



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Theses and Dissertations

Thesis Collection

1994-03

**Policies, practices, and the effect of gender
discrimination on the integration of women officers in
the Department of the Navy**

Margosian, Mary Ann B.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943**



DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND THE EFFECT OF GENDER DISCRIMINATION ON THE
INTEGRATION OF WOMEN OFFICERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

by

Mary Ann B. Margosian
Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy
B.S., Oakland University, 1978

and

Judith M. Venzryk
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.A., University of Illinois, 1985

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 1994

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE 08 March 1994	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis
----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE *Policies, Practices, and the Effect of Gender Discrimination on the Integration of Women Officers in the Department of the Navy	5. FUNDING NUMBERS
6. AUTHOR(S) Margosian, Mary Ann B. and, Venzryk, Judith M.	

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5000	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
---	--

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
---	--

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE *A
---	------------------------------

13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)

This thesis explores the impact of gender discrimination and institutional bias on the integration of women officers in the Department of the Navy. Semi-structured, in-depth personal interviews with 61 women Navy and Marine Corps officers were the major source of data.

This thesis includes an examination of the phenomenon by which gendering processes occurs within society, organizations, and the military; a historical review of women's roles in the military and of the social forces that influenced their participation; and identification of structures and practices that have maintained and promoted masculine hegemony within the military.

An explanation of the interview protocol establishes the methodology used to obtain nine major themes from analysis of data. The themes explicate barriers to women's integration as well as factors that seem to enhance their assimilation. The conclusion provides recommended actions to foster the full integration of women into the sea services.

14. SUBJECT TERMS Women Officers in the Department of the Navy, Gender Bias in the U. S. Navy and Marine Corps, Combat Exclusion Policies and Women Officers, Discrimination Against Women in the Military	15. NUMBER OF PAGES 151
	16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL
---	--	---	----------------------------------

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the impact of gender discrimination and institutional bias on the integration of women officers in the Department of the Navy. Semi-structured, in-depth personal interviews with 61 women Navy and Marine Corps officers were the major source of data.

This thesis includes an examination of the phenomenon by which gendering processes occurs within society, organizations, and the military; a historical review of women's roles in the military and of the social forces that influenced their participation; and identification of structures and practices that have maintained and promoted masculine hegemony within the military.

An explanation of the interview protocol establishes the methodology used to obtain nine major themes from analysis of data. The themes explicate barriers to women's integration as well as factors that seem to enhance their assimilation. The conclusion provides recommended actions to foster the full integration of women into the sea services.

1011
11/2/05
C.I.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	DATA COLLECTION METHODS	3
	A. OVERVIEW	3
	B. INTERVIEWS	4
	C. DATA ANALYSIS AND THEME DEVELOPMENT	5
III	LITERATURE REVIEW	6
	A. INTRODUCTION	6
	B. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN GENDER AND SEX	6
	C. GENDERING PROCESSES	9
	1. Divisions Along Gender Lines	10
	2. Construction of Symbols and Images	11
	3. Interactions Between Men and Women	15
	4. Production of Individual Identity	15
	D. GENDERING WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS AND THE MILITARY	15
	1. Conventional Views of Organizations	15
	2. Division of Labor	16
	3. Power	20
	4. Sexuality	23
	E. MASCULINE HEGEMONY	25
	1. What Masculine Hegemony Is	26

2.	Images and Myths of the Male Warrior . . .	27
3.	Women's Exclusion	31
F.	HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE AND SOCIAL FORCES . . .	35
1.	Overview	35
2.	A History of Women's Participation	36
a.	Revolutionary War	36
b.	Civil War	37
c.	World War I	38
d.	World War II	39
e.	Korean War	44
f.	Vietnam Era	45
g.	Post-Vietnam	48
h.	Recent History	49
i.	A Decade of Change	53
G.	SUMMARY	56
IV	ANALYSIS	58
A.	OVERVIEW	58
B.	THEME I: WOMEN EXPERIENCE OPPOSITION TO THEIR PRESENCE	58
1.	Theme	58
2.	Justification	59
C.	THEME II: HARASSMENT IS PERVASIVE	70
1.	Theme	70
2.	Justification	70

D.	THEME III: TRADITIONAL FEMININE STEREOTYPES LIMIT WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION	75
	1. Theme	75
	2. Justification	75
E.	THEME IV: WOMEN'S BODIES AND SEXUALITY ARE USED TO EXCLUDE THEM	81
	1. Theme	81
	2. Justification	81
F.	THEME V: WOMEN DECONSTRUCT AND RECONSTRUCT THEIR FEMININITY TO FIT INTO THE ORGANIZATION	84
	1. Theme	84
	2. Justification	84
G.	THEME VI: WOMEN MAKE DECISIONS TO SUCCEED AND TO NEGATE GENDERED STEREOTYPES OF MILITARY WOMEN	93
	1. Theme	93
	2. Justification	94
H.	THEME VII: WOMEN INTERACT WITH MEN AS "PROFESSIONALS" TO AVOID THE APPEARANCE OF FRATERNIZATION OR IMPROPRIETY	98
	1. Theme	98
	2. Justification	98
I.	THEME VIII: WITHOUT FULL INTEGRATION WOMEN WILL REMAIN SECOND CLASS CITIZENS	103
	1. Theme	103
	2. Justification	103

J. THEME IX: SUPPORTIVE LEADERS, ALLIES, MENTORS AND A POSITIVE COMMAND CLIMATE FOSTER WOMEN'S INTEGRATION	112
1. Theme	112
2. Justification	112
CHAPTER V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	123
A. SUMMARY	123
B. CONCLUSIONS	124
C. RECOMMENDATIONS	127
D. PROGNOSIS	131
APPENDIX A INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	132
APPENDIX B DEMOGRAPHICS	136
LIST OF REFERENCES	137
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	142

I INTRODUCTION

The original subject of this thesis was the causes and effects of sexual harassment upon women officers in the Department of the Navy. The Tailhook 1991 scandal and the resulting Navy-wide mandatory sexual harassment stand down served as catalysts for this study. In the turbulent wake left by the Tailhook scandal, leaders both within the Department of the Navy, as well as Congress have primarily focused on the issue of sexual harassment. Initial research in this area, however, suggested that sexual harassment was, in fact, an extreme manifestation of a larger, yet more subtle problem, that of gender discrimination. As a result the focus of the study shifted away from sexual harassment and toward gender discrimination within the Navy and Marine Corps.

