives of service-men or as something they provided to others. Examples included service-women seeing men stand up for one another when teased, giving rides to one another in cases of emergency, helping someone study for tests or train for physical fitness tests, helping someone through a break-up, and other examples of providing emotional or financial support in times of need. This level of care-giving is encouraged by the military to facilitate family bonds and is witnessed by women in the lives of service-men. For example, Nadia stated:

Let's say you got drunk one night and you needed a ride and you couldn't drive. You could call the first sergeant and he would come. He would not be happy about it, but he would come and get you and drive you home, literally drive you home because he would rather you call him at 12:00 at night than get into your car and drive drunk and get a DUI and then you're going to have to explain it to our commander why you drove drunk that night. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

Nadia went on to explain that while she never asked the first sergeant for a ride home, she knew service-men who did. She stated, "Half of the medics took that option." While Nadia may have felt like she had access to a ride home, her specific example described how service-men received family-like caregiving. Similarly, when asked about a specific example of the military family in action, Karen used an instance involving male Marines. She stated:

Some Army kid made fun of this 'Faggy marine' and two marines, who also made fun of him for being gay, stood up and told him [the Army kid] to shut the fuck up for criticizing a Marine. It's a big brother approach, like 'Hey only I can make fun of him. I can call him gay and you can't.' It's a brotherhood thing. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Nadia and Karen described men receiving care that went beyond camaraderie. Importantly, they speak about men as recipients of this care and not themselves. With the exception of Cristina and the service-women who have experienced combat, which I discuss below, service-women did not give specific examples of being recipients of caregiving in the same way. In fact, fourteen service-women discussed the family narrative only in general terms or to invoke camaraderie. The difference between the way the family operates in service-women's lives compared to how it operates in the lives of service-men is observed by women in interaction, hinting at women's exclusion from the family. Service-women use the institutional expectation around caregiving to simultaneously explain the existence of military family while also relaying their exclusion from these experiences in social interactions. Further, not only does Karen use an example involving men to describe how the military family works but she also uses the term *brotherhood* to describe the Marine Corps family experience, denoting this family as something masculine. This

example also shows that straight men are the gatekeepers to military insider status. Two straight Marines draw on their masculinity derived from their status as marines, often viewed as the most masculine branch of the military (Archer 2012), to reprimand service-men in the Army. They have power over both the service-man in the Army and the Marine who they make fun of for being gay, demonstrating how masculinity can provide the power to confirm and deny the identity work of others (Cast 2003) and how homophobia can be used to achieve masculinity and reinforce spaces as masculine (Pharr 1997). This example helps demonstrate that women's insider status often depends on how they are understood and received by men. It also shows how the military family is often constructed as a brotherhood, one where men have the status as gatekeepers and women do not.

Fictive Caregiving

When service-women did use personal examples to illustrate the military family in action, some spoke about their own role as fictive caregivers (N=11). Service-women in my sample who invoked their role as fictive caregivers but did not emphasize being recipients of care (n=5) were women in positions of power over other service-members (either officers or Non-commissioned officers (NCOs)) and were in their 30s. For example, when probed for a specific example of how the military was like a family, Natalie, an officer in the Air Force who served for 12 years, stated, "I mean, I had a guy [an individual who worked under her] show up and he had really bad financial problems and so we called his bank, his insurance and we worked out plans for him." Here, Natalie described the measures that she and another service-woman took on behalf of a young male service-man rather than providing an example of when she was the recipient of family-like caretaking from other service-members. She emphasized her role in taking care of this younger service-man so that he could "focus on his job and not worrying

about ‘oh wait, I have to pay for this or that’.” In this example, Natalie sees her role in the military family as one of supportive caretaker, performing tasks that ultimately help others. Similar to women in masculine corporations (Kanter 1977a), service-women are often placed into roles of institutional support, especially when they have been excluded from combat and certain military occupational specialties (Enloe 1983). They carry these support roles into their military interactions. Margaret, an NCO over 30, also explained her role as a caretaker in the military family:

One of my Junior Marines...I worked with him a lot on his writing. I mean my Marines - oh lord, sometimes I just wanted to murder them. I used to call them my special children. I would be like, “Ya’ll are my special children.” Because I don’t know what they were thinking. But half the time, they weren’t paying attention or they’d kind of mess around and they’d get the stories wrong. Somebody, I can’t remember who it was, misquoted the Base Commander-- -and I was like, “You got to be kidding me.” And I worked with them a lot. I spent a lot of time teaching them how to write and to edit, and just really intensely working with them. And one of them won Best New Writer of the Year. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Margaret not only emphasizes her caretaking role, but she uses the word “children” to describe her relationship with those who worked under her, placing herself in the role of mother. When asked for a specific example of the military family, she discussed how she plays a role in family-like caretaking for her Marines, but she did not describe being on the receiving end of such treatment. This demonstrates how service-women may identify with the military family due to their own work as fictive caretakers, rather than as recipients of family caregiving. Importantly, age and rank may constrain who can access this strategy. The only service-women who shared personal examples of the military family through their own role as fictive care-givers were all in positions of power over other service-members and were older than most enlisted service-members. Conversely, many service-women, regardless of age or rank, shared specific examples of service-men benefiting from the military family (i.e., recipients, as care-givers, as mentors, as

teasing brothers, or brothers who get teased). Therefore, men have a larger range of inclusion the military family. Even when women are able to *attempt* inclusion as fictive caregivers, this does not always gain them access, and this strategy is not available to all service-women. Therefore, women see men receiving deep levels of care in ways that they do not. Some women claim that they provide deep-level caregiving to other service-members (both men and women), but still do not describe themselves as receiving it. Even though some service-women emphasized caregiving for other women, among my participants the accounts of women receiving care were limited in comparison to the examples they gave of service-men receiving care. Outside of the service-women discussed in the “combat experience and inclusion section” one woman discussed another service-woman in a caretaker role. She stated “I think we sort of both fell into like a Mother-Daughter kind of role. But not really, like she never tried to be my mom and I never try to be her daughter, but we were really good friends.” Ultimately, military caregiving as opposed to camaraderie is absent from the accounts of many service-women, marking them as outsiders. I now turn to service-women who more explicitly state their exclusion from caregiving.

Disruptions to the Family Narrative

Despite having not benefited from military family caregiving, many of the service-women I spoke with still stressed the family narrative in their *talk* about the military. The family narrative is an important marker of military insiderness, emphasized by institutional narratives and witnessed by service-women in the lives of other service-members. Women engage in talk about the military family to claim insider status within the institution because the idea that the military is a family has been stressed to them during recruitment, training, and through institutional expectations. I have shown how women use the term family to explain camaraderie

they experience during their service. However, their talk about the military family as a caregiving support system is not confirmed by their experience of military life. Service-women are limited in how the military family is enacted in their lives, which serves to disrupt their identity as military insiders. Witnessing military family caregiving in the lives of service-men but not receiving this care themselves is a passive disruption to service-women's identities as military insiders. However, some service-women spoke more directly about their exclusion from the military family. Vivian described feelings of isolation when she wasn't allowed to join the Wounded Warrior program:

Like the enlisted Marines at the hospital sought me out and were like you qualify...But the officers on base refused to let me in. So, I didn't get to take advantage of the services that the program provided, like relaxed working hours, and assistance driving to and from doctor's appointments, and it was something like a 30-minute drive. At the time, they were giving me basically unlimited narcotics, which I did need for pain. But it put me in a position of having to suffer through my pain to drive safely, or to be pain free but possibly be driving under the influence. I didn't benefit from the family-like support that the military created in the Wounded Warrior program. And I didn't feel like I had any recourse because it was a Colonel who denied me. I was alone on an island and I felt like I had to beg other officers to pick me up from a surgery that I was not legally allowed to drive myself home from. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Vivian explained that the Wounded Warrior program is a tangible benefit of the military-family concept, in that it is designed to assist service-members with personal matters such as getting to and from the doctor's office. Service-members need approval to join this program and her request was denied by a Colonel, a high-ranking officer, who told Vivian that the program "wasn't for me it was for people with like battlefield injuries or cancer" despite the fact that she met the qualifications set by the hospital running the program. Vivian's commander used his discretion and drew his own formula for eligibility based partially on warrior masculinity. She did not inquire further, perhaps due to the strict hierarchy and expectation to follow orders, yet she felt ostracized by being excluded from the program and felt like there were no colleagues she

could rely on to pick her up. Vivian's experience demonstrates how service-women can be denied both the relational benefits of the military family as well as tangible benefits based on this concept. The need for inclusion in the military family and support from both relational and tangible benefits is particularly important as service-members are isolated from other support networks. In Vivian's case, she was stationed in Hawaii, thousands of miles from civilian family and friends, and felt further isolated at not being able to access support from within the military. Similarly, Cristina, who emphasized the camaraderie she experienced in the Army, points to how the military family can be exclusive:

What was interesting was that throughout basic training, you're always taught you know pick up... pick up a soldier and we never leave anyone behind and look out for your brothers and sisters. But as soon as someone deviates from the conventional, you know, you have to have this type of personality or you have to act this type of way, as soon as you deviate from that, you're kind of seen as an outsider. (Army, Enlisted, Latina)

Cristina explained that while all service-members are taught the military as family narrative in training, that it is through interaction that access to the family is actually gained. In such a male dominated space where men are gatekeepers to inclusion, many women are viewed as deviating from the conventional and are then treated as outsiders. Similarly, Maria, a woman in her thirties who was enlisted in the Army, emphasized her role as a caretaker for other service-members, including service-women, describing herself as a "mother" figure. She provided other service-members with support in training, including navigating relationship issues. However, when describing her own experiences, she explains an instance when she was denied care-giving when she went up for the Army promotion boards:

You didn't get supported. When you go to the board, they didn't support you with information or with guidance. With nothing. Nada. I asked my sergeant four times if...if he could help me with my uniform...with my Class A uniform to set up. You know so I have the patches all in the right place and stuff, you know? And nobody ever called me back. And then my...so I tried my best on my own. You know? I looked in the guidance book and studied on my own. And nobody guided me through the movements of what I

have to know for the...for the boards. Nothing. Nobody. And when I arrived in the morning for the boards, my uniform was messed up. It was not right. And they blamed it on me. And I'm like hey, where's my...I had no sponsor. I had no instruction. Nobody from the NPOs gave a crap. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Maria's account emphasized her exclusion from receiving supportive caregiving from others, even those officially tasked with watching out for her. Through these interactions, she learned that while she provided a deep-level of care for other service-members, she was still denied caregiving. These examples show how service-women's experiences with the family do not align with the institutional promises of family nor with how they see family caregiving in action in the lives of service-men. While women experience and appreciate the camaraderie of the military, this is not the same as the deeper level of care that service-women report seeing men receive, nor the same as the level of care some service-women report providing. Thus, military family caregiving, as opposed to mere camaraderie, is absent from the experiences of service-women, except as providers of care. These interactions lead to a deeper understanding of the limits of the military family, and a realization that women are excluded.

Sexual Assault Victims and the Family Narrative

Notably, sexual assault victims in my sample (n = 9) do not invoke the family narrative in the same way that other service-women do. In the majority of accounts of service-women who have experienced sexual violence (n=7), there is either an absence of the family narrative discourse or they emphasize a rejection of the military as family concept. Importantly, the ways that sexual assault victims speak about service-men is notably different from women who have solely experienced harassment and not sexual assault. One way to explain this difference is to consider sexual violence as the ultimate rejection of the "military as family" concept. Sexual assault and the institutional response to sexual assault distances women from the idea the military is a family and decrease the salience (Stryker and Burke 2000; Stryker 1980; Stets 2005)

of a military identity for these women. Service-women who experience sexual violence do not feel connected to people they were told to think of as “brothers” but who assault them. Thus, both interactionally and structurally, service-women who are victims of sexual violence see themselves as excluded from the military family and do not prop up the family narrative in their talk about the institution.

I argue that service-women who were sexually assaulted attempt to cope with the trauma by creating distance between themselves and the military, including service-men. They do this by: 1) describing attempts to separate themselves from markers of military insiderness, such as their uniform; 2) invoking the family narrative or markers of the family narrative in negative terms; or 3) using neutralizing words like “co-worker” and “boss” to describe other service-members rather than familial terms. Some of these strategies, such as separating themselves from markers of military insiderness and using words like “co-worker” demonstrate an absence of the family narrative, while others such as describing aspects of the military family in a negative way demonstrate a rejection of the family narrative. Service-women who have been sexually assaulted often use a combination of these strategies to create distance between themselves, service-men, and the institution.

The service-women in my sample who have been sexually assaulted do not accept the institutional premise of family. This is especially true when the institution fails to respond to sexual assault in a satisfactory way. For example, an enlisted soldier was sexually assaulted by a man in her unit and reported the incident. The Army investigated her case:

They told me that I was going to be able to go to the duty-station of my picking. And I was in a relationship at the time, so I chose to go to [Southeastern State]. And then when my orders came down; I had orders to [Northwestern State], so they couldn't have really moved me farther away from where I was trying to go. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Abigail felt betrayed by those working on her case. She had agreed to a transfer after being told she would be able to pick her next duty station, only to be transferred thousands of miles away from that location. She stated: “my life is flipped upside down by the incident and then I had to move 3,000 miles away at the same time so it’s kind of a lot to deal with, all in like a month.” Not only did she experience sexual violence, but she is disappointed that the military failed to address and respond to her assault in a satisfactory way. She requested a duty station near her support networks and was isolated when she had to move thousands of miles away. She stated that she did not want to travel across the country for trial proceedings when:

All they’re trying to do is slander and try and make you out to be the bad person... So, we sent a letter over to the Legal Counsel over at [Military Base] saying that I was not willing to participate in that, and requesting on Judicial Punishment for him and I’m pretty sure that he ended up getting a letter of reprimand for providing alcohol to a minor and that was it... I like slept in late for work one day, and had to do 14 days of extra duty and he got less than that. Yeah I slept through my alarm, and I had more of a punishment than he did. It’s definitely an interesting system I guess.

The sexual assault coupled with the way the Army handled Abigail’s case made her lose trust in the military as an institution. She stated: “Because since the assault, I am not the soldier that I used to be. I was super gung-ho about the Army; super motivated, and I loved it and then this happened and I kind of lost all respect for the organization and my leaders.” Not only did the sexual assault and her command’s response change Abigail’s outlook on the military, but it also changed her sense of self, she no longer felt like “the soldier that I used to be.” She did not view herself as a part of the institution and she rejected the idea that the military was an inclusive organization. She continued:

So, I have a hard time respecting, and being motivated to be a part of an organization that I feel in a way let me down... I don’t even like putting on the uniform any more. I had this big idea that the Army was going to be this awesome thing and experience for me, and that’s not what it turned out to be. So, it’s unfortunate that I had this experience right off the bat, but at the same time I kind of got to see the Army for the worst that it can be. The way the whole process ended up working and how I got moved 3,000 miles away,

it's just -- I don't think that I'll ever be able to get over the fact that that happened, and I just don't want anything to do with the Army anymore because of it." (Army, Enlisted, White)

Here, Abigail distances herself from the Army in general, as well as specific indicators that she is associated with the Army, such as her uniform. Abigail's frustration with the military justice system combined with the assault shows how she feels exploited at multiple levels. Rather than propping up the institutional narrative of the military as family, she explains how her disappointment with the military's response to her sexual assault is directly linked to her desire to detach herself from the Army. She also avoids any use of familial terms. Similarly, an enlisted woman in the Navy experienced an attempted rape during her service. After the assault, she was sent to a mental institution because, during this traumatic period, she stated she wanted to hurt herself. Ultimately, the military used Monique's experience at the mental institution against her by arguing that she could not be considered a credible witness, and they dropped her case. They also used her hospitalization to claim she had a personality disorder. Assigning her a personality disorder code removed her eligibility for post-service medical benefits, a consequence that she believes was a direct punishment for reporting the assault. She went on to express other issues with how the military handled her case:

They don't protect you. Like that's something I will say about the military that has to change. If you accuse someone of sexual assault or any type of assault or anything, they don't protect you. They just make you continuously see this person. You know what that does to somebody? (Navy, Enlisted, Black)

Monique explicitly rejects the notion that service-members protect one another. After the attempted rape and the military's negative response to her experience, report, and symptoms, Monique decided to leave the Navy. After she left she stated "I burned my uniform, like when I got my separation papers I burned my uniform. And I was like...I like did not look back." The military's negative response to Monique's sexual assault case revealed to her that the military is

more invested in protecting men and upholding the brotherhood than addressing sexual violence. These factors led her to reject the military as an institution. This is distinctly different from service-women who are denied access to the family by not receiving caregiving and who nonetheless, prop up the family narrative that has been emphasized by the military. Monique's sexual assault and the military's response work together to show her that the military is a brotherhood structurally and interactionally, despite what the institution claims about family. Thus, Monique does not prop up the military as a family but instead demonstrates a desire to disassociate from the military altogether.

Both Monique and Abigail express a desire to distance themselves from their uniforms: the visible marker of military insiderness and inclusivity. Citing regulations relating to hair, dress, body weight, and physical fitness, prior research has explored how service-members' bodies are not their own, but rather tools of the military (MacLeish 2013). Service-members are tasked with maintaining their bodies as instruments of the institution (MacLaeish 2013) and are officially sanctioned if they are 'overweight' or cannot perform physically. I argue that service-women who have been physically assaulted and violated can no longer accept that their bodies are tools to be used by the military. In this case, they re-claim their bodies by denigrating and destroying one of the physical markers of military ownership, the uniform. Additionally, when the institution cannot protect, and even does further damage to service-women who have experienced sexual assault, they can no longer uphold the idea that the military is a family, nor can they attempt to claim that they belong in such a space. For example, Cecelia is an enlisted Marine who was raped by her base sponsor who continually showed up to her room with alcohol and insisted on coming into her room to "check on me." She expressed her disillusionment with

the military as family in her victim impact statement during the court-marital that was hearing her case. She stated:

I came to the Marine corps to be empowered, learn how to be strong, and how to lead. To find myself, to find a family who was close to me. But once again I was wronged by someone who was close to me. Someone who was supposed to protect me.” (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Latina)

Cecelia stresses that the idea that the military as a family was a powerful motivator for why she joined the Marine Corps. Experiencing sexual assault from a service-man she trusted made her lose trust not just in him, but in the military as an institution and the potential family that it could provide. She also emphasizes that this person was supposed to protect her, highlighting the institutional expectations of commanders as well as informal expectations on how the military family is enacted. Thus, the betrayal is felt at the interpersonal and institutional level. When the experience of the assault is combined with vulnerability created by the institution (in this case, the Marine Corps gave him continued access to her room), service-women’s lack of inclusion is cemented as their perpetrators are protected. The violation of family-like elements such as the exploitation of trust or caregiving also makes service-women reject the idea that the military is family—as evidenced by Cecelia’s use of the family narrative in negative terms. This can occur even when a service-woman is assaulted by a non-service-member, but still receives a negative response from her command. For example, Melanie was raped by an Iraqi policeman while on deployment and reported it to her command. She stated:

They basically told me nothing was going to get done because even if they went to his command they would just high five him and that was what my command told me. So, I ended up just hating that command team because I felt so let down by people who are supposed to be fighting with me... We all sat around the table and they pretty much told me they’re like ‘well we don’t recommend this goes anywhere because even if you do say anything nothing will happen because he’s Iraqi they won’t care.’ They were like ‘you can go to the Chaplain if you want but he probably can’t do anything either because he travels and he’s not here right now.’ So, they pretty much kind of just dismissed me. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Even though Melanie was not raped by a U.S. service-man, she expresses her disappointment with how her command handled her report. The fact that this occurred on deployment, a time when team and family-like bonding is essential to individual and organizational success, heightened Melanie's outsider status. She stated:

Well I didn't really have any... it's like so nobody really cared that I was hurting or what happened, and it seemed like the very people I was trying to protect kind of turned on me and they wouldn't take me seriously. It's like for our final photo it was like a group shot before we re-deployed we went back to the same place to take that photo and I had to stand next to the damn same guard who attacked me. And I was just like -- I couldn't grasp what the hell made them think that was okay. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Rather than stressing the family-like bonds she had with other service-members, Melanie emphasized her colleagues *lack* of care for her. Similarly, she invokes the idea of protection, a family-like expectation she had of service-men she deployed with, in negative terms. She was in therapy after her first deployment and her unit was getting ready to deploy again, she stated:

Yes... she [her therapist] recommended that I don't get deployed especially since I was deploying with a bunch of guys. There aren't any girls on my team. So, and I don't trust them, honestly I don't trust the guys I work with... Honestly, my boss is incompetent in his job and in everyday tasks. So, I could not see him realistically... if we were to get hit on a convoy firing his weapon to make sure I'm not getting taken or anything. And I don't trust his instinct. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Melanie's experience with sexual violence, the actual rape as well as the command's response, shaped the way she viewed the military. Here, Melanie uses a neutralization technique calling her commander her "boss" and service-men in her unit "guys I work with" rather than referencing them in familial, or even military, terms (i.e. brothers, commander, soldiers, etc.). The interactional and institutional proof that she was an outsider lead her to reject the idea that the military was a family. Rather, she viewed the military as an institution comprised of people she could not trust, which lead her to leave. In explaining this decision, she stated:

I feel like the camaraderie and the teamwork and people watching out for each other just isn't there. And that the military is headed towards just a really bad direction with their leadership and the way they want to do things now. (Army, Enlisted, White)

When the military fails to keep the promise that family-like bonds and protection is a special benefit of membership, service-women reject the institution as a whole. Melanie's rape and her unit's response served as evidence that there was no support for her, leading her to reject the idea that the military even provides camaraderie, the most basic form of bonding that many service-women in my sample stressed in their talk about family. Further, Melanie rejects the idea that the intense military training bonded her to other service-members:

You always see in movies how everybody is like a team and they're working together, and they build friendships. I never found that and as much as I tried when I went through basic training to make friends I was always the odd girl out... I absolutely hated it because to me it was three months of getting picked on by drill sergeants and by girls. It was like high school all over again and I just absolutely hated it. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Melanie's example shows how she, like other service-women, had expectations that the military would feel like a family where she could trust, rely on, and be supported by other service-members. She explained that this idea was reinforced by media portrayals of military training. However, her lived experience of the military was different from this depiction. Sexual violence severs the idea that women belong in the military family, especially when the command's response reinforces outsider status. This realization decreases the saliency of a military identity for these service-women, who no longer feel connected to the institution or those within it. Therefore, many women who experience sexual assault do not prop up the institutional narrative of the military family in their talk about the institution. Rather they reject it completely by speaking of the military as family in negative terms or by not using this language at all.

Even though only 10% of child sexual assault victims (Finkelhor & Ormrod 2001; Richards 2011) and 8-10% of adult victims of sexual assault (Belknap 2010; Macy et al. 2010)

do not know their offender the myth persists that stranger rape is common (Chasteen 2001; Lonsway & Fitzgerald 1994). These myths shape perceptions, fears, and responses to sexual assault. For example, Chasteen (2001) found that women often overestimate the rates of stranger rapes in the United States. Thus, individuals still anticipate that the majority of sexual assaults will be perpetrated by strangers. Even though violence often occurs within families, with many instances of child sexual abuse being perpetrated by an adult family member (Russell 1984; Sedlak et al. 2010), it can also be difficult for individuals to admit this because it runs contrary to dominant constructions of family as safe, nurturing, places (Mitra 2013). Similarly, service-women who have heard the family narrative repeated throughout their service and who have been trained to think of violence as enacted by military insiders on those defined by the institution as enemies, might not anticipate violence *within* the institution. However, when sexual violence occurs it can sever the notion of the military family as a safe, nurturing space for service-women who believed as such. Additionally, service-women may feel an additional layer of harm since the institutional promise of family did not live up to their expectations nor the military's portrayal of this narrative.

Combat Experience and Inclusion

Whereas most of the service-women I spoke with did not experience the “military as family” concept in their experience with the armed services, a small group of women did report a sense of familial inclusion. Notably, these participants were mostly women who had experienced combat while deployed (n=11, including 8 out of 9 women who had experienced combat; see table 3.1 in Appendix C). In this section, I argue that women who have experienced combat are able to gain inclusion in the military family because they can access patriarchal dividends (Connell 2005) due to their combat experience.

Traditionally, combat roles have been reserved for men. Women were officially excluded from combat until 2013, when the ban on women in combat was repealed, and many units are still in the process of integrating women. The exclusion of women from combat roles demonstrates one of the ways in which the military constructs and valorizes a masculine form of family. Within the military, warrior masculinity has been understood as a representation of “hegemonic masculinity” where service-members are given the right to use lethal force to maintain domination over others (Barrett 1996; Hale 2012; Hinojosa 2010). Traditional displays of hegemonic masculinity include aggression, violence, control over emotions, risk-taking, and heterosexuality (Connell 1995; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Kaufman 2001; Schrock and Schwalbe 2009), and these characteristics are highly valued in the military (Hinojosa 2010; Hutchings 2008). Thus, individuals who are able to display the appropriate emotions and characteristics will be given the most societal and institutional benefits, or patriarchal dividends, in the form of power, prestige, and the ability to have one’s masculine identity confirmed by others (Connell 2005). Since warrior masculinity is linked with combat experience, risky deployments, and the legal use of lethal force (Barrett 1996; Connell 1995; Dunivin 1994; Hale 2008; 2012) within the military’s masculinity hierarchy, service-members experiencing combat and demonstrating bravery and heroism in combat situations have the greatest status. By excluding women from combat roles, the military constructed the idea that women were not full members of the institution (Hale 2012). Similarly, the image of a service-member risking their life in combat to aid other service-members or support the mission is an ideal representation of sacrifice for the military family. However, until recently, women were excluded from this image due to the ban on women in combat positions. Therefore, while the military uses the terms family and brotherhood interchangeably, by excluding women from opportunities to give the ultimate

sacrifice, the military privileged its male members and excludes women. Even though the combat ban has been lifted, the military has been slow to integrate military occupational specialties previously reserved only for men. Additionally, the current Secretary of Defense, Jim Mattis, when addressing the Corps of Cadets in September 2018 regarding integration stated:

How did the infantry get its name? Infant soldier. Young soldier. Very young soldier. They're cocky, they're rambunctious. They're necessarily macho. And it's the most primitive, I would say even evil, environment — you can't even explain it. (Copp 2018)

The defense secretary drew on masculine imagery to suggest that integrating women into the infantry is problematic. Similarly, the military uses masculine images to depict and define the combat service-member, maintaining the perception that combat sacrifices are only made by men (Sasson-Levy 2011b).

However, despite the official ban on women serving in combat, the military created several exceptions in order to enhance military effectiveness in combat areas. For example, Erin was an enlisted Marine who was selected to participate in the Lioness Program. This program was designed to circumvent the combat exclusion policy that was in place until integration implementation began in December 2015. The military deployed women under non-combat military occupational specialties, and then selected them while deployed to spend 30 days in combat zones (the maximum number of days they could spend without being considered deployed into combat). The lioness program was the precursor to the Female Engagement Teams (FET). The FET teams trained together in the United States before deploying as a unit specifically designed to attach to infantry units. The FETs circumvented the 30-day rule by spending 30 days with an infantry unit in a combat zone, followed by a few days at the base, and then being attached to a different infantry unit for another 30 days. In effect, these programs put thousands of women into combat situations, despite the official ban on women in combat.

Reflecting on her experience in the Lioness program and the controversy over overturning the combat exclusion policy, Erin stated:

They try to play up the whole sexual side of it and that's bullshit because it's based on the type of relationships that you can form together. If I can get the guys that I work with on the front line to think of me as a brother, then I could do that in the infantry too. We're nothing but brothers. We're a brotherhood. Had they done the move sooner, I would've stayed in. I would've been a career marine with no family. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American)

Erin is speaking about the military opening combat and infantry occupational specialties to women. She portrays belonging to the military brotherhood and being a wife and mother as mutually exclusive. She identifies the military family as a brotherhood that is not compatible with other forms of family such as getting married and having children. If the military had allowed her to continue to pursue combat roles and to be an official a member of the brotherhood, she would have forgone the other form of family. Her example demonstrates that service-women who have experienced combat situations often feel like members of the military brotherhood and that membership to the military brotherhood is prioritized over other forms of family.

While other service-women invoked the military as family narrative, it was most often combat women who spoke about being recipients of military family caregiving. Erin stated:

Erin: They're the brothers I never wanted. I don't know. I had their back. They had my back.

Me: Do you have a specific example?

Erin: My buddy, Walker, he went through boot camp the same time I did. He was like my brother because we went through the whole process together [they went to several bases together at the same time]. I could call him up anytime day or night if I needed a ride and he would come pick me up. It didn't matter where I was. If I was in [city near base] or stuck in [city an hour or so from base] or whatever, it was just like, "Hey Walker, can you please come pick me up? I'm stuck." He's like, "Okay." It happened a few times. He wouldn't complain or anything. He would just come pick me up. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American)

Erin continues to share an experience where she acted as a fictive caregiver, cooking an entire thanksgiving meal for five service-men because “we didn’t have a place to go so we decided, let's get together.” Erin is one of the few service-women to provide examples of how she received caregiving as well as provided caregiving. She also described an experience where several service-men stood up for her when she was blocked from getting on a plane during her deployment:

We were all in line, getting on the plane and out of nowhere, this crew chief just stops me and pushes me to the side. It was like, "What are you doing? I'm with them?" Then all the guys turned around and they're like, "She's with us. She's with us." They're trying to pull me on the plane and I was trying to get by this guy who wouldn't let me get by. The guys, they used to call me Erry. They're like, "Don't worry Erry. We'll figure this out." They got on the plane and they went to go get somebody higher up. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American)

Erin explained that the service-men that she described as “brothers I never wanted” successfully stalled the pilot from taking off until a higher-up could confirm that she should be on the flight. This example demonstrates how achieving acceptance among one group of service-men does not guarantee automatic inclusion in every military space. The male pilot assumed that she was not to deploy with an all-male unit. However, Erin’s experience shows that once a service-woman has achieved some level of inclusion, she can both use this status to claim further access or others might do so on her behalf. In this case, Erin spoke up for herself and the service-men backed up her claims. This demonstrates that she has a larger range of access to the military family than most of my other participants described.

Similarly, Heather who deployed with a female engagement team, shared experiences she had as a recipient of caregiving:

The first one was after I spent five years in the Marine Corps I had made a decision to get out. And I had a gunnery Sgt. who was in charge of me tell me that no... No, I don't want you to get out this is where you belong, you need to stay. And I had kind of already missed my chance of putting in a package to stay in the Marine Corps, and... We have

this program ... you couldn't have gotten in trouble you had to have a first-class on your physical fitness. And he was just like “Oh well does she qualify?” So, then they kind of turned to me and said well where you want to go? And I was like I named off the top of my head I was like all go to Hawaii. And they gave it to me and I reenlisted the next day. And it was probably the best... The best decision that somebody else made for me ever (laughs). (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Heather gave this example when speaking about why she decided to be a career marine. In many ways, she and Erin are similar to the other service-women quoted earlier in this chapter: they completed military training, learned the family narrative, are subject to the military's expectations of caregiving and loyalty, and stationed in male-dominated workplaces away from family, friends, and other networks of support. However, the difference is that their combat experience allows them to construct themselves as “honorary males” and therefore to be included in the brotherhood (Kanter 1977: 966). Women have gained access to male-dominated organizations like corporations (Kanter 1977) or gangs (Miller and Brunson 2000) by constructing themselves and being received as “honorary males” by other group members. Erin portrays this when she stated:

The guys didn't see my gender they just saw me. Another marine. Branson? Yeah, he was like my brother. He saw me as like a brother, that's the type of relationship that I had with the guys in the shop. We had another girl in the shop around the same age. but the difference between me and her, she was a female Marine. Me, I was just a marine. There was no question about gender, no messing, we're there to just be a Marine. And the female Marines, they cry and whine and bitch about everything, they use their feminine parts to get what they want. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native-American)

Erin distinguishes between “female marines” and “marines,” constructing the two as opposites. In doing so, she claims that she is more like a man than a woman to explain her inclusion. She enacts and props up masculinity in a way that does not challenge the organization as male dominated and that allows it to exclude most women.

In an organization that valorizes combat at the top of the masculinity hierarchy, however most service-members, including men, will not achieve this level of recognition. Therefore, it is

difficult to exclude the women who have this experience and who have enacted brotherhood by risking their lives for others. Masculinity in the military infantry is context specific. It emerges and is enacted differently than in non-combat or hypothetical combat situations (Hockey 2003). Hockey (2003) argues that acts of heroism one might celebrate in a hypothetical combat situation might be considered risky or dangerous in actual combat. Similarly, in actual combat situations, warrior identities are not as tied to bodies and gender as in hypothetical combat situations where women are consistently constructed as outsiders. Women who have experienced combat can also “mobilize” combat masculinity (Martin 2001) in interaction with other service-members. Further, combat experience may be visible by markers on an individuals’ uniform, cementing these women’s masculinity achievements. If a service-woman is eligible for and receives a combat action ribbon for engaging the enemy or being under hostile fire, this will be displayed on her uniform. Similarly, if she receives an award such as a silver star, the navy cross, or the air force cross, she will wear this on her uniform and would display that she experienced combat and demonstrated valor against an enemy. The women in my sample who experienced combat recalled being shot at, shooting at others, and surviving and responding to attacks by improvised explosive devices. These experiences would make them eligible for such ribbons and awards. These markers of combat experience would then be visible while wearing a uniform.

Women’s inclusion in interactions and activities that cement brotherhood, such as sacrificing their lives for one another and the military in general, gains them status as “honorary males” (Kanter 1977; Martin 1982; Miller and Brunson 2000). Service-women who have not experienced combat or who are only hypothetically asked to sacrifice their lives for others, are excluded from positions that would allow such inclusion. Further, the masculine environment of the military, and the interactions within it, exclude women due to their associations with

femininity. By comparison, the many service-men who never experience combat or even deploy do not face these same challenges of inclusion because their gender gains them access through their association with masculinity. In the next chapter, I will explore how the male-dominated and masculine environment of the military serves to include men and exclude women while giving men the power to confirm or deny women's attempts at masculinity (Cast 2003).

CONCLUSIONS

The findings presented in this chapter demonstrate that the military encourages its service-members to think of one another like family. The "military as family" narrative is encouraged by invoking family discourse in recruitment materials and training exercises, and membership to the military family is often explained as a key benefit of military service. Further, since service-members are separated from their family and friends and isolated in military spaces, they may seek to form family-like bonds with others. The military's focus on caregiving encourages service-members to care for one another like family. The military encourages family-like caregiving and trust to serve its institutional goals, such as loyalty to the institution and mission effectiveness. While the military uses the words brotherhood and family interchangeably to explain this key benefit of membership, in interaction women realize that the military family is a brotherhood that excludes them and results in them not receiving caregiving in the same way men do. Additionally, the former ban on women in combat shows that the military as an institution does privilege masculinity and brotherhood even though it uses the more gender-inclusive term of family in recruitment and training.

I argue that women's limited access to the family in comparison to service-men's access to deep caregiving serves as a minor disruption to their military identities, that they can attempt to repair by invoking the family narrative to explain camaraderie. However, service-women are

repeatedly presented with this dilemma as service-men are gatekeepers to inclusion. Ultimately, service-women's use of the family narrative, and some service-women's roles as fictive caregivers, is not enough to gain insider status. This is problematic as service-women have completed the same stressful and mentally difficult military training, isolation from non-military support groups, and disconnect from civilians as service-men. It is through the process of interaction and denial of insider status that women learn that the military family is ultimately a brotherhood. Sexual assault victims experience a more active disruption to the idea that the military is a family, both through the assault itself as well as negative institutional and individual responses to the assault. These service-women do not prop up the institutional narrative around family, but rather reject it. In their talk about the military, service-women who were sexually assaulted emphasize their outsider status and their desire to separate from markers of a military identity. Therefore, individual experiences can change the meaning of the institutional narrative around family in ways that mark women as outsiders, or in the case of women in combat, as insiders.