This study is part of a larger on-going study being conducted at the Naval Postgraduate School on issues surrounding gender as they relate to the Department of the Navy. While numerous statistical studies have been conducted for and by the U.S. Navy, this study provides a qualitative analysis from the perspective of women officer's experiences in the sea services. The intent of the authors was to provide a voice to the statistical studies that have been conducted by using personal narrative to describe individual experiences.

The issues identified within this study are not unique to the Navy. They are, however, more virulent due to the environment and the unique culture in which they occur. The close identification of the military to the state gives the military an influence and privilege rarely enjoyed by other institutions. The military's special status allows it to discriminate in forms not tolerated within society at large, using the issue of national security to rationalize its extraordinary status (Enloe, 1983, p. 11).

The goal of this study is to enhance policy makers' awareness of hidden, as well as obvious, barriers to the full integration of women within the military.

In the next chapter, data collection and analysis methodology is presented. A comprehensive literature review will then be presented. Following the literature review an examination and analysis of women's experiences, organized along major themes will be provided. These themes form the basis for the recommendations and conclusions presented in the final chapter.

II DATA COLLECTION METHODS

A. OVERVIEW

This thesis is part of an extensive, ongoing study being conducted at the Naval Postgraduate School on gender issues in the United States Navy. This thesis team conducted an intensive study to identify and understand hegemonic processes and how they are institutionalized and manifested within the U.S. Navy. Institutional bias and gender discrimination in society and the history of women in the military was examined through a comprehensive literature review. Sources included: video taped briefings, surveys, government reports, civilian academic papers, books, articles, and published data on applicable topics from various surveys, commissions, and study groups.

The emphasis of this study was on the description of subjective interpretations of personal experiences, asking general questions of feelings, beliefs, and experiences without being able to identify all variables prior to the interviews. The end product was a narrative description that inductively generated hypotheses from the information collected, rather than deductively testing a theory or predicting behavior. This thesis focuses on the perceptions

of women Naval and Marine Corps officers and describes their experiences as professionals in a masculine environment.

B. INTERVIEWS

The interview protocol, included as Appendix A, was developed to obtain chronological life history from participants, through their adult lives and careers. Questions were designed to elicit general views and feelings as well as detailed accounts of their experiences as women officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. Participants were asked to relate specific incidents and examples to support their views and feelings about their experiences in the Navy and Marine Corps. From their responses, negative and positive environments and events that impacted on their lives and careers were identified.

Sixty-one in-depth interviews were conducted with women officers from both the United States Navy and Marine Corps. Women Naval officers assigned to the Naval Postgraduate School were asked if they would participate in thesis research involving women's experiences in the Navy. A deliberate attempt was made to include officers representing as many communities, ranks, and the greatest range of experience as possible. Due to the lack of senior Navy women officers and women Marine Corps officers at the Naval Postgraduate School, women representing those groups from the San Diego, CA area were interviewed. A demographic chart of the communities and

ranks of participants is included as Appendix B. Interviews lasted from approximately 1.5 to 3.5 hours, with the average interview length being two hours. Verbatim transcripts were prepared for use in the analysis.

C. DATA ANALYSIS AND THEME DEVELOPMENT

Data analysis was conducted in a manner to identify common recurring themes from the perspective of women officers with respect to social practices that uphold or reinforce traditional notions of masculinity and femininity. Techniques described in Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Miles (1983) and Miles and Huberman (1984) were used for data analysis. General themes were developed by highlighting those issues that were strongly emphasized or discussed at length by participants and comparing them to previous interviews. An iterative process of systematically and alternately reviewing theoretical insights and data resulted in the identification of ten common themes. Each team member independently analyzed all interviews to develop initial themes. Initial themes were compared and common recurring themes were consolidated.

III LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will focus on the concept of gender and the effects of gender-centered perspective on both society as a whole and the military, one distinct segment of society. The primary focus in our examination of the military will be on the U.S. Navy.

The intent is to explain how structure and practice maintain and sustain a bureaucratic hierarchy where men are dominant and women are often invisible and marginalized. First, the phenomenon by which gender and sex are defined and differentiated will be examined. Next the gendering processes that occur within society, organizations, and the military will be explored. This section will be followed by a discussion of male hegemony. Finally, a historical perspective both of women's role in the military and of the social forces that have influenced their participation will be presented.

B. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN GENDER AND SEX

Although often used interchangeably, it is important to differentiate the terms "gender" and "sex." In modern western culture the biological reproductive categories of "female" and "male" are assumed to be the absolute basis of gender and

sexuality in everyday life (Connell, 1987, p. 66). Yet biologically based arguments simply cannot be used to explain arrangements that are as historically and cross-culturally variant as are gender arrangements (Ferguson, 1984, p. 28).

Opponents of the sociobiological school of thought have long argued that gender is the product of cultural influences. For example, Oakley (1972, p. 116) makes the distinction between sex and gender, arguing that sex refers to basic physiological differences between men and women while gender refers to culturally specific patterns of behavior which may be attributed to the sexes (Mills, 1988, p. 363). Sex (or "biological sex") is the term suggested by biological characteristics such as the chromosomal pattern and reproductive organ composition of individuals, (Powell, 1993, p. 35) whereas gender, more than merely being a biological classification of the sexes, includes the societal orientations, values, and roles distinguishing women from men and the interactions between them (Bell and Nkomo, 1992, p. 241). Joan Acker, in her 1992 article "Gendering Organizational Analysis" asserts:

Gender refers to patterned, socially produced, distinctions between male and female, feminine and masculine. Gender is not something people are, rather it is a daily accomplishment that occurs on a daily basis as a person interacts socially and professionally (1992, p. 251).

To exist in this society as a human being from birth means to be "gendered" as either female or male (Fox-Genovese, 1991,

p. 83). Extensive studies on early socialization have demonstrated definitively that gender identity and gendered behavior in children are social creations (Safilios-Rothschild, 1976, p. 8). Gendered social structure is created and reinforced by the practices of example, instruction, rewards and admonitions of parents, teachers, siblings, and other influential figures, through which a child learns first, that there are two genders; second, the gender to which she or he belongs; and finally, how to and how **not** to behave as a proper member of that gender.

Parents conceive and maintain the gender identity and marking of their children through their choice of names, clothing, toys, sports and games, books, and other forms of entertainment. Gendering practices create a dichotomy among pre-adolescent children, producing two distinct, homogenous groups: "girls" and "boys." Children internalize these forms of identity and use them to develop their own concept of "self" and to organize their social world (Bem, 1981, p. 25). The gender division of parenting in our society further enhances and reinforces the development of "feminine" and "masculine" personalities (Chodorow, 1978, p. 11).

During puberty, as children develop physical sexual characteristics, their behavior is further dichotomized and organized around "gender-appropriate" sexual scripts. However, these anatomical secondary sex characteristics are less important as gender markings than the elaborate display

signals of behavior and communication patterns that transmit femininity as contrasted with masculinity (Lorber, 1991, p. 16).

C. GENDERING PROCESSES

The study of gender in organizational behavior while not mainstream, is also not new. In fact, study in this area has been recorded in research literature as early as 1939 (Roethlisberger and Dickenson, 1939). As research on women in management has become a significant field of study in the last twenty years (Kanter, 1977; Larwood and Wood, 1977; Nieva and Gutek, 1980; Powell, 1988), gender segregation is increasingly recognized as a reflection of social structure (Gross, 1968; Epstein, 1970; Oppenheimer, 1970).

Recent theorists do not view gender as an addition outside ongoing processes, but rather, as an integral part of the process (Acker 1990, Connell 1987). Connell explicates his theory of gender based on a social theory of practice where structure and practice are intertwined. Structure, Connell explains, constrains our ongoing daily actions through an interplay of social rules among a vast array of social institutions (i.e., family, church, school, military). Everyday human practice presupposes social structure and thereby makes and remakes structure. Neither is conceivable without the other.

Gendering is not an inexorable fate but rather an ongoing social and historical process, one that generates its own contradictions and therefore requires constant maintenance by those in power, and one that can be resisted. Considerable effort goes into maintaining, upholding, and resisting the meanings of femininity and masculinity (Ferguson 1984).

Gendered processes are concrete activities, what people do and say, and how they think about these activities. The daily construction, and sometimes deconstruction, of gender occurs within material and ideological constraints that set the limits of possibility (Acker, 1992, p. 251). Using Acker's definition the term *Gendered Processes* means that:

advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine (1992, p. 251).

Acker goes on to describe four interacting processes that work to uphold our notions of gender:

1. Divisions Along Gender Lines

This process includes divisions of labor, of allowed behaviors, of locations in physical space, and of power. An example of this, across various societies, has been the association of female with "domestic" and male with "public" spheres of responsibility (Burrell, 1980, p. 94).

Industrial capitalism brought about the separation of the work place from the home and caused the question of women's relative status to develop in this form (Cockburn,

1991, p. 77). Prior to the industrial revolution, economies of scale, and the specialization of labor, women were a fully functioning element of the self-supporting family unit. Their labor was appreciated and well-recognized for the positive contribution it made to the success of the family (Ferguson, 1984, p. 47).

Hostility to the factory system in the early nineteenth century was not only a protest of the cruel conditions under which unmarried girls, wives, and children labored to save their families from destitution, but "was bound up with the desperate defense of a way of life...fear of the independence of wives and daughters working under another roof, with other men, coming back with their own wages" (Rowbotham, 1973, p. 44). Working-class men who prided themselves on their independence, witnessed the growing independence of their wives, daughters, and children with unease. By the late 1830s, the middle class conception of masculinity began to permeate society. The notion of "work," no longer simply the activity of whichever gender turned its hand to productive tasks, was gradually being redefined as "occupation" and associated with *manhood* and *independence* (Davidoff, 1990, p. 16).

2. Construction of Symbols and Images

These symbols and images explain, express, reinforce, or, more rarely, oppose divisions along gender lines. They

have many sources and forms: language, ideology, popular and high culture, dress, print and broadcast media.

In response to the industrialization of America, the family evolved from a producing unit to a consuming unit and "real work" was redefined as that performed outside the home for wages. Nineteenth century middle class women increasingly found themselves confined to the private, domestic realm where there was less and less to be done. The role of women as both loving caretakers of and willing subordinates to their husbands was elevated in status, as the "cult of true womanhood," which provided mythical guidelines for women's character and behavior (Ferguson, 1984, p. 49). Women were expected to provide a safe domestic haven for their exhausted and harassed male-worker husbands. Men who followed orders all day at work expected to return to a scene of domestic bliss and tranquility. If a husband did not find it, he was justified in taking his frustrations out on his wife.