The military as family narrative is reinforced in multiple spaces and at different points in service-members' careers, and women learn to tell the family narrative and adapt the meaning to their own experiences. Many service-women invoke the family narrative in general to explain family membership as a key benefit of military service. Further, service-women often use the word family to explain camaraderie that they experience. While some women, officers or NCOs in their thirties, were able to give specific examples of how they acted as fictive caregivers to other service-members, most service-women only spoke about the family in general terms or gave examples of how the family operated in the lives of service-men. The ease with which men have access to the military family makes women's limited or lack of access all the more salient

to them. In some ways, access to the military family denotes full transition to a military identity and serves as a symbolic boundary of military insiderness. Since service-members are promised that if they transform themselves they will become members of this military family, individuals in the military see the enactment of the military family as a sign that they have transformed and changed in the way that they were expected. In other words, gaining access to the military family is the reward for changing physically, mentally, and emotionally into a Marine, Soldier, Sailor, or Airperson—something service-members are promised during recruitment, in training, and during their service. When women attempt to “do family” in the military, they realize that they are not able to access some of the social benefits of membership that the military promised (Holstein and Gubrium 1995a; 1999). When women see their male counterparts gaining access to the military family in a variety of ways (and in ways that they do not), they begin to re-evaluate how access to this family is gained. It is not simply making the physical, psychological and value changes that will grant them access, but rather inclusion is linked to a gendered self—a masculine self—who makes these changes. This is further cemented by the women who are able to gain access, as service-women who have experienced combat describe being recipients of caregiving. This is why, as I argue in the next chapter, service-women attempt to gain inclusion through various masculinity displays. The next chapter explores how service-women invoke masculinity and manage femininity to claim insider status in the “brotherhood” of the military.

CHAPTER 4

STIGMATIZED IDENTITIES AND MASCULINE IDENTITY WORK

In this chapter, I explore how service-women “do masculinity” in the military context in attempt to gain insider status in this masculine institution. Service-women perform identity work in a hyper-masculine context that often devalues women. Although women serve in the military, this does not automatically grant them an association with masculinity—rather their inclusion is constantly called into question and they are cast as inappropriate service-members. This chapter examines how women navigate being cast into stigmatized feminine identities while trying to demonstrate their masculinity. Because the military is a near-total institution, they must navigate this tension in a variety of contexts such as in the workplace, in social settings, and in their places of residence (for those who live on base). I also show how women adopt stereotypes cast upon them by service-men and self-stigmatize as well as use these same stereotypes to stigmatize other women.

GENDER IDENTITY

Identity is a system of meanings that are communicated through interactions (Schrock and Schwlabe 2009; West and Zimmerman 1987). Gender is embedded in social practices, processes, and interactions, as well as within organizational structures (Acker 1992; Lorber 1998). West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that individuals “do gender” by learning and conveying practices, talk, and actions that indicate in interaction that they are men or women. While individuals are socialized on how to “do gender” appropriately from a variety of socialization agents, such as in the home (Kane 2006), in school (Martin 1998), and through peers (Pascoe 2005), the military is also actively involved in shaping meanings and expectations around gender (Hale 2012; Hinojosa 2010). Significantly, research shows that: (1) gender

differences are not natural occurrences based on sex; rather, they are socially constructed; and (2) although gender socialization occurs at an early age, the interactional approach to gender suggests that these identities are not fixed. This demonstrates the fluidity and adaptability of gender and gender identity. The ways in which individuals “do gender” is based on context, situations, and interactions within a given space.

Military Masculinity

As explained in the introduction, the military has been categorized as a gendered institution (Acker 1992), where gender is embedded in the organization’s practices, processes, policies, and power systems. Individuals do not simply bring their pre-existing forms of masculinity and femininity into the workplace; rather, gender is taught and practiced through interacting with others within specific contexts (Acker 1990, 1992, Williams 1995).

Additionally, identities are constrained by the structures and institutions in which they operate, and individuals look to the meanings established by institutions to invoke certain identities. In this way the context of the military shapes the ways in which a military identity is invoked.

Sasson-Levy (2011b:405) conceptualizes the military as an “extremely gendered organization” where “the level of gendering” is high and requires great effort to change.

As an institution, the military is actively involved with constructing and shaping masculinity within the military and the civilian world (Hale 2012; Sasson-Levy 2006). The concept of military warrior masculinity has been understood as a representation of “hegemonic masculinity” where service-members are given the right to use lethal force to maintain domination over others (Barrett 1996; Connell 1995; Hale 2012; Hinojosa 2010). Where service-members are constructed as self-sacrificing heroes who risk their lives for the lives of others, those who display warrior masculinity receive top patriarchal dividends. Much like the police

force (Prokos and Padavic 2002), the military has often used masculine imagery and symbols to show and define what it means to be a service-member, warrior, and war hero. Therefore, service-members can claim masculinity through their role in maintaining domination through the use of force.

Masculinity displays are also raced and classed (Barrett 1996; Pyke 1996). Pyke (1996) argues that one way upper-class men display masculine privilege is by not having to be overly aggressive and violent. Similarly, Barrett (1996) discusses the different constructions of masculinity among men in the U.S. Navy based on military occupational specialty. He suggests that understandings of masculinity shift with differential associations. For example, among naval aviators, masculinity was constructed as taking risks when faced with danger, while among supply officers, who do not have access to these masculinity experiences, masculinity was invoked through emphasizing technical rationality (Barrett 1996). In the Israeli military, Sasson-Levy (2003b) finds that blue-collar soldiers emphasize masculinity through their role in their home-life as providers, while white-collar soldiers claim masculinity through both approximating and distancing themselves from the military warrior masculinity. She argues that this dual-identity process allows for white-collar soldiers to stress that they are traditionally masculine, but that they also have relevant skills, education, and attitudes associated with professional workers. While upper-class service-men might desire to distance themselves from more violent forms of masculinity to claim an upper-class and professional identity, they do so while simultaneously participating in an organization that gives them access to the legal use of force over others (Hinojosa 2010). Therefore, while service-men construct masculinity in a variety of ways based on race, class, and military occupational specialty, they do so with an affiliation to an organization that allows them hyper-masculinity status, given the military's

association with aggression, physical strength, violence, and dominance. This chapter examines how service-women navigate a context where warrior masculinity is valorized yet difficult for them to obtain because they are often constructed as military outsiders. I argue that women's masculinity displays are more constrained than men's because they are cast as outsiders in the military context.

Service-women's Outsider Status

In traditionally masculine settings, men might derive some of their identity through the notion that the work they do is masculine and therefore different from, and better than, women's work (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Martin and Jurik 2007; Schrock and Schwalbe 2009; Woodward and Winter 2004). Some have hypothesized that because of this, when women enter into these traditionally masculine spaces, some men compensate by increasing their displays of masculinity (Prokos and Padavic 2002). In these cases, men might compare themselves directly to women, point out flaws in women in the workplace, show disdain for women and femininity, and make claims that women do not belong in order to accentuate the differences between men and women and to reiterate their own masculine identity (Ainsworth et al. 2014, Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Belknap 2015; Zimmer 1986). These strategies have been noted in masculine spaces like building trades (Denissen and Saguy 2014), corrections (Belknap 2015; Burdett et al. 2018; Zimmer 1986; 1987), firefighting (Ainsworth et al. 2014), policing (Belknap 2015; Martin and Jurik 2007; Moore 1999; Prokos and Padavic 2002), and the military (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Hale 2012; Hinojosa 2010; Kimmel 1999; Silva 2008).

Women's integration into the military has historically been met with resistance, both within and outside the military (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Winslow and Dunn 2002; Yoder 1991). Men have resisted the inclusion of women by stating that women will weaken the military

and showing their disdain for women and traditionally feminine traits. One participant who attended the Air Force Academy stated that the Class of 1979 (the last all-male class at the Air Force Academy) calls themselves the “LCWB” or the “Last Class with Balls.” The LCWB moniker demonstrates pride in an all-male class seen as more masculine (with balls), and therefore better, than the mixed sex classes that would follow. Women’s presence in the military and now in combat occupational specialties challenges the idea of the male warrior traditionally associated with these roles (Hale 2012) and threatens masculine identity derived from doing “men’s work” (Martin and Jurik 2007; Woodward and Winter 2004).

In Chapter Three, I demonstrated how military training cultivates a family narrative and emphasizes caregiving. In this chapter I discuss how service-members in charge of overseeing military training, education, and worksites might embed masculinity in these daily interactions. Men vastly out-number women in the U.S. military. At the same time, many service-men attempt to prove their masculinity (Hale 2012; Hinojosa 2010) by promoting and espousing an aggressive warrior masculinity. Others might resist women’s presence in the military to try and maintain the space as masculine. In doing so, they denigrate femininity and associate femininity with weakness (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Koeszegi et al. 2014; Rosen et al. 2004).

One way that men in the military assert their masculinity is to define themselves in opposition to femininity and to women (Hennen 2001), a strategy found in other male dominated occupations (Belknap 2015; Martin and Jurik 2007). Many women interviewed for this study reported that drill instructors, peers, or supervisors degrade men in the military by calling them “girls,” “women,” or “pussies.” One woman in the Navy articulated how stereotypes about women can be used against men: “The idea of a woman is that we are weaker, and it’s a way to put down men.” Similarly, Harrison (2003) found that in the Canadian military the word “man”

is withheld until a service-man in training earns this “title” through performing well physically. Therefore, a dichotomy is set up between men and women in the military, where men become synonymous with strength, success, and military identity, and women are constructed as weak military outsiders. These gendered processes existed in the military before the introduction of women; however, now there are women in the military who are now recipients of this treatment. Rather than the presence of women changing the hyper-masculine culture, these gendered insults persist and thrive with new targets (Rosen et al. 2004). The women in this study stated that the stereotype that women are physically weaker and more emotional than their male counterparts was used to justify keeping women out of certain Military Occupation Specialties (MOS, meaning a job field within the military), to claim in advance that women would fail in certain exercises, or to discuss the failures of women in the military in general. While stereotypes about women being physically weaker and more emotional are prevalent throughout society, Samantha stated:

People use the term pussy to refer to women as weak in the civilian world all the time. While it’s annoying, it doesn’t bother me as much. Because when done in a military setting, it’s much more relevant, because the people are saying that weak people can’t do the job and women are weak. (Marine Corps, Officer/Enlisted, White)

Even though stereotypes about women are also used in the civilian world, in the military they are used to imply that women cannot do their jobs and to suggest that women do not deserve to work for the military. One cannot be feminine and be a good service-member because in interaction, these two identities are constructed as incompatible (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Kimmel 2000) These stereotypes serve as ways for some men to resist and sanction women who enter the male-dominated space that is the military (Miller 1997). As a result, women must constantly navigate resistance to their presence in training, during their military occupational specialty schools, at their duty-stations, and while deployed.

Paradoxically, the emphasis on warrior masculinity occurs at the same time as the military stresses the family narrative and the importance of trust/loyalty/caregiving. The fact that both the family narrative and warrior masculinity are a part of military education, training, and interactions has serious implications for women. Women are socialized in the same ways as men during their initial military training. They are told that if they successfully transform physically and mentally and adopt military values, they will become members of the military family. Yet, women also learn that to be feminine is to be seen as a less than ideal service-member. Women expressing femininity may be portrayed as bad at their jobs, which provides evidence that women should not be in the military. Through this, women realize that access to the military family is based on performances of gender, as well as a successful transformation during initial training. They begin to more strongly invoke a militarized masculine identity and deemphasize their feminine and female identity markers. Ultimately, service-women cultivate and invoke a traditional hetero-normative masculine identity to demonstrate that they should be granted access to the military family and included as military insiders. Their efforts to establish that they “belong” in the military are hampered by their more limited access, relative to their male counterparts, to traditionally masculine displays. This chapter explores service-women’s masculinity narratives and the resistance women face. I also demonstrate that the ways in which service-women try to avoid stigmatized labels simultaneously reproduces them and perpetuates inequality in the military.

Brotherhood

While service-men must constantly work to prove their display of masculinity in the military workplace (Barrett 1996), service-women must work to *establish* their military identities, which can be called into question through any association with femininity. Hale

(2012) argues that a sense of belonging to the military community allows service-members to develop appropriate military masculinities. When these military masculinities are displayed and enacted, it reinforces an individual's sense of belonging in the institution. I argue that when women are denied full access to the military community or family, they try to gain access through the appropriate masculinity displays.

When Ayanna, a member of the Air Force, discussed why she joined she stated, "I think because I didn't join a sorority, or I didn't do those clubs in school, that was kinda like my...my...my brotherhood if...if you will." Similarly, when asked why she enlisted in the Marine Corps over another branch, Carol stated that "the camaraderie that we have, it's very much the brotherhood of the Marine Corps and from what I've seen it's even stronger in the Marine Corp than other branches of service." Not only does Carol invoke a family narrative when explaining why she joined the Marine Corps, but she also speaks about the Marine Corps family as a masculinized family. The women in my sample are not the only ones who use the term brotherhood to describe the military family. This image is reinforced by media portrayals of the military, demonstrated in military advertisements, and emphasized by male service-members. Archer (2012) argues that men view the enactment of brotherhood to be a significant part of being in the Marine Corps. For example, one Marine who discussed his military experience in an interview for a military news outlet stated, "Brotherhood means a lot to me, and that's what the Marine Corps is" (Crutcher 2014). Recognizing this, women try to display and exhibit masculinity in order to gain access to the military brotherhood.

Despite the fact that military education utilizes the concept of a military family as well as a brotherhood, the military emphasizes values that are based on traditional hegemonic masculinity. For example, Vicky, an Asian-American officer in the Army, stated "What the

Army values is somebody who's hyper-aggressive, who's very, very type A, who's very loud and outspoken when in charge." Service-men often invoke masculinity and denigrate femininity during various interactions with one another and with service-women. The effect of this is that the concept of the military as a brotherhood is adopted by service members as more appropriate and accurate than conceptualizing the military as a family. Against this, women try to behave in ways that they hope will gain them access to the brotherhood.

While men can use their participation in the military to construct their own masculinities (Hinojosa 2010), women have a harder time because they are cast as outsiders within the institution (Archer 2012). The military is numerically dominated by men. Many of the women in my study explicitly stated that the military is a masculine space. A Captain in the Marines stated "well, the Marine Corps is like 6% female, so it really doesn't matter where you go, you are predominantly surrounded by men." Another Marine, who works as a mechanic, spoke about how male Marines often made jokes about women, but then reasoned that "Obviously, me as the one female in my shop, I'm the minority. How fair is it of me to come in expecting all of them to change their work environment just because I'm there?" She described the space as a masculine one and stated that as a female in the Marine Corps, she does not expect to have the same rights to that space as male Marines. This implies that there is little to no room for women or femininity in the military workspace. June, an officer in the Air Force, stated that the military has "the culture of a guy's world and a guy's environment and as a female you're automatically the outsider." June speaks to the military not only being male dominated but having a masculine culture and environment that marks women as outsiders. Women's inclusion seemingly necessitates their conformity to military insiders—service-men. Unlike women in ROTC in Silva's (2008) study who did not emphasize masculinity and redefined femininity to justify their

participation in masculine military pursuits, service-women in my sample tried to emphasize masculinity and distance themselves from feminine identity markers. This is, perhaps, because the military is a near-total institution dominated by masculinity, whereas women in ROTC are also in college where they can express a range of identities. Therefore, one strategy that service-women in my sample use is the pursuit of the “right female” who can gain access by simultaneously achieving and performing masculinity, while managing femininity.

SERVICE-WOMEN’S MASCULINE IDENTITY WORK

A part of “doing masculinity” for men (and women) from a variety of social locations is “doing difference” and “doing dominance” (Barrett 1996; West and Fenstermaker 1995). Often, men do masculinity by devaluing “others” and re-affirming their dominance over these subordinated others. One way that men invoke a masculine identity and display masculinity is through the denigration and devaluing of women and femininity (Cahill 1989; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Hennen 2001; Schilt 2006). However, these strategies are not limited to men, as women in my sample invoked masculinity in similar ways. In what follows, I show how service-women invoke masculinity by claiming a pre-military masculine identity, invoking defensive posturing against other service-members, and through controlling emotional displays.

Pre-military Masculinity

Many of the service-women I spoke with emphasized that they had a masculine identity before the military and that they joined, in part, because they wanted to further cultivate that masculinity. For example, Vivian, a Marine Corps Captain, stated:

I was always a Tom Boy and I never fit in. Like, I was not a typical girl; girls never liked me, I never had girlfriends, and I was not into girly things. That’s why I joined. I thought I would really like the challenge, how tough it was... I never felt more like I could be myself then when I was in the Marine Corps. My personality was finally like... acceptable. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Vivian explained that the military attracted her precisely because she was “not a typical girl.” She attempts to justify her decision to join the service by emphasizing her distance from civilian women and her comfort with the masculine space of the Marine Corps. Similarly, Karen, a corporal in the Marine Corps stated that she does not get offended by dirty jokes or derogatory comments made by her male peers in the military because, “I expected it. I was in 8th grade woodshop and it was just me and the boys. My teacher loved me, and I was good at it. I am not a lesbian, but I have tendencies toward liking things for boys and being good at them.” Karen not only suggests that liking masculine hobbies and her experience with boys and men prepared her for the military, but she also distances herself from a stigmatized feminine identity in the process. She wants to stress that she is masculine enough, but not so much so that her sexuality would be called into question. By stressing that she likes “things for boys” she reinforces the military as a masculine space. Some participants, like Meredith, even claimed that their pre-military masculinity lead to their success in the organization. She stated:

So, this was after the first time we played war games. They didn't realize that I had grown up in the woods with brothers. And so, I was point, because I was in—if you're point, you're usually gonna die—and usually you're the lowest ranking person. I'm a little bit devious. So, they set me at point, and they're like you're gonna go point and then you're gonna sit and wait until they come up So, I laid down in the ditch, and I kind of perched myself up. And I laid there. And as they stepped over me, I killed them.
(Navy, Enlisted, White)

These examples demonstrate how service-women use their pre-military masculinity to claim membership and success in the masculine institution. Karen stated that her prior interest and experience in male-dominated activities prepared her for the masculine culture of the military. She also highlighted that she had the “right attitude” toward derogatory jokes and comments prior to joining the Marine Corps which allowed her to better fit in. Meredith emphasizes that her experiences with her brothers in traditionally masculine outdoor activities

prepared her well for war games and success in military training. These masculine identity claims allow service-women to carve out a sense of belonging in a space that is often not receptive to women. By claiming that they did not change to be masculine for the military, that they were always this way, they are attempting to demonstrate that they are a natural fit with the institution. This is an extension of the boundary making that service-members often do to distance themselves from civilians and from markers of femininity. The women who emphasize that they had masculine identities before they joined the military are using masculinity to further emphasize their distance from civilian women as well as other service-women to bolster the claim that they do, in fact, belong in the military family.

Defensive Othering

Devaluing femininity in military education not only shapes men's masculinity performances but it also influences how women perform their gender. Prior research has found that women in masculine spaces often identify with the dominant group in the space and engage in "defensive othering" that reinforces the dominant groups' values and status (Ezzell 2009; Sasson-Levy 2003). Women might denigrate other women to demonstrate that some women are incompatible with masculine occupations and spaces (Yoder 1991). Some of the service-women in my sample invoked their masculinity and downplayed their femininity by posturing themselves against "non-masculine" or "not-as-masculine" others (including other women, gay men, and straight service-men). For example, service women demonstrated their masculinity by marking themselves as "different from other women." Similar to the behavior of women in the Israeli military (Sasson-Levy 2003), the women in my study often discussed their own behavior, characteristics, and abilities in contrast to other service-women who they viewed, disdainfully, as feminine and inferior to both service-men and themselves. For example, Vivian stated:

I am not one of those girly women. I don't paint my nails or anything like that. I am not afraid to get dirty or carry my own things. Other women still play that role, you know, the helpless 'help me I'm a girl.' You can't do that in the military. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Vivian distances herself from other women by denigrating traditionally feminine behaviors like nail painting. She contrasts being "girly" with her own identity by emphasizing that she is tough and not concerned with appearances. These are both characteristics associated with masculinity. Finally, in using the word "girly" as an insult, she echoes sentiments that she may have heard in military training where service-men are called "girls" or "pussies" to punish them for not keeping up physically (Barrett 1996; Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Kimmel 2000). At the same time, she reifies the dominant view that femininity is problematic and undesirable. Similarly, Karen stated "Well you know there are women who when they get to their next duty station, they let the guys carry their stuff to their room. I would never do that. It gives off the wrong idea." Karen uses other women who exhibit what she identifies as problematic behavior to construct her identity in opposition to these women and characteristics. Vivian and Karen assert that they are different from other, more feminine, women in the military, therefore emphasizing that they are masculine. By defining themselves in opposition to these women, they distance themselves from femininity in order to prove their masculinity. Meredith draws this boundary more directly "But being a tomboy definitely helped, because some of the females that I worked with...some of them didn't do so well." Meredith distances herself from other service-women by drawing attention to her self-identification as a tomboy. Not only does she stress that she is different from other, more feminine women, but she also suggests that she is better because her masculinity makes her more successful in military situations and interactions. Service-women also combine posturing with downplaying their femininity. Meredith went on to explain how she fit in "You

know I never wore makeup when I was working. And I used to laugh and say my perfume was eau de' diesel." By emphasizing she is too masculine to wear make-up or perfume while working, Meredith suggests that women who display more femininity have trouble fitting into the masculine culture of the military. Margaret more directly stated that the best way to fit into the military is to downplay feminine identity markers:

You just do everything with them, and I think the way to get along the best and be the most respected is almost to lose a little of your femininity. And that's how I kind of felt coming out of the Marine Corps. I was like, 'Who knew? I can paint my nails. I can do my hair. I can do whatever I want.' (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Margaret explained that respect from service-men comes from downplaying femininity. This is a strategy that she actively engaged in to gain inclusion. Importantly, when drawing these boundaries between themselves and other women, service-women also reinforce the negative associations that their male counterparts have with femininity in the military space, justifying the exclusion of some women from the military (or brotherhood).

While service-women define themselves in opposition to more "feminine" women, they also define themselves in relation to, and better than, men who would typically be considered "masculine." Because masculinity is valued over femininity, women compare themselves to masculine men to demonstrate their own worth. For example, Emilia, an enlisted Marine stated:

I was doing my 20 pull-ups and there are a lot of guys that I knew that couldn't even do that... like this one guy who would just dead hang, but everyone thought he was such a tough guy. So, it was—I felt kind of empowered by that. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Latina)

Here, Emilia invokes her masculinity by demonstrating that she is physically stronger and more physically fit (traditional markers of masculinity) than a male Marine that others considered "tough." In this way, she attempts to prove that she is stronger than him which makes her feel empowered in the masculine space. Similarly, Carol, another enlisted Marine, stated: "A lot of times it's fine, but there's still a lot of males who get butt-hurt over it and it's like, I ran faster

than you, I did more pull-ups... get over it.” Here Carol emphasizes she is more physically fit than some men to prove her masculinity. Physical fitness is an important marker of military success and military masculinity (Hinojosa 2010). Service-members must meet minimum physical fitness standards to maintain their good standing in the military. Additionally, different physical fitness standards between men and women have historically been used as a reason to maintain excluding women from combat (Cohn 2000; Woodward and Winter 2004). To demonstrate that they belong women often try to meet or exceed men’s’ physical fitness standards (Silva 2008). Similarly, women use their physical ability to display masculinity and claim insider status by posturing against men who they outperform. If they are more physically fit than men who are insiders within organization, then this cannot be used to marginalize them.

Carol also stated that some men get “butt-hurt” over the fact that she physically outperforms them. To reinforce the idea that these men are weaker than her she portrays these men as gay men—the *other* military other. She not only postures herself against the men she outperforms, but against gay men as well. Prior research has found that men, including service-men, use homophobia to construct their own heterosexual masculinity (Hinojosa 2010; Keddie 2005; Kimmel 1994; 2011) as well as to enact sexism (Pharr 1997). Sometimes men accuse other men of being gay in order to belittle and ostracize them while simultaneously bolstering their own heterosexual masculinity (Keddie 2005; McGuffey and Rich 1999). Carol does not accuse others of being gay, but she uses a term that implies homosexuality to call attention to their comparative weakness and inferiority. By invoking a homosexual reference when contrasting her superior physical capabilities to that of weaker service-men, Carol uses her heterosexuality to further bolster her masculinity (Hennen 2001) in an attempt to demonstrate she fits the hegemonic ideal (Connell 1995).

Controlling Emotional Displays

Service-women also try to distance themselves from feminine identity markers through controlling physical and emotional displays. While emotional displays and physical failure are problematically linked to women, tolerating physical pain has been found to be a marker of strength and mental fortitude among service-men (Hockey 2003). Military masculinity can be cultivated by controlling emotional responses to physical pain and demonstrating one's ability to take on physical suffering (Hockey 2003; Sasson-Levy 2011b). Therefore, women try to distance themselves from femininity by controlling the ways in which they respond to physical and emotional pain. For example, Margaret stated:

I can't be very flirtatious. I can't be showing weakness. When I was on that AP Hill trip, I hurt my back really bad. We were on the back of -- it's like three guys and me. I was sitting on one of those big, brown jugs that they put water in. It's hard plastic. And I was sitting on that and I don't know what the guy did; but he must've drove off the road, because we were driving along and were going way too fast and all of a sudden, it was just Wham! Wham! Wham! These hard bumps. Like he hit so hard, that the back-gate popped open. Yeah, and I was in combat gear and sitting there, and plus I had my camera gear and all that too and it really hurt my back. It just crushed - compounded my spine, and I hurt so bad, but I couldn't let a single one of them know. I was like, "Nobody is going to know that I just hurt my back." and so I carried my gear. I carried everything around with me, and then when I got back home - I think I just laid down and cried. I was like, "I hurt so much!" But I'd rather do that, then letting them know, "Oh this little girl that went out with us, she couldn't handle it. Oh, gee it hurts." you know? "Oh, she's in the truck, and she got hurt." You can't do that. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

While Margaret stressed that she cannot be flirtatious, to avoid being labeled "slutty", she also stated that she cannot show weakness. For her, this means not showing that she is in physical pain by not complaining or crying. Importantly, she views any expression of physical pain as weakness, a perception that could have disastrous consequences in a combat situation and for her own health. She focuses on appearing strong to exert masculinity over these other concerns. Similarly, Meredith stated that she endured pain and did not cry so she would not appear weak in front of service-men:

Because being the female in the job that I held, I was always being watched. I was always being looked at. I remember this one time I got hit in the face with uh...I was running a fuel truck. And it had a fuel nozzle about this big...solid metal. And it was cold, cold, cold. It was um like January And I'm rolling the hose up and it came off the hook...the hammer came off the hook and it spun around and it hit me right in the jaw. It felt like somebody punched me. And it was cold. And I remember looking around first to see if anyone was around before I cried. Because crying... 'cause they pounded it into your head don't cry...never show your weakness. Don't...you know? So, you had to learn how to be stoic and not show emotions. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

Meredith demonstrates how emotional displays in the face of physical pain are seen as weakness.

In a moment of extreme pain, Meredith does not simply react. First, she checks to ensure that she is alone before she allows herself to address her pain. Enduring physical pain is a signal of strength (Barrett 1996; Sasson-Levy 2011b) and the need to demonstrate strength in front of service-men is more important to her than her pain. The notion of silent suffering also encourages women to endure emotional pain. For example, Anna was deployed in Afghanistan when her ex-husband tried to start a custody battle over their daughter.

Meanwhile the camp is being mortared there are people being killed because the people trying to help are going crazy and they're shooting at and people are blowing up convoys and I had to deal with the shit as well it was terrible. And I was advised to not say anything because they're going to use it against you... use this against me... How do you use this against me? But they meant it. It was a nightmare. (Army, Officer, Latina)

Anna was vulnerable both physically and mentally on deployment. She was not only isolated from her family, but her family formation was being threatened while she was deployed. In spite of the military's emphasis on care-giving, Anna was advised by her military peers not to tell her commanders or seek assistance about the custody issue. This advice was likely given so that Anna did not call attention to the fact that she was a mother experiencing emotional hardship, indicators of sexuality that serve as markers of femininity that are denigrated in military spaces. Thus, women are encouraged to endure emotional pain in silence.

Despite the fact that some service-women claim a pre-military masculinity in order to fit in to the military brotherhood or claim that they are more masculine than service-women and some service-men, this is not enough to fully overcome their outsider status. Even when service-women control their emotional displays, they still face resistance to their masculinity displays. In the next section, I show that when women perform masculinity they are cast into stigmatized feminine identities to maintain the hegemonic gender order that preserves male domination (Schipper 2007). Service-women must try to manage and decrease the saliency of these stigmatized identities.

STIGMATIZED FEMININE IDENTITIES

Women in General

Identity theorists argue that power in the social structure or power within a specific relationship often translates to power to control the interaction, and power to have one's own identity verified (Cast 2003; Stets and Burke 2005). This means that the social structure and the power structure often shape which individuals may better confirm their own identities, place others into identities to help confirm their own identities and resist the identities in which others try to place them (Cast 2003). Service-men have power over service-women in the military masculine environment and often resist or deny women's masculinity displays. One way that service-men deny women's masculine identity work is to cast them into an undesirable feminized identity. Stigma and the consequences of stigma are rooted in unequal power systems (Goffman 1963; Schwalbe et al. 2000). Women are often portrayed as deviant and outsiders in male dominated spaces because femininity and workplace competency are often constructed in opposition to one another (Denissen 2010; Denissen and Saguy 2014). Therefore, women who display masculinity violate norms of femininity, while those who display femininity are put in

the position of being seen as incompetent or poor workers, resulting in what Schur labels “deviant-either-way” (1984:73). Further, Schippers (2007:95) argues that when women attempt to enact hegemonic masculinity they are placed into “pariah femininities.” She argues that one of the key components of hegemonic masculinity is that it is constructed as complementary and superior to hegemonic femininity. Therefore, when women enact practices associated with hegemonic masculinity they disrupt the hierarchy of the gender order by taking away men’s exclusive ability to do masculinity. Stigmatizing women for enacting masculinity serves to return the hierarchy required to maintain the hegemonic gender order (Schippers 2007). In this way, when hegemonic masculinity is enacted by women it is re-classified as feminine and stigmatized. Therefore, women in the military must constantly participate in “gender maneuvering” (Schippers 2002), the act of manipulating everyday actions to call into question and reorganize gendered meanings in an attempt to avoid being placed into stigmatized feminine identities. Because the military is a near-total institution, service-women must do gender identity work in a variety of contexts, including social settings, recreational spaces, and even in their places of residence if they live on base.

Several of the women I interviewed, echoing other research findings, explained that there are only three kinds of military women, “easy, bitch, and dyke” (Archer 2012: 370). The labels “bitch, slut, dyke” reinforce the idea that women are not real members of the military family, and challenge women’s masculinity displays. These labels cast women into undesirable identities, or “pariah femininities” (Schippers 2007) where women are denigrated as women and seen as incompatible with a brotherhood. The “bitch” and the “dyke” labels are often used to call into question women’s masculinity displays while the “slut” label is used to cast women into an undesirable feminized and immoral identity. These labels are reinforced through jokes and songs

to denigrate women in general. This is demonstrated in a joke about women that Karen shared with me:

So, a joke that my recruiter told me was you know military people get rank and it's painted as stripes on their uniform? Well the joke...it goes what's the difference between a zebra and a WM [Woman Marine]? A zebra didn't have to lay on its back to get its stripes. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

This joke assumes that women can only rise in the ranks through sexual activity because they are not hard working, smart, or physically fit enough to be promoted any other way. Additionally, it should be noted that WM was an abbreviation for “women marine” that quickly became corrupted into “woman mattress” or “walking mattress.” Referring to women marines as mattresses is a way for men to assert male domination by suggesting that the only purpose for a woman in the Marine Corps is to sleep with male marines. This idea is reinforced in interaction with military peers, commanders, and those in charge of service-women’s careers. For example, Samantha was an enlisted marine who later commissioned as an officer. When inquiring about this process from the Marine Corps Commissioning Program (MCP) she was told:

I was verbatim told that “you are only here as a body warmer or a bed warmer.” He went into stories about how women went in as prostitutes for the military, like a long time ago or whatever. And then he said, “now you are just in the military.” Going to MCP to see that attitude, was very disheartening. (Marine Corps, Officer/Enlisted, White)

This office is in charge of assisting those who want to commission as officers in the Marine Corps. Rather than directly call Samantha a slut, the service-man in this office attempted to discourage Samantha from pursuing an officer track by reinforcing the slut label and sexually objectifying women in general. His power within that office gave him the ability to protect the space as masculine.

Similarly, women are sexually objectified and labelled sluts through military cadences. Although it is officially banned, one military cadence occasionally used while running

perpetuates the notion that men should be allowed to do as they please with the bodies of women of color: “I wish that all ladies were holes in the road, and I was a dump truck and I would fill them with my load. Hey mama-rita, I love my mamacita.” This particular cadence (shared with me by a former Air Force cadet who was forced to sing this particular song while at the Air Force Academy) portrays women as disposable sex objects and has racial overtones. The line “hey mama-rita” is a play on margarita, invoking the notion that women of color are objects that exist for male pleasure and consumption—like a margarita. The cadence goes on to condone violence against women: “I wish all the girls were statues of Venus and I was a sculptor I’d break them with my... [penis is implied here but not said aloud] hey mama-rita, I love my mamacita.” The racial element to the cadence points to the hyper-sexualization and devaluation of Latina women in particular, portraying them as objects to consume and then violently dispose of after they are used. Therefore, the slut label not only resists women’s presence in military spaces but portrays them as incompatible with military service outside of service-men’s ability to use their bodies. Furthermore, the slut label is more likely to be applied to women of color who are already portrayed as hyper-sexual (Bryant-Davis et al. 2009; Collins 2004; Tillman et al. 2010) and are more likely to be in enlisted ranks (Burton 2014) where their daily activities are more likely to be monitored and rumors are likely to be spread.

Individual Labelling

Additionally, stigmatizing labels are often applied to specific service-women to portray them as military outsiders. Many women spoke about these stereotypes in a way that suggests they had been typecast with one or more of these labels by service-men at some point during their career. For example, Vivian stated:

I know I was the bitch. People didn’t like that I didn’t smile. I was always told to smile, from my commanders and from my own marines. When I corrected my Marines about

saying that to me, I could tell they thought it was too aggressive, I was too mean. That's how you know you're the bitch. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

While Vivian stated that she portrayed masculine characteristics, such as aggression, it was not read positively by the service-men with whom she interacted and it did not facilitate her inclusion into the brotherhood. In this case, a service-woman's attempt at masculinity displays are used against her to portray a problematic feminized identity: the "bitch." Deborah, a lawyer in the Air Force, also explained how when she displays traits stereotypically associated with men that she is seen as "the bitch." She stated:

If I do my job and I have a really strong personality, I'm a bitch. If a guy does his job with my exact personality he's just assertive and there's that double standard. You know, and it's I don't know that that will ever, I don't know when that will change or how that will change but I think that's a constant and I dealt with it throughout the last four years of it's just I thought if there was a profession out there that would embrace strong assertive women it was going to be the military and that has been the one aspect where the military has mildly let me down. (Air Force, Officer, White)

This demonstrates how women's masculinity displays can be used against them and how the same behaviors by people in the same positions are received differently based on gender. If Deborah is assertive, she is labelled the "bitch," which is a way for service-men to resist her position of power as a lawyer, an officer, and a Marine. Since only men are rewarded for traits associated with hegemonic masculinity (such as strength and assertiveness), the military promotes a double standard that serves to maintain male power and domination in the space. This helps explain how service-women's inclusion is based on how service-men interpret service-woman's behaviors.