It was an era of Victorian fashion and values, when "a man's home was his castle." Women were supposed to be vessels for virtue, soothing the wounds of men who ventured daily into the cold, cruel, morally corrupt world. The loving devotion of women to their families was supposed to serve the dual purpose of supplying intimacy and nurturance, while simultaneously reconciling them to the dominance, and frequently abuse, men exercised over them. The cult of true

womanhood was an instrument that structured women's experience around the needs of the traditional family.

The Great Depression of the early 1900s kept American women in the home as there were few enough jobs for men. The First World War swept many married women into factories and offices to replace men who had entered the military. However, they were swept out again, just as rapidly, with war's end and the return of male soldiers (Cockburn, 1991, p. 79). Although "Rosie the Riveter," was needed and contributed significantly to the World War II production effort, she too was quickly demobilized following the war. Her contributions were rationalized as war-time, short-term, anomaly: Women in normal times do not work outside the home and especially not in traditionally masculine jobs (Enloe, 1983, p. 188). Once again, a powerful ideology of femininity and domesticity pressed a housewifely role on women (Cockburn, 1991, p. 79).

The swelling tide of consumer goods production in the 1950s introduced new, modern products, along with a new image of the ideal life and family. Modern entertainment, in the form of television, brought these images directly into homes across the nation. Advertisements in women's magazine depicted a life of domestic ease brought about by electric refrigerators, clothes washers and dryers, vacuum cleaners, and other powered household appliances, now affordable to the middle class. On television, the fictional Cleavers presumably reflected life in the average American family.

Meanwhile, in a weekly portrayal of domestic crises, Robert Young proved "Father Knows Best."

In 1958 the Mattel Toy Company introduced the "Barbie" doll, providing Americans with a new image for women: one that was blond, tall and slender, yet curvaceous. The Barbie doll remains a very popular children's toy in the 1990s. In fact, toy industry experts estimate that 98 percent of all girls in this country will play with a Barbie doll at some point in their childhood (Eitelberg, 1990, p. 14). Barbie's unrealistic measurements provide the body image women obsess over and strive to achieve. Women contestants and winners in America's "beauty" contests are Barbie clones, exhibiting large breasts, tiny waists, and long, slender legs. Although women have moved into the paid labor force in ever larger numbers since the 1970s, the majority of women who work outside the home continue to do most of the work inside the home as well (Ferguson, 1984, p. 65). Household cleaning products, dish washing and laundry detergent advertisements predominantly feature women, and are frequently aimed at women. Men are more often depicted in beer commercials and advertisements for "masculine" products, such as performance automobiles and power tools, as being athletic, virile, ruggedly handsome, and deserving of women sporting those Barbie doll faces and figures.

3. Interactions Between Men and Women

These processes include interactions between women and men, women and women, men and men, including all those patterns that enact dominance and subordination, and create alliances and exclusions. Examples of this gendering process will be explored in greater depth in the next chapter.

4. Production of Individual Identity

Identity is formed through one's choice of work, use of language, clothing, and presentation of one's self in a gendered society. It is the internal mental workings of individuals as they consciously construct their understandings of the organization's gendered structure of work and opportunity and the demands for gender-appropriate behaviors and attitudes. Again, examples of this gendering process will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter.

D. GENDERING WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS AND THE MILITARY

1. Conventional Views of Organizations

Conventional views of organizational theory have been blind to gender (Mills and Tancred, 1992, p. 1). As ever larger numbers of women enter both public and private organizations, filling both traditional and non-traditional roles, these views have been increasingly subject to reexamination. In fact, the whole of organizational theory has been reconsidered on the basis that a fundamental gender-centered substructure characterizes the work place (Mills and

Tancred, 1992, p. 1). The development of organizational analysis theories, which paralleled the growth and development of industrial organizations, occurred predominantly in a patriarchal vacuum. The theories developed were based predominantly, if not solely, on the basis of men's experiences. Therefore, traditional theories cannot be gender neutral.

Rosabeth Moss Kanter contends in her 1993 edition of Men and Women of the Corporation that organizations are inherently gendered since the vast majority of upper management is traditionally male. As noted by Kanter:

Women populate organizations, but they practically never run them. As of the last census, men constituted over 96 percent of all managers and administrators, earning over \$15,000 yearly and nearly 98 percent of those earning over \$30,000 yearly . . . Women are to clerical labor what men are to management--in almost the same proportions. Managerial and clerical jobs are the major sex-segregated, white-collar occupations, brought into being by the development of the large corporation and its administrative apparatus (1993, p. 18)

Additionally, society's general belief that men make better leaders endows them with power.

The following three sections will describe the means by which organizations, including the U.S. Navy, are gendered: Division of Labor, Power, and Sexuality. These three elements act as powerful constraints on social practice.

2. Division of Labor

Due to women's relatively late entry into the work force, management presumes they are less committed to their

careers and less committed to the organization. Therefore they often end up in traditionally female, dead-end jobs (Kanter 1993, p. 137). These jobs include care-giving, secretarial, administration, and human resource positions.

Within the Navy, women officers are found in the highest concentrations as nurses or General Unrestricted Line Officers (GenURL). GenURL officers do not receive specialized training and perform duties as the "Jill's" of all non-combat related trades. They fill billets as Administrative, Legal, Public Affairs, and Communications Officers; as Directors of Counselling and Assistance, and Family Service Centers, and as Officers in Charge Of Personnel Support Detachments and Transient Personnel Units (U.S. DoN, NOCMAN, Vol 2, 1990, p. 10).

Men managers often perceive women as being less loyal and dedicated because they believe the company has to compete with women's societally-imposed obligations for attention. The gender-centered perspective argues that women do not possess the skills or behavioral characteristics to perform competently in managerial leadership positions. Instead, a masculine ethic of rationality and reason is identified with the ideal manager:

This 'masculine ethic' elevates the traits assumed to belong to men with educational advantages to necessities for effective organizations: a tough-minded approach to problems, analytic abilities to abstract and plan; a capacity to set aside personal, emotional considerations in the interests of task accomplishment; a cognitive

superiority in problem solving and decision making (Kanter, 1993, p. 22).

Furthermore, some men justify women's continued exclusion from upper management with the argument that women simply **cannot** be as devoted to the organization as their male contemporaries, believing that: Married women's priorities are centered around their families, while single women's priorities are centered around getting married.

Gender stereotypes suggest that women lack the high level of commitment essential for a successful managerial career. However, researchers have found no differences in the commitment of men and women in either professional or nonprofessional jobs. Instead, commitment is best explained by variables other than a person's gender. Age, education, and the possession of higher order growth needs are positively linked to commitment (Powell, 1993, p. 168).

A review of the military's higher ranks confirms they are primarily composed of men (U.S. DoN, BUPERSCOM-213, 1994). In the Navy, the most senior position, that of Chief of Naval Operations, has never been filled by a woman or a non-warfare specialist, and in the 27 years since women were authorized by Public Law 90-130 to hold permanent rank as Flag officers, there have been only nine Navy women, other than nurses, who have attained Flag rank (Ebbert and Hall, 1993, p. 212).

Even when women are promoted to positions of authority they are excluded from membership on the management team.

They are unintentionally and intentionally excluded from the informal, and sometimes intimate, bonding process that occurs in management. They aren't invited to participate in or attend management sporting functions, i.e., playing golf or softball; attending pro football games; or participating in weekend fishing or hunting trips. They aren't privy to the conversations and politicking which occur in the executive washroom, nor are they able to participate in locker room banter after an intense game of racquetball with the boss. These practices ensure that women remain "outsiders" within the organization.

It is no surprise that managers, the majority of whom are men, are most comfortable when surrounded by those who think and act like themselves. With so many daily reminders of how different women are it comes as no surprise that male managers tend to "homosexually reproduce," (Kanter, 1993, p. 63) choosing to mentor and promote those most like themselves, who most often are men. Kanter notes how proteges acquire sponsors:

Identification [is] the issue: 'Boy wonders rise under certain power structures. They're recognized by a powerful person because they are very much like him. He sees himself, a younger version, in that person...Who [what male manager] can look at a woman and see himself?' (1993, p. 184).

By selectively promoting those individuals exhibiting their same qualities male managers reinforce the belief that they, themselves, **deserve** the authority they have been given.

3. Power

Power has been viewed by scholars as part of the ongoing daily process that constitutes and reconstitutes organizational reality (Mumby, 1988, p. 33). Power relations can be thought of as processes whereby limitations along gender lines are determined. Within the hierarchical power structure of organizations, policies are established at the highest echelons, but their enforcement occurs at various levels, including the lowest levels, through individual actions. The result is that established policies are often subject to a variety of interpretations and inconsistent enforcement.

Power relations, in the form of gendered processes and practices within organizations, may be open and overt, as when managers choose only men for some positions and only women for others (Burrell, 1992, p. 76). Examples of this type of gendered practice within the Navy have been the selection and training of men exclusively as F-14 Fighter pilots or women exclusively as General Unrestricted Line (non-warfare specialty) Officers. (While there are small numbers of men in the GenURL community, they were only allowed to transfer into this community when they had **failed** to qualify as a warfare specialist, or when a medical condition prevented their continued operation within their warfare community.) Until very recently F-14 pilots were entitled to special flight pay

that other women pilots were not because, as women, they were ineligible to fly combat aircraft.

Conversely, power relations may be deeply hidden in organizational processes and decisions that appear to have nothing to do with gender. This type of gendered practice can be seen in the Navy's policy for accruing entitlement to career sea pay. Personnel assigned to ships classified as "combatants" earn day-for-day credit on their sea duty counter regardless of whether the ship is at the pier, in dry dock, or underway. Personnel assigned to non-combatant ships, which on the average spend less time at sea than combatants, earn credit on their sea duty counter only for those days they actually spend underway. Even if the non-combatant ships are "forward deployed," being homeported outside the Continental United States (CONUS), their personnel are still restricted in accruing sea duty to the actual days that the ship is underway.

All personnel must accrue three years of sea duty credit before they are entitled to receive an additional \$150 a month career sea pay (U.S. DoD, MILPAYMAN, 7000.14-R, 1993). Personnel on combatants can earn their entitlement to career sea pay in a single three year tour. However, their contemporaries assigned to non-combatants may require several tours at sea, often spanning a period of six or more years, before they accumulate sufficient underway sea time that entitles them to career sea pay. This policy is especially

telling in light of the fact that until 1994 women could **only** be assigned to non-combatants. Equally significant is the fact that 1990 statistics placed eighty-six percent of women's sea duty billets on "Tenders," whose primary mission is maintenance and repair and are thus categorized as non-combatants (U.S. DoN, CNO, 1990, p. v-61).

In these two examples, power, in terms of both economics and prestige, is bestowed on the basis of gender. Men exercise yet another form of power when they sexually harass women or when the practices of sexually objectifying women or telling sexual jokes denigrating women are part of the work culture (Burrell, 1992, p. 76).

In the U.S. Navy such practices are evident in the lyrics to a formation running song:

My girl's a real Navy girl; She's got a pair of hips just like two battle ships; She's got a pair of legs just like two whiskey kegs; She's got a pair of breasts just like two treasure chests.

Furthermore, within the overall climate of anti-female attitudes in the Navy, there are certain military subcultures that are more hostile to women. One example, of this is the "Flyboy" subculture of military aviation. Within this community the young male rules. He is told constantly that he is one of the best, one of the elite, and he is constantly challenged to prove it (Devilbiss, 1993, p. 34). One theory on the causes of sexual harassment postulates that form of harassment has little to do with sexuality--it is an

expression of power and hostility (Powell, 1993, p. 127).
Viewed in this light, the extreme form of sexual harassment, sexual assault, which occurred at Tailhook 1991 is understandable coming from returning war heroes who feared women's encroachment into their sacred realm of combat.