The above examples demonstrate how service-woman can be cast into one of these identities based on how her actions and demeanor are interpreted by service-men. In addition, service-women can also be labeled through how others interpret her past behaviors and actions, through physical markers, or based on how they respond to sexual comments or advances from

service-men. Lisa stated:

They knew I used to be a cheerleader and so a lot of them thought I was dumb and had gotten my job by sleeping around. They think ‘oh she’s pretty, she’s blonde, she can’t be smart she must be a slut.’ I’ve actually had people say to me in meetings when I did something right, ‘Oh I guess you’re not just a dumb cheerleader.’ (Air Force, Officer, White)

Lisa’s example shows how easy it is to be labelled. In Lisa’s case, her prior experience as a cheerleader is used to label her as unintelligent and slutty and thus call her military identity into question. Lisa demonstrates how the “slut” label also comes with other problematic associations. Service-women who are labelled the “slut” are thought of as not having earned their jobs, having slept their way to the top, and are therefore not qualified.

Further, indicators of women’s sexuality, such as marriage or pregnancy, are often used to stigmatize women and label them “sluts.” Mackinnon (1982) argues that sexuality is a power system where social norms of heterosexuality ensure women’s subordination. She also argues that sexuality defines gender and serves as “the linchpin of gender inequality” (1982:533). Because of the entanglement of gender and sexuality and the subordination of women within heterosexual norms (Mackinnon 1982), markers of women’s sexuality, such as a wedding ring or a pregnant body, serve as evidence of women’s femininity, making them incapable of achieving “honorary male” status. The “slut” label implies that women join the military to flirt, have sex with service-men, or to find a husband. Interestingly, even though “finding a husband” might seem the antithesis of slutty, women who marry service-men (especially women who marry service-men and then leave the military) are viewed as “sluts” because other service-members retroactively define their motives for joining the military as centered around men and marriage—the “wrong” reasons to join. Because the military family is a brotherhood, women who marry a service-man are not seen as enacting the “military as family” narrative but are further constructed

as military outsiders. For example, Margaret explained that:

It's hard to overcome that [stereotypes about women] until the guys realize that there are women out there who are not looking to have sex. Who are not looking to get married. Who are just there to do their job, and that's someone you can rely on and depend on. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Margaret's discussion of how to gain respect of service-men implies that service-women who get married or have sex are unreliable. In an organization where trust and loyalty are constantly portrayed as necessary for military functionality and effectiveness (Harrison 2003; Lindsay 2013; Verweij 2007), being labeled unreliable makes one incompatible with core military values.

Similarly, women who are pregnant are seen as adversative to the military mission because they cannot deploy. Deployment in the military is one of the ultimate displays of masculinity and an important marker of military insiderness. Margaret expresses this sentiment when she stated, "Being in the Marine Corps, and not deploying is like training for the Olympics, and never playing." Those who cannot deploy often fall into the following categories: physically unfit, mentally unfit, and pregnant, all of which are seen as problematic. For example, a Marine Corps Officer stated, "We're 6% women and if you become pregnant, there's a stigma to that which sucks but it's there." Similarly, a woman enlisted in the Marine Corps stated:

Because I had only been in Iraq for two months and it's not like they can date when you got pregnant and everything else, so they were like... Oh well.... They didn't ask me straight out if I... You know got pregnant in Iraq, but my command was just like.... No, no, no, no, she's married she has two kids she volunteered for this deployment she wasn't trying to get out of the deployment... This is a happy thing. So, don't treat her like this is a punishment this is a good thing. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Heather risked being ostracized by her military peers because she found out she was pregnant while deployed. Pregnancy is a marker of both femininity and femaleness. Because military policy excludes pregnant women from deploying there is a stereotype that women intentionally get pregnant to avoid deployment. Margaret explained "We would have a saying about how you

could tell there's a deployment schedule coming up, pending on the number of pregnancies of female marines." Service-women are portrayed as using their sexuality, femininity, and femaleness to escape institutional obligations in ways that men cannot—reinforcing their outsider status. Pregnancy is often used to label women as slutty because it is both a physical representation that a service-woman has had sex and it leads other service-members to question women's motives. Therefore, service-women who get pregnant are seen as disloyal, untrustworthy, and unable to support their peers – evidence that women do not belong. Thus, any association with sex and sexuality is used to cast service-women in the stigmatized identity of the "slut." This is especially true when sex and sexuality are associated with other service-members. In these cases, women are often portrayed as distracting service-men from their missions and are perceived as threats to the family. Service-men's relationships do not result in negative treatment for them in the way it does for women. Service-men's marriages serve as proof of their heterosexuality as well as often result in more independence (married enlisted service-members can live off base). While women's relationships with men also indicate heterosexuality, an important marker of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995), it also points to their femininity and spoils the idea that they could be an "honorary male." This reinforces the idea that the military family is a specific kind of family—a brotherhood. Anna demonstrates this when explaining her difficulties getting cleared for deployment:

Because I had HPV... not even fucking symptoms but I had an abnormal Pap smear and I was declared a defective soldier and I was like are you kidding me? And I'm sure my husband has and we give it back and forth to each other you know? Whatever. (Army, Officer, Latina)

Anna's deployment was held up for several months because she had HPV and she was labeled problematic for being unable to deploy. The label comes as a result of an STI, one that men

cannot be tested for, meaning that once again women are stigmatized and penalized for association with sexual activity in ways that men are not.

The labels “bitch,” “slut,” and “dyke,” can also be applied based on how a service-woman responds to sexual attention from men. Melanie, an enlisted woman in the Army, stated “Like if you don’t flirt with guys you’re either gay or you’re a bitch.” Similarly, June stated:

If you don’t go out with guys, then you’re a dyke, so if you hook up with guys... you’re a slut... You also have to figure out where you want to be on the spectrum, so you can be a big slut or a dyke; those are your options as a female marine. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Asian-American)

These examples show how a positive or negative response to a service-man’s sexual advance results in a problematic label for service-women. Kelly explained this when she stated: “They’re going to keep trying to pursue you until you either put out or flip out.” Women who “put out” will likely be labelled “the slut” while women who “flip out” will likely be labelled “the bitch” demonstrating how no matter how women respond, they risk a stigmatized identity. Similarly, Maura explained “you’d get pressured if you wouldn’t have sex with the guys they would say you...you’re gay. It’s like yeah, I’m gay ‘cause I don’t wanna have sex with you.” Therefore, no matter what response women give to men’s sexual advances, they risk being cast in a stigmatized feminine identity. This is especially challenging in a context where men severely outnumber women and where service-women are likely to be given sexual attention either at work or while interacting with other service-members on base or in the barracks. While most women in my sample explained that they received unwanted sexual attention from men (asked on dates repeatedly, recipients of sexual comments or jokes, and touched inappropriately), women of color faced additional challenges. Many of the women of color explained that men discussed ownership over their bodies each time they joined a new unit or were sexually harassed by multiple men on a daily basis. This was the case even when the service-woman was an officer

and outranked several of the men (or was in charge of them) in the unit. For example, Anna stated:

Your soldiers call dibs on you. When I'm new to a unit I already hear people say 'Ohh look at that new captain, she's so cute, ima hit that' You know like they're going to do me. Then they fight each other over this fictitious affair we are going to have. They are for real getting angry and competitive. It's crazy, it really is. (Army, Officer, Latina)

This demonstrates that, upon coming into a new unit, women of color are discussed as if their bodies are available to men in the unit (both below and above their rank). Consistent with quantitative findings that Black service-women are more likely than white service-women to experience unwanted sexual advances from military peers (Buchanan et al. 2008), women of color in my sample told stories of unwanted sexual attention as ongoing, continuous events that affected them across several spaces and positions in the military. Emilia, an enlisted Marine, explained "I'm just... like... overwhelmed. You can't go into a dining facility without getting stared down. You can't walk around the gym without getting stared down. It's like I don't want to go out because I don't want to feel like a piece of meat." Similarly, Cristina, an enlisted woman in the Army, stated " They just come to you. They don't even know you, okay? They just work with you and they just come and like making like really harassing statements or whatever, you know. And they'll be like you were so hot you should come down and we'll go on a date or something and I'm just like ugh." The controlling image of Black and Latina women as seductive and promiscuous (Bell 2004; Collins 2004) helps to explain why women of color experience constant unwanted sexual attention. Women of color are often put in the position of responding to unwanted male sexual attention. Therefore, women of color are at an increased risk of being labelled one of the three stigmatized feminine identities.

Because women of color are stereotyped as hyper-sexual (Bryant-Davis et al. 2009; Collins 2004; Tillman et al. 2010), they are more likely to be labelled the "slut." For example,

when Cristina tried to raise an issue in her unit, she was silenced by her commander saying, “You’re a fiery little mama.” The commander and other soldiers then laughed and ignored the issue that she raised. This treatment of Cristina, along with the unit’s collective non-response to her concerns, demonstrates how a racialized version of the “slut” label silences women of color in the military. Further, the word “fiery” is a reference to the stereotype that Latins are hot-headed and quick to anger (García-López 2008). The image of the “angry Black woman” or the “spicy Latina” compounds their sexualization because it makes it so that if they defend themselves, they are perceived as being out of control and overreacting. These racialized gender stereotypes add an additional layer to the “bitch” label. When commanders are mostly White men (Quester and Gilroy 2002), it leads to White men being advantaged in decision-making authority, the ability to shape organizational culture, and discretion in how policies are implemented. Thus, race becomes embedded in the organizational structure (Acker 2006) in ways that mark women of color as outsiders to the institution.

Overall, labeling women “slutty” is done to sexually objectify service-women and to call into question their ability to do “masculine” work, preserving the workspace as masculine. By comparison, the “dyke” label shows how men use homophobia to assert masculinity and neutralize the threat of women in traditionally masculine spaces (Denissen and Saguy 2014). Denissen and Saguy (2014) argue that tradesmen label women co-workers “lesbians” to call into question their status as women, thereby maintaining the idea that their work is still inherently masculine. Similarly, service-women in my sample stated that men used the “dyke” label when they perceived women, as Kelly stated, as “trying too hard... trying to be manly and macho.” This is problematic in a context where women are attempting to display masculinity to gain inclusion, as these displays can then be used to label them the “dyke,” which is not an

appropriate military identity. The dyke label has existed prior to the repeal of DADT and certainly carried different consequences for women prior to 2010, when it could be used to discharge a service-woman. Almost half of the Army (46%) and Air Force (49%) service-members discharged under DADT in 2007 were women, despite the fact that men comprise the majority of these branches (Shanker 2008). Even though DADT has been repealed and sexuality can no longer be used as a reason for discharge, service-women still want to avoid this label because it remains stigmatized in the military context. Maura explained how service-women have to balance their femininity with their masculinity in order to minimize opportunities for harassment:

I was thinking about the dyke...the dyke comment. You know like you always had to prove that you were...your femininity. But you couldn't be too feminine I guess maybe...because then you'd get harassed more. (Air Force, Enlisted, White)

Not only do women risk further harassment regardless of how they respond to unwanted sexual attention, (Mackinnon 1979), they also risk being labelled “dyke” or the “slut” based on *how* they respond to male sexual attention. However, women also risk being labeled the “dyke” if they appear too masculine or risk further harassment if they appear too feminine. They must balance their masculinity displays with femininity in ways that do not allow them to adopt and display a consistent identity.

MANAGING FEMININITY

When women's masculinity strategies fail to gain them access to the military family and brotherhood, they often turn to managing their femininity. They do this in two ways: (1) they try to avoid and control labels that will be applied to them from other service-members; and (2) they discuss “other women” using stereotypical labels of female service members to prevent being labeled in a similar way. These women who become invested in the masculine space, attempt to

be the “right female service-member” or the “alternative girl” that can fit in with service-men by managing their femininity. June goes on to say:

I just didn't care. I did my own thing. If boys asked me out, I'd honestly say, that sounds great. I'd say, 'I'm going to church tonight, you want to come?' and that would pretty much squash the fact that I would maybe sleep with them and I didn't really care what they thought ... but most [other service-women] would hook up. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Asian-American)

Here June shows that she tried a strategy where she remained open to service-men's sexual attention (to avoid being labeled “the dyke”) but that she was also closed to casual sex and hooking up with service-men (to avoid being labeled “the slut”). She evades these labels by invoking church and subtly adopting a religious, sexually conservative identity. She portrays this strategy as rare by claiming that other service-women “hook up” and would therefore be labeled the slut. While June explained one strategy to avoid being labelled, many of my participations stated that it was difficult to escape being categorized. For example, Jennifer stated:

I told my marines that they will hear time and time again are three types of women in the Marine Corps and that they have to get used to it. People will call you the slut, the bitch or the dyke and there is nothing you can do about it. You can only try to control which one you will be, but that's about it. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Some service-women stated that they tried to control which label would be applied to them. “If I have to be one of these, I'll be the bitch,” Samantha said. Another enlisted marine, stated that her commander, who was also a woman, told all of the female marines in her unit that, “There are only three types of women in the Marine Corps: Bitches, Hoes and Dykes, and you want to be the bitch. That's from the beginning they are telling us this.” This shows how service-women coach one another on how to manipulate the labelling process, and how women try to control the labels applied to them, rather than challenging them. Further, in trying to control which label gets applied to them, service-women create a hierarchy of the three labels, with slut being the least desirable. Margaret stated:

Yeah, there are the women who would go hard-core - almost were bull-dykish where they would get their hair cut short, and, "I can lift more than you." and just try to be all intense Rambo. 'Let's talk about trucks. I'm going to chew tobacco.' And for some of them, that's really who they are and there are other women who that's not who they are but that's who they think they have to be. And then there's women who play it off on, 'Oh I'm a girl. I'm going to have all the guys do my stuff' and that's the kind of ones we hated personally. You have one of those, and then everyone sees that as, 'Oh you can't rely on them, because they're just going to make guys do their work, and they're going to use their looks, and they're going to flirt their way through the ranks.' (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Similar to girls in youth gangs who are initiated through being "sexed in" rather than "beaten in" (Miller and Brunson 2000), Margaret's account shows how service-women who are perceived as "the slut" receive less respect than service-women who are perceived as "the bitch." While "the bitch" and "the dyke" are closer to masculinity than "the slut," they are nonetheless not appropriately masculine and when these labels are applied, they still reinforce service-women's outsiderhood. Therefore, even though service-women can try to apply the label they think is least feminine and they perceive as therefore the least ostracizing, they are still not able to be complete insiders since service-men will still categorize them as problematic. Their investment in how service-men define them is evidenced in their attempts to have the "right" label applied to them and to avoid the "slut" label. While this identity work might make them feel more masculine than other service-women, it also serves to prop up the troubling assumptions about women, gender, masculinity, and the military that marks their outsider status. Further, when women enact masculinity, they are still stigmatized by being cast into "pariah femininities" such as the "dyke" or the "bitch" (Schippers 2007). Thus, women's gender identity work leads them to be stigmatized-either-way (Schur 1984) and they must learn how to navigate these stigmatized identities.

NEGOTIATING STIMGA

Importantly, while service-women coached each other on how to avoid these labels or

choose the “right label”, service-women simultaneously reproduced these images and constructions of the “typical female service-member” in their talk about one another. Managing the stigmas associated with femininity keeps many women from forming relationships with other women, a process Hochschild (1973) calls “becoming defeminized.” Service-women attempt to avoid negative stereotypes and labels associated with women and femininity by severing their relationships with other women, labeling other women, and trying to stand out as an “honorary male” (Kanter 1977; Martin 1982; Miller and Brunson 2000). The “slut” label was the label service-women most often applied to “other women” in an attempt to distance themselves from other women and from this label. Angela, a pilot in the Navy, discussed how she escaped the slut label, saying:

And it's a fine line too, because if you're not careful then you're perceived as that person that's only there because you're hooking up with the skipper, even though it's not true, it's a perception thing. And you know, I walked that line by just busting my ass and just doing a good job by being, not only as good, but better. I had to be better. I had to be 10 times better. And that way if I was ever questioned, I always just rise to the occasion. And the ones, the women that weren't, they were there for other reasons, and were being—you know what I'm saying, they eventually washed out, they didn't end up sticking around because, obviously they couldn't perform; they were there for specific reasons. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

Here, Angela described how she fought off the “slut” label by performing better than her male counterparts. Interestingly, proving that she is not a “slut” involves both emphasizing that she works harder than others and emphasizing that there are women in the military who *are* there to have sex for promotions, validating the stereotype that she herself is trying to escape. Angela defines women who might fit the “slut” image to demonstrate that this is not who she is.

Similarly, Meredith stated:

I think she got out of the military. I don't know what happened to her. She was just not.... I think she ended up getting married actually. But there was a lot of women that did that too, and it was really hard because it was like I worked so hard—you know—to

be good at what I did, and there were some women who were just there to meet a guy.
(Navy, Enlisted, White)

Meredith relies on the myth that many service-women only join the military to flirt and get married in order to emphasize her own hard work. She expresses frustration at service-women she believes join the military only to find a husband. She juxtaposes this characterization against her own motivations for joining the military—seemingly blaming the other women for stereotypes about service-women. In Armstrong et al.'s study of college women and the "slut" discourse, they argue "women were both potential recipients of sexual stigma and producers of it—simultaneously engaged in both defensive and oppressive othering" (Armstrong et al. 2014:108). Similarly, the service-women in my sample are aware that at any moment they could be labeled "the bitch," "the slut" or "the dyke." Not only are they trying to avoid these labels, but they are also trying to avoid being cast as the "typical female serviceperson." Similar to Armstrong et al.'s (2014) "mythical slut," the "typical female serviceperson" does not need to really exist; anyone can fill this role. This construct allows women to define and distance themselves from "bad" service-women in order to understand themselves as "good" service-women. The "typical female service-member" construct allows service-women to claim masculinity and insidership through distancing themselves and labelling others. This construct is used by both men and women in the military and is perpetuated by commanders. Margaret recalls a time where a higher-ranking woman in her unit pulled all of the other women aside:

She was talking about -- her roommate from when she first got in the Marine Corps...she would carry around a book bag with a pillow in it.... to sleep over at you know other guy's rooms. And she's like, 'Don't be that.' and she would immediately tell us, 'It reflects upon everyone. It reflects upon me.' (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Margaret's commander uses the slut construct to set an example of how she expected her service-members not to act. Labelling other service-women "the bitch, slut or dyke" and

therefore distancing themselves from these labels also allows for women to feel in control of their own success within the organization. Women also use these stereotypes/labels to explain why some women fail. For example, Mallory stated:

You gain respect just by working. If you don't flirt with the higher ups and everything, and you don't flirt with every guy you see. You don't build that slutty reputation; as long as you work hard, you pass your PT test, you don't complain, you don't talk about your personal life. As long as you go in acting like you're hard-core at least, people won't want to mess with you. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

Mallory constructs flirting as not only negative but as the opposite of hard working. Any display of sexuality for women can result in being labeled the slut and therefore also results in service-women being labelled lazy, stupid, and physically unfit for the military. Mallory attempts to claim inclusion by emphasizing her hard work and juxtaposing this with the problematic behaviors of other service-women. By pointing out the behaviors of service-women that resulted in them being labelled, Mallory feels as though she is in control of her own inclusion. However, this is not the case, particularly when other service-women use this same strategy. At another point during the interview, Mallory stated:

Well the other girls just decided to start this rumor that me and him were having sex while we did combative, which obviously was not true. I talked to my drill sergeant about, my specific drill sergeant. He said that what I said in the letter - that technically has nothing to do with fraternization. There's nothing against tickling. There's nothing I could've got in trouble for, and that's why they were giving me a hard time and stuff about it because they were just making this big rumor that I was sleeping around with one of the guys. Honestly, I never talked to him. He was in a separate platoon. I saw him maybe three times during the training. (Army, Enlisted, Black)

The strategy that Mallory emphasizes, working hard, did not protect her from being labeled “the slut” by other service-women. Trying to manage and avoid labels often fails in a context where service-women are more visible and are constantly being tested. By focusing on their own behavior rather than on the problematic labels, these women might actually experience more feelings of outsidership when they *are* labeled because they perceive themselves as having

failed. Further, women who focus on their own behaviors and the individual behaviors of others are quick to label and ostracize other women. In the example cited above, Mallory attempted to explain how the other service-women misunderstood her particular situation to distance herself from the slut label. However, in her discussion of other service-women she is quick to apply the slut label to others and points to what she perceives as their problematic behavior, not recognizing that these stereotypes serve to limit and ostracize all service-women. The existence of these labels allows for many behaviors of service-women to be interpreted as inappropriate and incompatible with military values. Similarly, Kayley discussed her colleague:

We had this female, she was from a small, coalmining town. And she was a plumber. She didn't have an aptitude for it. She didn't have an interest in it. And she enjoyed the fact that she was a young, attractive female. And she messed with a married man, had a baby out of wedlock. She would go to the clubs a lot. I remember pulling her aside and just saying you know you can't...if you wanna be successful at this, you can't be doing this. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

While many service-women recognize that these are stereotypes, they still use them to both describe other service-women as well as to explain the individual failures of other service-women to fit in the organization. Kayley juxtaposes the feminine traits of her colleague against both her military occupational specialty (a plumber) and the military in general. She uses her colleagues' femininity to explain her outsider status. While Kayley does not use the term "slut" in discussing this other service-woman, she implies that based on the service-woman's looks and her going out to clubs that she fit this stereotype and was therefore unsuitable for the military. This fails to recognize that these stereotypes are limiting the opportunities and experiences of service-women who are only seen through this lens. This strategy also offers a false sense of protection from being ostracized from the military family.

Service-women who demonstrate their masculinity by posturing against other women are often proud or feel a sense of accomplishment when it is noticed. For example, Andrea stated,

“I’ve been told, ‘well, you’re not a typical female Marine’ and that is a compliment.” By distancing themselves from these *other* women, and from the “typical female in the military,” they are able to assert their membership claim through their own displays of masculinity. If they are not feminine, not like the stereotype, then clearly they belong in the institution. Therefore, by emphasizing how they are not feminine, but rather, masculine, they confirm for men in the military that some women do not fit into the military brotherhood, but some (like me) do. While they attempt to personally elude the label of “typical female service-woman” they simultaneously reproduce it. Additionally, they prop up male dominance in the organization by seeking approval, respect, and camaraderie with men and status as “honorary males,” (Kanter 1977; Martin 1982; Miller and Brunson 2000) often isolating, excluding, or othering service-women in the process (Hochschild 1973). Angela stated:

No, it was difficult but once I would rise to the occasion and I met the standard that the guys were at, I had earned the respect of the guys, and they took me in and we did a great job, and that was it, that was the end of it. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

Angela suggested that most women do not meet the men’s standards, which explains their exclusion. She draws one boundary (between herself and other women) in order to break down another (between herself and men in the military) to claim insider status. Service-women often reinforce and reify the boundaries set by men by explaining how they are different and should be able to transcend these boundaries.

Prior research has shown that the “bitch,” “slut,” and “dyke” labels have consequences for women in the military relating to unit cohesion, successful leadership, and bonding between service-women (Archer 2012). I show that it also has implications for camaraderie and inclusion more broadly—as these labels work to cast women as outsiders to the military family and the military as an organization. Therefore, these labels shape the ways in which women interact and

display their gender in the military workplace. As will be shown in Chapter Seven, these labels also have implications for how women respond to sexual harassment.

Women's masculinity displays are often denied by service-men, and even other service-women. The labels of "bitch," "slut," or "dyke," all serve to associate service-women with a problematic or "pariah femininity" (Schippers 2007). Service-men and women create a hierarchy of these labels, with "slut" being at the bottom of that hierarchy. While the "slut" is worthy of attention from service-men, it is the wrong kind of attention—sexual attention. Therefore, the perception of women's sexuality is used to call into question their ability to be military insiders. Similarly, the "dyke" label functions to use sexuality as the source of exclusion because homosexuality is portrayed as a disqualifier for achieving hegemonic and warrior masculinity (Connell 1995).

The women in my sample emphasized that the "bitch" label was the most desirable of these three options and often the one that they tried to adopt. Even though the "bitch" label allows women to escape scrutiny about their sexuality, it is still a stigmatized feminine identity that carries consequences for women (Archer 2012). Therefore, there is no acceptable label or display for service-women to adopt to try to claim membership in the military. Monique tries to navigate this dilemma by creating a neutral identity label for herself that acknowledges the stereotypes but distances herself from them. She stated:

Okay so I always say there's three types of women in the military. There's the very feminine ones who they all sleep around and work their way through the chain of command. There're the ones like me—in the middle—just like regular girls, trying to just keep their head down and make it. (Navy, Enlisted, Black)

Monique associates the stigmatized labels with service-women's inappropriate gender displays claiming that being too masculine or too feminine result in negative labels. She attempts to carve out space for herself by claiming to be "a regular girl." However, the military does not have an

appropriate gender identity for service-women, meaning that throughout their military careers, “regular girls” are often cast into stigmatized identities that they then have to manage. The only positive label they can apply to themselves is actually a rejection of women, when a service-woman is told that she is “not a typical service-woman.” This is demonstrated by an enlisted Marine in my study who, in response to my question “How would you describe a female marine,” stated “Honestly, I will say to people I need you to look at me as a Marine, not as a female Marine, because when you look at me as a female Marine you limit me.” Despite service-women’s attempts to gain access through masculinity displays and managing femininity, they are still constructed as military outsiders as their masculine identity work is often denied when they are cast in a stigmatized feminine identity.

CONCLUSIONS

Service-women attempt to gain insider status in the military through masculine displays. However, their masculine identity work is often resisted and denied in interaction with service-men. Women are cast into stigmatized feminine identities or “pariah femininities” that mark them as military outsiders. Women try to balance femininity and masculinity to maneuver between labels, however, indications of their sexuality often serve as evidence of their femininity, marking them as incapable of properly displaying masculinity and therefore barring them from “honorary male” status. Further, if women reject sexual advances from service-men or appear too masculine, they risk being labelled the “dyke.” This is an othered identity in the military context where being gay was institutionally prohibited until 2010 and lacks one of the key markers of hegemonic warrior masculinity, heterosexuality. The strategies women adopt to try to manage the stigma associated with problematic feminine labels ultimately fail. Many women try to deflect stigma through defensive othering, labeling other service-women as

problematic, and applying stigmatized feminine identities to them to avoid being labelled themselves. However, this replicates gender inequality and reifies these stereotypes about service-women. It also does not allow women to escape the labels, especially because even while service-women apply one label to other women, they must also simultaneously avoid the other two stigmatized feminine identities. Some try to accept the three labels and present an identity that will allow them to avoid what they perceive as the least desirable label, “the slut.” Often service-women try to be labelled “the bitch,” however this identity is still not appropriately masculine enough to gain women insider status and does not resolve the dilemma. Finally, some service-women try to recognize the problematic labels and apply them to other women while also creating a neutral label to apply to themselves. Monique uses the term “just a regular girl” to describe this identity that she views as not slutty and not too masculine. Other service-women negate the problematic feminine identity and call themselves “not a typical female service-member.” These strategies also fail because in a near-total institution, women must constantly perform and defend these in interaction at work, in social interactions with service-members, and in their personal spaces (such as their home, grocery stores, or the gym), while others seek to categorize them in the more familiar stigmatized feminine identities. Furthermore, a negation of an identity is not satisfactory for women seeking to cultivate, invoke, and have military identities confirmed. In the next chapter, I examine how the military as an institution protects masculinity and prioritizes men through its policies, rules, expectations, and spatial arrangements which not only contributes to women being military outsiders but puts them at risk for sexual violence.

CHAPTER 5

INSTITUTIONAL CONTRIBUTORS TO SEXUAL ABUSE VULNERABILITY

In the last chapter, I explored how women's sense of belonging in the military hinges on men confirming or denying the women's insider status and their own masculine identity work. More specifically, while some women may feel included in this community, their access is constantly in jeopardy and can be denied at any time. Ultimately, most women fail to gain a sense of inclusion because masculinity is prioritized and protected at the institutional level, which I examine in this chapter.

Gendered organization theory argues that organizations are not gender neutral (Acker 1992; 2006). Rather, gender informs processes, practices, routines, structures, and power dynamics within organizations (Acker 1992; 2006). Prior research has shown that the military is a male-dominated space that valorizes hegemonic and warrior masculinity and devalues femininity (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015; Hale 2012). Additionally, much like the police force (Prokos and Padavic 2002), the military has often used masculine imagery and symbols to show and define what it means to be a service-member. Hegemonic, warrior masculinity is therefore entrenched in the military's organizational structure, seeping into how individuals carry out rules and expectations (Acker 2012) as well as shaping how military spaces are experienced. It also affects the different features of the military intended to create family-like bonds between service-members. The gendered context of the military embeds masculinity in spatial features and in expectations of caregiving, loyalty, and trust in ways that solidify the concept of a military brotherhood, protect male-domination, and exploit women.

While women's exclusion from being recipients of caregiving serves to mark them as outsiders, a more definitive indicator of their exclusion is the sexual harassment they experience

from service-men, and their vulnerability to sexual abuse. Organizational features, including the caregiving expectation that encourages family-like bonds, can be exploited to create sexual abuse vulnerability. When women learn to expect that military is family, it bonds them to the institution and service-members. They are encouraged by the family narrative to trust, be loyal, and self-sacrificial to other service-members and to prioritize their unit and the institution over themselves. However, when service-men do not reciprocate this treatment, it creates vulnerabilities that exclude and exploit women. In this chapter, I show how institutional features of the military such as spatial arrangements, and expectations of caregiving and loyalty, can cause vulnerability to sexual abuse.

SPATIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Military bases are a blend of work spaces, personal spaces, and recreational spaces. On-base lodgings are either private houses or group-style living quarters called barracks. Organizational rules, based on rank and marital status, dictate who *must* live on base, who *can* live on base, and *where* those individuals are permitted to live. Married service-members, regardless of rank, living with their spouse can live on base in a family home or receive a housing allowance to live off base. While unmarried enlisted service-members in *top* enlisted ranks can live off base, most unmarried enlisted personnel must live on base in group-style housing, the barracks. For example, “The Marine Corps believes that lower-ranking enlisted Marines living together is essential to discipline, unit cohesion, and esprit de corps. Under the Marine Corps program, junior Marines (E-1 to E-3) share a room and a bathroom. Marines in the pay grades of E-4 and E-5 are entitled to a private room” (Powers 2018). Additionally, military bases have a variety of social spaces, including restaurants, bars, grocery stores, and gym

facilities. This ensures that service-members, particularly those living on base, have frequent interactions with their coworkers outside of the official workspace.

Scholars have studied the importance of male control of space in increasing the risk for sexual harassment and assault in fraternities (Armstrong et al. 2006; Martin and Hummer 1989), in schools (Hlvaka 2014) and in housing (Tester 2008). The military is dominated by men, particularly at higher ranks, which often leads to men controlling both work and social settings on military bases. Not surprisingly, these spaces are often highly masculinized. This can range from temporary signage and decorations to permanent fixtures. For example, phrases, photos, and memorabilia from deployments decorate clubs and restaurants on military bases. Squadrons returning from deployment typically make plaques commemorating the experience, such as table decorations or wall hangings. These commemorative decorations contain the name of everyone in the squadron, the squadron's emblem and nickname, and sometimes inside jokes from deployment. The plaques serve to highlight deployment as a goal for all service-members and are often hyper-masculine. For example, in one officers' club I visited on a Marine Corps base, the phrase "make sure to give the 'ballsack' a good tap" was engraved on one of the lunch tables. While this is likely an inside joke for the squadron who made that table decoration, it is indicative of both the masculinized interactions in the military as well as how this masculine culture is embedded in military physical spaces. It also exemplifies how sexuality is used in the construction of masculinity (Connell 2005) and used to maintain gender inequality (Mackinnon 1982), contributing to a sexualized work environment, which has been correlated with high levels of sexual harassment (Morgan and Gruber 2011).

Additionally, when observing a court-martial on a Marine Corps base I noticed a post-it note on the thermostat outside of the courtroom that read "Please do not adjust. Thank you! –The

Court Brethren.” This sign, while not hyper-masculine, excludes all women who work in these law offices, demonstrating how men can “mobilize masculinity” to unintentionally promote dominance at work (Martin 2001). In fact, masculinity is built into much of the language used in military spaces: airman, corpsman, and rifleman are words that invoke men yet are used to refer to service-members regardless of sex. These examples demonstrate how military spaces can be a reminder that men dominate the military and can reinforce hyper-masculinity. Service-women are constantly surrounded by masculinized signage, inspirational posters, and décor, both at work and while socializing, which reinforces the notion that women are outsiders in the military space and suggests that men are gatekeepers to inclusion in the military family.

As mentioned above, military bases are a mixture of work buildings and facilities, social spaces, and personal spaces. Living and working with the same people and interacting with them in informal settings can produce family-like relationships and have team-building benefits. However, when men control the space, and the spatial features support masculinity over femininity, service-men gain power that they can exert over women. Once mapped onto a masculine organizational context, the spatial arrangements of the military can be exploited by men to create sexual danger for women. Like women who are sexually harassed by their landlords (Tester 2008), service-women living on base who are sexually harassed cannot escape harassment by going home. Margaret, an enlisted Marine, stated “And it’s not like in the civilian world - where if you have a problem, you just leave it at work. There is no ‘leave it at work’, it’s all work.” Perpetrators not only have knowledge of where service-women work and live and their daily routines, they often have access to women’s personal spaces, social spaces, and workplaces. This spatial blending of public and private spheres makes service-women especially vulnerable to perpetrators who exploit their social control of the military workplace. For

example, one enlisted Marine participant, Cecelia, was raped in the barracks by an on-duty superior officer. Not only did he know where she lived, but his job as an on-duty officer was to patrol the barracks, giving him an opportunity and an excuse to knock on her door several times throughout the night. She stated, “I had every right to drink in the safety of my room trusting the thought that no one would harm me, especially being in my room.” Her experience demonstrates how even women’s own rooms are not private, safe, or protected. Consistent with Acker’s (1992; 2006) contention that the control of women is a gendered process used to maintain men’s dominance in organizations, men who exploit their positions of power are protected by the combined factors of military spaces being dominated by men and of men’s authority within a hierarchy with little oversight.

On-duty officers are not the only ones who have access to the rooms and private spaces of other service-members. Anyone who lives in a barracks has access to everyone else’s homes and can be alerted to daily routines. June, a former Marine, described what it was like to be one of the few women living in the barracks:

June: If you know who you are, which most girls don’t at 18, which is when they join the military. If you know who you are, you can keep your own values and not compromise to the 10 guys who come to your door every day and ask you out.

Me: And is that common? People knock on your door and ask you out?

June: Oh, definitely. All the time. People you’ve never seen before and they know that ‘the girl’ lives there or whatever. Yeah, definitely. (Air Force and Marine Corps, Enlisted, Asian-American)

June described living in an area where many service-men had access to her private living space. As one of the only women in the barracks, she and her room location were known to service-men she had never met. Women’s low representation in the military makes them stand out in military spaces, giving service-men knowledge of, access to, and ultimately control over women’s living spaces and movements. This is true even for low-ranking service-men, who might not hold

positions that give them official power over other service-members. Service-women see this as inevitable and a consequence of living in close quarters, Kayla stated: “I think any time a lot of people are stuck together without a lot of space, um unfortunately more likely to get sexual harassment.” Kayla’s reluctant acceptance of sexual harassment vulnerability demonstrates how male domination of space and the masculinization of space becomes a normalized and accepted part of the military. This can be intensified in other settings such as on deployment or in military workspaces like ships, planes, and submarines. Kayla elaborated:

When I was on the ship, not the harassment but more I guess unwanted...unwanted attention was a little bit more common. If you think about it you’re living with 1,000 people, 75% are guys you know on a very small ship for seven or eight months. Not making it excusable but just the circumstances in which you would encounter it are probably more likely... on more like a ship than... on shore where you’re going...you’re going back to your house every night (Navy, Officer, White).