Although Navy leaders have deemed sexual harassment "inappropriate behavior," it is the day-to-day practice of individuals at various levels throughout the organization that work to maintain or alter these gender relations. Perhaps this is one of the reasons there remains a persistent, though increasingly underground, hostility toward women in the Navy, despite organizational attempts to eradicate it.

4. Sexuality

Sexuality, gender, and bodies can be organizational assets, however they can also be a source of problems for management and are therefore often objects of, and resources, for control. All workers have physiological needs on the job. Management controls productivity by regulating lunch and toilet breaks as well as physical movement within the workplace. Researchers have observed that women are more tightly controlled in this manner than men, and higher level employees enjoy greater physical freedom and more autonomy. They are also granted special privileges related to their bodily functions such as access to executive dining rooms and bathroom facilities (Acker and Van Houten, 1974).

Reproduction and sexuality may be both disruptive and distracting within the workplace and therefore "undermine the orderly and rational pursuit of organizational goals" (Acker, 1992, p. 255). Women's bodies--female sexuality, their ability to procreate and their pregnancy, breast feeding, and child care, menstruation, and mythic "emotionality"--are suspect, stigmatized and used as grounds for control, exclusion, or objectification (Kanter, 1977, p. 152). Men's sexuality, however, rules most work places and therefore reinforces their power within the organization.

One example of this preoccupation with women's bodies and bodily functions in the military is seen when the military uses the argument that it is logistically too difficult to sustain women in the field because of their hygienic needs. Military men's obsession with women's sexuality is reflected in Brian Mitchell's assertion, in Weak Link, The Feminization of the American Military, that "the presence of women in the military inhibits male bonding, corrupts allegiance to the hierarchy, and diminishes the desire of men to compete for anything but the attentions of women."

★ Many men still regard women primarily in the context of patriarchal relationships, where they have known them as mothers, sisters, wives, lovers, or casual sexual partners (Huff, 1990, p. 12). Anne Huff argues in her 1990 article "Wives--of the Organization" that an enormous amount of mixed-gender organizational life is colored by these social

experiences which results in a bifurcated disadvantage to women: First, not only does evoking such relationships prevent men from discovering new ways in which to conceive of and relate to women, but it reinforces their comfortably familiar, well defined and accepted male dominance. Second, it reinforces and amplifies the differences between men and women propagated by society's gendered paradigm. In the military this is readily evident in the assignment policies that restrict most women to "traditional" clerical and fleet-support occupational fields.

E. MASCULINE HEGEMONY

Then-Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Robert H. Barrow, in a 1980 interview with Time Magazine discussing the Marine Corps' future, justified women's continued exclusion from "combat" roles, despite their successful performance in expanding "support" roles, verbalizing the belief commonly held by the majority of military personnel that:

War is man's work. Biological convergence on the battlefield would not only be dissatisfying in terms of what women could do, but it would be an enormous psychological distraction for the male who wants to think that he's fighting for that woman somewhere behind, not up there in the same fox hole with him. It tramples the male ego. When it gets right down to it, you've got to protect the manliness of war (Wright, Time, 20 June 1980, p. 73).

The logical questions that follow are: "Why is war **man's** work?" And why is it necessary "when it gets right down to

it . . . to protect the **manliness** of war?" In order to answer these questions one must first understand masculine hegemony.

1. What Masculine Hegemony Is

In the military there is a hierarchy of privilege wherein pre-eminence is based on the ideal of male, heterosexual sexuality legitimizing organizational power. This is known as "masculine hegemony." Masculine hegemony, also referred to as hegemonic masculinity, is typified by the image of the strong, technically competent, authoritative leader who is sexually potent and attractive, has a family, and who has his emotions under control (Acker, 1990, p. 153). Hegemonic masculinity is always constructed in relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women (Connell, 1987, p. 184). This hierarchal ordering of masculinity within the U.S. Navy will be explained in detail in the next section.

Despite women's progress, the modern U.S. military remains a **male** organization. It is composed of and run predominantly by men. Its organizational values and attitudes reflect a masculine inclination, temperament, outlook, and ethos (Devilbiss, 1993, p. 33). Women's bodies cannot be adapted to hegemonic masculinity: to function at the top of male hierarchies requires that women render irrelevant everything that makes them women. Therefore, it is always from the perspective of a male-dominated and male-defined

institution that the role of women in the military is considered. Militarism presumes a concept of "masculinity" that only makes sense if supported by the complementary concept of femininity (Enloe, 1983, p. 7).

The Navy, an organization with a deeply entrenched, persistent culture, generates its own enduring patterns of dominance and control. Its members are separated and stratified by rank, designator, billet, and gender. It is an understatement to say that the military glorifies masculinity; in fact the military reveres and worships it (Devilbiss, 1993, p. 34). Brian Mitchell contends that:

Many men are attracted to the military by its intensely masculine and deeply romantic character. The uniforms, the rank, the danger, the purposefulness, the opportunity to earn the respect of men and the admiration of women, all contribute to the military's enduring hold on the imagination of men and boys (p. 185).

2. Images and Myths of the Male Warrior

The U.S. Navy, a classic masculine, warrior culture which idolizes the traditional military qualities of aggressiveness, strength, perseverance, and dominance, has been described by scholars as a "hyper-masculine" entity (Britton and Williams, 1991, p. 23). The myth of the ultimate male warrior is embraced, glorified and perpetuated for the American public by Hollywood through movies such as the classics: *The Sands of Iwo Jima*, *The Green Berets*, *Patton*; and more recently: *Top Gun*, *Full Metal Jacket*, and *Navy SEALs*.