Kayla’s explanation demonstrates the lack of separation between the work and personal space in the military. Her belief that unwanted sexual attention is more likely to occur on a ship or in the barracks demonstrates how the blending of work, social life, and private space can create more risk and opportunity for sexual violence because it gives service-men more access to service-women in a space that prioritizes them. Service-women report similar experiences in spaces like submarines and planes. For example, Angela, a pilot in the Navy stated:

And I’ve had situations where I was at 40,000 ft. altitude and I’m flying with two pilots for an international flight, and one of them puts his hand on my knee, you know? There’s nothing you can really do about that except remove his hand and pretend like it didn’t happen, because unfortunately the culture is if you’re one of the few women and you say anything, then you get labeled as a person who’s going to call sexual harassment. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

Angela’s experience shows how men’s control of space in a small enclosed area can create sexual danger for service-women. Her emphasis on trying to avoid being labelled reveals her belief that reporting experiences of sexual harassment will result in her being ostracized rather

than the perpetrator being punished. Thus, women's knowledge that a space is controlled by men encourages their silence in the moment of unwanted touching, and their understanding that the military is a masculine environment in general *keeps* them silent about such instances. Women are also at risk on deployment, a time when they are isolated and away from their support networks. Erin, an enlisted Marine stated:

There was probably about, on that whole base, about seven to eight female marines. We all lived in this one little tent... It was horrible there. We couldn't walk anywhere without people saying things. They weren't afraid to say it out loud. They would look at you and say like, "I just want to bend you over right here. Rip your fucking pants off." They're like, "She looks like a fighter" and it was like, "Oh well, I'll just hold her face down." Or, "That one's not so great looking but you don't need to look at her face to find her pussy." They would say things like that all the time just out loud, so you could hear it. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American)

Erin explained how the male-dominated base was a hostile place for her and the seven other women deployed there, showing how even on deployment, while women are isolated from their family and support networks, women are still treated as outsiders. Erin described denying herself food in order to avoid being sexually harassed: "It got to where we didn't even want to go to the chow hall anymore. We hated going to the little commissary. We hated going there and just anywhere in public during the day was a pain because it was just constant." The sexual danger that exists in military spaces, which is intensified in smaller spaces or spaces that are more male-dominated, demonstrates how the spatial arrangements maintain service-men's power. For example, in Erin's experience, she was made to go to the chow hall even after telling her gunnery sergeant about these comments. Rather than addressing the behavior of service-men, her gunnery sergeant challenged Erin's protest, thereby ensuring her continued harassment and protecting male power of this space. Similarly, Angela tried to tell higher ranking officers about an attempted rape she experienced from someone in their unit:

He showed up at my door, and was pounding on my door, wanting to borrow something for his flight suit, I opened my door and he forced himself into my room. and he basically tried to get on me, and luckily enough I was able to get him out of my room, and later, the next day, when I was doing a pre-flight, I was in a flight station with the two lieutenant commanders and said listen I had a situation last night with so and so, it was really awkward, and they both were like, we don't want to hear about it. Because they liked him. They liked the guy. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

This experience, combined with her being touched on a plane by a higher-ranking officer, solidified for Angela that military spaces were sites of male power, domination, and control. The lieutenant commander's failure to acknowledge and reprimand the lower ranking man in their unit for attempted rape demonstrates how men use their positions of power to protect masculine privilege in military spaces. Similarly, Samantha, an enlisted Marine, submitted a request to have the lock to her barracks door fixed after a service-man continually tried to break in.

In my barracks room, I was having people—someone was trying to break in at night. He very clearly knew that I was in there. You couldn't lock the door permanently. I tried to get someone to fix it, I asked someone, what can we do? And he said, 'Why don't you just get a bat?' I was just trying to get someone to care—I can't lock my door, and someone is trying to get in all the time. I ended up doing...setting up my own alarm with spoons. Actually, before I did that instead of fixing the problem they said, "well if you can't be by yourself we'll just put someone else in there with you then." They had no interest in fixing it. I think they even said, 'We don't have money to fix the locks.' So, I set up the spoons. (Marine Corps, Officer/Enlisted, White)

Samantha's experience demonstrates how service-women's concerns about safety in military spaces, including their own homes, are dismissed. Unlike an individual living off-base, Samantha must rely on other service-members to fix her locks. By forcing Samantha to live on base and requiring her to seek out assistance from the military for home-repairs, the military increases its control over her while simultaneously increasing her dependence on men who do not perceive sexual threats as problematic. Notably, when Samantha was in an all-woman platoon she said, "the best part about it? Not getting harassed."

CAREGIVING, TRUST, AND LOYALTY

While the expectation for caregiving can be beneficial in many situations, such as ensuring a drunk colleague arrives home safely or helping individuals out of financial trouble, in a context where masculinity is privileged over femininity and men have more power than women, it can also create opportunities for harm and sexual violence. For example, Rebecca, a White woman enlisted in the Marine Corps, described an experience she had after socializing with men who lived in her barracks. They were drinking, and at one point, Rebecca noticed that one of the guys, Allen, became very intoxicated. Rebecca and another Marine helped him back to the barracks and up a set of stairs. The male marine helping Rebecca lived a floor below Allen and asked if she was okay to take Allen up the next flight of stairs. She agreed. When she got Allen to his room “He said he wanted to come to my room. He wanted to keep hanging out. He said, ‘let’s keep hanging.’ He sounded depressed and he said he didn’t want to be alone.” She made excuses to leave but Allen kept pushing, eventually physically pulling her into the room. Rebecca stated that she stayed in the room because “I saw a Marine in distress, I didn’t want to leave a Marine like that. I’ve had depression.” Allen then exploited Rebecca’s company and care and forcibly pulled her onto his bed and reached up her shirt. She pushed him away and left the room. Rebecca stressed that her training had emphasized recognizing and assisting service-members in distress, which lead her to interact with Allen in a way that she would not have otherwise. Rebecca did not want to violate the “feeling rules” (Hochschild 1979) surrounding caregiving but when these expectations are exploited, it creates risk for sexual violence.

The extreme stress and mental duress of military training often creates loyalty to the institution and camaraderie among those who successfully complete military training (Callahan 2009; Hale 2012; Harrison 2003; Kimmel 1994). Not only do military slogans invoke the word

‘loyalty²,’ but many military training exercises are based on developing trust among service-members, trust in commanders, and trust in the institution. Trust and loyalty are important for forming bonds among service-members who are expected to sacrifice for one another as well as potentially sacrifice their lives in combat situations (Harrison 2003; Lindsay 2013; Verweij 2007). Verweij (2007) argues that trust, loyalty, and love among service-members are needed for survival in combat situations. Service-members are taught in training that there is no greater bond than the one they will share with whom they train, serve, and deploy (Citröen 2018; Halvorson 2010). The military views caregiving, trust, and loyalty as essential for mission effectiveness and therefore encourages these bonds among its members.

Commanders are expected to ensure that their service-members remain safe and uphold the reputation of the institution by ensuring obedience and loyalty through parental-like control (Harrison 2003; Longley 2015). The idea that commanders should take care of people who personally and professionally work for them is reinforced in rules, regulations, trainings, and interactions. In such a context, service-members come to expect, and respect orders given about their personal lives. Therefore, commanders often give orders that one would not expect in other workplaces, and those who work for them are expected to trust their commanding officers and carry out those orders. Again, while trust is important to military operations, it can also be exploited to cause harm and protect male power in the institution. In such a context, the lines between training, orders, and harassment become blurred (Bayard de Volo and Hall 2015).

For example, Cecilia, an enlisted Marine who was new to the base, was assigned a base sponsor who was married, ten years older than her, and several ranks higher. A base sponsor is responsible for orienting service-members new to base. He showed up to her room in the

² The first value in the Arm’s seven core values is loyalty. The Marine Corps motto “Semper Fidelis” translates to “Always Loyal” or “Always Faithful.”

barracks with a bottle of alcohol and asked to come in. She initially said no, but since he was on duty “he kept coming back to check up on me.” Eventually, she let him in and they drank together, had a conversation, and he left. The next time he came back to her room, she let him in and he raped her. In any other work context, a supervisor going to a much younger worker’s home with a bottle of alcohol would be considered inappropriate. In the military context, the expectation to trust service-members, especially officers, can override feelings of uncertainty or suspicion. In Cecilia’s case, the perpetrator was also her base sponsor, and in an official role to look after her. She stated “I trusted him as my sponsor, as my NCO. I told him I trusted him.” It is the violation of this trust that she referenced in her victim impact statement in court. She stated: “It’s sad and hurtful to think that the person I thought who had my back, didn’t.” Further, Cecilia’s attacker was only tried for adultery³ and fraternization not for sexual assault. While he was convicted, Cecilia did not feel as though the charges reflected the severity of the crime.

When trust is exploited by service-men to cause harm, this forms an additional layer of damage. Further when the institution fails to give a response victims’ feel is adequate, they feel let down by the institution at multiple levels. Cecilia was not satisfied with the conviction because she felt that her perpetrator should have been charged with more serious crimes.

Cristina shared a story about her drill sergeant using his power to fraternize and flirt with soldiers he was training:

³ Adultery is illegal in the military and can result in a court-martial. The maximum punishment for adultery according to the Uniform Code of Military Justice is “Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 1 year” (UCMJ 2018). The military sometimes tries perpetrators for adultery instead of sexual assault either because commanders convening the court-martial want to bring a lesser charge, and therefore lesser consequences if convicted, than sexual assault (Ricks 2017) or because it is easier to legally prove that sexual intercourse occurred than it is to prove that consent was not given. Further, both parties can be tried for adultery even if only one of them is married. While no one in my sample was tried for adultery, there have been reported cases of rape victims being tried for adultery after reporting their married attackers (Eagan 2012).

In the commercials—you know advertising for the Army commercials—you always hear your drill sergeant is your role model, and your leader, and somebody that you look up to. And they're the top soldiers in the Army. But I felt like that was not the case at all. I did not wanna be in his presence. You see when you're in basic training, you're deprived of a lot of things. You're deprived of a clean shower. You're deprived of I guess like food sometimes. You're deprived of just resting...I was just tired all the time. You know obviously there's always a tension like for females, you go without seeing your boyfriend or your husband...your significant other, I should say, without...you know you go without them, you know talking or seeing them for a long time. And my drill sergeant he...we were always dirty. We...and I...we stank. He was always very...he was the only drill sergeant that had like cologne on... And the females would say comments. Oh, drill sergeant, oh, he's always good looking and he's always... Oh, drill sergeant... And then it got to a point where you know they would call him "daddy." He knew this, and he would say well, "how 'bout goodnight daddy" before he left for the day. And that was okay to him. (Army, Enlisted, Latina)

Cristina explained how someone she trusted disappointed her by exploiting the power he had over her and other Army recruits by lingering in the barracks and inviting sexual attention. In doing so, he corrupted the military expectation that commanders are parental, trustworthy figures and invokes a sexualized version of the family narrative. Christina's drill sergeant was in a position of power as someone who could start or end these women's military careers through his evaluations and recommendations. The fact that these women were under extreme stress and deprived of physical and emotional comforts, made them more vulnerable. In this situation, positions of power and expectations of trust are further compounded by the fact that drill instructors' interactions with service-women extend into all aspects of their lives for several weeks.

NORMALIZING VULNERABILITY

Institutional features of the military, including ones that support the military-as-family concept, compounded with the military's highly masculine gendered context, cements the exclusive brotherhood culture of the military. In this way, these features protect the organization's male-domination and foster service-women's vulnerability to sexual abuse.

Service-women are not only more vulnerable through the easy access that perpetrators have to their homes and personal spaces, but this is exacerbated by simultaneously receiving messages that service-members should be bonding like a family. Since the military is portrayed as a family that looks out for one another, women are told to trust other service-members, especially, their superiors. This likely results in some service-women trusting individuals or situations that they would normally distrust—again creating vulnerability for sexual assault. Additionally, if sexual violence does occur in these contexts, victims feel not only betrayed that the assault occurred, but the additional betrayal that their military family played a role in the assault. Cecelia might not have trusted her perpetrator without the institution reinforcing the idea that she should. Rebecca might not have gone to the room of a drunk co-worker if she had not been told to watch out for fellow marines in distress. Like women raped by intimate partners (Mercado et al. 2015; Wiehe and Richards 1995), service-women sexually assaulted by service-men experience betrayal from someone who they thought they could trust, adding an additional layer to the harm caused. They also feel betrayed by the broken institutional promise of a family, especially if their co-workers and their commanders do not support them when they come forward. For example, women in situations of sexual vulnerability may not be recognized as service-members in distress who are in need of caregiving and support. Katherine stated:

And the fact that my coworkers were completely willing to stand around and not recognize, you know, the distress of the fellow female. Be like, you know seriously she is trying to pull her wrists away. Not because she really likes him. But because she wants to get away. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Katherine described a situation where her co-workers ignored signs that their colleague was in a dangerous situation that could have resulted in sexual assault. While she was at a party on deployment, she and several male service-members saw a service-woman cornered and pinned up against a wall, being held by the wrists by a service-man. Katherine described being the only

one to intervene and she uses the organizational narrative of distress to call attention to her peers' lack of involvement. Importantly, she applies the label "service-member in distress" to sexual assault while her male counterparts do not. Katherine went on to explain that the men in her unit saw this as "a hook up issue" or an interpersonal problem, and not one where they should interfere. Not including sexual vulnerability in the concept of distress further demonstrates service-women's outsider status and portrays the military family as a brotherhood that protects the interests of service-men.

Some service-women grow so accustomed to exclusion and outsider status that they re-frame situations or experiences in which they did not suffer negative behavior as actual markers of inclusion. For example, throughout her time in the Navy, Kayley was sexually harassed, solicited for sex, and even retaliated against for not having sex with a commander. Throughout our interview, she stated that her experiences with this commander and her time in his unit caused her great stress. However, after these negative experiences, Kayley described a duty station that she liked:

These guys became brothers to me. They would protect me through thick and thin. Nobody was gonna mess with me because they had my back. And none of them did any sexual harassing. I don't know if they did it to anybody else, but they didn't do it to me. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

When asked to describe a specific example about her inclusion in the military family, Kayley explained how simply the absence of markers of exclusion, such as sexual violence and harassment, made her feel a family-like connection to men in her unit. This demonstrates not only that men are gatekeepers to inclusion, but that sexual harassment serves as a significant disruption to service-women's military identities. Using the absence of sexual harassment and sexual violence to illustrate the idea of the military family is very different from the specific and tangible ways that service-women describe the military family as being active in the lives of

service-men. Notably, Kayley's use of the familial term "brother" to describe her relationship with colleagues who did not harass her shows how service-women seek out the military as family narrative, despite their general exclusion from its benefits and the harm that the military brotherhood can cause.

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I have shown how the features of the military, such as spatial arrangements and expectations of caregiving, trust, and loyalty, when mapped onto a masculine organizational and cultural context can be exploited and make women vulnerable to sexual harassment and violence, cementing the institution as a brotherhood that excludes women. In the next chapter, I explore how organizational rules, policies, and bureaucratic procedures can be exploited to cause harm to service-women. I examine how the military's bureaucracy serves to empower service-men to harass as well as provides the tools that they can use to cause harm.

CHAPTER 6

BUREAUCRATIC HARASSMENT OF U.S. SERVICE-WOMEN

This chapter identifies tactics and consequences of workplace harassment that occur through administrative channels, a phenomenon I label bureaucratic harassment. I identify bureaucratic harassment as a force by which some service-men harass, intimidate, and control individual, as well as groups of, service-women through bureaucratic channels. Examples of bureaucratic harassment include issuing minor infractions with the intention of delaying or stopping promotions, threatening to withhold military benefits for reporting sexual abuse/harassment, and revoking service-women's qualifications in order to remove them from positions or units. The manipulation of administrative rules and regulations is made possible by the interplay between a gendered and raced organizational climate and bureaucratic features such as discretion, hierarchy, and the blending of work and personal life. I show that bureaucratic harassment has both raced and gendered implications. Ultimately, harassment which is enacted through bureaucratic means is often overlooked but carries distinct consequences for the professional careers and workplace experiences of the victims.

GENDER AND ORGANIZATIONS

Gendered organization theory argues that masculinity and femininity are built into organizational policies, practices, culture, and structures (Acker 1992; 2006). Similarly, understanding "gender as a social institution" (Martin 2004) or "gender as social structure" (Risman 2004) acknowledges how gender operates on multiple levels and contributes to how individuals and institutions establish and reinforce each other through gendered meanings. The military is dominated by men and military training and education has been categorized as encouraging an aggressive warrior masculinity while also devaluing femininity (Bayard de Volo

and Hall 2015; Hale 2007; Snyder 1999). Prior research has found that workplace expectations and treatment of women of color is often based on harmful stereotypes which marginalize them further (Collins 2000; Lugo-Lugo 2012; Texeira 2002). These attitudes about race and gender are currently embedded in the military's organizational and interactional structure. In this chapter, I examine how the gendered and raced context of the military shapes the ways in which the military bureaucracy is implemented.

Prior research has identified several barriers to service-women's ability to report harassment, including unknown or unclear reporting protocol, problems with chain-of-command reporting, fear of undermining unit morale, and intentionally being misled about reporting policies (Jeffreys 2007; Pershing 2003; Sadler et al. 2003). Moreover, job-related threats such as being transferred, court-martialed, or discharged from the military can intimidate survivors of sexual abuse into not reporting (Jeffreys 2007). For example, service-men have used "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) to deter sexual assault victims from reporting abuse and as a pretext for discharging women based on sexuality (Burks 2011). In spite of these documented practices, few studies have focused on the precise bureaucratic nature of these barriers to reporting and the professional and administrative harm they cause. I build on this research by conceptualizing harassment enacted through bureaucratic and administrative channels as a distinct type that causes a unique form of professional harm.

BUREAUCRACY, ORGANIZATIONS, AND HARASSMENT

Some scholars argue that bureaucracy eliminates personal bias from hiring, firing, evaluations, and policies by creating standards that apply to all workers equally (e.g., Bielby 2000). Others claim that bureaucracy is conducive to harassment because rational logic and the appearance of equality conceal power relations and imbalances within organizations (e.g., Acker

2006; Putnam and Mumby 1993; Reskin 2000). This view holds that the hierarchal enforcement of rational logic rewards traditionally masculine displays such as competition, control, and aggression (Ferguson 1984; Maier and Messerschmidt 1998; Martin 2001). Others argue that bureaucracy is not inherently gendered or harmful to women, but rather is shaped by the institutional context and culture in which it is enacted (Britton 2000; Martin 2013)

Social location, such as gender, race, class, sexuality, and age, shapes inequality and oppression. These social locations all intersect and should be studied in relation to one another and not as isolated categories (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1992). Organizational context and social location both have an effect on women's experiences with and perceptions of workplace harassment (Texeira 2002; Welsh et al. 2006). In a gendered and raced organization like the U.S. military, it is important to take an intersectional approach to exploring workplace harassment (Welsh et al. 2006).

I build on these understandings of bureaucracy, organizations, and inequality by examining how individuals within bureaucratic institutions can mobilize power to cause harm. I focus on how social attitudes, beliefs, and hierarchies relating to gender and race become embedded in organizational structures leading to workplace inequality (Acker 2006; Britton 2000; Kanter 1977; Martin 2004; Risman 2004). While prior research has examined selective implementation of policies and discretion-based decision-making on harassment (Bobbitt-Zeher 2011; Byron and Roscigno 2014; Tester 2008), my focus on the experiences of service-women draws attention to the administrative tactics and consequences of bureaucratic harassment. Specifically, I examine how policies and administrative processes are *misused* to harass service-women. I examine the interplay between bureaucracy, institutional policies, workplace culture, and harassment at both organizational and individual levels.

I conceptualize that harassment achieved through bureaucratic means is distinct in its tactics and consequences, and that it has a unique effect on the victim's workplace environment and career because the harassment is facilitated and legitimized by the organization. Identifying this phenomenon as "bureaucratic harassment" makes these processes and tactics visible. I explore how bureaucracy can be an essential component of workplace harassment on both an organizational and individual level. I focus on the mechanisms that create opportunities for bureaucratic harassment in the military workplace, the tactics that are used, and the experiences and consequences of this treatment, along with their gendered and raced implications. I find that within the U.S. military, features such as a strict hierarchy, high levels of discretion granted to those in positions of power, and workplace expectations that commanders regulate the personal lives of service-members create the conditions for bureaucratic harassment. The gendered and raced organizational context shapes these processes; in a context where white men predominate in supervisory positions, harassers are likely to be white men.

I define bureaucratic harassment as the purposeful manipulation of legitimate administrative policies and procedures, perpetrated by individuals who hold institutional power over others and used to undermine colleagues' professional experiences and careers. Bureaucratic harassment refers to both the specific actions of individuals who actively manipulate bureaucratic policies, as well as the organizational structure that enables harassment and protects perpetrators. I argue that knowledge of bureaucratic procedures and access to bureaucratic channels is a source of power that can be used to cause harm. This concept acknowledges the interplay between organizational context, the power that individuals derive from bureaucratic structures, and the ability to manipulate policies and rules to harass.

Bureaucracy is central to this type of harassment as it is both the source of power and protection of the perpetrator *and* the tool that they use to harass co-workers or subordinates.

BUREAUCRATIC HARASSMENT

Over one-third of the service-women I interviewed experienced bureaucratic harassment (n=16), including half of the women of color in my sample. This represents a significant portion of my participants, especially since I did not directly ask about this phenomenon during the interviews. As with many forms of workplace harassment, bureaucratic harassment is often motivated by racism or sexism, with the intention of limiting the victim's professional career. Both the military culture and command structure reflect standards of white, hetero-normative masculinity (Moore 1991). Across the military, Blacks comprise less than 4 percent of top officer positions, Latino/as comprise less than 3 percent, and women (in total) comprise less than 9 percent of these positions (Quester and Gilroy 2002). Therefore, the majority of service-women are being commanded by white men in a gendered and raced organizational context and are therefore at risk for experiencing bureaucratic harassment.

My research finds that organizational features such as hierarchy, discretion, and organizational expectations that commanders control the personal lives of service-members facilitate bureaucratic harassment. First, I demonstrate how individuals in positions of power are able to use their authority to manipulate policies through discretionary implementation of rules, regulations, and evaluative procedures. Next, I outline how service-men can mobilize social power based on race and gender to gain institutional influence over women of color regardless of rank. In this section, I demonstrate how women of color are vulnerable to bureaucratic harassment not only from commanders but also from their peers. I then discuss how bureaucratic harassment can be used to intimidate service-women out of reporting incidents with sexual

harassment and abuse. Next, I examine how discretion and hierarchical power are intensified in an organizational setting where commanders are expected to give advice on and control the personal lives of those who work for them. Finally, I discuss the consequences of bureaucratic harassment for service-women's individual lives and then I address how it shapes the military collectively.

Hierarchy and Discretion

According to service-women, their commanders and military peers rely on the bureaucratic system, *and their power within it*, to pursue workplace harassment. For example, Angela, a Navy pilot, stated that her commander often made negative comments about women, and when he came into her unit, he actively tried to ground her from flying and move her to a desk job. She said:

Well, you know I had heard that he obviously didn't [want women in the service], you know, he'd make jokes about how he thought women shouldn't be in the Navy and this and that, and I never took anything to it, and then slowly some of these things started happening. All a sudden I'm not getting put on flights, those things are occurring ... and he's trying to pull my [flight] qual[ifications], you know, it just didn't add up. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

Although Angela recognized that this instance of bureaucratic harassment is motivated by sexism, her account focused on the bureaucratic dimension of the harassment. When her commander could not persuade her to move to the desk job by grounding her from flights, he resorted to the administrative system to build a case against her. Angela went on to say that after she would not voluntarily transfer, she failed an exam where only two of her answers were marked as incorrect, and she then was prohibited from retaking the exam by her commander despite a protocol where anyone failing an exam can and should retake it within 90 days. She continued:

And then they tried to take my qualifications away from me, and I told them they couldn't do that because they didn't follow the procedure for allowing me to retake the test in 90 days. So, my master chief took me into his office and he told me repeatedly that I needed to convert and change my rate. Even though I had a bachelor's degree in Aeronautics and I had over 3,000 flight hours, he wanted to convert me to PS, which is the equivalent of someone who works in an office and does accounting. (Navy, Enlisted, White)

Subsequently, Angela was reprimanded for not retaking the exam in the 90-day time period. The commander in this situation relied on the bureaucratic and discretionary power granted to him by the military to damage Angela's military career.

Angela's experience reveals how the misuse of bureaucratic policies can be facilitated by a hierarchal power structure where power in decision-making is based on rank. In the military, individuals with higher rank are afforded greater respect, responsibility, and power, as well as greater discretion in evaluations and policy implementation. Additionally, those with higher rank have more experience with bureaucratic rules and regulations. This can enable commanders to manipulate existing policies and exploit the fact that many service-members might not be familiar with the rules and/or might be hesitant to question their superiors. Additionally, unlike in contexts where an employer's discretionary firing of pregnant women (Byron and Roscigno 2014) or a landlord's discretion in evictions (Tester 2008) may be used to demonstrate harassment and build a case against perpetrators, a commanding officer's discretion is a *protected* aspect of military operations and considered essential to military effectiveness.

Angela's commander's expressed reluctance to work with women is not an isolated incident; rather, it is indicative of attitudes shared by many service-men and supported by the military's masculinist environment (Vogt et al. 2007). Altogether, the military provides the culture, structure, and tools that service-men can use to control and damage service-women's careers. In Angela's case, because her commander was in charge of setting the flight schedule

for her unit, administering and evaluating tests required for certification, and recommending transfers, his unchecked manipulation of the rules, regulations, and evaluative procedures allowed him to achieve the goal of getting Angela out of his unit. Due to this bureaucratic harassment, Angela terminated her Navy career and left feeling like the military “is not a place for women.”

Race, Power, and Hierarchy

Another tactic used to bureaucratically harass service-women is to issue a series of administrative sanctions for small or non-existent “infractions.” For example, Anna, a Latina Army officer, submitted a leave request for one of her soldiers to a colleague who tracked personnel movements in the unit:

So, my senior enlisted guy requested leave, I approve it, then my battalion commander has to approve it. So, I forward it to the Captain [who tracks personnel happenings in the unit] and this motherfucker denied it. He has no authority to do that. So, I fight him on it, fight for my enlisted guy’s leave. So, he turns around and gives ME a “counseling statement.” It said I was disrespecting a superior officer. He is the SAME RANK as me ... And he says my attitude is detrimental to unit morale and he has no other option but to recommend a dishonorable discharge. (Army, Officer, Latina)

While the counseling statement filed by her peer had little bearing on Anna’s career because he was not her commanding officer and did not outrank her (in fact, a superior officer discarded it), her peer tried to establish a paper trail documenting that she was not a competent leader. Despite their equal rank, this White male captain attempted to mobilize the social power derived from his race and gender to exert bureaucratic power over Anna in the workplace. By citing Anna’s “attitude” in the infraction, he used tropes surrounding women of color as quick to anger and unprofessional (García-López 2008). Notably, only Black and Latina women in my sample reported that their “attitudes” were cited in infractions or performance reviews, demonstrating the gendered racism that motivates bureaucratic harassment in these cases (Texeira 2002).

Collins (2000) argues that the controlling images that support oppressive systems are highly adaptive and can be invoked to oppress, discriminate against, or disempower women of color. Based on these tropes, specific actions or statements by women of color are more likely to be interpreted negatively by others.

Similarly, another service-man of her same rank attempted to establish a paper trail against Anna, claiming she was overweight even though she recently gave birth. She said:

I need to have a pregnancy profile in place. So, a pregnancy profile involves having an Army doctor signing an Army piece of paper saying that I had a baby. What the hell is wrong with our regular doctor saying this? Well I guess the Army doctor is special (laughing) so they want me to take time out of my civilian day ... not paying me ... and have me go to an Army doctor ... so that they don't have to have me take a PT [physical training/test] for six months after I give birth. But since there's no pregnancy profile in place I am now subject to these regulations. And I am like, "Well, are you going to send me to the doctor?" And he said, "No." Well then, fucking fine! So, then he put an administrative flag on me to say that I am a fat soldier. (Army, Officer, Latina)

Even though this officer was the same rank and did not have any authority over her, Anna was forced to spend a significant amount of time responding to the administrative flag and trying to get it removed from her record. Anna's experience also highlights the micro-processes of harassment that emerge when military standards and policies are based on male bodies (Furia 2010) that exclude pregnancy, further casting women as inappropriate members of the military. By targeting her post-partum body as problematic and using this to administratively punish her, her colleague invoked the stereotype that mothers are not ideal workers (Byron and Roscigno 2014; Ridgeway and Correll 2004).

Notably, only women of color in my sample were victims of harassment from those who did not outrank them (understood as "contra-power harassment"). This demonstrates how in a White masculine institution, social power based on race and gender can be translated into bureaucratic power (Mckinney 1992; Rospenda et al. 1998). This makes women of color,

regardless of rank, particularly vulnerable to bureaucratic harassment from service-men, especially given their underrepresentation in the officer corps (Burk and Espinoza 2012).

Discouraging Reporting

Another aspect of how bureaucratic harassment may be used to undermine women in the workplace involves service-men manipulating policies to prevent women from reporting abuse. For example, Samantha, a white enlisted Marine, met significant resistance when she tried to report sexual harassment from her supervisor. Her Gunnery Sergeant frequently sexually harassed her and the other women in her unit: “He would drop pencils near his desk and ask the females to bend over and pick them up.” This same man also aggressively grabbed her in the barracks where he was drinking with women ranked lower than him, violating the military policy against fraternization between members of different ranks. Recalling this experience, she stated, “I used to wrestle in high school and he came up when I was in a room by myself and he, like, grabbed me [saying], ‘I heard you’re a wrestler, let’s wrestle.’” Samantha tried to report the issue, despite being discouraged from doing so by several leaders in her unit. Ultimately, her major coerced her into not reporting the harassment through administrative means:

They told me they would cancel all of my leave for Christmas if they had to investigate. It was clear that this was a threat. I was asked, “Do [you] really want to ruin this man’s career? If we have to go forward, we will have to cancel your leave.” I ended up just dropping it. (Marine Corps, Officer/Enlisted, White)

The major’s position of power in the military hierarchy gave him the ability to grant and take away leave without documenting a reason. Since the reason for canceling leave would not be revealed on documentation, Samantha could not prove it was related to her attempt to report harassment. This enabled her superior to misuse the bureaucratic system to keep her from reporting sexual abuse. His threat to take away an earned benefit negatively affected Samantha’s

professional life. After suffering from the harassment and assault she experienced, she grew anxious of the further harm that she would suffer from losing her leave:

At that point I was so upset I just wanted to get out of there and go home for Christmas. The thought of losing that Christmas leave—I mean all I wanted to do was go home and get out of there. So yeah, we dropped it. (Marine Corps, Officer/Enlisted, White)

Samantha not only experienced sexual harassment, but she was subjected to further harassment under the bureaucratic system and, ultimately, she was denied access to official reporting channels for sexual abuse. In effect, Samantha's major prioritized the career of her harasser over her own. In this way, bureaucratic harassment can protect perpetrators and silence victims of sexual abuse, further alienating service-women from the institution.

Organizational Expectations

The potential misuse of discretionary power in military bureaucracy is exacerbated by the way professional and personal life is blended in the organization and the resulting expectations for commanders. As previously stated in this dissertation, the military not only regulates how a service-member must dress, behave, and speak at work, but it also restricts how service-members dress, behave, and speak in civilian spaces. Commanders are expected to control and regulate many aspects of service-members' personal lives. For example, the Marine Corps has a "civilian attire policy" which dictates when and where Marines are "authorized" to wear civilian clothing, including the stipulation that "Eccentric or faddish styles are not acceptable within the grooming standards of the Marine Corps" And that they cannot wear "eccentricities of dress" or "clothing articles not specifically designed to be normally worn as headgear (e.g. bandannas, doo rags)" (Marine Corps Uniform Regulations 2018). It is important to note that ambiguous rules surrounding non-work-related choices of service-members combined with the high level of discretion afforded commanders can result in harassment and racial discrimination. This is

especially true when “Commanding Officers have the ultimate responsibility for determining when hairstyles are eccentric, faddish, or out of standards” (Navy Personnel Command 2017).

For example, Ayanna stated:

I am an African-American female, and I don't have a perm. So, my hair is naturally curly and “fro-ish” I guess if you will. I remember my first base, my second supervisor—like one day I'd straightened my hair—and one day he came to me and said, ‘your hair looks really nice.’ And I was like ‘thank you.’ And he was like ‘no, it looks really, really nice, ‘cause there was this one time a couple of months ago where you had your hair like a certain way and it was extremely faddish but I didn't know what to say so I didn't say anything. But you never did it again.’ And I was like ‘what?’ ... And from that day like I never straightened my hair again. Like that was...that was always like an issue with.... And aside from that you know there were a few other incidents where people would say ‘is your hair in standard, or you might wanna check, or is that faddish?’ (Air Force, Officer, Black)

Military hair standards are based on White women's hair and commanders interpret the military rules around hair and clothing in ways that exclude the hairstyles of women of color. This means that women of color experience negative attention and even official sanctions for wearing their hair naturally. The definition of a fad or “eccentricities of dress” are highly subjective and can make women of color easy targets for citations and bureaucratic harassment. Further, the fact that these hair and dress standards based on White bodies are codified in military rules and can produce military punishments demonstrates how the military is a raced institution with “direct control” procedures in place that preserve white dominance (Acker 2006:454).

Commanders are also expected to care for everyone in their unit, both professionally and personally, and to give advice to service-members about non-job related issues, behaviors, and actions. Commanders also have the ability to make rules about behavior in non-work settings that, like laws, have severe consequences if broken. For example, a Military Protective Order (MPO) operates like a temporary restraining order in the civilian world (Tozer 2011). In domestic violence situations, an MPO is a short-term order that prohibits a service-member from

having contact with the victim, requires her/him to stay away from the victim's home, or even forces her/him to move into the barracks (Tozer 2011). Unlike a temporary restraining order in the civilian world, there is no court hearing required to issue an MPO, meaning that commanders may issue MPOs whenever *they* find it appropriate. Commanders' level of discretion and ability to issue directives with near-legal standing is a significant aspect of military bureaucracy.

Commanders might be motivated to control the personal lives of those who work for them to maintain their own reputations. For example, a military lawyer stated:

You don't want to be the commander with all of the 'problem Marines,' so you stop the problems before they end up in our office or before they become real issues. Like if you have someone who is always fighting with his wife, and you think it would become domestic disturbance down the line you are going to want to get involved before that happens. Or if you have someone with a drinking problem, they are going to get into trouble with that eventually. You try to intervene before then so you don't look like a bad commander. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Thus, service-members' personal lives can be a reflection on commanders and their leadership. If a commander has several reports of service-members with poor behavior, or often has service-members who end up in disciplinary hearings, s/he will have to explain this to her/his bosses. Commanders, then, might have even more of an incentive to advise, control, and restrict those working for them. This can become problematic when commanders have a high level of discretion and there is little oversight over these interactions.

This blending of work and non-work space, and the blurring of professional and personal oversight by commanders, creates more opportunity for harassment, including the manipulation of evaluation procedures. Commanders are routinely required to complete performance reviews for individuals in their units. These reports assess qualities regarding character (e.g., courage, effectiveness under stress, initiative), leadership (e.g., leading and ensuring the well-being of subordinates), and intellect (e.g., decision-making ability and judgment) (Marine Corps 2012)

and are highly vulnerable to the commander's opinion and discretion. Additionally, commanders can consider non-work-related factors when completing evaluations. Maura's experiences reveal how formal military policies and informal expectations can blur the line between work and personal life when a commander's discretion results in administrative consequences for intimate choices. Maura said:

His voice would change when speaking to me; it would go up a bit and was mocking-like. There were also ... like, many little comments he made. And then I got engaged and the EPRs [Enlisted Performance Reports] he gave me were damning. I hadn't done anything but excellent work. I worked over 40 hours a week. It was the sort of things I got assigned to Like he would say, "I need you to go to base liquor store for our picnic next week." Things you don't ask a military person to do. There were other enlisted people who didn't outrank me and never got handed any of those jobs. But they were all male. The attitude he had and the damning EPR ... he gave me scores that were one off from what I needed to be promoted. It would take me forever to make rank at that point with those scores. He was mad at me because I was leaving and marrying an officer and he saw me as traitor for marrying an officer as an enlisted ... you know, and he was an enlisted. (Air Force, Enlisted, White)

Maura's commander treated her differently from men and made derogatory comments to her, which themselves are examples of workplace harassment. However, it is the evidence of her sexuality, her engagement, that serves as a particular point of anger for her commander. Upon finding out that she was engaged to the Marine Corps officer she was dating, he then turned to the administrative system and exploited his power within the military bureaucracy to cause her professional harm. Dating between enlisted and officer ranks is known as "fraternization" and is prohibited in the military. In this case, the commander should have reported Maura's fiancé for fraternization, as this offense is only levied against the higher-ranking individual. However, instead of reporting an officer who outranks him, the commander chose to address the violation by giving Maura low marks on her performance review. Here, again, discretion abets the commander's punishment, allowing him to give her a low score without documenting the reason. Maura, in turn, cannot prove it was due to her dating choices and cannot fight the score. When

commanders' discretionary power over bureaucratic policies and procedures intersects with expectations about behavior in non-work settings, it empowers them to control and penalize non-work-related actions, such as Maura's personal choice of who to marry.

Normalizing Harassment

Some service-women accept this type of discretionary punishment as appropriate. For example, when I spoke about this instance with another service-member, a white, Marine Corps officer, she said, "He probably ranked her low on judgment as dating an officer is considered bad judgment and absolutely deserves some sort of punishment from the commander." This service-member did not see anything wrong with punishing Maura for marrying an officer. Although fraternization rules exist to protect *lower* ranking individuals from being exploited by *higher* ranking individuals, she still supported the punishment of the lower ranking service-member. Similar to young women who normalize sexual harassment and abuse (Hlavka 2014), this demonstrates that there are instances of bureaucratic harassment that are accepted and normalized. Within an environment that privileges masculinity, some service-women may accept as normal, and even participate in, sexist practices that discriminate against women.

Thus, examples of bureaucratic harassment in the U.S. military include purposefully manipulating policies to revoke qualifications, citing service-women for small infractions to build a negative paper trail, or using discretionary authority to prevent service-women from reporting experiences with other forms of harassment and abuse. The military's bureaucratic structure allows and facilitates this form of harassment. Unchecked access to discretionary policies and complete authority in how to run their units, including writing performance reviews and approving benefits, gives commanders extraordinary power in the military workplace. This power can be mobilized to do harm to service-women, especially given the expectation that

commanders may regulate service-members' personal as well as professional decisions. In this way, bureaucratic harassment disrupts service-women's professional lives and carries distinct consequences, which I discuss below.

PERSONAL CONSEQUENCES

Bureaucratic harassment is experienced at a personal and organizational level and, even if ultimately unsuccessful, negatively affects the victim and leaves her open for further abuse. For example, when Maura received a negative review after getting engaged to an officer, she stated, "It would take me forever to make rank at that point with those scores." Being kept at a lower rank makes her ineligible for trainings, positions, or opportunities reserved for service-members at the next rank as well as keeps her at a lower pay-grade. A negative counseling statement, such as the one Anna's co-worker filed, can have a similar effect. Furthermore, when an individual is slow to make the next rank, she is seen as being a weak service-member, and this can be used to separate her from the military. Losing one's earned qualifications, as Angela was threatened with, can dislodge one's path within her military occupational specialty, result in a transfer or being removed from a unit entirely, and render her training useless in the civilian world. Therefore, the original administrative strike can have multiple negative consequences.

Perpetrators of bureaucratic harassment use legitimate military procedures and processes to harass their subordinates or peers. The use of these legitimate channels often includes documentation that is detrimental to victims' careers, meaning that women spend a significant amount of time trying to respond to, recover from, or remove an administrative strike. Some women must attend classes or workshops in response to the cited infraction. The perceived legitimacy of the harassment may make service-women feel as though they do not belong in the

military. Some service-women silence their experiences to maintain their military careers, ensure post-service benefits, or demonstrate that women do belong in the military.

Bureaucratic harassment also has consequences outside of the military career. For example, June, an Asian American enlisted member of the Marine Corps, had a fairly positive experience in the Marine Corps. Upon deciding to enroll in college, and therefore not to re-enlist, she requested to leave the military early, so she could start the fall semester on time. This is a fairly common request with established procedures that June followed. She recalled:

I turned in all my papers and I turn in my package to the Marine Corps and then my officer says, “If you ask again I’m going to kick you out with an admin discharge, other than honorable.” And so, I had like three and a half years of good service, no bad conduct marks, you know, I had good conduct marks, and I just said, “Okay,” and waited and then I got out with an honorable discharge. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Asian-American)

As a result, June stayed in the military through her contract, starting school a semester late and losing her opportunity to play soccer at an institution that recruited her to do so. These consequences, she weighed, were better than what she would have faced receiving something other than an honorable discharge. Forcing a service-woman to leave the military through an administrative separation, especially if listed as “other than honorable,” would not only end her military career but also revoke all post-service benefits and negatively affect civilian employment opportunities. In June’s case, this is particularly salient, as an honorable discharge is necessary to receive veteran’s funding for her education.

The effects of bureaucratic harassment may follow individuals into their post-service lives in other ways, too. Monique, a Black enlisted member of the Navy, who attempted rape was also discussed in Chapter 3, described her experience, providing a poignant example:

He tried to rape me. I ended up running out the car and just getting away from him and catching the little shuttle and going back to my barracks. I remember I was like, “Forget this.” I had this number from my therapist and I said, “I’m very depressed I want to hurt myself.” They took me to a mental hospital and I was there for like a week with crazy

people. Like crazy people who were detoxing from drugs. I reported it, what happened ... I did undisclosed reporting so only my commander knew ... Come to find out, I reported it, they investigated it, and it was his word against mine and of course because I was technically crazy, they didn't believe me ... Then when I went to get out of the Navy, I got this code that said I have a personality disorder. (Navy, Enlisted, Black)

It is clear Monique was suffering from the experience of an attempted rape. Yet, her institutionalization was used to question her creditability and to dismiss her sexual assault case rather than as evidence that she had experienced trauma. Monique further explained that because she was marked as having a personality disorder, she was unable to receive medical benefits from the military. Monique's case is not unique; the Veteran Affairs Committee has accused the military of improper use of personality disorder diagnosis to medically separate service-members so that they do not have to pay for post-service medical benefits (Draper 2011). In these instances of bureaucratic harassment, experiences with other kinds of abuse can be used against victims to separate them from the military, as well as sever responsibility for post-service medical needs. Monique's experience points to an institution which prioritizes preserving its masculine culture over creating a workplace that is inclusive of women.

Scholars argue that the military shapes meaning both within the armed forces and the civilian world (Hale 2012; Sasson-Levy 2003). Civilians' respect, glorification, and adoration of the military (Belkin 2012) means that military categorizations and the outcomes of military legal or medical systems have significance in civilian spaces. For example, when hiring a veteran, civilian employers can request a form (DD-214) that documents an individual's record of service, including how that service ended. Victims of bureaucratic harassment who received any military punishment, cited misconduct, or other than honorable discharge will forever carry this with them on their record. Therefore, the stigma of being labeled by the military as having a

personality disorder, like Monique, or being dishonorably discharged, as June could have been, carries additional weight when this information is readily available to civilian employers.

COLLECTIVE EFFECTS

Within a gendered institution, the active manipulation of bureaucratic rules, regulations, and policies can be used to protect the organization as a masculine space. Importantly, the gendered and raced context of the military shapes not only who is likely to be given power through rank and discretion, but it also determines the actions, behaviors, and individuals that are targeted through bureaucratic harassment. In addition to limiting individual women, bureaucratic harassment can be used to undermine groups of women or women in general. For example, under the combat exclusion policy (in place until December 2015), the U.S. military did not deploy women as members of combat units. However, women were routinely “attached” to combat infantry units. The subtle difference meant that women were not *technically* deployed into combat but were unofficially deployed into combat situations. The Female Engagement Team (FET) was one model of all-women teams attached to infantry units in combat zones. Olivia, a White Marine Corps lieutenant who had been on two FET deployments, stated:

There was a major, he was like the operations officer, he used to be like, all the time he would say, “I don’t think women belong in the infantry.” You know, he would say things like, “It would be a disaster to have women in the infantry.” (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

This officer’s sexist views had a direct collective impact on Olivia’s team. She explained that originally, the FET had one lieutenant, an officer rank, in charge of 4-5 teams of enlisted marines attached to infantry units. The lieutenant was not attached with them to the infantry units but managed them from base. While in combat zones, each team was headed by a sergeant, an enlisted rank. Prior FETs recommended a lieutenant lead the teams on the ground because sergeants cannot make decisions during operations meetings where other team leaders are

officers (e.g., lieutenants, captains, and majors), nor can they make financial decisions for their teams. Thus, attaching a lieutenant would give the women-only units more power.

Though this recommendation was set to take place in future deployments, the same major who made it clear that he did not think women belonged in the infantry ended up blocking this policy change, thereby limiting the FETs' power in combat zones. Thus, the major's decision limited deployment opportunities for women officers and made FETs dependent on officers from other exclusively male units in combat situations. This demonstrates how bureaucratic harassment can occur at the collective level through policies created to block the success of groups of service-women and preserve men's dominance in combat decision-making.

Olivia spoke out after discovering that the recommendation was blocked. She was subsequently the target of individual-level bureaucratic harassment:

I went into the CO's [commanding officer's] office and talked to her about it. I was the XO [executive officer] you know, so her second in command. She told me that this was the decision from the operations officer and that this was how it was going to be. I one hundred percent disagreed with this and let her, and the major know it. I told them that this was undercutting our effectiveness and capabilities and that this course of action ensured that the FET teams would be limited and restricted in theater ... So anyway, then they called me into the office and basically ... they just told me I would no longer be going on the deployment. That's when they said, "You are mutinying," [and] they kicked me off. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

In spite of her experience leading a prior FET deployment, Olivia was fired from her position as the executive officer and dismissed from the unit, just a week before they deployed. She explained:

I fought this policy because I felt like it was made for sexist reasons. This man had said so many times that he didn't think women should be in the infantry and that they weren't capable. The decision [not to attach lieutenants to each team] wasn't made to better the FET team or to help the mission or even to ensure the safety of my Marines. (Marine Corps, Officer, White)

Despite the clear gender implications of the major's decision to block this policy recommendation, Olivia's objection is interpreted as an act of rebellion rather than a legitimate attempt to enhance her team's effectiveness and expose a sexist action. The service-woman commanding the FET team supported the major's decision to block the policy recommendation and to fire Olivia from the deployment. In effect, by punishing Olivia for voicing her concerns, Olivia's superiors reinforced the military's masculine command structure and sustained the prevailing sexism that limits women's opportunities and experiences in the U.S. military. Olivia's experience demonstrates how one commander can employ bureaucratic and administrative policies at his discretion to limit the military experiences and success of both an individual woman and groups of women. In this way, individuals may continue to limit women's ability to serve in combat despite the military lifting its ban on women in combat in December 2015. This is notable given the Marine Corps commandant's recommendation that women in the Marine Corps should remain excluded from certain combat specialties, despite the ruling that all military occupational specialties must integrate (Baldor 2015). Further, Jim Mattis, the current Secretary of Defense, stated to the Corps of Cadets that:

But we cannot do something that militarily doesn't make sense, and I've got this being looked at right now by the chief of staff of the Army, commandant of the Marine Corps ... this is a policy that I inherited, and so far the cadre is so small we have no data on it. (Copp 2018)

Mattis went on to say that "clearly the jury is out" on integration of women into the infantry (Copp 2018). Therefore, even though policy requires integration it is unlikely to be implemented by service-members when leading officials speak out against it. Further, the ability to exclude women from combat roles through bureaucratic harassment also cuts service-women off from access to the patriarchal dividends that these experiences provide. As will be demonstrated in the

next chapter, women experiencing combat can be a significant factor in them standing up to sexual harassment.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter examines the relationship between bureaucratic systems and workplace harassment by documenting how the purposeful misuse of organizational rules, regulations, and policies can negatively affect women, constituting a distinct form of harm. In the U.S military, bureaucratic harassment is a way for service-men to degrade women's military experiences and damage service-women's professional lives. As more women move into combat units, they may experience increased resistance and harassment. Yet, despite rules and policies embedded within the military's bureaucratic structure to help mitigate or punish abuses, this same structure allows bureaucratic harassment to flourish. As a result, many service-women come to expect a level of harassment in their work lives, making them choose between "coping with it," or leaving the military all together. Angela, the Navy pilot, was referring to what I call bureaucratic harassment when she stated, "Unfortunately it was one of the reasons I ended up resigning and turning in and going inactive was because I couldn't take it anymore." This is an option nine other women in my sample also took. The sum of this treatment causes many service-women to question their role in the military and ultimately reinforces the space as masculine. Knowing how women experience harassment in gendered bureaucratic workplaces and how access to harassment reporting procedures and policies can be resisted, obstructed, and blocked, is essential for changing these processes and supporting better integration of women into these workplaces.

This chapter demonstrates how the military's bureaucratic structure can be used to cause harm to service-women. Previous chapters demonstrated how women often feel like outsiders in interaction with other service-members, either through their lack of experience with family-like

caregiving, their experiences with sexual violence, the denial of their masculine identity work, and being cast into stigmatized feminine identities. In the last chapter, I demonstrated how the military as an institution can facilitate and protect male domination and create sexual assault vulnerability for women through its spatial arrangements and expectations on care-giving, loyalty, and trust. This chapter demonstrates how gender and race are embedded in the military's bureaucratic policies in ways that enable service-men to maintain organizational power and cause harm to service-women. In the next chapter, I examine the ways in which bureaucratic harassment, perceptions of the military family, gender identity work, combat experience, and sexual assault shape women's responses to sexual harassment.

CHAPTER 7

SERVICE-WOMEN'S RESPONSES TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This chapter explores women's responses to sexual harassment in the military workplace. I build on previous chapters by demonstrating how the gendered and raced bureaucracy, the institutional context, and the pervasive importance of membership to the military family shape how women experience and respond to sexual harassment. I then demonstrate how individual experiences with sexual assault and combat alter service-women's interpretation of institutional narratives in ways that shape their experiences and responses to sexual harassment.

I also show how some service-women remain silent about workplace sexual harassment victimization, and even modify their own behavior in attempt to decrease negative interactions with service-men. While these response strategies can sometimes help women avoid harassment experiences, they do not confront the behavior of perpetrators, nor address the masculine culture of the military that encourages them. Furthermore, I show that women's desires for inclusion in the military family and their resulting masculinity displays serve as interactional barriers to addressing harassment.

Finally, I show how experiencing sexual harassment presents an identity dilemma for service-women who are trying to claim inclusion in the military family or who are trying to enact a masculine identity. To make sense of harassment, and to solve the identity dilemma that harassment presents, some service-women downplay and excuse harassment to decrease its saliency in their lives. Often, service-women invoke the family narrative to rationalize the sexual harassment they experience. Others re-frame their experiences as masculine by claiming that enduring sexual harassment is a marker of toughness. These framing strategies do not confront perpetrators; rather, they are deflective responses that reinforce the masculine culture of the

military and normalize harassment. I then examine two groups of women that do confront harassment: sexual assault victims and women who have experienced combat. I argue that sexual assault victims reject the military as family narrative and do not see themselves as potential military insiders. Therefore, they do not pursue the same response and framing strategies as other women. Sexual assault victims in my sample directly confronted harassers and reported them. Similarly, women who have experienced combat directly confront harassment in interaction and challenge it through reporting. I argue that service-women who have experienced combat are motivated to fight harassment from their positions as insiders in the military brotherhood. Neither of these groups of women re-frame the motivations of harassers. Overall, I argue that masculinity shapes all of these response and framing strategies. The masculine culture of the military encourages silence in the face of harassment for women who desire to fit in and avoid being ostracized. Masculinity also constrains responses to sexual harassment by determining access to the military family. Refer to table 7.1 in Appendix C to see women's responses to sexual harassment.

SILENCE, AVOIDANCE, ACQUIESCENCE

Almost all the women in my sample (N=38) stated that they were sexually harassed or that they worked in an environment where they were the targets of inappropriate sexist and racist comments. Rather than confronting or reporting this behavior, most participants remained silent and tried to ignore it. Maura explained that many women do not come forward or report sexual harassment because of the military's masculine environment:

Almost exclusively in almost every command that you go to—and I don't care which service it's in—the highest-ranking people and the reporting officials are almost always male. So, if you're female, you feel this pressure to conform to this that the male...the male attitudes, you know? And it's...it's just...I think that's a big part of it. (Air Force, Enlisted, White)

In Maura's opinion, male domination in top positions ensures that masculinity is privileged in the institution. She also described how another barrier to reporting is that women might have to report to men that outrank them. Prior research on military sexual harassment has found that poor reporting procedures, confusing and convoluted rules for reporting, and the perception that one is unable to go outside the chain of command to report, are significant barriers to reporting for women who are harassed in the military (Jeffreys 2007; Pershing 2003; Sadler et al. 2003). If women feel like their only option is to report to a man who outranks them, especially one who might also participate in sexist talk at work, then this can also encourage women's silence. Sarah stated:

I think for me it was uncomfortable because he was a higher-ranking person than me. This guy would allude to the lack of sex life with his wife. And it's like, I don't exactly know how to react in a way that is what you, as my superior, want to see. Like, if I say "ew that's gross and it makes me uncomfortable," how are you going to perceive me - as this innocent little girl who can't handle a little, you know, some talk or whatever? (Air Force, Officer, White)

Here, Sarah explained her hesitation to confront comments that made her uncomfortable; in part because she was unsure if her commander was being sexually suggestive toward her. Sarah's commander is protected by his position in the hierarchy, since he has power over her career, and because of his status as a man. In this masculinized workplace, Sarah fears being perceived as an "innocent little girl" for calling attention to inappropriate comments, a label she wants to avoid. This demonstrates how the male dominated culture of the military, combined with adherence to a strict hierarchy, work together to encourage silence around sexual harassment and inappropriate comments. Furthermore, perceptions of women who confront or report harassment as problematic serve to preserve masculine domination and privilege.

Just as women cope with negative stereotypes about women by learning to overcome them instead of challenging them (Archer 2012), women learn to cope with harassment instead

of fighting it at the interpersonal and institutional level. This coping mechanism may arise because service-women are aware that when individuals come forward, they can face even more negative treatment and harassment. Cristina stated:

This male, he was very popular. He was very well liked... And an allegation came up against him from a female... And apparently, she was sexually assaulted by him. And I remember that everyone was really, really upset, and they gave her a lot of ...they gave her a hard time 'cause of...because essentially an allegation against you will have consequences for him. People were saying things like well if it wasn't for her, he would have graduated with us. Actually, he came from a poor town in Alabama. He was kind of seen as someone that was trying to better himself, making a better life for himself by joining the military. They would say you know he was just trying to...he was just a good kid. He was trying to do the right things. And um you know—and I hope I'm not offending you—but and this bitch comes along and she fucks up everything for him. And it's her, she's a slut. She's the one that led him on. But I feel like he did...he might have done something that he shouldn't have. But because he was so popular, and because he was so...that the girl who brought up the allegations was sort of demonized. (Army, Enlisted, Latina)

In this case, even though Cristina believed that the victim was assaulted, other service-members sympathized with the perpetrator and ostracized, harassed, and vilified the victim. In a context where sexual assault victims are blamed for their own attacks, one is unlikely to come forward about sexual harassment, which they might view as a lesser offense. The knowledge that bureaucratic procedures can be used against service-women might further encourage silence in such situations.

Instead of confronting harassment, some service-women in my sample modified their own behavior in response to sexual harassment. Some women implemented avoidance strategies or other non-confrontational responses, such as altering their appearance, to limit instances of future harassment. For example, instead of reporting an officer who harassed several women in the unit, Molly, a woman who was enlisted in the Air Force at the time, chose to avoid him. She stated:

A specific person who was very high ranking in comparison to me. He used to... kind of, like, tease girls. He was married, and he used to tease girls by poking us in the sides when he walked by. I remember feeling very uncomfortable about it. And I didn't know what to do but because he was so high ranking... He was higher ranking than my boss and this issue wasn't recognized so I kind of just put up with it. I avoided him. I found myself just trying to avoid running into him. I would pay attention to where he was, and I wouldn't go near him. If I had to see him I would stand far away and make sure he couldn't touch me, you know? I made sure I was always facing him when I had to see him or talk to him. He moved out of the unit a year or so after and that was that. (Air Force, Officer/Enlisted, White)

Due to military hierarchy and the lack of clarity on reporting high ranking officers, Molly did not report a man who harassed her and other women, even after she was touched by him repeatedly. Rather, she adapted her own behavior to try to avoid him. This took significant time, energy, and planning, which was a distraction from Molly's military duties. She endured this treatment and implemented these strategies for over a year, while this man continued to harass her and others. This demonstrates how one perpetrator can severely impact the work environment for service-women. Maura also described an extreme case of this strategy. As an enlisted Air Force service-woman, Maura was paired with an enlisted man who was several ranks higher than her and with whom she was required to work. Recalling the experience, she said:

And he would ride with me. And I can remember on one of those occasions, he said 'well, it's about lunchtime; maybe we should stop and get some lunch.' And I said 'hey, that sounds good to me.' So, he said 'what would you like to eat.' And I said, 'I don't know; what do you feel like?' And he said, 'why don't you reach over here and see.' (Air Force, Enlisted, White)

Maura further explained that the same man was often paired with her in one-on-one situations, leading her to suspect that he used his rank to arrange alone time with her, so he could take advantage of her. At one point, he repeatedly tried to pressure her for sex while they were painting a room together. At another, he touched her breast. The harassment finally stopped when she got married and moved away from that duty station. In reflecting on her decision to get married, she stated that:

I think that one of the reasons why I was willing to accept his proposal, and to get married so quickly, and to leave [Southern state] ... was because I was absolutely desperate to get out of that office. (Air Force, Enlisted, White)

In this extreme example of service-women's avoidance strategies, Maura said that she accepted a marriage proposal from someone she later called "an abrasive jerk" and "a control freak" and whom she told me she probably should not have married, in order to end harassment from a predatory man at her duty station. She went on to say:

I didn't even have the words to stand up for myself. And...and too, I think having been raped when I was 19 maybe made me easy pickings. I'm not sure if that's logical or not, but I think that's kind of what happened. Because I was...was more malleable to other people's wishes because I was too afraid of rocking the boat. (Air Force, Enlisted, White)

Maura was raped prior to her military service and felt that this experience shaped how she responded to sexual aggression from the higher-ranking service-man in her unit. However, the military also trains individuals to prioritize the institution over themselves, which might encourage service-women to engage in strategies that take themselves out of the situation but that do not challenge the system. Rather than directly confront him or report the incident, she pursued a strategy that would ensure she would no longer have to interact with him. Maura's not wanting to "rock the boat" shows her acquiescence to masculine domination, and the sexual vulnerability in military spaces that comes with that domination.

Other service-women I spoke with, particularly those who were constantly sexually harassed by many different service-men, chose to adjust their appearance to try to escape some of this treatment. They likely opted for this strategy because it would be difficult to avoid so many service-men throughout their day. Monique described this strategy:

When I got there, I was sexually harassed from the minute I walked through the office. Yeah, I had really taken a lot of care in my appearance when I first went in the military. You know I wore makeup. I would make sure my hair looked nice. I would make sure my uniform was pressed every night, and my shoes were shiny. Like by the time...by the time...I got to my duty station I think by May or June. By the time we got to

Thanksgiving, I had completely let myself go physically to protect myself from the things people would say to me. (Navy, Enlisted, Black)

These examples show how the military discourages women from reporting or confronting harassment. Service-women are navigating an environment where they have little control and where men's power is normalized (Burdett et al. 2018; French 2004; Hlavka 2014). When the prevailing response to reporting sexual harassment and sexual assault is to disbelieve and even harass the victim, women are discouraged from confronting their harassers. Thus, many service-women remain silent in the face of harassment and attempt to ignore this behavior. The fact that women expect a certain level of harassment in the military and can expect a level of mistreatment for reporting harassment (Hlavka 2014), is likely why many service-women develop individual strategies to try to avoid it. While sometimes successful, such as when Maura was able to leave the base where her commander was harassing her, the responsibility for stopping harassment then falls on women, which further isolates them within the institution. Additionally, these strategies do not actually stop perpetrators from harassing, as they can then move on to a new victim. The masculine culture of the military that encourages silence in the face of harassment also ensures men's continued domination of the military workplace by empowering men through bureaucracy. In these male-dominated and masculinist spaces, where women are expected to handle harassment on their own, women must develop their own ways to understand and re-frame the harassment they experience.

DOWNPLAYING, EXCUSING, AND PARTICIPATING IN SEXUAL HARASSMENT

At the same time that women must determine how to respond to their experiences with sexual harassment, they are also left trying to make sense of and reflect on the incidents. Though many service-women remain silent while being harassed and then try to avoid perpetrators in the future, these experiences have a long-term impact on how women see themselves within the

military. Sexual harassment is an act of exclusion that marks women as outsiders to the military family and presents them with an “identity dilemma” (Charmaz 1994; Dunn and Creek 2015; Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996). When an individual’s identity is called into question, or when someone imposes an unwanted or contradictory identity on another, that individual can experience an identity dilemma (Charmaz 1994; Dunn and Creek 2015). Identity dilemmas can be particularly problematic when the identity being called into question is salient to the individual attempting to invoke that identity. For service-women who have adopted the concept of the military as family, this is a disruption to their sense of inclusion. Service-women must make sense of their desire to be included in the military family alongside experiences of sexual harassment which indicate that they are outsiders to this family. Service-women “risk stigma” (Dunn and Creek 2015) as outsiders if they acknowledge sexual harassment as a marker of exclusion. Therefore, they must develop different ways to understand harassment in order to solve the dilemma and repair any rupture to their military identities, which are salient identities in a near-total institution and in a context where service-women live, work, and socialize with others invoking a military identity (Stryker and Burke 2000; Stryker 1980). I argue that women invoke the military as family narrative to downplay and excuse the actions of service-men in ways that allow them to claim inclusion at moments of exclusion. Similarly, service-women use sexual harassment to demonstrate their masculinity by taking a feminizing experience and framing it as a test of strength. These strategies of reframing harassment allow women to think of sexual harassment in ways that do not cause such extreme disruptions to their sense of inclusion in the military institution.

The Family Narrative Barrier

While many of the service-women I spoke with shared experiences of sexual harassment in the military workplace, they also described examples of how the military family was present in the lives of service-men. These contrasting experiences exemplify the boundaries to their inclusion in the military family. I argue that because sexual harassment experiences force women to confront their outsider status, some service-women either downplay and excuse these experiences or emphasize their participation in sexist talk to try to claim insider status. Service-women solve the identity dilemma caused by sexual harassment by re-interpreting the motives of harassers in ways that do not call into question their inclusion in the military family. They do so by invoking the military as family narrative when they downplay, excuse, and explain how they participate in sexual harassment.

For example, some service-women claim that while service-men make inappropriate comments and/or sexually harass them in the military workplace, this treatment is not malicious. Rather, it is innocent or seen as a form of teasing or banter. Carol explained that in her unit men talk about sex, ask her about sex, and “often make inappropriate comments.” While she did not elaborate on those comments, she stated that she did not want to hear them. Reflecting on the situation, she stated:

I know they do respect me and they do care about me, and they look out for me as a little sister. But, they're guys, so.... So, if I can, I just remove myself from the situation. But if I can't leave for whatever reason, like if they we're on a job working, then it's like ok, hey, I might say, 'Ok, look, let's change the topic.' It's not something that I get all offended about because I realize that I'm the one that's kind of out of place here, so, they're not doing it to be offensive to me. They're just guys, it doesn't matter. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

While Carol responds to sexual harassment by remaining silent or removing herself from situations she finds inappropriate, she simultaneously re-interprets the motivations behind her

colleagues' sexually objectifying talk in an attempt to make sense of why this behavior is taking place. Seeing her colleagues as unintentionally offensive helps her to minimize these negative interactions. This allows Carol to maintain closeness to men in her unit despite their sexist comments as well as to regain a sense of insidership to the military culture and family—which she characterizes as a masculine space. Similarly, Margaret, an enlisted Marine in a particularly male-dominated military occupational specialty stated “Yeah, I mean they say gross stuff and talk about who is bigger and this and that. Or they ask me who I think is bigger and stuff. But you know, they don't mean it to be offensive. They are like my brothers and it's just... like teasing.” Similarly, in discussing how she dealt with sexual harassment or inappropriate jokes, Meredith stated:

It made me so mad. And then I realized they don't even realize they're doing it. So... and if it's not malicious, I can't...so how can I be mad? I mean I can be mad, but it is what it is. And I...I'm only one person. I can't change the culture...this culture. So, you know, that's one thing I have learned. In the military I learned to pick my battles.
(Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Here Meredith excuses sexual harassment by claiming that service-men do not mean to cause harm with such treatment. She recognizes that the behavior is problematic, yet in the same sentence excuses it because she cannot change the culture. Her statement that there was no point to get mad demonstrates how anger is considered the wrong emotion in such a situation. The “correct” feeling is family-like closeness which Meredith invokes when she said: “I was one of the guys... And so that worked for me but that didn't work for everyone. But I remember the guys.... I mean and so we just kinda...we became like siblings, you know.”

All three of these service-women rely on the family narrative to downplay and excuse sexual harassment and to explain why they do not stand up to sexism. By saying that the service-men who make such comments are just teasing, these service-women can excuse their behavior

as unintentionally offensive and non-harmful. By stating that these men are like brothers, these women are able to *feel* connected to them despite harassment and sexist comments. They use the strength of the institutional family narrative to deflect attempts to exclude them from what is actually a military brotherhood. By not confronting the behavior, they avoid further isolating themselves in this masculine space and they are able to demonstrate the correct feelings towards service-men (Hochschild 1979). In such situations, the family narrative serves to do two things: it dissuades service-women from standing up to harassment and it justifies their lack of intervention by normalizing the behavior of their male colleagues. Though sexual harassment is just one way that men exclude women from the military brotherhood, it demonstrates how men have the power to decide who is included in this community. Taken together, the existence of the family narrative and women's desire to be included in this community, function to preserve women's subordinated status when they are denied access but repeatedly seek inclusion.

Rather than seeing sexual harassment as an example of their outsider-status in the military, a few service-women emphasized their participation in sexist talk, arguing that taking part *signals* their inclusion in the military family. These service-women not only downplay and excuse sexual harassment, but they condone it by participating in it. In explaining how she handles inappropriate comments at work Mallory stated: "I'm a very open person, and I guess in a way you would say I'm perverted, so there's going to be jokes. In today's society, you can be like, "That's what she said," kind of stuff. (Army, Enlisted, Black)." Mallory claims not to be offended by explicitly sexual comments in the workplace as long as they are intended as jokes. Therefore, Mallory frames service-men's intentions as attempts at humor rather than exclusion, and she goes further by emphasizing her participation in these comments. Participating in the sexist jokes is a strategy that some service-women adopt to gain and claim inclusion. Humor has

been known to solidify relations between members of an in-group while at the same time denigrating members of an out-group, in this case, service-women (Holmes and Marra 2002; Kotthoff 2006). To be a member of the in-group, some service-women align themselves with service-men in opposition to other women. For example, one NCO in the Marine Corps stated “There is some kind of brothers’ sense when people joke and talk to each other. If you’re included in the banter, then you are in the brotherhood.” This banter often involves sexist talk and sexual harassment, and some service-women claim that because men speak this way in front of them, they are included. For example, Karen stated:

But I don't really think that the majority of those guys are really that sexist. I think the fact of the matter is, is that I hung out with people long enough that I got to be privy to their locker room humor... Guys are very, very you know open sexually, and they will -- and if you're a friend, they'll just -- there's no holding back on anything. Like I've heard the most grotesque sex stories ever. There've been plenty of times I've been in the room with people who are having sex, because of where you are. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Karen frames sexual harassment as a joke to neutralize any threat to her military insider status that this behavior might signal. She went on to say that her friends would often talk about sex at work and sexually objectify women co-workers. She claimed that this talk did not bother her because “My friend used to refer to me as the biggest misogynist he’d ever met in his entire life. Because I pretty much was.” Karen claimed she participated in sexist banter and in sexually objectifying other service-women to demonstrate her closeness with service-men. Similar to women in masculine occupations like policing and corrections (Yoder 1991; Zimmer 1987), she viewed her participation in denigrating women, including herself at times, as demonstrative of her military insider status. This strategy also allows her to excuse sexual harassment by re-framing men’s intentions as innocent and not sexist.

While many service-women downplay sexual harassment, some excuse sexual harassment, and a few actually participate in workplace sexual harassment, very few service-women acknowledge that this is a specific strategy they use to claim membership in the military family. Margaret stated:

There's too few women. I think something like... less than 10% of American people joining the military.... Less than 1% of that is Marines, and you know way less than 1% of that is females. There is some kind of, 'We're all just brothers, anyway.' feeling. And if you are the one who's like, 'Oh that's really offensive.' then you'll kind of get pushed out of that brotherhood. Because you're always fighting a battle where you know that you're going to work twice as hard to be considered half as good. So, it's just kind of a hard place to be in, and I loved it, but four years was long enough. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Margaret acknowledged that her decision to downplay sexual harassment is directly linked to her efforts at being included in the military brotherhood—a masculinized version of family.

However, having to constantly downplay this behavior created a strain on Margaret's life in the military, which is why she acknowledges that this strategy could only be used for a certain amount of time, and she ended up leaving the military after four years. In addition, the perception that confronting harassment will result in men relegating women as outsiders ignores the fact that harassment itself is a marker of exclusion.

Together, these examples show how service-women distance themselves from being victims of sexual harassment in order to repair the rupture that this treatment causes to their military identities and sense of belonging. My analysis indicates that service-women invoked family terms, like “brotherhood” or “brothers” to repair the distance that sexist comments might cause between them and “their brothers” –the service-men. That is, they must constantly excuse, downplay, or tolerate sexual harassment to attempt inclusion. Yet, for many of the service-women, this minimization, excusing, and/or tolerating becomes unbearable when they realized the futility of their efforts: that sexist and harassing treatment is constant, and their strategies of

inclusion do not ultimately gain them access to the family. Like women in policing who adapt to the gendered and oppressive environment by exiting the profession (Martin and Jurik 2007), This leads many service-women to leave the military altogether.

Just as it can be difficult to admit that nuclear families can be sites of violence (e.g., Mitra 2013), it is difficult for service-women to admit that their military homes can be spaces where violence occurs. One of the aspects of family dysfunction that is produced by this narrative is women participating in, remaining silent about, and enduring sexual harassment. Much like Black women who stay silent about sexual assault (Tillman et al. 2010) to demonstrate that they are strong, many service-women remain silent about sexual harassment and do not stand up to harassers. The illusion of being included in the military family requires women to re-frame any negative treatment they experience as non-threatening. Therefore, service-women's desire to be included in the military family shapes how they adapt and respond to sexual harassment. Some women downplay sexual harassment and reinterpret sexism as teasing. Some claim that men's sexist comments and sexual objectification of women in their presence is actually an indicator that they are included. Service-women in this group often describe the military as a masculinized version of family—a brotherhood, where they expect and accept sexism and sexual harassment in order to be included. In the absence of sexual violence, service-women who experience sexism and sexual harassment are able to downplay these experiences in effort to diminish their outsider status. While these strategies allow women to solve identity dilemmas caused by sexual harassment, they do not address the issue of harassment in the military workplace. This demonstrates that resolution strategies often have costs rooted in the power imbalances that create such dilemmas in the first place (Dunn and Creek 2015). In the military, the subordination of women allows for harassment to flourish,

encourages women to adopt strategies of avoidance, and presents identity dilemmas that women attempt to solve by re-framing the motives of harassers rather than confronting their behavior.