In the U.S. Navy, for example, the image of the successful officer is one of the dedicated, forceful, brave warrior. A famous World War II recruiting poster shows a woman dressed in sailors' garb proclaiming "I wish I were a **man**, I'd join the Navy." The Code of Conduct, a set of ethical standards for U.S. service members who become or are at risk of becoming prisoners of war, until revised in 1991 stated:

- I am an American fighting man, I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense.
- I will never forget that I am an American fighting man, responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free.

The U.S. Marine Corps continues to seek "A Few Good Men," using the images of the medieval knight and forged steel in their recruiting commercials, and boast that "every man is a rifle man."

All work in the military can be considered "gendered." By preventing women from performing certain jobs the myth of "war as men's work" is preserved--giving men a sense of privilege **as men** (Enloe, 1983, p. 174). In the Navy there is a hierarchy of jobs based on the proximity of the job to the masculine warrior ideal. This hierarchy is officially reinforced as part of the organizational culture through a pay

scale that gives the greatest rewards to those performing the most hazardous duties.

For example, the U.S. Navy SEAL (Sea, Air, Land) is world-renown as the ultimate warrior. SEALs stand at the top of the job hierarchy. A small, elite fighting force, SEALs perform dangerous and covert missions requiring special skills, physical and mental strength, endurance, and an undying devotion to each other. They receive special pay and allowances including: dive pay, jump pay, hazardous duty pay and other special pay (U.S. DoD, MILPAYMAN, 7000.14-R, 1993) depending upon the missions to which they are assigned. Additionally, they are often exempt from conforming to Navy uniform regulations and grooming standards.

Naval Aviators stand on the next rung down from the SEALs in this hierarchy, although their Surface Warfare and Submariner counterparts think differently and would argue this point. **Within** the Aviation community there is yet another hierarchy, with Tactical Air (TACAIR) pilots at the pinnacle. TACAIR is further stratified with the Fighter community presuming status over the Attack community. This hierarchy can be further broken down based on the airframe flown. Within the Fighter community F-14 (Fighter) pilots consider their FA-18 (Fighter/Attack) counterparts' masculinity to be diminished by their dual mission and, in fact, coined the acronym "FAGs," Fighter Attack Guys, when the aircraft was first introduced. Pilots flying fixed wing, prop, and rotary

aircraft fall in graduated order behind their TACAIR counterparts, each subject to their community hierarchy. Regardless of the airframe they fly all aviators receive flight pay. However, those pilots in TACAIR also receive Aviation Continuation Incentive Pay (ACIP) designed to retain their experience and skill.

Surface Warfare Officers argue that the Navy is a sea-going entity and that "sailors belong on ships and ships belong at sea." They contend their Aviator, "Flyboy," counterparts should have joined the Air Force if they wanted to fly. They scorn their Submariner counterparts on the basis that no true sailor, i.e., real man, rides below the sea rather than on its surface. Within the Surface Warfare community, those individuals qualifying on Cruiser/Destroyer (CRUDES) platforms, the "fighting" ships, are considered superior, especially now that America's battleships have been returned to mothballs. Surface Warriors serving on Amphibious ships, which while still classified as combatants have limited warfighting capabilities, lack the prestige of their CRUDES peers but are considered more vital than those assigned to "non-combatant" ships.

One thing that Aviators and Surface Warriors do agree on is that the Submariners, or "Bubbleheads" as they are unofficially known, are a "different breed" and as such deserve to be in class of their own. Recent changes in the

assignment policies for women seem to uphold this distinction as women continue to be excluded from duty aboard submarines.

3. Women's Exclusion

Most significant in this hierarchy of the masculine warrior ideal is that women have traditionally been excluded from it. More recently, as women have entered jobs previously "off-limits" to them, i.e., Surface Warfare Officers aboard non-combatants, pilots of non-tactical aircraft, they find that while not excluded **entirely**, they remain at the very bottom of the hierarchy in terms of their status. Their continued exclusion from combat prevents them from moving up the hierarchal ladder. While Surface Warfare Officers speak a different language than their Submariner or Aviator counterparts, they share a common bond as combatants and speak "warrior-ese," a language rife with references to weaponry, tactics, and battle damage assessments. Women, non-combatants, do not and cannot speak this dialect, at least not with any credibility. This language barrier serves as a source of exclusion. Only male homosexuals who have betrayed the warrior ideal with their "failed masculinity" are valued less than women.

The military reproduces hegemonic masculinity by continuing to reserve the lion's share of status and rewards for male heterosexuals (Connell, 1987, p. 47). Even men of the Restricted Line such as Intelligence or Public Affairs

Officers, or members of the Staff Corps, such as Supply, Judge Advocate General, and Medical Service Corps, are granted status and privilege over women who serve on non-combatants. By their assignment to combatants, albeit in a non-warfare role, men of the Restricted Line accrue entitlement to sea pay on the same basis as warfare specialists.

Due to restrictions on their assignment and status as "non-combatants" women are considered a less valuable asset to the Navy than their male counterparts, perpetuating and supporting this established job hierarchy. Dana M. Britton and Christine L. Williams, in their 1991 article "Looking For A Few Straight Men: Military Policies of Exclusion and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity," further explain the effect of this stratification within the military:

By institutionalizing a particularly virulent and violent heterosexual masculinity, the armed forces bestows status advantages to men over women. The military perpetuates an almost mythological form of masculinity: the soldier is aggressive, macho, bloodthirsty. Recruiters advertise that they are looking for 'a few good men' and popular movies proclaim that 'war at its worst' inspires 'men at their best.' (Hamburger Hill, 1988) Though few 'real life' soldiers live up to this image, the myth has great cultural vanity and serves as a reward for military service available only to men (p. 18).