I will now turn to another interactional barrier to reporting sexual harassment in the military: women's masculinity performances and their identity as service-members. I argue that even in the face of sexual harassment, women prioritize their masculinity and excuse, justify, and downplay sexual harassment through masculinity displays.

The Masculinity Barrier

Not only does sexual harassment serve as a reminder that women are outsiders to the military brotherhood, but it also categorizes them as a victim, which is a feminized identity implying weakness and often portrayed in opposition to a masculine identity (Dunn and Creek 2015). Therefore, experiencing sexual harassment for service-women who are also trying to maintain a masculine identity presents another "identity dilemma" (Charmaz 1994; Dunn and Creek 2015; Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996). Service-women address this dilemma by not acknowledging or confronting the harassment, in attempt to maintain their masculinity in interaction with other service-members. Service-women who do not confront sexual harassment must also try to understand this treatment in ways that will not call into question their masculinity. These women re-assert their masculinity through two ways of explaining sexual harassment: 1) emphasizing their masculine responses to this treatment and 2) claiming that endurance of sexual harassment is a display of strength, which is a traditionally masculine trait. Rather than re-framing the intentions of service-men, these service-women attempt to transform the meaning sexual harassment has for their lives. Instead of being a feminizing experience, they re-frame harassment as a marker of masculinity. For example, Karen stated:

Well, my recruiter was giving me a hard time for being a girl and another recruiter who knew me better said to him 'Karen is not a chick; she's just a dude with tits.' And it's

true, you know. I don't get upset about stuff that most girls do. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

In this same moment, Karen is denied insider status for being a “girl” and simultaneously given “honorary male” (Kanter 1977) status from another service-man. Importantly, though, keeping “honorary male” status in this interaction hinges on Karen maintaining her masculinity, rejecting a victim identity, and remaining stoic (Connell 1995; Weiss 2010). Essentially, Karen cannot admit that the recruiter's comments were sexist or that they bothered her because that would jeopardize her masculine identity. Therefore, Karen distances herself from other women in the military and from traditional femininity (she does not get “upset”), and also asserts her masculinity at the same time (she is a man in a woman's body). However, despite the fact that one service-member gives her “honorary male” status he has to tell the other service-man to ignore her body, as her sex betrays her masculinity displays. Her female body stands as a constant reminder of her femininity and outsider-ness; thereby inviting harassment from others. Nevertheless, stating that she does not get upset about sexism allows her to both trivialize the marginalization she faces and distance herself from feminizing emotions (being upset) and feminine roles (being a victim). Similarly, Meredith stated:

They [service-men in her unit] didn't do that to me [hit her on the butt] because I'd punch them or something. But I mean I remember one time I was on the jobsite and all a sudden the guys all swarmed around me. I'm like I don't know what's going on... what's going on? And this one kid came up to me and he goes 'Hey, Meredith, I bet I can make your boobs'...he said, 'I bet you a buck I can make your boobs'... what'd he say?... 'I can make your boobs bounce without touching them.' Alright there's something going on because all you guys are standing around me here, so something's going on. 'So, you're betting me a dollar that you can sit here, and you can make my boobs move without touching me?' He goes 'yeah.' I go 'alright.' He goes wonk (gestures that he grabs her boobs) He goes 'it was worth a buck.' And I was like 'I gotta give you props, that was pretty good but if you ever do that'... you know... so I took it in stride...they knew that with me—because I was one of the guys—and I always.... You know what I mean? (Navy, Enlisted, White)

In explaining a moment of unwanted groping, Meredith claims she is one of the guys. She excuses this behavior both in interaction and in telling me about the experience. She claims that she is one of the guys because of her reaction—emphasizing that she “took it in stride” demonstrates that she did not get upset like other women might. She excuses this experience as “boys being boys” (Jeffrey and Barata 2017; Weiss 2009) and simultaneously claims membership to this masculine group. However, both during the experience and in her re-telling of the event, Meredith is conflicted by having to make a choice between being a victim or being one of the guys. Despite the fact that this is a gendered form of aggression directed at her, due to the hyper-masculine culture of the military, Meredith does not have the space to respond to such a transgression as well as maintain her masculine identity and her sense of belonging in the military. Thus, she prioritizes the latter. Similar to the dynamics of gangs (Miller and Brunson 2000), there are organizational features that support both the domination of men and the exploitation of women in the military space. Meredith is placed in the constraining position of choosing victimization or staying silent about it in order to display masculinity. Similar to girls in youth gangs that agree to gang-rape initiation rituals to gain inclusion (Miller and Brunson 2000), Meredith makes a patriarchal bargain (Kandiyoti 1988) and acquiesces to the violence in hopes that it will gain her access to the military brotherhood. The hyper-masculine culture of the military and the pressure for women to claim masculinity to fit in often makes them complicit in their own victimization. Further, Meredith’s reaction to unwanted groping is contradictory to how she claimed she would react if a service-man touched her. She started her account by stating that she would be physically violent if she was touched, an aggressive masculine response. However, this response also requires her to apply the label victim to herself and the label

perpetrator to the men in her unit, something she is unwilling to do to try to gain “honorary male” status.

Other service-women frame sexual harassment as a test of strength and characterize their ability to cope with such treatment as a display of toughness. Just as enduring physical pain in silence is a sign of strength (Barrett 1996; Sasson-Levy 2011b), service-women similarly frame enduring emotional pain, even though it is directly caused by their male co-workers. Thus, they take a feminizing experience and masculinize it using the military warrior discourse. For example, Karen stated:

Here is my perspective on it. You're in a boys' club...there's going to be sexist jokes, and yeah, whatever. There's going to be a low level of misogyny probably all the time because there's 95 percent men. Just a sheer numbers game. And so, when girls are like, "I just can't believe this" and I'm like, "Did you think you were joining the Girl Scouts?"...I joined the military expecting to get fucked up. I joined expecting to get screamed at, put through hell, run through the wringer, stressed out. I joined the military expecting to get tested. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Karen criticizes other service-women’s responses to harassment and misogyny, demonstrating the expectation that the responsibility for handling harassment often falls on those who are mistreated (Hlavka 2014). Additionally, she not only distances herself from other women who get offended by sexism in the workplace, but she reifies the idea that women who do get offended are weak and those who do not are strong and tough. Therefore, excusing and enduring sexual harassment enables women to prove they are masculine. Karen further illustrates this when she described putting up with sexual harassment as similar to enduring other military training (such as physical and emotional tests). She emphasizes her masculinity in how she responds to sexual harassment by distancing herself from feminizing experiences, emotions, and a victimized identity. Similarly, Margaret claims that being in the masculinized environment creates strength. She stated:

I remember, we met this girl and she was really pretty, really nice. This redhead, she had a full tattooed sleeve, and you know when we wear sleeves up. I remember my Master Sergeant saying this and he's married, and he loves, loves, loves his wife but he would say things like, "Oh I would just jizz on her arm." and it's like, "Whoa, okay. Hi." It didn't really offend me because I was in that environment and I know that doesn't mean anything. I think you just get a hard skin to that. You're like, "Oh it's the way it is."
(Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

Margaret claims that she is not offended, and that her exposure to the masculine environment has led her to become tougher in the face of inappropriate, harmful, comments. Similar to how men who are raped might not report it because of being perceived as weak or feminine (Bullock and Beckson 2011; Fleisher and Krienert 2009; Hoyt et al. 2011), women calling attention to sexual harassment risks others perceiving them as weak and as victims. Therefore, when confronted with experiences that could highlight femininity or threaten masculinity displays, such as sexist talk and instances of sexual harassment, some service-women instead claim insidership rather than confront the behavior and risk being perceived as a victim.

Service-women's focus on being tough and being masculine often forces them to be silent about sexual harassment they experience. Being "tough" or a "warrior" valorizes adversity, struggle, and courage, and many of the service-women in my sample interpret gendered forms of struggle (such as sexual harassment) through this lens. They re-frame enduring sexual harassment as tough and as another obstacle they have to face to be seen as strong. Service-women flip the dominant view of victimization from an indicator of weakness to a sign of strength. Similar to how the "Strong Black Woman" discourse can normalize powerlessness and encourage silence about the sexual harassment and assault that Black women face (Beauboeuf-Lafontant 2007; Potter 2008; Tillman et al. 2010), warrior masculinity and service-women's commitment to appearing strong can contribute to a normalization of sexual harassment within the military. Additionally, the expectation that service-women be strong in the face of sexual

harassment discourages reporting or even discussing such experiences. It does not give women the space to critique these experiences, as they perceive openly being a victim as the antithesis of being tough or strong. By demonizing victimization and placing emphasis on toughness, the military makes it difficult for victims of sexual harassment to admit, discuss, or report these experiences without them jeopardizing the notion of themselves as good service-members. Unlike the victims of domestic violence in Dunn's (2010) study, the victims in my sample cannot take on a "survivor" identity to resolve their identity dilemma, because a survivor is still associated with victimization which is a feminized identity, stigmatized in the masculine military context.

While many service-women remain silent about harassment, downplay and excuse harassment, they often draw a distinction between sexual harassment and sexual assault. Mallory, an enlisted woman in the Army, explained that a higher-ranking service-man called her "jailbait." In explaining her decision not to report this behavior, she draws a distinction between sexual harassment and unwanted touching. She stated "If you just say something to me, I'm not going to get you in trouble for it. It's when you touch me, or you try to hurt, that's when I'm like, "Okay, this needs to stop." Mallory explained that she would not report inappropriate sexual comments or other forms of sexual harassment. However, if someone were to touch her, she would report that behavior. Thus, her response is shaped by her perception of the severity of the offense. I examine this further below where I show that women who were sexually assaulted and reject the military as family narrative respond differently to sexual harassment. By highlighting how sexual assault victims in my sample reject the idea that the military is a family, I show that different forms of victimization can change the salience of a military identity and eliminate identity dilemmas arising out of sexual harassment in the space.

CONFRONTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Sexual Assault Victims

In Chapter Three, I showed how sexual assault victims reject the idea that the military is a family. Whereas some of these women simply did not promote the military as family concept in their talk, others invoked the word “family” in negative terms. In doing so, sexual assault victims identify the military as a brotherhood that not only excludes them but makes them vulnerable to sexual assault. Based on how the military responds to their sexual assault cases, they also recognize that the military brotherhood protects the institution and its masculine environment over service-women. In this section, I show how rejecting the military as family narrative and expressing disappointment in the military as an institution changes the way service-women experience and respond to *sexual harassment* in the workplace. Because sexual assault victims do not view themselves as military insiders or seek membership to the military family, sexual harassment does not present an identity dilemma for them. The salience of a military identity is severed by sexual violence, meaning sexual assault victims do not experience a rupture to their military identities when harassed. This, in turn, shapes how they respond to such treatment.

Many of the service-women who expressed rejection of the family narrative combat harassment either by directly confronting the behavior or by utilizing official reporting channels. For example, after an attempted rape, Monique expressed that she could tolerate sexual harassment or racism around her. Recall that prior to being assaulted, she tried to alter her appearance to avoid harassment. She described one instance of how she responded to harassment after the attempted rape, stating:

...I remember getting in a fight with one of my coworkers ‘cause he was passing around this like email, and it was like very sexually explicit, very racist. Like every type of

stereotype and offensive thing he could find was in this email and I balled it up and threw it in the trash. And he got really mad at me. And I ended up like screaming at him and everybody in the whole like command was like what is going on with her? I was just like unstable because I was depressed and angry at the same time, you know? Like if you're constantly being sexually harassed, if you don't feel safe, if you don't feel like anyone's advocating for you, if you don't think anyone understands you. (Navy, Enlisted, Black)

In this example, Monique no longer tries to sidestep issues of harassment by changing her behavior, nor does she attempt to frame it as a joke. Rather, she connects the experience of receiving this email with other instances of harassment and sexual abuse in the military. In mentioning that she felt unsafe, Monique demonstrates awareness of her vulnerability in military spaces. Explaining that she felt as if no one was advocating for her could refer both to other service-members or the institution itself allowing these behaviors to continue. These comments reveal a recognition of her outsider status, which alters her response to this treatment. Perhaps motivated by others' perceived lack of care for her and the broken institutional promise of family, she actively confronts this behavior in interaction. Similarly, Marie, a cadet at the Air Force Academy, was raped by an upper-classman while in school. She ended up leaving the academy due to both the poor institutional response to her experience and medical conditions associated with her rape. However, during the reporting process she remained at the academy and described negative treatment from her peers after standing up to sexual harassment:

This idea of teamwork and these are your brothers and sisters. And I mean the whole military concept is...is around this idea of teamwork. So, everything from class papers to you know physical training—everything—you need your classmates. So, because this kid who was sending out the porn was liked by everybody, and I took an issue with it, um they...they were pissed. They were pissed, and they told me they would let me die. (Air Force, Officer, White)

When Marie was told by her peers, after reporting another student for sharing porn through the student email listserv, that if they were deployed and her life was in danger that they would let her die, the concept of military teamwork was shattered. These comments cemented in her mind that the Air Force was not a place of inclusion. She emphasizes that her exclusion from the

military family was one of the reasons she decided to leave the academy, stating that without team-like support she could not survive in the military environment. Marie's understanding of the harassment she received is markedly different from how service-women who have not been sexually assaulted try to understand such treatment. Marie does not downplay sexual harassment, but rather sees harassment a mark of exclusion. By focusing on how her classmates did not act like appropriate "brothers and sisters" in this incident, she reveals how her rejection of the family narrative is central to how she understands harassment experiences.

Many service-women who were victims of rape or sexual assault while in the military identify this experience as sparking a change in how they view the military and how they respond to sexual harassment. Melanie directly said that her sexual assault changed how she dealt with future harassment:

Melanie: The sexual assault because that changed how I viewed everything.

Me: What do you mean by that... it changes how you view everything?

Melanie: How I trusted people, how I dealt with situations. Before I would be one to go.... we would just kind of laugh about it and ignore it and now I'm more serious about it. Because I guess if it happens to you it's more of a serious problem than hypothetically something happening. (Army, Enlisted, White)

Melanie explained that she took jokes about women or inappropriate comments more seriously after she was sexually assaulted. She recognized that sexual violence was a continuum rather than a distinct episode, altering her response to harassment. After her assault, Melanie also realized that she was already an outsider within the organization and did not believe that standing up to sexual harassment in the workplace would further risk her sense of inclusion. In this way, rejecting the notion that the military is a family can be a pathway to confronting sexual harassment within the institution. When service-women experience sexual violence, they are not only denied the experience of the family in interaction, they also feel betrayed and exploited by the military's family-like structures. Rather than excuse or downplay sexual harassment to repair

an identity rupture, sexual assault victims view harassment as a part of the military's sexual abuse problem and confront it. Because of their identity as military outsiders, they do not experience an identity dilemma when faced with harassment; and are thus empowered to challenge sexual harassment. However, these examples also demonstrate how the responsibility to challenge harassment still falls on women. Sexual assault victims' status as outsiders who challenge harassment may not lead to cultural or institutional change where service-members are taught to only trust insiders. Therefore, while their victimization leads them to advocate for themselves in future negative interactions and victimizing experiences, these responses might further isolate them in the military workplace.

Women with Combat Experience

Previously in this chapter, I show how some service-members attempt to gain inclusion in the military brotherhood through participation in misogyny. Insiderness, for these women, is fleeting and limited. However, as argued in Chapter Three, service-women who have experienced combat often express inclusion in the military family as both caregivers and as recipients of care and mentoring. These women's experiences with the military family more resembled that of service-men. I argue that combat serves as their rite of passage into "honorary male" status because women who experience combat can claim warrior masculinity, often considered a top masculinity in the hierarchy of masculinities (Barrett 1996; Hale 2012; Hinojosa 2010). Service-men are more likely to confirm the masculine identity work of women who experience combat, giving these women greater confidence in their interactions and allowing them to better negotiate the sexist climate of the military. "Honorary male" status does not protect these service-women from *experiencing* sexual harassment in the workplace. However, it shapes how these women *experience* and *respond* to sexual harassment. Importantly,

harassment does not present an identity dilemma for them, as they feel firmly included in the military brotherhood. Rather, their resolute sense of inclusion shapes their response. For example, Erin, who deployed to Afghanistan and served on a lioness team as a part of her deployment, stated that her and the seven other women on her base were sexually harassed and objectified every time they went to the chow hall. Erin mentioned that when service-men commented on her body or talked about having sex with her that:

I would always say something back to shut them up. "Go ahead. Fucking try it. See what happens." Or "Shame on you. Shame on all of you fuckers. How dare you talk about another marine like that?" I was like, "Yeah, I see all your wedding bands. I'm sure your wives would like to know what you just said about me. They just looked at me. They're like, "You can't talk to me like that because I'm a staff NCO." I'm like, "No, you can't talk to me like that because I'm a woman." (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native-American)

Here, Erin directly confronts those who make inappropriate comments to her and attempt to mark her as someone outside the military family. She does not attempt to downplay or excuse these actions. Instead, she views these experiences as harmful and she sees the harassers as poor service-members. She went on to explain how this sexual harassment persisted daily, even when she commented back, and that it got so bad that she and the other women refused to go to the chow hall. When she reported the behavior to their gunnery sergeant, he told Erin and the other service-women that they were still required to go to the chow hall. Rather than go back to the chow hall, she reported it to an officer at the rank of Captain, breaking orders from her gunnery sergeant by seeking assistance from an officer that outranks them both "We were like, "we aren't going to the chow hall, because every time we go there, all we get are verbal attacks all the time. We don't want to do it anymore." When confronting her harassers did not work, Erin initially adopts an avoidance strategy to mitigate incidents of future harassment. However, when this strategy fails, she again chooses to confront the harassment directly by reporting the offending

behavior to multiple higher-ranking officers. Erin explained that at the insistence of their Major, the Captains accompanied them to the chow hall and:

As soon as we got to the chow hall, it started, and it was so frustrating that we had to go through all of that, so we could get this gunny to back off... We got back, and we didn't even want to talk to the Major because we were mad at him for making us go. The two captains told him, they were like, "It's exactly like they say it is." He was like, "Well why don't you guys say anything?" I was like, "Sir, I have mad respect for you, but it happens every fucking day, in front of you. It's happened in front of your fucking officers. It's happened in front of every fucking marine here and nobody says anything. Nobody backs us up. Nobody says, 'Shut the fuck up. You're talking about another fucking marine.'" I was like, "Nobody says that, but if I say that, if I correct someone, who's telling me they're gonna bend me over right then and there, if I say something to defend myself, I'm wrong. That's what you guys are telling me. That's what I get in trouble for." Because I'm not gonna put up with that. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Native American)

When Erin's reporting is met with resistance she doubles down and reprimands the Major of her command (a breach of respect for hierarchy) for his failure to address the issue. Erin does not see sexual harassment as normal, nor does she frame it as a test she must endure to prove she fits in. Instead, she views it as undeserved and inexcusable behavior against another Marine, for which the offending service-men should be held accountable. Her insider status, as a Marine on a combat deployment, gives her standing in interactions with other Marines and leads her to believe that it is the institution's responsibility to address her mistreatment. These are markedly different views from service-women who downplay and excuse sexual harassment. Ultimately, the Major assigned officers to go to the chow hall and reprimand those who made comments about Erin and the other service-women on the base. It is important to note that Erin's status as an "honorary male" did not decrease harassment against her, but it did give her leverage with her commanders that allowed her to successfully advocate for herself in response to the harassment.

Similarly, Emilia is an enlisted Marine who served on a FET. Emilia explained that sexual harassment and inappropriate comments were prevalent in the Marine Corps:

I can't even tell you how many times I had to, like, correct male marines from saying stuff and even, like, female Marines from saying stuff because they would just go along with things or they would, like, you know, join in on stupid, stupid, conversations that should not have been happening; you know what I mean? (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Latina)

She explained that she stood up to inappropriate comments often. When I asked for a specific example, she stated:

This brief that we went to, it was like a couple days of it or something, like a sexual harassment and assault brief. There were these guys in front of me and, you know, they show videos and things like that and then ask questions after the fact or whatever. This moron, there's this woman and I think he was even like laughing or something and he's like "oh she's trying to get raped" and I was like, are you fucking kidding me? Are you serious? Like do you know where you're at? I gave him like this death stare. And then after the thing I went to him and said like "that's never cool to say anything like that." I like asked him what his name was, and I talked to his higher-ups after the fact... I was like you know what you might want to keep an eye on this guy. You might want to make him write something or I don't know what you do...like but he needs some kind of.. he needs to be reprimanded for sure. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, Latina)

Emilia, like Erin, confronted inappropriate comments as they occurred and also reported the offending marine to his higher-ups. For service-women who have experienced combat, sexual harassment is not a normalized behavior, nor is it a rupture to their military identity that they feel as though they have to repair. While their status as insiders does not protect them from experiencing sexual harassment, it does give them some power in the negative interaction as it does not present an identity dilemma for them. Service-women who have experienced combat call attention to this behavior as well as report it, partially due to their confidence as insiders, as well as their own ability to call into question the military experiences and identities of other service-members, particularly those who have not deployed. Furthermore, these women shared positive experiences and outcomes when they did report harassment and inappropriate comments. Erin's major forced high-ranking officers to intervene when she was being harassed in the chow hall. The individual Emilia reported for making a rape joke during a sexual assault

training video stated that the commander she spoke with reprimanded him. Carol, who deployed with a FET, stated that while she did not often confront harassment she experienced, service-men in her unit stood up for her. She stated:

Those guys that I work with when they hear rumors about me, like I don't even have to be there I don't even have to have any knowledge of it whatsoever; they'll hear it and they'll say, no, that's not true, and you're not going to talk about her like that. : and they can get away with that more than I can, as far as like shutting it down, because it's not, oh well why are you denying it? It's like, it's serious, he knows her, whatever, we're not gonna talk about it. (Marine Corps, Enlisted, White)

The rumors Carol refers to are versions of the “bitch, slut, dyke” labels. While her “honorary male” status does not make her less of a target for being cast into these pariah femininities (1/3 women who experienced combat mentioned being labelled in some way), it does invite bystander intervention from male marines in her unit. This example demonstrates that women’s masculine achievements can result in other service-men standing up for them in interaction. These men see Carol as a member of the military family and provide supportive caregiving which in this case also helps confront harmful masculinity displays by their colleagues. However, Carol’s perception that confrontation from men is better than if she had stood up for herself, shows how masculinity tied to male bodies remains situated at the top of the masculinity hierarchy.

Women’s success in combat does not challenge the value of warrior masculinity, since this identity is still unattainable to most service-members, men included. In this context, service-women who access warrior masculinity and its patriarchal dividends can use their position of power to stand up to harassment, negotiate for equality, and disrupt the normative masculine context that seeks to oppress them. The actions of these service-women do not reconfigure hegemonic masculinity to be inclusive, as Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue is possible. However, their use of a hegemonic masculinity (that has been categorized as problematic, aggressive, and oppressive) to challenge gender inequality in the form of harassment,

demonstrates how masculinity can be used to either question or reproduce gender hierarchies. In other words, service-women prop up warrior masculinity by aspiring to and achieving the status, and then by using it in interaction. However, they may also use this masculinity to question and confront other aspects of masculinity, especially those that create exclusion, harm, and inequality through sexual harassment.

Women who have achieved warrior masculinity are able to invoke more flexible identities. Sasson-Levy (2011b) argues that in “extremely gendered institutions,” gender identities are more constrained and service-members perform extreme versions of gender identity. I show that like some service-men (Barret 1995; Sasson-Levy 2003b; Wasserman et al. 2018), once service-women achieve warrior masculinity their gender identity displays can be less strict. These women can adopt an identity that emphasizes their status as a victim of sexual harassment without risking stigma and jeopardizing their insider status.

Although combat experience can be one pathway to resisting sexual harassment, this reliance on achieving an identity based on warrior masculinity reveals that women’s power to address gender inequality is still defined and constrained by masculinity. This demonstrates how masculinity as a form of domination is adaptable and ever-present, despite changing institutional policies aimed at addressing inequality. Integrating women into combat units is one way to alleviate discrimination against women. This is especially true when service-men also use women’s status as “honorary males” to confront harassment on their behalf. However, this does not address the value placed on warrior masculinity and the power that comes with achieving it.

CONCLUSIONS

The military is a male-dominated space where sexual harassment is prevalent and often seen as an expected, normalized part of service. The service-women I spoke with reported

experiencing sexual harassment at multiple points during their military careers. Most women endured this treatment in silence and developed their own individual strategies for managing harassment. Some service-women altered their own behavior in attempt to avoid perpetrators and remove themselves from negative situations. Developing individual avoidance strategies allowed service-women to try to escape harassment without calling attention to themselves as outsiders and without having to question male dominance of the military space. Service-women are also encouraged to remain silent about harassment because the military's bureaucracy can be manipulated to cause women additional harm. However, sexual harassment serves as a salient reminder that women are outsiders in the military space, causing a disruption to their military identities. Some women try to solve this dilemma by invoking the family narrative to downplay or explain away sexism, thereby re-interpreting the motivations behind this behavior. Some women participate in sexist talk to demonstrate their insider status and to claim that this treatment does not denote their outsidership. Others attempt to solve this dilemma by admitting that sexual harassment is problematic behavior, but framing harassment as a marker of toughness and masculinity. These strategies allow women to claim inclusion at moments of exclusion in attempt to repair the rupture that sexual harassment causes to their military identities. However, this simultaneously reproduces gendered inequalities in the military workplace. Therefore, masculinity and the desire to be in the military family are two interactional barriers to women confronting and reporting sexual harassment they experience.

However, women on the far ends of the warrior masculinity continuum do not experience an identity dilemma when harassed, and both groups confront harassment either in interaction or through reporting channels. The two groups of women who directly confront sexual harassment are those who perceive themselves as outsiders to the military brotherhood, and those who feel

included in the military family, meaning that harassment does not present an identity dilemma for them. Many women are so constrained by the desire to fit in, to be a part of the promised military family, to be appropriately masculine to fit into the brotherhood, that they do not stand up to harassment. It is women who have gained insider status, or those who accept outsider status and no longer desire to be insiders, that stand up to harassment. Sexual assault victims see themselves as outsiders to the brotherhood, as demonstrated by their rejection of the military as family narrative in their talk about the institution. Sexual assault victims reject the idea that the military family is inclusive, and they recognize that it is not just an exclusive brotherhood, but a site of masculinity that creates sexual danger. Thus, when they are confronted with sexual harassment they connect these experiences to sexual abuse vulnerability more generally. Sexual assault victims confront and report sexual harassment they experience because doing so does not pose a threat to their status as insiders, they already perceive themselves as outsiders. The institution's negative response to sexual assault terminates perceptions of potential inclusivity into the military brotherhood, which shapes how they experience and respond to sexual harassment.

Women who have been in combat and feel included in the brotherhood also stand up to sexual harassment they experience. These women view sexual harassment as unacceptable behavior that they feel compelled to correct, rather than markers of their outsiderhood. Ultimately, while combat experience allows women to advocate for themselves in sexist, unequal, and harassment situations—the larger issue is the masculine culture of the military that makes these extremes the only way for women to feel like they belong and to have the power to control troubling interactions. Further, service-women who have achieved “honorary male” status are still seen as women and still harassed by service-men. While these women stand up to

harassment and have some leverage with commanders, their “honorary male” status does nothing to protect them from victimization. Thus, women engage in “gender maneuvering” (Schippers 2002) and try to balance their femininity with their masculinity to both avoid harassment and to achieve “honorary male” status. However, most women cannot achieve combat masculinity and have to respond to harassment in ways that will not mark them as outsiders. Masculinity puts all service-women at risk of sexual harassment and violence, including those considered “honorary males,” and it both constrains service-women’s responses to sexual harassment as well as defines those who have the power to confront this treatment.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this dissertation, I examine individual, interactional, and institutional contributors to service-women's sexual abuse vulnerability. A key part of my findings focuses on the concept of the military as a family, and the promise made to men and women that by serving in the U.S. military they will be members of the military family. The military reinforces the family narrative through expectations of caregiving, emphasizing that service-members should look out for one another and show loyalty and trust in other service-members and to the institution. These factors, along with the military's spatial arrangements and strict hierarchy of power, work together to create sexual abuse vulnerability when mapped onto the masculine and gendered values, traditions, and culture of the military. While I acknowledge that it is individual service-men who harass or assault service-women, I demonstrate how they are enabled to do so by institutional factors such as a strict hierarchy, discretion of commanders, and blending of personal and work-life. I also show how the military's bureaucratic structure can be a source of power as well as a tool that individuals can use to harass. By highlighting how service-men can manipulate rules, policies, and evaluations to cause harm to individual and groups of service-women, I show how the interplay between a gendered institution and bureaucratic features work to place service-men in positions of power that they can manipulate undetected. In doing so, I identify a type of workplace harassment not found in the extant literature. By naming bureaucratic harassment and outlining its tactics and consequences, my work makes visible an important dimension of workplace harassment and sexual abuse. The military needs to be aware of the ways in which it creates sexual abuse vulnerability and should focus on addressing

problematic spatial arrangements, policies, expectations, and practices that are easy to manipulate (such as discretion and the blending of work and personal life).

My findings also show how the desire for fictive kin can be exploited by institutions. Prior research on fictive kin usually emphasizes the potential for individuals to gain access to material and social benefits usually found in families from non-related individuals (Ebaugh and Curry 2000; Muraco 2006; Stack 1974). I show that during recruitment and training, the military cultivates the idea that the military is a family which provides such support to its members. I also show that service-women might seek out the military particularly for this benefit. Some service-women join the military to escape negative or abusive situations, which means that they are already vulnerable to future victimization (Arata and Lindman 2002; Boney-McCoy and Finkelhor 1996; Desai et al. 2002; McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008; Russell 1984). In the military, service-women must navigate an institutional context that advocates caregiving and kinship, but which allows exploitation and othering. I show how military spatial arrangements and expectations of caregiving and loyalty can make service-women vulnerable to sexual assault in ways that replicate family violence.

Additionally, I show how individual, interactional, and institutional level factors shape service-women's *responses* to sexual harassment. For example, sexual harassment presents an identity dilemma among women for whom a military identity is salient. They resolve this dilemma by reinforcing their masculinity or emphasizing their inclusion in the military space to simultaneously downplay and excuse their victimization. However, I theorize that sexual assault victims do not face an identity dilemma when harassed, due to their adoption of an outsider identity, and that this can serve as a platform for confronting harassment. While many service-women invoke the military as family narrative in their talk about the institution, sexual assault

victims reject this narrative. I argue that sexual assault, combined with poor institutional responses to assault, can change women's understanding of the military family. Sexual assault victims seek to distance themselves from markers of military insiderness, such as their uniforms, and lament the lack of trust, protection, and loyalty they experience from the institution and other service-members. In contrast, I find that women who have experienced combat also stand up to harassment, showing how individual experiences can change the meaning and salience of institutional narratives in ways that mobilize resistance to harassment.

In highlighting the two groups of women who stand up to harassment, I demonstrate the power of masculinity in determining military interactions and identities. Masculinity constrains the choices available to service-women seeking inclusion and fearing exclusion, and it shapes the categories of women who resist inequality. Notably, women who have adopted identities that allow them to resist harassment are in the minority, demonstrating how the masculine context and interactional environment create the possibility for resistance only at the margins. My analysis centers on the masculine structure and those invested in maintaining the structure that constrains service-women. Further, by identifying the family as a site of identity construction and validation, I show the importance of the family narrative in maintaining oppression in the military context. As the narrative currently operates, it excludes the majority of women. However, in demonstrating how some service-women change their orientation to the family narrative, I show how individuals have the power to re-shape the meaning of institutional narratives for their own lives. Highlighting this process might allow other service-women to resist the way the family narrative currently operates and ultimately change it to be more inclusive in interaction.

By exploring the structural, interactional, and individual level factors associated with the process of identity construction, harassment, and resistance, I show that the oppression of service-women is multifaceted and intersectional. However, I do not assume that the military is a static site of oppression. Service-women who had achieved warrior masculinity displayed some leverage in harassment situations. Additionally, the fact that some men commanders took service-women's reports seriously demonstrates how men can use their institutional power to challenge violence, inequality, and harassment. This suggests that if more women use their interactional power to confront harassment, and men use their institutional power to punish harassers, women may face fewer consequences when reporting harassment. Nonetheless, as long as masculinity achievements are the main way for women to earn the respect of service-men and be perceived as military insiders, service-women will still be disadvantaged and oppressed by the military system.

My dissertation serves as a case study to explore "gender as a social structure" (Risman 2004) or "gender as an institution" (Martin 2004). In this project, I show how gender is embedded in individual, interactional, and institutional levels of the military in ways that produce sexual abuse vulnerability and broad inequality. I show how masculine culture at the institutional level and gendered interactions between individuals each create meaning for one another, and reflect one another, so as to produce "an extremely gendered organization" (Sasson-Levy 2011b). I demonstrate how service-women seeking to develop and enact a military identity use conceptions of masculinity derived from the institution in interaction with other service-members. That is to say, they learn that a military identity is linked to masculinity and they try to perform masculinity in ways that the institution values and in ways that they see other service-members enact. However, because they are women performing masculinity, they are stigmatized,

leading them to adopt individual level strategies to try to fit in (such as downplaying and excusing harassment, denigrating other women, and engaging in self-stigma). These strategies ultimately reinforce “gender hegemony” (Schippers 2007:101). Further, I contribute to the idea of gender as a social structure by introducing the concept of bureaucratic harassment. This demonstrates that not only are the interactional, individual, and structural levels of gender related—but that individuals are aware of and can manipulate gendered structures to privilege themselves or to oppress others. Service-men actively use the bureaucratic structures, and their power within the institutional hierarchy, to maintain and exert power over others.

Building on workplace harassment literature which shows how confusing or convoluted rules can prohibit reporting of sexual harassment (Jeffreys 2007), I show that the bureaucratic system itself can be used as a tool to cause harm. Because the military claims to be an inclusive employer for women, people of color, and more recently, lesbian, gay, or bisexual individuals, victims of discriminatory treatment might not recognize certain experiences as emblematic of harassment. While many service-women in my sample experienced instances of harassment that were motivated by racism and/or sexism, several of them did not explain these experiences as gendered or raced. Instead, they specifically emphasized the administrative and bureaucratic aspects of their harassment. Sasson-Levy (2003; 2011b) argues that women in “extremely gendered institutions” may not recognize sexism because re-framing this treatment as non-victimizing denies the harassers’ ability to victimize them. Not seeing oneself as a victim of sexual and/or racial harassment yet being able to describe in detail the administrative attacks and consequences they suffered, highlights the way in which gendered and raced institutions control the careers and professional experiences of those working within them. Exploring the intersection of bureaucracy and workplace harassment reveals the problematic processes and

components of gendered bureaucratic workplaces that can enable some employees to limit the careers of their colleagues.

Feminist scholarship has explored how gender is embedded in work structures (Acker 2006; Britton 2000), and how race shapes the gendered workplace (García-López 2008; Texeira 2002). Scholars also have examined the use of policies to facilitate workplace inequality (Bobbitt-Zeher 2011). However, the particular ways in which individuals are able to use bureaucratic policies as a tool to harass within gendered and raced organizations has been understudied. My findings indicate that service-men are able to draw on institutional power derived from their rank and position, as well as social power based on gender and race, to have greater knowledge of and access to bureaucratic policies, which they can manipulate to cause harm. The documentation that may accompany this harassment serves as evidence against the *victim*—making harassment difficult to prove. Therefore, it is not that women do not know how to report (Jeffreys 2007), nor simply that they fear the consequences of reporting (Pershing 2003), but that the system that they use to report can be an active agent of harm. The perceived legality of these actions lends legitimacy to harassment, encourages victims’ silence about their mistreatment, and increases women’s frustration with employment in these workplaces. By identifying the unique form of harm that can be enacted through administrative channels as bureaucratic harassment, I aim to make visible a specific dimension of workplace harassment that damages the careers of victims, impedes the achievements of institutions, and preserves gender and racial inequality.

My dissertation also contributes to the literature on gender, femininities, and masculinities by exploring gender identity and gender performances in a near-total and “extremely gendered” (Sasson-Levy 2011b) institution. Prior research has shown how men

invoke and use warrior masculinity (Hale 2007; 2012; Hinojosa 2010; Sasson-Levy 2011b), and how men's military masculinities are shaped by their other social locations and military positions (Barrett 1996; Wasserman et al. 2018). However, unlike service-men who are able to invoke a variety of masculinities, including those outside of the warrior masculinity (Sasson-Levy 2003b; Wasserman et al. 2018), service-women are more constrained. I show how women engage in gender maneuvering (Schippers 2002) and try to balance femininity and masculinity to achieve "honorary male" status (Kanter 1977). Women's masculinity displays are seen as problematic because they are being performed by women (Schippers 2007), yet their femininity is also seen as problematic in an institution that values, promotes, and rewards hegemonic warrior masculinity. I show how women are cast into stigmatized "pariah feminine identities" (Schippers 2007) such as "the slut," "the bitch," and "the dyke" when they perform masculinity or display femininity. The same service-woman can be cast into multiple "pariah femininities" throughout her military career, and these labels restrict women's participation as full military members. The military's status as a near-total institution compounds the effects of women's outsider status, and even service-women who achieve "honorary male" status are harassed by service-men. Therefore, service-women try multiple strategies to become military insiders and "honorary males," yet this status only grants them leverage in unequal interactions and not protection from harassment.

This dissertation also shows how sexual harassment complicates gender identity and performances. While most women's strategies to cultivate an identity as military insiders fall short, it is sexual harassment that serves as a persistent reminder of women's outsiderhood and most presents an identity dilemma for them. My findings indicate that women downplay, excuse, and even participate in harassment in order to claim masculinity. Martin (2001) documented how

men in corporations “mobilize masculinity” at work to subtly and unintentionally maintain male domination. I document how service-women also mobilize masculinity in similar ways. By emphasizing strength in the face of harassment they prioritize their masculinity over seeking justice for sexual harassment. Further, by showing how service-women use masculinity to both challenge and excuse sexism and harassment, I show that masculinity is not static and that service-women can invoke masculinity in a variety of ways and to achieve a variety of outcomes. Finally, throughout these chapters I demonstrate how new military policies aimed at creating gender equality, such as integrating infantry units and opening up more Military Occupational Specialties to women, are constrained by masculine power structures and interactions that continue to privilege men. Through bureaucratic harassment, powerful individuals can maintain domination and unofficially continue repealed policies that contribute to inequality. Additionally, I show how some service-women “mobilize masculinity” (Martin 2001) against other women. Service-women who experience combat can mobilize their masculinity in ways that challenge harassment but also in ways that reproduce sexism and prop up male dominance in interaction. Service-women who achieved warrior masculinity use this identity to resist harassment, but they may also denigrate other service-women by labeling them with a stigmatized feminine identity, posturing, and engaging in defensive othering. By encouraging women to valorize combat roles and by rewarding women who fulfill them, masculinity is preserved as dominant within the organization. This demonstrates how masculinity as a form of domination is adaptable, because oppression is maintained even as gender equality is achieved through the integration of military occupational specialties.

I also explore how masculinity is not tied to men’s bodies and that some women can gain access the military’s “patriarchal dividends” (Connell 1995) by participating in combat roles. I

show how women with combat experience have more freedom of gender expression than other service-women. They can admit to being victims without having their insider status questioned. This shows that a more fluid military identity is possible for women who have achieved warrior masculinity, and that service-women can use masculinity to resist inequality. However, service-women who have achieved “honorary male” status are still targets of harassment. Therefore, the status that many service-women spend their military careers seeking does not grant them protection from harassment.

My intersectional approach allowed me to highlight how social location and military positions shape service-women’s experiences throughout their military careers. The military offers a range of economic, educational, health, and professional development benefits, but access to these benefits comes at different costs based on one’s social location. Social location shapes access to social benefits such as inclusion in the military family and being recipients of caregiving. I examine how women’s attempts at inclusion in the military family are shaped by age and rank, as older women who are either officers or non-commissioned officers act as fictive caretakers to gain access. I also highlight how, in a context where hierarchy is respected and valorized, it is important to consider institutional rank and position in intersectional analysis. Indeed, military occupational specialty and experience with combat shape inclusion in the family as well as the way women “do masculinity.” Therefore, MOS and combat experience shaped access to institutional narratives and interactional benefits which in turn shaped women’s responses to sexual harassment. Finally, I found that harassment experiences are gendered and raced, with women of color in my sample explaining more constant, persistent, experiences with unwanted sexual advances. Women of color also described being harassed by those who work under them. Stereotypes about women were used to label all service women and resist their

inclusion in military spaces; however, racialized labels were used to harass and marginalize women of color.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Bureaucratic harassment is likely to occur in other workplaces that are hierarchal, where there is a high level of discretion afforded to those in positions of power, and where there is a blending of work and personal life. Other military and paramilitary organizations such as military academies, police departments, and correctional facilities, as well as other top-down bureaucratic organizations such as some academic institutions and large corporations, are likely places where employees experience this kind of treatment. While the military has a variety of rules and regulations that commanders can manipulate, bureaucratic harassment could also be present in organizations where there is little administrative oversight and few institutional rules. For example, small businesses and start-up companies that lack clear rules for hiring, firing, promotion, and reporting harassment could be susceptible. In such organizations, those with bureaucratic power could easily draft a rule to damage someone's professional experience and career. Additionally, work environments where there is an expectation to work long hours, conduct work in "out-of-office settings" (Morgan and Martin 2006), and to attend social events with coworkers could be vulnerable to bureaucratic harassment because interactions in these settings can have professional consequences. Even within organizations that have a formal human resources department and established policies for reporting discrimination and harassment, power based on rank, skill, or social category can be translated into bureaucratic power and protection, especially when work is organized in smaller autonomous units such as teams. When these particular bureaucratic features are influenced by an organizational context that supports sexism and racism, it is likely that men will be situated in places of power and have

the ability to manipulate policies, rules, and regulations to undermine certain colleagues. Future research should explore the concept of bureaucratic harassment in these organizations and specifically ask about the bureaucratic dimensions to harassment in interviews. In addition, bureaucratic harassment is likely enacted against men of color, to police sexuality, and to constrain masculinity among men. Exploring how men from various social locations experience bureaucratic harassment may reveal more about the gendered and raced dynamics of military employment.

Although it was beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is clear that service-women's need to constantly prove their military identities against frequent challenge and rejection takes a psychological toll. Many of the women in my sample self-medicated with alcohol. Hardly any were seeking support through mental health services, likely because of both the stigma of mental health in the military and the ability for mental health records to be used against service-members, such as to medically separate service-members and withhold post service benefits. While research explores the mental health effects of military sexual assault and rape (Calhoun et al. 2018; Kimerling et al. 2010; Sadler et al. 2004; Skinner et al. 2000), future research should examine the mental health effects of harassment, identity dilemmas, and being cast in stigmatized identities. Future research should also qualitatively explore how service-women manage these mental health effects in the context of a near-total institution.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Existing research on sexual assault in the military has identified several barriers to reporting; including procedural barriers such as the discretion commanders have in investigating a case and confusing reporting procedures (Jeffreys 2007). Service-women also fear the consequences that they might experience for reporting, such as being further ostracized, being

separated from their units, and losing their jobs (Firestone and Harris 1999; Jeffreys 2007; Pershing 2003; Sadler et al. 2003). Additionally, service-women might not report because they do not anticipate a satisfactory response or they have come to view sexual harassment as acceptable behavior (Firestone and Harris 1999; Pershing 2003). While some of the service-women in my sample might not report harassment for these reasons, they also described additional barriers to reporting. Some women in the military do not confront or report harassment because not doing so helps them in other aspect of their military lives. Specifically, not reporting can signal a masculine identity that they hope will grant them access to the military family. Prior research has not considered that women might not report or stand up to harassment in order to protect their own masculine identities in a male dominated space. Women seeking insider status to a promised, but withheld, military family might have to make difficult choices in order to gain inclusion, one of which being whether to remain silent about harassment. Policies aimed at stopping harassment do not consider the fact that women's not-reporting is important for their masculine identity work and their attempts of inclusion in the military family. Therefore, policies should be updated to include the acknowledgement of interactional barriers to reporting identified in this dissertation. The Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program should be made aware of interactional barriers to reporting and disseminate this information to military leaders and commanders. Commanders could better promote a harassment-free work environment if they were informed of all types of the barriers to reporting.

In this dissertation, I show that the interactional level can undermine attempts at equality in the structural level. Previous scholarship suggests that the interactional level can also be a site of transformation (Deutsch 2007; Ridgeway and Correll 2000) and could therefore be used to address the military culture that is harmful to women. For example, prior research has found that

command climate can shape sexual abuse reporting within a unit (Firestone & Harris 2009; Miller 1997; Rosen & Martin 1997; Sadler et al. 2003). Sadler et al. (2003) found that if an officer allowed or engaged in sexist comments or behavior, service-women were more likely to be raped in those units. Similarly, Buchanan et al. (2014) found that when service-women felt that commanders did not tolerate harassment and were respectful of women in their units, they experienced less harassment and were more satisfied with their reporting outcomes. Therefore, commanders can promote healthy working environments with less sexual harm and re-shape masculine military culture (Buchanan et al. 2014; Sadler et al. 2003). I recommend that commanders receive training and implement strategies on how to promote a harassment-free and equal working environment. Importantly, this training should include identifying spatial and organizational contributors to harassment. For example, commanders could be trained to look out for and remove over-sexualized and hyper-masculine signage, decorations, and images around base. Additionally, commanders should be mindful of rank when making assignments for base sponsors, duty schedules, and work projects. Several of the women in my sample were made vulnerable to sexual violence because they were required to interact with service-men who far outranked them in isolated and intimate spaces. Commanders should also be trained on vulnerability to harassment and sexual assault based on social locations such as race, sexuality, and rank. For example, if commanders knew that women of color are more likely to be victims of contra-power harassment and seductive behavior, they can better target their interventions and responses. Further, commanders should set a tone that is intolerant of harassment, where they reprimand individuals who engage in harassing behaviors.

I recommend that sexual harassment and assault prevention training begin as soon as service-members enter the institution. If discussions of sexual assault are embedded into basic

training when service-members are learning other core military values it can begin the process of normalizing discussions of this type of victimization. Further, having drill instructors who are often hyper-masculine and aggressive discussing sexual assault prevention in a more informal style than a standard military training might create more engagement from trainees. Sexual assault and prevention training should also be more scenario-based and include a discussion of common victim feelings, reactions, and behaviors. Many of my participations shared Kelly's view that trainings on sexual assault tended to be "boring powerpoint lectures. Basically, checking a box that says sexual assault is bad, don't do it." The military should better integrate sexual assault prevention into informal discussions as well as formal trainings and should include discussions of sexual harassment behaviors as well.

My dissertation shows how bureaucratic harassment was used to limit women's power and participation in combat roles despite the military's gender integration programs and goals. Similarly, bureaucratic harassment can be used to continue other military policies that have been repealed, such as Don't Ask Don't Tell (repealed in 2011) and the ban on transgender people (lifted for active-duty service-members in 2016 but recently targeted by the Trump administration). Thus, while certain forms of harassment and exclusion are no longer legal on paper, the intersection of bureaucratic discretion and workplace harassment can allow the invisible continuation of these policies and perpetuate inequality on an organizational level. I recommend that military leaders and military lawyers be made aware of bureaucratic harassment so that the institution can begin to address it as a form of inequality. Recognizing that bureaucracy can be a tool used to cause harm is particularly important as many service-members might not explicitly identify their experiences as sexual harassment.

I also recommend that the military implement specialization among lawyers. In the military, lawyers can work in different areas of law every time they get a new billet. Therefore, one lawyer might start out working criminal law and then move to operational law or legal services. In the civilian world, lawyers focus on one type of law and can specialize within that based on experience. If military lawyers could specialize, they could spend their military legal careers developing skills and strategies for crimes that are difficult to prosecute, like sexual assault.

Additionally, the military has several policies related to sexual assault that are helpful to victims. These policies include access to expedited transfers for victims, access to free medical, legal, and counseling services, access to a victim advocate, access to a military lawyer specifically tasked with representing victims (Special Victims' Counsel or Victims' Legal Counsel), and the ability to report retaliation for documenting an incident of assault. Once a sexual assault has been reported, the military requires a coordinated approach where all parties that interact with the victim (commanders, lawyers, medical professionals, etc.) meet monthly at a case management group meeting to discuss the case status, victim progress, and services for the victim. However, a major obstacle to victims is access to these policies and programs. This dissertation shows how bureaucratic harassment can be used to keep individuals from reporting sexual assault and from accessing administrative channels that could help them. Commander discretion is a major factor in access to reporting channels. For example, recall Abigail who was sexually assaulted and promised an expedited transfer that prioritized her location preferences. While Abigail was transferred, it was thousands of miles from where she had asked to go and away from her support networks. Therefore, while the expedited transfer policy is important, access to this policy in a way that prioritizes victim preferences remains restricted. I recommend

that there be checks placed on commanders' discretion that do not have to be initiated by lower-ranking service-members. While "requesting mast" is a military policy that allows for individuals to go outside of the typical command structure, again, access to this policy can be denied by those in power. Therefore, I recommend that commanders' discretion be limited in evaluations and in implementing military policies.

Further, expediated transfer, along with many other services, are only available to sexual assault victims. This dissertation demonstrates how pervasive sexual harassment is in the military. Previous research suggests that high levels of sexual harassment within a unit and command support for harassment are correlated with higher frequencies of sexual assault in those units (Sadler et al. 2003). The Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program (SAPR) should be expanded to target sexual harassment through its trainings, programming, and services. For example, I recommend that expedited transfers be available to those facing sexual harassment as it can be so pervasive that service-women find their own ways to leave (recall Maura who got married in order to be transferred) to or end up leaving the military altogether. Importantly, two of the four women who stood up to sexual harassment without having been in combat or having experienced sexual violence were victim advocates trained under the SAPR program. Therefore, if the program targeted training towards more individuals under a wider scope, it would have the potential to change more service-members' understandings and responses to harassment.

Many of the service-women in my sample joined the military to escape negative situations. Some had experienced neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse before joining. This is consistent with the quantitative literature that suggests that women who join the military have higher percentages of childhood sexual victimization than their civilian counterparts (Bostock

and Daly 2007). This finding is not surprising given the fact that the military promotes itself as a place where members receive support, stability, and a family. Therefore, since the military's family narrative is particularly appealing to those escaping abuse, and because having been a victim of abuse is a risk factor for future victimization (Arata and Lindman 2002; Boney-McCoy and Finkelhor 1996; Desai et al. 2002; McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008), the military should be prepared to address prior victimization among its members. The institution should offer services targeted at addressing pre-military victimization such as counseling, support groups, and help lines. The military should also make information about common symptoms of and reactions to victimization (i.e. depression, PTSD, substance abuse, etc.) readily available so that individuals may be encouraged to seek help processing their trauma. In the civilian world, this is done through education programs in schools (Miller-Perrin et al. 2018). The military could include these discussions during training and commanders could provide frequent reminders, similar to how the military currently embeds discussions of suicide prevention into public dialogue (Department of Defense 2015). The institution currently encourages commanders, chaplains, military service-providers, and healthcare providers to promote healthy mindsets and to encourage help-seeking behaviors (Department of Defense 2015). Further, the military should work to de-stigmatize seeking mental health services for sexual assault.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations." *Gender & Society* 20(4): 441-64.
- . 1992. "From sex roles to gendered institutions." *Contemporary Sociology* 21(5): 565-70.
- . 1991. "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender & Society* 4(2):139-158.
- Adams, Jann. 1997. "Sexual harassment and Black women: A historical perspective." Pp. 213-224 in *Sexual harassment: theory, research, and treatment*, edited by William O'Donohue. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ainsworth, Susan, Alex Batty and Rosaria Burch. 2014. "Women constructing masculinity in volunteer firefighting." *Gender, Work & Organization* 21(1): 37-56.
- Antecol, Heather and Deborah Cobb-Clark. 2001. "Men, women and sexual harassment in the U.S. Military." *Gender Issues* 19(1): 3-18.
- Arata, Catalina and Linda Lindman. 2002. "Marriage, child abuse, and sexual revictimization." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(9): 953-971.
- Archer, Emerald. 2012. "The power of gendered stereotypes in the U.S. Marine Corps." *Armed Forces & Society* 39(2): 359-391.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth, A., Laura Hamilton, Elizabeth M. Armstrong and J. Lotus Seely. 2014. "'Good girls': Gender, social class, and slut discourse on campus." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77(2): 100-122.
- Barrett, Frank. 1996. "The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the U.S. Navy." *Gender, Work & Organization* 3(3): 129-42.
- Baldor, Lolita. 2015. "Officials: Marine Commandant Recommend Women be Banned from some Combat Jobs." *Marine Times*, 18 September.
<http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/story/military/2015/09/18/officials-marine-commandant-recommends-women-banned-some-combat-job/72421888/>
- Bartik, Warren, Helen Edwards, and Michael Kiernan. 2013. "Adolescent survivors after suicide: Australian young peoples' bereavement narratives." *Research Trends*. 34(3): 211-217.
- Bayard de Volo, Lorraine and Lynn Hall. 2015. "'I wish all the ladies were holes in the road: The U.S. Air Force Academy and the gendered continuum of violence.'" *Signs* 40(4): 865-89.
- Belknap, Joanne. 2015. *The Invisible Woman: Gender, Crime, and Justice, 4th Edition*. Belmont, CA. Cengage Learning.

- , 2010. "Rape: Too Hard to Report and Too Easy to Discredit Victims." *Violence Against Women* 16(12):1335-1344.
- Beauboeuf-Lafontant, Tamara. 2007. "'You have to show strength': An exploration of gender, race, and depression." *Gender & Society* 21(1): 28-51.
- Becker, Howard. 1996. "The epistemology of qualitative research." Pp. 53-72 in *Ethnography and Human Development: Context and Meaning in Social Inquiry*, edited by Richard Jessor, Anne Colby and Richard Shweder. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, Howard and Blanche Geer. 1960. "The analysis of qualitative field data." Pp. 652-660 in *Human Organization Research*, edited by Richard Adams and Joseph Preiss. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Becker, Gary. 1965. "A theory of the allocation of time." *Economic Journal* 75(299): 493– 517.
- Begley, Mary and Ethel Quayle. 2007. "The lived experience of adults bereaved by suicide: A phenomenological study." *Crisis*, 28(1): 26–34.
- Belkin, Aaron. 2012. *Bring me men: Military masculinity and the benign façade of the American empire, 1898-2001*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bell, Ella. 2004. "Myths, stereotypes, and realities of Black women: A personal reflection." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 40(2): 146-159.
- Berg, Bruce. 2009. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 7th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- , 2001. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 4th edition. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bielby, William. 2000. "Minimizing workplace gender and racial bias." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(1): 120-129.
- Bielby, William and James Baron. 1986. "Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(4): 759-799.
- Bobbitt-Zeher, Donna. 2011. "Gender discrimination at work: Connecting gender stereotypes, institutional policies, and gender composition of workplace." *Gender & Society* 25(6): 764-86.
- Boney-McCoy, Sue and David Finkelhor. 1996. "Is youth victimization related to trauma symptoms and depression after controlling for prior symptoms and family relationships? A longitudinal, prospective study." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 64(6), 1406-1416.

- Bostock, Deborah. J., and James Daley. 2007. "Lifetime and current sexual assault and harassment victimization rates of active-duty United States Air Force women." *Violence Against Women* 13(9): 927-944.
- Britton, Dana. 2000. "The epistemology of the gendered organization." *Gender & Society* 14(3): 418-34.
- Bryant, Clifton. 1979. *Khaki-collar crime*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bryant-Davis, Thema, Heewoon Chung, and Shaquita Tillman. 2009. "From the margins to the center: Mental health effects of sexual violence in ethnic minority women's lives." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 10(4): 330-357.
- Buchanan, NiCole, Isis Settles, Angela Hall, and Rachell O'Connor. 2014. "A review of organizational strategies for reducing sexual harassment: Insights from the U.S. Military." *Journal of Social Issues* 70(4): 687-702.
- Buchanan, NiCole. T. 2005. "The nexus of race and gender domination: The racialized Sexual harassment of African American women." Pp. 294-320 in *The Company of Men: Re-Discovering the Links between Sexual Harassment and Male Domination*, edited by James E. Gruber and Phoebe Morgan. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Buchanan, NiCole. T., Isis Settles, and Krystle Woods. 2008. "Comparing sexual harassment subtypes for Black and White women: double jeopardy, the Jezebel, and the cult of true womanhood." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 32(4):347-361.
- Bullock, Clayton and Mace Beckson. 2011. "Male victims of sexual assault: Phenomenology, psychology, physiology." *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry Law*, 39(2): 197-205.
- Burdett, Freda, Lynne Gouliquer, and Carmen Poulin. 2018. "Culture of corrections: The experiences of women correctional officers". *Feminist Criminology* 13(3): 329-349.
- Burk, James and Evelyn Espinoza. 2012. "Race relations within the U.S. Military." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38: 401-422.
- Burke, Peter. 1991. "Identity processes and social stress." *American Sociological Review* 56(6): 836-849.
- Burks, Derek. 2011. "Lesbian, gay, and bisexual victimization in the military: An unintended consequence of Don't Ask Don't Tell?" *American Psychologist* 66(7): 604-13.
- Burton, Christie. 2014. "Current perspective on the intersectionality of military women." Pp. 43-57 in *Undeserved Women of Color, Voice, and Resistance: Claiming a Seat at the Table*, edited by Sonja Brown Givens and Keisha. Edwards Tassie. New York: Lexington Books.

- Butler, John and James Schmidtke. 2010. "Theoretical traditions and the modeling of sexual harassment within organizations: The Military as Data." *Armed Forces & Society* 36(2): 193-222.
- Byron, Reginald and Vincent Roscigno. 2014. "Relational power, legitimation, and pregnancy discrimination." *Gender & Society* 28(3): 435-62.
- Cahill, Spencer. 1986. "Language practices and self-definition: The case of gender identity acquisition." *The Sociological Quarterly* 27 (3): 295-311.
- Calhoun, Patrick, Amie Schry, H. Ryan Wagner, Nathan Kimbrel, Lori Bastian, Jean Beckham, Harold Kudler, and Kristy Straits- Straits-Tröster. 2018. "The association between military sexual trauma and use of VA and non-VA health care services among female veterans with military service in Iraq or Afghanistan." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 33(15): 2439-2464.
- Callahan, Jamie L. 2009. "Manifestations of power and control: training as the catalyst for scandal at the United States Air Force Academy." *Violence Against Women* 15(10): 1149-1168.
- Campbell, Rebecca. 2002. *Emotionally Involved: The Impact of Researching Rape*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Campbell, Rebecca and Adrienne Adams. 2009. "Why do rape survivors volunteer for face-to-face interviews?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 395-405.
- Campbell, Rebecca, Adrienne Adams, Sharon Wasco, Courtney Ahrens and Tracy Sefl. 2008. "Training interviewers for research on sexual violence." *Violence Against Women* 15(5): 595-617.
- Cast, Alicia. 2003. "Power and the ability to define the situation." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66(3): 185-201.
- Chappell, Allison and Lon Lanza-Kaduce. 2010. "Police academy socialization: Understanding the lessons learned in a paramilitary-bureaucratic organization." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 39(2): 187-214.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- . 2000. "Constructivist and objectivist grounded theory." Pp. 509-535 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- . 1994. "Identity dilemmas of chronically ill men." *Sociological Quarterly* 35(2): 269-288.

- Chasteen, Amy L. 2001. "Constructing Rape: Feminism, Change, and Women's Everyday Understandings of Sexual Assault." *Sociological Spectrum* 21(2):101-139.
- Cherlin, Andrew. 2002. *Public and private families: An introduction*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Citroën, Linda. 2018. "Why veterans must relearn the concept of trust." *Military.com*.
<https://www.military.com/veteran-jobs/career-advice/military-transition/why-veterans-must-relearn-the-concept-of-trust.html>
- Clark, James. 2016. "The Crucible is where Marines are made and here's how." *Task & Purpose*, 3 May. <https://taskandpurpose.com/crucible-marines-made-heres/>
- Coffey, Amanda and Paul Atkinson. 1996. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, Laurie, and Janet Swim. 1995. "The differential impact of gender ratios on women and men: Tokenism, self-confidence, and expectations." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 21(9): 876–883.
- Cohn, Carol. 2000. "'How can she claim equal rights when she doesn't have to do as many push-ups as I do?': The framing of men's opposition to women's equality in the military." *Men and Masculinities* 3(2):131-151.
- Collett, Jessica, Kelcie Vercel and Olevia Boykin. 2015. "Using identity processes to understand persistent inequality in parenting." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 78(4): 345-364.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2004. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- . 2000. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- . 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2005. "The social organization of masculinity." Pp 67-88 in *Masculinities Second Edition*, Raewyn Connell. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge, Polity Press; Sydney, Allen & Unwin; Berkeley, University of California Press. Second edition, 2005.
- . 1987. *Gender and Power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell Raewyn. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept." *Gender & Society*. 19(6): 829– 859

- Cook, Clarissa and Malcolm Waters. 1998. "The impact of organizational form on gendered labour markets in engineering and law." *Sociological Review* 46(2): 314-339.
- Cooley, Charles Horton. 1902. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Copp, Tara. 2018. "Here's Mattis' full response to VMI cadets on women in infantry." *Military Times*, 26 September. <https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2018/09/26/heres-mattis-full-response-to-vmi-cadets-on-women-in-infantry/>
- Corbin, Juliet and Anselm Strauss. 2008. *Basics of Qualitative Research*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coyle, Bonnie, Diana Wolan, and Andrea Van Horn. 1996. "The prevalence of physical and sexual abuse in women's veterans seeking care at a Veterans Affairs Medical Center." *Military Medicine* 161(10): 588-593.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1992. "Race, gender, and sexual harassment." *Southern California Law Review* 65: 1467-76.
- . 1991. "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color." *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241-99.
- . 1989. "De-marginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and anti-racist politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140:139-167.
- Cromwell, Paul and Quint Thurman. 2003. "The devil made me do it: Use of neutralization by shoplifters." *Deviant Behavior* 24(6): 535-550.
- Crutcher, Jericho. 2014. New Marine Knows Meaning of Brotherhood. *Marine News*, 29 August. <https://www.marines.mil/News/News-Display/Article/496690/?new-marine-knows-meaning-of-brotherhood>
- Culbertson, Amy and Paul Rosenfeld. 1994. "Assessment of sexual harassment in the active-duty Navy." *Military Psychology* 6(2): 69-93.
- Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women Race and Class*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Dellinger, Kirsten. 2004. "Masculinities in 'safe and 'embattled' organizations: Accounting for pornographic and feminist magazines." *Gender & Society* 18(5): 545-566.
- Delsing, Marc and van Aken, Marcel. 2005. "Family loyalty and adolescent problem behavior: The validity of the family group effect." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 15(2): 127-150.

- Denissen, Amy M. 2010. "The right tools for the job: Constructing gender meanings and identities in the male-dominated building trades." *Human Relations* 63(7): 1051-69.
- Denissen, Amy and Abigail Saguy. 2014. "Gendered homophobia and the contradictions of workplace discrimination for women in the building trades." *Gender & Society* 28(3): 381-403.
- Desai, Sujata, Ileana Arias, Martie Thompson & Kathleen Basile. 2002. "Childhood victimization and subsequent adult revictimization assessed in a nationally representative sample of women." *Violence and Victims* 17(6): 639–653.
- Denzin, Norman and Yvonna Lincoln. 1994. "Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research." Pp. 1-18 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Department of Defense. 2016. Demographics Profile of the Military Community. Accessed: <http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2016-Demographics-Report.pdf>
- , 2015. Department of Defense Strategy for Suicide Prevention. http://www.dspo.mil/Portals/113/Documents/TAB%20B%20-%20DSSP_FINAL%20USD%20PR%20SIGNED.PDF
- , 2012. Sexual assault prevention and response report, Fiscal Year 2012. http://sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/FY12_DoD_SAPRO_Annual_Report_on_Sexual_Assault-VOLUME_ONE.pdf
- , 2011 April. "Department of Defense Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military." http://www.sapr.mil/media/pdf/reports/Department_of_Defense_Fiscal_Year_2011_Annual_Report_on_Sexual_Assault_in_the_Military.pdf. Accessed April 2013.
- Department of the Navy, Headquarters United States Marine Corps. 2018. "Marine Corps Uniform Regulations." Accessed at <https://www.marines.mil/Portals/59/Publications/MCO%201020.34H%20v2.pdf?ver=2018-06-26-094038-137>
- Department of the Navy. Navy Civilian Attire Policy. <http://www.cusnc.navy.mil/Civilian-Attire-Policy>
- Deutsch Nancy. 2004. "Positionality and the pen: Reflections on the process of becoming a feminist researcher and writer." *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(6):885–902.
- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How institutions think*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

- Drake, Monika. 2006. "Ambivalence at the academies: Attitudes toward women in the military at the Federal Service." *Social Thought & Research* 27: 43-68.
- Draper, Deborah. 2011. "Defense health care: Status of efforts to address lack of compliance with personality disorder separation requirements. Personality disorder discharges: Impact on veterans' benefits hearing." *House Committee on Veteran Affairs*.
<http://archives.veterans.house.gov/hearings/Testimony.aspx?TID=3192&Newsid=2266&Name=%20Debra%20A.%20Draper,%20Ph.D.,%20M.S.H.A>
- Deutsch, Francine. 2007. "Undoing gender." *Gender & Society* 21(1): 106-127.
- Dunivin, Karen. 1994. "Military culture: change and continuity." *Armed Forces & Society* 20(4): 531-547.
- Dunn, Jennifer. 2010. *Judging Victims: Why We Stigmatize Survivors and How They Reclaim Respect*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publications.
- , 2005. "'Victims' and 'Survivors': Emerging Vocabularies of Motive for 'Battered Women Who Stay.'" *Sociological Inquiry* 75(1): 1-30.
- Dunn, Jennifer and S. J. Creek. 2015. "Identity Dilemmas: Toward a More Situated Understanding." *Symbolic Interaction* 38(2): 261-284.
- Eagan, Daniel. 2012. "Documenting Sexual Assault in the Invisible War." *Smithsonian.com* 22 June. <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/documenting-sexual-assault-in-the-invisible-war-135440379/>
- Ebaugh, Helen and Mary Curry. 2000. "Fictive kin as social capital in new immigrant communities." *Sociological Perspectives*, 43(2): 189-209.
- Emerson, Robert. 2001. *Contemporary Field Research: Perspectives and Formulations*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, INC.
- Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2000. *maneuvers: The international politics of militarizing women's lives*. Berkeley: university of California Press.
- , 1993. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- , 1983. *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarisation of Women's Lives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Esterberg, Kristin G. 2002. *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

- Ezzell, Michael. "Barbie Dolls on the Pitch: Identity Work, Defensive Othering and Inequality in Women's Rugby." *Social Problems* 56(1): 111-131.
- Ferguson, Kathy. 1984. *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fine, Michelle, Lois Weis, Susan, Weseen, and Loonmun Wong. 2000. "For Whom? Qualitative Research Representations and Social Responsibilities." Pp. 107-131 in *Handbook for Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Finkelhor, David and Richard Ormrod. 2001. "Factors in the underreporting of crimes against juveniles." *Child Maltreatment* 6(3): 219-229.
- Firestone, Juanita and Richard Harris. 2009. "Sexual harassment in the U.S. Military Reserve component: A preliminary analysis." *Armed Forces & Society* 36(1): 86-102.
- , 1999. "Changes in Patterns of Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military: A Comparison of the 1988 and 1995 DoD Survey." *Armed Forces & Society*, 25(4): 613-632.
- , 1994. "Sexual harassment in the U.S. Military: individualized and environmental contexts." *Armed Forces & Society* 21(1): 25-43.
- Fleisher, Mark and Jessie Krienert. 2009. *The myth of prison rape: Sexual culture in American prisons*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Fontana, Andrea and James Frey. 1994. "Interviewing: The art of science." Pp. 361-76 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- French, Sandra L. 2003. "Reflections on healing: Framing strategies utilized by acquaintance rape survivors." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 31:298-319.
- Furia, Stacie. 2010. "Navigating the boundaries: Army women in training." Pp. 107-126 in *Gender and Sexuality in the Workplace*, edited by Christine Williams and Kirsten Dellinger. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- García-López, Gladys. 2008. "'Nunca te toman en cuenta [They never take you into account]': The challenges of inclusion and strategies for success of Chicana attorneys." *Gender & Society* 22(5): 590-612
- Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- . 1961. *Asylums*. London, UK: Penguin.
- . 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Grillo, Trina. 1995. "Anti-essentialism and intersectionality: Tools to dismantle the master's house." *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 10(1):16-30.
- Guthrie, Doug and Louise Roth. 1999. "The state, courts, and equal opportunities for female CEOs in U.S. organizations: Specifying institutional mechanisms." *Social Forces* 78(2): 511-542.
- Hale, Hannah. 2012. "The Role of practice in the development of military masculinities." *Gender, Work & Organization* 19(6): 699–722.
- . 2008. "The Development of British military masculinities through symbolic resources." *Culture and Psychology* 14(3): 305-332.
- Hall, Gwendolyn. 1999. "Intersectionality: A necessary consideration for women of color in the military?" Pp. 143-161. In *Beyond Zero Tolerance*, edited by Mary Katzenstein and Judith Reppy. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hall, Lynn. 2017. *Caged Eyes: An Air Force Cadet's Story of Rape and Resilience*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Halvorson, Angela. 2010. "Understanding the military: The institution, the culture, and the people." Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/military_white_paper_final.pdf
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14(2): 575-599.
- Harned, Melanie, Alayne Ormerod, Patrick Palmieri, Lunda Collinsworth, and Maggie Reed. 2002. "Sexual assault and other types of sexual harassment by workplace personnel: A comparison of antecedents and consequences." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 7(2): 174-188.
- Harrison, Deborah. 2003. "Violence in the military community." Pp 71-90 in *Military Masculinities Identity and the State*, edited by Paul Higate. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Hay, Mary Sue, and Timothy Elig. 1999. "The 1995 Department of Defense sexual harassment survey: Overview and methodology." *Military Psychology* 11(3): 233-242.

- Hennen, Peter. 2001. "Powder, pomp, power: Toward a typology and genealogy of effeminacies" *Social Thought and Research*. 24(1&2): 121-144.
- Higate, Paul and Alisa Cameron. 2006. "Reflexivity and researching the military." *Armed Forces & Society* 32(2): 219-233.
- Higate, Paul. 2002. "Traditional gendered identities: National service and the all-volunteer Force." *Comparative Social Research* 20: 229-235.
- Hinojosa, Ramon. 2010. "Doing hegemony: Military, men, and constructing a hegemonic masculinity." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 18(2): 179-194.
- Hlavka, Heather. 2014. "Normalizing sexual violence: Young women account for harassment and abuse." *Gender & Society* 28(3): 337-58.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1979. "Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85(3):551-575.
- Hockey, John. 2003. "No more heroes: masculinity in the infantry." Pp. 15-25 in *Military Masculinities Identity and the State*, edited by Paul Higate. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Holmes, Janet and Meredith Marra 2002. "Over the edge? Subversive humor between colleagues and friends." *Humor* 15:65-87.
- Holstein, James and Jaber Gubrium. 1995a. "Deprivatization and the construction of domestic life." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57(4): 894-908.
- , 1995b. *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Holstein, James and Jaber Gubrium. 1999. "What is family?" *Marriage and Family Review* 28(3-4): 3-20.
- Hoyt, Tim, Jennifer Klosterman Rielage, and Lauren F. Williams. 2011. "Military sexual trauma in men: A review of reported rates." *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation* 12(3): 244-260.
- Hutchings, Kimberly. 2008. "Making sense of masculinity and war." *Men and Masculinities* 10(4): 389-404.
- Jeffrey, Nicole and Paula Barata. 2017. "'He didn't necessarily force himself upon me, but...': women's lived experiences of sexual coercion in intimate relationships with men." *Violence Against Women* 23(8): 911-933.
- Jeffreys, Shelia. 2007. "Double jeopardy: Women, the U.S. Military and the war in Iraq." *Women's Studies International Forum* 30(1): 16-25.

- Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1988. "Bargaining with patriarchy." *Gender & Society* 2(3):274-90
- Kane, Emily. 2006. "No way my boys are going to be like that: Parents' resistance to Children's Gender non-conformity." *Gender & Society* 20(2): 149-176.
- Kanter, Rosabeth. 1977a. *Men and women of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- .. 1977b. "Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(5):965-990.
- Kaufman, Peter. 2003. "Learning to not labor: How working-class individuals construct middle-class identities." *The sociological quarterly* 44(3):481-504.
- Keddie, Amanda. 2005. "On fighting and football: gender justice and theories of identity construction." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 18(4): 425-444.
- Kimmel, Michael. 2011. "Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity." Pp. 134-51 in *Theorizing Masculinities, The Social*
- .. 2000. "SAVING the MALES: the sociological implications of the Virginia Military Institute and The Citadel." *Gender & Society* 14(4):494-516.
- .. 1994. "Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity." Pp. 119-141 in *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by H. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kimerling, Rachel, Amy Street, Joanne Pavao, Mark Smith, Ruth Cronkite, Tyson Holmes, and Susan Frayne. 2010. "Military-related sexual trauma among Veterans Health Administration patients returning from Afghanistan and Iraq." *American Journal of Public Health* 100: 1409-1412.
- Kleinman, Sherryl. 2007. *Feminist Fieldwork Analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Koeszegi, Sabine, Eva Zedlacher, and Rene Hudribusch. 2014. "The war against the female soldier? The effects of masculine culture on workplace aggression." *Armed Forces & Society* 40(2): 226-251.
- Kotthoff, Helga. 2006. "Gender and humor: The state of the art." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(1): 4-25.
- Kupenda, Angela. 2012. "Facing down the spooks." Pp. 20-29 in *Presumed Incompetent: The intersections of Race and Class for women in Academia*, edited by Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs, Yolanda Niemann, Carmen Gonzalez, and Angela Harris. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

- Letherby, Gayle. 2003. *Feminist research in theory and practice*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Lever, Janet. 1976. "Sex difference in the games children play." *Social Problems* 23(4): 478-487.
- Lindsay, Patrick. 2013. *The spirit of Gallipoli: The birth of the Anzac legend*. London: Hardie-Grant Books.
- Lofland, John, David A. Snow, Leon Anderson, and Lyn Lofland. 2006. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Australia: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Longley, Kyle. 2015. *Grunts: The American combat soldier in Vietnam*. New York: Routledge.
- Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1994. "Rape Myths in Review." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18(2):133-164.
- Lorber, Judith 1998. "Beyond the binaries: Depolarizing the categories of sex, sexuality and gender." Pp. 15-25 in *Contemporary Feminist Thought* edited by Mary Evans. New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.
- Lugo-Lugo, Carmen. 2012. "A prostitute, a servant, and a customer service representative: A Latina in academia" in *Presumed Incompetent: The intersections of Race and Class for women in Academia*, edited by Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs, Yolanda Niemann, Carmen Gonzalez, and Angela Harris. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Mackinnon, Catharine. 1979. *Sexual harassment of working women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 1982. "Feminism, Marxism, method and the state: An agenda for theory." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 7 (13): 515-44.
- MacLeish, Kenneth. 2013. "Armor and anesthesia: Exposure, feeling, and the soldier's body." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 26(1) 49-68.
- Macy, Rebecca J., Mary C. Giattina, Susan L. Parish and Carmen Crosby. 2010. "Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services Historical Concerns and Contemporary Challenges." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25(1):3-32.
- Maier, Mark, and James W. Messerschmidt. 1998. "Conflicts and contradictions in organizational masculinities: Exploring the gendered genesis of the *Challenger* disaster." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 35(3): 25-44.
- Marine Corps. 2012. USMC Fitness Report. United States Marine Corps.
https://dmna.ny.gov/forms/naval/NAVMC_10835_EF_5334.pdf

- Martin, Karin. 1998. "Becoming a gendered body: practices of preschools." *American Sociological Review* 63(4): 494-511.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey. 2013. "Sociologists for women in society: A feminist bureaucracy?" *Gender & Society* 27(3): 281-93.
- , 2003. "'Said and done' versus 'saying and doing': Gendering practices, practicing gender at work." *Gender & Society* 17(3): 342-66.
- , 2004. "Gender as a social institution." *Social Forces* 82: 1249-1273.
- , 2001. "Mobilizing masculinities: Women's experiences of men at work." *Organization* 8(4): 587-618.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey and Robert Hummer. 1989. "Fraternities and rape on campus." *Gender & Society* 3(4): 457-73.
- Martin, Susan Ehrlich. 1982. *Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Martin, Susan Ehrlich and Nancy Jurik. 2007. *Doing Justice, Doing Gender: Women in Legal and Criminal Justice Occupations 2nd edition*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- McClain, Natalie, Kathryn Laughon, Richard Steeves, and Barbara Parker. 2007. "Balancing the needs of the scientist and the subject in trauma research." *Western Journal of Nursing Research* 29(1): 121-128.
- McClure, Stephanie. M. 2006. "Improvising masculinity: African American fraternity membership in the construction of a Black masculinity." *Journal of African American Studies* 10(1): 57-73.
- McCoyd, Judith and Corey Shdaimah. 2007. "Revisiting the benefits debate: Does qualitative social work research produce salubrious effects?" *Social Work* 52(4): 340-349.
- McDaniels-Wilson, Cathy and Joanne Belknap. 2008. "The extensive sexual violation and sexual abuse histories of incarcerated women." *Violence Against Women* 14(10): 1090-1127.
- McGuffey, C. Shawn and B. Lindsay Rich. 1999. "Playing in the gender transgression zone: Race, class and hegemonic masculinity in middle childhood." *Gender & Society* 13(5): 6-8-627.
- McKinney, Kathleen. 1992. "Contrapower sexual harassment: The effects of student sex and type of behavior on faculty perceptions." *Sex Roles* 27(11-12): 627- 643.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a social Behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Mercado, Rowena, Melissa Foynes, S. Louisa Carpenter, and Katherine Iverson. 2015. "Sexual intimate partner violence as a form of MST: An initial investigation." *Psychological Services* 12(4): 348-356.
- Merton, Robert. 1972. "Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(1): 9-47.
- Miller, Laura. 1997. "Not just weapons of the weak: Gender harassment as a form of protest for Army men." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60(1): 32-52.
- Miller, Jody and Rod Brunson. 2000. "Gender dynamics in youth gangs: A Comparison of males' and females' accounts." *Justice Quarterly* 17(3):419-448.
- Miller-Perrin, Cindy, Robin Perrin, and Claire Renzetti. 2018. *Violence and Maltreatment in Intimate Relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Military.com (2018a). Marine Corps Boot Camp Timeline At a Glance. <https://www.military.com/join-armed-forces/marine-corps-boot-camp-schedule.html>
- Military.com. (2018b). Military Benefits at a Glance. <https://www.military.com/join-armed-forces/military-benefits-overview.html>
- Militaryspot.com (2018). Marine Corps—Benefits. <http://www.militaryspot.com/marines/marine-corps-benefits>
- Mitra Nishi. 2013. "Intimate violence, family, and femininity: Women's narratives on their construction of violence and self." *Violence Against Women* 19(10): 1282-1301.
- Moore, Brenda. 2002. "The propensity of junior enlisted personnel to remain in today's military." *Armed Forces & Society* 28(2): 257-278.
- . 1996. *To Serve My Country, to Serve My Race: The Story of the Only African American WACS Stationed Overseas During World War II*. New York: New York University Press.
- . 1991. "African American women in the U.S. Military." *Armed Forces & Society* 17(3): 363-384.
- Moore, Brenda, and Schuyler Webb. 1998. "Equal Opportunity in the US Navy: Perceptions of Active-Duty African American Women." *Gender Issues* 16(3): 99-119.
- Moore, Dahlia. 1999. "Gender traits and identities in a 'masculine' organization: the Israeli Police Force." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 139(1): 49-68.

- Moore, Mignon R. 2008. "Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision making in Black, lesbian stepfamilies." *American Sociological Review* 73(2): 335-356.
- Morris, Madeline. 1996. "By force of arms: Rape, war, and military culture." *Duke Law Journal* 45(4): 651-781.
- Muraco, Anna. 2006. "Intentional families: Fictive kin ties between cross-gender, different sexual orientation friends." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68(5): 1313-1325
- Noaks, Lesley and Emma Wincup. 2004. *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Noll, Jennie, Lisa Horowitz, George Bonanno, Penelope Trickett, and Frank Putnam. 2003. "Revictimization and self-harm in females who experienced childhood sexual abuse." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18(12): 1452-1471.
- Nuttbrock, Larry and Patricia Freudiger. 1991. "Identity salience and motherhood: A test of Stryker's theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 54(2):146-157.
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense. 2015. Population representation in the military services. <https://www.cna.org/pop-rep/2015/contents/contents.html>
- O'Neill, William. 1998. "Sex scandals in the gender integrated military." *Gender Issues* 16(1-2): 64-85.
- Ontiveros, Maria. 1993. "Three perspectives on workplace harassment of women of color" *Golden Gate University Law Review* 23(3): 817-828.
- Pascoe, C.J. 2005. "'Dude, you're a fag': Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse." *Sexualities* 8(3): 329-346.
- Payne, Elizabeth. 2010. "Sluts: Heteronormative policing in the stories of lesbian youth." *Educational Studies* 46(3): 317-36.
- Pershing, Jana. 2003. "Why women don't report sexual harassment: A case study of an elite military institution." *Gender Issues* 21(4): 3-30.
- Pessin, Hayley, Michele Galietta, Christian Nelson, Robert Brescia, Barry Rosenfeld, and William Breitbart. 2008. "Burden and benefit of psychosocial research at the end of life." *Journal of Palliative Medicine* 11(4): 627-632.
- Peterson, Zoe and Charlene Muehlenhard. 2010. "Conceptualizing the wantedness of women's consensual and non-consensual sexual experiences: Implications for how women label their experiences with rape." Pp. 525-540 in *Speaking of Sexuality: Interdisciplinary*

Readings 3rd edition, edited by Nelwyn Moore, J. Kenneth Davidson, Sr and Terri D. Fisher. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Pharr, Suzanne. 1997. *Homophobia: A Weapon of Sexism*. Berkeley, CA: Chardon Press.
- Potter, Hillary. 2015. *Intersectionality and Criminology*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2008. *Battle Cries: Black Women and Intimate Partner Abuse*. New York: NY: NYU Press.
- Potter, Hillary and Devon Thacker Thomas. 2012. "We told you that's how they are": Responses to white women in abusive intimate relationships with men of color. *Deviant Behavior* 33(6): 469-491
- Powers, Rob. 2018. "US Military housing barracks and housing allowance: What the recruiter never told you about military Housing." *The Balance Careers*, 5 February. <https://www.thebalance.com/what-the-recruiter-never-told-you-3332705>
- Prokos, Anna, and Irene Padavic. 2002. "'There oughta be a law against bitches'": Masculinity lessons in police academy training." *Gender, Work and Organization* 9(4): 439-59.
- Putnam, Linda and Dennis Mumby. 1993. "Organizations, emotion and the myth of rationality." Pp. 36-57 In *Emotion in Organizations*, edited by Stephen Fineman. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pyke, Karen. 1996. "Class-based masculinities: The interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power." *Gender & Society* 10(5): 527-549.
- Pyke, Karen and Tran Dang. 2003. "'FOB' and 'whitewashed': Identity and internalized Racism among second generation Asian Americans." *Qualitative Sociology* 27(2): 147-72.
- Quester, Aline and Curtis Gilroy. 2002. "Women and minorities in America's volunteer military." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 20(2): 111-121.
- Rabe-Hemp, Cara. 2009. "POLICEwomen or PoliceWOMEN? Doing gender and police work." *Feminist Criminology* 4(2): 114-129.
- Razack, Sherene. 1994. "What is to be gained by looking White people in the eye? Culture, race, and gender in cases of sexual violence." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19(4): 894-923.
- Reddy, Madhavi, Matthew Fleming, Nicolette Howells, Mandy Rabenhorst, R. Mitch Casselman, and Alan Rosenbaum. 2006. "Effect of method on participants and disclosure rates in research on sensitive topics." *Violence and Victims* 21(4): 499-506.

- Redmond, S. A., Wilcox, S. L., Campbell, S., Kim, A., Finney, K., Barr, K., & Hassan, A. M. 2015. "A brief introduction to the military workplace culture." *Work*, 50, 9-20.
- Reskin, Barbara. 2000. "Getting it right: Sex and race inequality in work organizations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 707-709.
- . 1988. "Bringing men back in: Sex differentiation and the devaluation of women's work." *Gender & Society* 2(1): 58-81.
- Richards, Kelly. 2011. "Misperceptions about child sex offenders." *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice* 429: 1-8.
- Ricks, Thomas. 2017. "After all this time, the military is continuing to hide its rape problem." *Foreign Policy* 5 October. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/10/05/after-all-this-time-the-military-is-continuing-to-hide-its-rape-problem/>
- Ridgeway, Cecelia, and Shelley Correll. 2004. "Motherhood as a status characteristic." *Journal of Social Issues* 60(4): 683-700.
- . 2000. "Limiting inequality through interaction: The end(s) of gender." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(1): 110-120.
- Risman, Barbara. 2004. "Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism." *Gender & Society* 18(4): 429-450.
- Rock, Paul. 2001. "Symbolic interactionism and ethnography." Pp. 26-38 in *Handbook for Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, Jon Lofland and Lyn Lofland. London: Sage Publications.
- Rohall, David, Morten Ender, and Michael Matthews. 2006. "The effects of military affiliations, gender and the political ideology on attitudes toward the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq." *Armed Forces & Society* 33(1): 59-77.
- Rosen, Leora, Kathryn H. Knudson, and Peggy Fancher. 2004. "Cohesion and the culture of hyper-masculinity in U.S. Army units." *Armed Forces & Society* 29(3): 325-51.
- Rosen, Leora and Lee Martin. 1997. "Sexual harassment, cohesion, and combat readiness in U.S. Army support units." *Armed Forces & Society* 24(2): 221-244.
- Rospenda, Kathleen, Judith Richman, and Stephanie Nawyn. 1998. "Doing power: The confluence of gender, race, and class, in contrapower sexual harassment." *Gender & Society* 12(1): 40-60.
- Rosenbaum, Alan, Mandy Rabenhorst, Madhavi Reddy, Matthew Fleming, and Nicolette Howells, N. L. 2006. "A comparison of methods for collecting self-report data on sensitive topics." *Violence and Victims* 21(4): 461-471.

- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Russell, Diana. 1984. *Sexual Exploitation: Rape, Child Sexual Abuse, and Workplace Harassment*. Beverly Hills: CA, Sage Publications.
- Sadler, Anne, Brenda Booth, Brian Cook, and Bradley Doebbeling. 2003. "Factors associated with women' risk of rape in the military environment." *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 43(3): 262-273.
- Sadler, Anne, Brenda Booth, Michelle Mengeling, and Bradley Doebbeling. 2004. "Life span and repeated violence against women during military service: Effects on health status and outpatient utilization." *Journal of Women's Health* 13(7): 799-811.
- Sanchez-Hucles, Janis. 1997. "Jeopardy not bonus status for African American women in the work force: Why does the myth of advantage persist?" *American Journal of Community Psychology* 25(5): 565-580.
- Sands, Diana., and Mark Tennant. 2010. "Transformative learning in the context of suicide bereavement." *Adult Education Quarterly* 60(2): 99-121.
- Sasson Levy, Orna. 2011a. "Research on gender and the military in Israel: From a gendered organization to inequality Regimes." *Israel Studies Review* 26(2): 73-98.
- Sasson-Levy, Orna. 2011b. The military in a globalized environment: Perpetuating an "extremely gendered" organization. In *Handbook of gender, work and organization*, edited by Emma Jeanes, David Knights, and Patricia Yancey Martin. Maldon, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Sasson Levy, Orna. 2006. *Identities in Uniform: Masculinities and Femininities in the Israeli Military*. Jerusalem: Eshkolot Series, Magnes Press.
- , 2003a. "Feminism and military gender practices: Israeli women soldiers in 'masculine' roles." *Sociological Inquiry* 73(3): 440-465.
- , 2003b. "Military, masculinity and citizenship: Tensions and contradictions in the experience of blue-collar soldiers' identities." *Global Studies in Culture and Power* 10(3): 319-345.
- Scheirs Veerle and An Nuytiens. 2013. "Ethnography and emotions: The myth of the cold and objective scientist." Pp 141-160 in *The Pains of Doing Criminological Research* edited by Kristel Beyens, Jenneke Christiaens, Bart Claes, Steven De Ridder, Hanne Tournel, and Hilde Tubex. Brussels: VUB Press.

- Schrock, Douglas. and Michael Schwalbe. 2009. "Men, masculinity, and manhood acts." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35(1): 277–95.
- Schilt, Kristen. 2006. "Just one of the guys? How transmen Make gender visible at work." *Gender & Society* 20(4): 465-490.
- Schilt, Kristen and Laurel Westbrook. 2009. "Doing gender, doing heteronormativity: 'gender normals,' transgender people and the social maintenance of heterosexuality." *Gender & Society* 23(4): 440-464.
- Schippers, Mimi. 2007. "Recovering the feminine others: masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony." *Theory and Society* 36(1): 85-102.
- , 2002. *Rockin' out of the box : Gender maneuvering in alternative hard rock*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Schur, Edwin M. 1984. *Labeling Women Deviant: Gender, Stigma, and Social Control*. New York: Random House.
- Schwalbe, Michael. and Douglas Mason-Schrock. 1996. "Identity work as group process." Pp. 113–147 in *Advances in Group Processes*, edited by Barry Markovsky, Michael Lovaglia, and Robin Simon. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Schwalbe, Michael, Sandra Godwin, Daphne Holden, Douglas Schrock, Shealy Thompson, and Michelle Wolkomir. 2000. "Generic processes in the reproduction of inequality: An interactionist analysis." *Social Forces* 79(2): 419–52.
- Schwerdtfeger, Kami. 2009. "The appraisal of quantitative and qualitative trauma-focused research procedures among pregnant participants." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 4(4): 39-51.
- Schwerdtfeger, Kami and Briana Goff. 2008. "The effects of trauma-focused research on pregnant female participants." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 3(1): 59-67.
- Scully, Diana and Joseph Marolla. 1984. "Convicted rapists' vocabulary of motives: Excuses and justifications." *Social Problems* 31(5): 530-544.
- Sedlak, A.J., Mettenburg, J., Basena, M., Petta, I., McPherson, K., Greene, A., and Li, S. 2010. *Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4): Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.
- Shanker, Thom. 2008. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Hits Women Much More." *The New York Times*, 23 June. <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/23/washington/23pentagon.html>

- Shields, Chris, Michele Kavanagh, and Kate Russo. 2017. A qualitative systematic review of the bereavement process following suicide. *OMEGA—Journal of Death and Dying* 74(4): 426–454.
- Silva, Jennifer. 2008. “A new generation of women? How female ROTC cadets Negotiate the tension between masculine military culture and traditional femininity.” *Social Forces* 87(2): 937-959.
- Sims, Carra, Fritz Drasgow, and Louise Fitzgerald. 2005. “The effects of sexual harassment on turnover in the military: Time-dependent modeling.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(6): 1141–1152.
- Skinner, Katherine, Nancy Kressin, Susan Frayne, Tara Tripp, Cheryl Hankin, Donald Miller, and Lisa Sullivan. 2000. “The prevalence of military sexual assault among female veterans' administration outpatients.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 15(3): 291-310.
- Smith, Andrea 2005. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- Snow, David and Leon Anderson. 1987. “Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities.” *American Journal of Sociology* 92(6): 1336–1371.
- Snyder, Claire. 1999. *Citizen-Soldier and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republic Tradition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Stets, Jan. 2005. “Examining emotions in identity theory.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1): 39-56.
- Stets, Jan and Peter Burke. 2005. “Identity verification, control, and aggression in marriage.” *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 68(2): 160-178.
- Stets, Jan and Peter Burke. 2000. “Identity theory and social identity theory.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(3) :224–37.
- Stets, Jan and Michael Carter. 2011. “The moral self: Applying identity theory.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 74(2): 192–215.
- Stack, Carol, B. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in the Black Community*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 1980. *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Palo Alto, CA: Benjamin/Cummings.

- Stryker, Sheldon and Peter Burke. 2000. "The past, present and future of an identity theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(4): 284-297.
- Tester, Griff. 2008. "An intersectional analysis of sexual harassment in housing." *Gender & Society* 22(3): 349-66.
- Texeira, Mary. 2002. "'Who protects and serves me?': A case study of sexual harassment of African American women in one U.S. law enforcement agency." *Gender & Society* 16(4): 524-45.
- Tilghman, Andrew. 2015. "All Combat Jobs Open to Women in the Military." *Military Times*, 3 December 3. <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/pentagon/2015/12/03/carter-telling-military-open-all-combat-jobs-women/76720656/>
- Till, Frank. 1980. *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.
- Tillman Shaquita, Thema Bryant-Davis, Kimberly Smith, and Alison Marks. 2010. "Shattering silence: Exploring barriers to disclosure for African American sexual assault survivors." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 11(2): 59-70.
- Tinney, Glenna and Melissa Dichter. 2015. "Intimate partner violence, military personnel, and veterans." Pp. 266-300 in *Women at war*, edited by Elspeth Ritchie and Anne Naclerio. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tjaden, Patricia. and Nancy Thoennes 2000. "Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of intimate partner Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." *National Institute of Justice*. NCJ 183781
- Tozer, Jessica. Know the facts—The military protective order. *DoD Live*, October 27, 2011. <http://www.dodlive.mil/index.php/2011/10/know-the-facts-the-military-protective-order/>
- Turchik, Jessica and Susan Wilson. 2010. "Sexual assault in the U.S. Military: A review of the literature and recommendations for the future." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 15(4): 267-277.
- Tzeng, Wen-Chii, Pi-Yu Su, Hsien-Hsien Chiang, Ping-Yin Kuan, and Jia-Fu Lee. 2010. "The invisible family: A qualitative study of suicide survivors in Taiwan." *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 32(2): 185–198.
- Ullman, Sarah. 2010. *Talking about Sexual Assault: Society's Response to Survivors*. American Psychological Association.
- Van Maanen, John. 1988. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Verweij, Desiree. 2007. "Comrades of friends? On friendship in the Armed Forces." *Journal of Military Ethics* 6(4): 280-291.
- Vogt, Dawne, Tamara Bruce, Amy Street, and Jane Stafford. 2007. "Attitudes toward women and tolerance for sexual harassment among reservists." *Violence Against Women* 13(9): 879-900.
- Wasserman, Varda, Ilan Dayan, and Eyal Ben-Ari. 2018. "Upgraded masculinity: A gendered analysis of the debriefing in the Israeli Air Force." *Gender & Society* 32(2): 228-251.
- Weber, Max. 1947. *The theory of social and economic organizations*, London: Collier Macmillan.
- Weiss, Karen. 2011. "Neutralizing sexual victimization: A typology of victim's' non-reporting accounts." *Theoretical Criminology* 15(4): 445-467.
- , 2009. "'Boys will be boys' and other gendered accounts: An exploration of Victims' Excuses and Justifications for unwanted sexual contact and coercion." *Violence Against Women* 15(7): 810-834.
- Welsh, Sandy, Jacquie Carr, Barbara MacQuarrie, and Audrey Huntley. 2006. "'I'm not thinking of it as sexual harassment': Understanding harassment across race and citizenship." *Gender & Society* 20(1): 87-107.
- West, Candace and Donald Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125-151.
- West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing difference." *Gender & Society* 9(4): 526-526.
- West, Carolyn M. 2006. "Sexual violence in the lives of African American women: Risk, response, and resilience." *Applied Research Forum: National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women* 1-10.
- Weston, Kath. 1991. *Families We Choose*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wiehe, Vernon and Ann Richards. 1995. *Intimate Betrayal: Understanding and responding to the trauma of rape*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wilkins, Amy. 2012. "Becoming black women: Intimate stories and intersectional identities." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 75(2):173-96.
- Williams, Christine. 1995. *Still a Man's World: Men do "Women's Work."* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Wilmot, William and Wesley Shellen. 1990. "Language in friendships." Pp. 413-431 in *Handbook of language and social psychology*, edited by Howard Giles & W. Peter Robinson. Oxford: Wiley.
- Wing, Adrien. 1997. "Critical race feminism and international human rights." *The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review* 28(2): 337-360.
- Winslow, Donna, and Jason Dunn. 2002 "Women in the Canadian Forces: Between legal and social integration." *Current Sociology* 50(5): 641-667.
- Woodward, Rachel and Neil Jenkins. 2011. "Military identities in the situated accounts of British military personnel." *Sociology* 45(2): 252-68.
- Woodward, Rachel and Patricia Winter. 2004. "Discourses of gender in the contemporary British Army." *Armed Forces and Society* 30(2): 279-301.
- Yoder, Janice. D. and Lynne L. Berendsen. 2003. "'Outsider within' the firehouse: African American and White women firefighters." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 25(1):27-36.
- Zavella, Patricia. 1993. "Feminist insider dilemmas: Constructing ethnic identity with Chicana informants." *Frontier: A Journal of Women Studies* 13(3):53-76.
- Zimmer, Lynn. 1987. "How women reshape the prison guard role." *Gender & Society* 1(4): 415-431.
- , 1986. *Women Guarding Men*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zinn, Maxine. 1979. "Field research in minority communities: Ethical, methodological and political observations by an insider." *Social Problems* 27(2): 209-219.
- Zussman, Robert. 2004. "People in Places." *Qualitative Sociology* 27(4): 351-363.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Can you begin by telling me about what you did before you joined the military?
2. Can you tell me about why you decided to join the military? (And the branch Specifically)?
3. Can you tell me about your transition into military from civilian life?
4. Can you tell me about 3 most prominent memories from your military experiences?
5. Can you tell me are 2 or 3 of the worst memories of your military experiences?
6. What is your MOS (Military Occupational Specialty)?
7. Can you walk me through yesterday at your job?
 - a. Is that typical?
8. Can you tell me about a time that was especially rewarding for you at your MOS?
9. Can you tell me about a time that was especially frustrating to you at your MOS?
10. Can you tell me about your unit's cohesion?
11. Can you tell me about a favorite colleague you have?
12. Can you tell me about a least favorite colleague?
13. How do you feel about the other women in your unit?
14. Can you tell about a time when a peer said something offensive at work?
15. Have you ever been deployed?
16. Were you deployed under your current MOS? Or a different one?
17. Can you tell me about your best memory from deployment?
18. Can you tell me about your worst memory while you were deployed?
19. Can you tell me about your readjustment after deployment?
20. What are your thoughts about the future?" "What role does the military play in your vision?"
21. [If they are no longer in the military] Why did you leave the military? What was it like leaving?
22. What type of life pressures do you experience? What stresses you out or has been difficult to deal with?
23. What is your home-life like? Live on base?
24. If you had a daughter, would you want her to join the military? Why or why not? Sons?

Sexual assault specific questions

1. Can you tell me about a time where you were, saw or heard about sexual abuse/harassment in the military? Walk me through that step by step. Men also?
2. What happens to people who are sexually abused while in the military (by someone in the military)? Why?
3. What happens to the military sexual abuser? How do you know? Why do you think this?
4. [If the person hasn't disclosed being a SA survivor by this point]: If you are comfortable talking about it, have you been a victim of sexual abuse (including sexual harassment) in the military? Can you tell me about that?
5. Did they officially report it? If so to whom? Who did they tell about it at the time? Who have they told since? Have they gotten counseling? Did it help? and what happened to

their abuser. Did they stay in the military? Why or why not? What was it like to leave or to stay in after the sexual abuse?

- a. Are there any informal support systems you have access to or use [support forums, online communities, friends]?
6. (strength-based end questions;) what were things you did (or do if still in military) to empower yourself in the military?
7. What are things you do to empower yourself today? [if no longer in the military]

Demographic Questions

Race/ethnicity, age, education, sexuality, region of country from/grew up (south west etc.), what force or forces of military served in, how many years in each and in what levels (e.g. private, sergeant, captain). Any children and ages and relationships status, are you currently in a committed relationship or married, have you been divorced?).

APPENDIX B:

TEXTUAL SOURCES

Military Regulations

Evaluations

1. Department of the Navy. 2015. Bupers Instruction 1610.10D Navy Performance Evaluation System. <https://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/reference/instructions/BUPERSInstructions/Documents/1610.10D.pdf>
2. Department of the Navy. United States Navy Fitness Report. <https://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/career/performanceevaluation/Pages/FITREPEVALReports.aspx>
3. Secretary of the Air Force. 2016. Air Force Instruction 36-2406. Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems. http://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_a1/publication/afi36-2406/afi36-2406.pdf
4. United States Army Center for Army Leadership. U.S. Army Performance Evaluation Guide http://thenewoer.com/presentation_content/external_files/US%20Army%20Performance%20Evaluation%20Guide%2015_JAN_14.pdf
5. United States Marine Corps. United States Marine Corps Fitness Report https://dmna.ny.gov/forms/naval/NAVMC_10835_EF_5334.pdf

Housing

1. Basic Allowance for Housing Rates. 2018. Militarybenefits.info <https://militarybenefits.info/2018-bah-basic-allowance-for-housing-rates/>

Uniforms and Grooming

1. Department of the Air Force. 2018. Air Force Guidance Memorandum to AFI 36-2903, *Dress and Personal Appearance of Air Force Personnel*. http://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_a1/publication/afi36-2903/afi36-2903.pdf
2. Headquarters Department of the Army. 2017. Army Regulation 670-1: Wear and Appearance of Army Uniforms and Insignia. https://d34c1g1f6volxx.cloudfront.net/media/pdf/ARN3644_AR670-1_Web_FINAL.pdf
3. Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps. Marine Corps Uniform Regulations. <https://www.marines.mil/Portals/59/Publications/MCO%201020.34H%20v2.pdf?ver=2018-06-26-094038-137>
4. Navy Personnel Command. 2017. United States Navy Uniform Regulations. <https://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/support/uniforms/uniformregulations/Pages/TOC.aspx>

Documents Relating to Sexual Assault

1. Department of Defense. 2012. Marine Corps Order 1754.11 (Family Advocacy Program Order: “FAP” Order).
https://www.marines.mil/Portals/59/Publications/MCO%201754_11.pdf
2. Department of Defense 2013. Marine Corps Order 1752.5B (Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Order “SAPR” Order).
https://www.marines.mil/portals/59/MCO%201752_5B.pdf
3. Department of Defense. 2016. Department of Defense Instruction 6400.01: Family Advocacy Program: Clinical Case Staff Meeting and Incident Determination Committee. Vol. 3, 1-39.
4. Department of Defense. 2016. Manual for Courts-Martial United States. Joint Service Committee for Military Justice.
https://www.mcmilitarylaw.com/uploads/6/6/2/2/66228603/mcm_2016.pdf
5. Department of Defense. 2016. DoD Retaliation Prevention and Response Strategy.
http://sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/Retaliation/DoD_Retaliation_Strategy.pdf
6. Department of Defense 2017. Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02: Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures. 1-123.
<http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/649502p.pdf>
7. Uniform Code of Military Justice. <http://www.ucmj.us>

APPENDIX C:

TABLES

Table 2.1: Sample Demographics

N=41		Air Force (N=11)	Army (N=9)	Marine Corps (N=16)	Navy (N=5)
Personnel Status	Enlisted	3	7	10	4
	Officer	8	2	6	1
Race	Asian	0	1	1	0
	Black	1	2	0	1
	Latina	0	2	3	0
	Native American	0	0	1	0
	White	10	4	11	4
Military Status	Active Duty	7	4	9	3
	Reserves	0	3	1	0
	Out of Military	4	2	6	2
Marital Status	Single	4	2	10	4
	Married	5	5	4	1
	Divorced	2	2	2	0

Table 2.2: Selected Interviewee Demographic Characteristics

Pseudonym	Branch	Personnel Status	Race
Maura*	Air Force	Enlisted	White
Sandra*	Air Force	Enlisted	White
Ayanna*	Air Force	Officer	Black
Molly*	Air Force	Enlisted/Officer	White
Katherine*	Air Force	Officer	White
Kelly*	Air Force	Officer	White
Lisa*	Air Force	Officer	White
Marie*	Air Force	Officer	White
Natalie*	Air Force	Officer	White
Sarah*	Air Force	Officer	White
Deborah*	Air Force	Officer	White
Nadia*	Army	Enlisted	Black
Mallory*	Army	Enlisted	Black
Cristina*	Army	Enlisted	Latina
Abigail *	Army	Enlisted	White
Grace*	Army	Enlisted	White
Maria*	Army	Enlisted	White
Melanie*	Army	Enlisted	White
Vicky*	Army	Officer	Asian-American
Anna*	Army	Officer	Latina
June*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	Asian-American
Emilia*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	Latina
Cecelia*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	Latina
Rita *	Marine Corps	Enlisted	Latina
Erin*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	Native American
Samantha*	Marine Corps	Enlisted/Officer	White
Carol*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	White
Heather *	Marine Corps	Enlisted	White
Karen*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	White
Margaret*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	White
Rebecca*	Marine Corps	Enlisted	White
Andrea	Marine Corps	Officer	White
Amy*	Marine Corps	Officer	White
Jennifer*	Marine Corps	Officer	White
Olivia*	Marine Corps	Officer	White
Vivian*	Marine Corps	Officer	White
Monique*	Navy	Enlisted	Black
Angela*	Navy	Enlisted	White
Kayley*	Navy	Enlisted	White
Meredith*	Navy	Enlisted	White
Kayla*	Navy	Officer	White

*Indicates that this service-woman is quoted in the dissertation

Table 3.1 Use of Family Narrative (N=32)

		Combat Experience	Sexual Assault Victims	Combat and Sexual Assault Victim	All other Service-women
In general/camaraderie	22	5	0	0	17
Fictive Caregiver	11	4	0	1	6
Emphasized Inclusion	12*	8	0	1	3
Rejected Family Narrative	8**	0	7	0	1

*8/11 (72.7%) of service- women who mentioned inclusion in the family narrative had experienced combat in some form.

**7/8 (87.5%) of service-women who rejected the family narrative had been sexually assaulted while serving in the military.

→32 out of 41 women (73.1%) used the family narrative in some way.

→These categories are not mutually exclusive. Some women who emphasized inclusion also invoked their role as fictive caregivers or discussed the family in general terms, and some who invoked camaraderie also invoked caregiving. However, it is worth noting that of the 22 women who used the family narrative in general terms, 14 of them only discussed family in this way (none of them experienced combat or were sexual assault victims). Also, no women that rejected the “family narrative” invoked the narrative in another way.

Table 7.1 Responses to Sexual Harassment (N=38)

		Combat Experience (N=9)	Sexual Assault Victims (n=8)	Combat and Sexual Assault Victim (n=1)	All other Service-women (n=21)
Silence	20	1	0	1	18
Downplay	13	1	1	0	11
Confront	18	7	8	0	3

*These categories are not mutually exclusive as women who remained silent about harassment also downplayed it. One sexual assault victim both confronted harassment and also downplayed it stating, “From what I went through... this is like a walk in the park compared to what I’ve already been through.”

*Two of the four service-women who stood up to harassment were trained sexual assault prevention victim advocates.