Brian Mitchell, states why it is men's preference that the military should remain unchanged:

The military is strongly hierarchal. It begs for leadership, demands loyalty, and lives for excitement. It is this way, first, because it was created by men, and, second, because such characteristics make it effective at making war...The personal bonds that men form with each other, as leaders, as followers, as comrades-in-arms, often enable ordinary men to perform acts of extreme self-

sacrifice when ideals such as duty, country, or cause no longer compel. The all-male condition reinforces all of the military's highest organizational values (1989, p. 64).

Combat exclusion laws enforce the historical pattern of patriarchal, masculinization of the Armed Services. Implicit in the law is the idea that men hold the power to decide **who** will fight and **who** is qualified to defend the nation:

For to be masculine is to be **not** feminine. To prove one's manhood is imagined to be to prove (to oneself and to other men and women) that one is not "a woman". Consequently, experiencing military combat and identifying with that institution totally committed to the conduct of combat is, for those men trying to fulfil society's expectations, part and parcel of displaying and proving their male identity and thus qualifying for the privileges it bestows (Enloe, 1983, p. 14).

Thus, the organization and its rituals are devalued if "even a girl" can perform the mission. At boot camp Drill Sergeants use psychological manipulation, taunting male recruits' by calling them "girls," "ladies," or "pussies," in an attempt to prepare them for combat by eliminating any sign of femininity, i.e., weakness, vulnerability, or sensitivity. *

Even in modern, highly technological militaries, the myth of combat dies hard. There is still the widely held belief that a man is untested in his manhood until he has participated in a "collective, violent, physical, struggle" against someone defined as "the enemy" (Enloe, 1983, p. 13). Today, in an era of "over the horizon" engagements, and "smart" bombs, a man whose glory has not come as the result

of victory in hand-to-hand combat can still be immortalized.

In the military, especially in war time, male bonding cuts through barriers that would normally separate class, religious, age or economic groups. Trying to cope with the chaos and dangers of the battlefield, where every decision takes on life or death consequences, military men need and rely upon the their "buddies" more than their civilian brothers ever will. In order to earn a buddy, to whom he may reveal his worst fears and vulnerability, a soldier must first prove worthy of such an intimate bond by remaining cool in the face of violence and death. That is, he must prove that he is a **man** (Enloe, 1983, p. 36). Military traditionalists argue that to maintain such masculine bonds, women must be excluded.

Acquisition of military manpower has required an elaborate gender ideology and social structure that has the American public believing that wars are fought on something called the "battle front" and supported on something called the "home front" (Enloe 1983, p. 211). And yet the military needs women, behaving *as the gender "women,"* acting in ways women are **supposed** to act, in order to provide men with masculinity-reinforcing incentives to endure the hardships of soldiering.

As warfare has evolved, commanders have become increasingly eager to have women performing duties at the front. This serves a dual purpose: it frees men for actual combat, while sustaining women in their traditional feminine

roles. But how can women as the gender "women" be recruited to perform duties at the front if, as women, they are supposed to be excluded from combat?

The military depends on women to carry out their military operations but are fighting to defend a social order that presumes that "respectable" women are neither appropriate to nor capable of non-traditional wartime roles. Therefore, women must be ignored or so ideologically degraded or marginalized that they do not threaten the carefully defended social order (Enloe, 1983, p. 110). By perpetuating the myth that in combat a **man** is **always** the best person for the job and maintaining an organizational culture that determines potential exclusively on the basis of gender, the military limits participation to a select segment of society.

F. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE AND SOCIAL FORCES

1. Overview

This section will examine how, by limiting women's participation through policy and law, the Navy maintains and promotes segregation of work exclusively on the basis of gender. We will examine American warfare from a historical perspective to reveal how women **have** been mobilized to provide military "manpower" in every conflict--directly refuting the argument that war is "man's" work. We will also examine the social forces which have alternately acted to restrict or broaden women's opportunities.

2. A History of Women's Participation

a. Revolutionary War

Prior to "legislated" definitions of combat and risk assessment policies, women served whenever and wherever they were needed. They have participated in every United States conflict beginning with the Revolutionary War. It was common practice for wives, lovers, sisters, and daughters to follow the army, providing sutler, nursing, cooking, comfort and tailoring services. Their presence was tolerated and welcomed by troop commanders, so long they did not slow the march or reduce battle readiness. Their true contributions to the war effort are not reflected in mainstream history.

The legend of Molly Pitcher is a classic example of the manner in which women's participation in the military has been ignored or trivialized. Numerous accounts of Continental Army heroines in battle have been condensed or distilled into the story of **one** woman who took the fight only after her husband had collapsed. Historian Linda Grant DePaw's research has uncovered quite a different "Molly Pitcher"--she was not one woman, she was **hundreds**. These women did not stand in the wings until their husbands collapsed. They were deliberately organized by General George Washington to serve as members of Continental Army gun crews. Their collective *nom de guerre* was derived from their relationship to the technology of 18th century warfare.

Artillery pieces of the era became too hot to operate if they weren't watered down between firings. It was the task of the Continental Army's "Molly Pitchers" to carry water to the gun crews in pitchers or jugs. Using women to carry water to the guns, reasoned the man-power short generals, would 'free men to fight' (Enloe, 1983, p. 122).

This explains the conflicting eyewitness accounts which described various women, all purported to be the "real" Molly Pitcher, performing heroic feats at different battlefields throughout the war. Such accounts include those of: Mary Hayes, wife of a seventh Pennsylvania Regiment artilleryman; Mary McCauley, heroine of Monmouth; and Margaret Corbin, who distinguished herself in the Battle of Fort Washington, by taking over her husband's gun crew position.

b. Civil War

In her book, Women in the Military, An Unfinished Revolution, Major General Jeanne Holm, USAF, (Ret.), recounts the service of American women, both North and South, during the Civil War:

Many of the restrictions and social conventions with respect to women's activities were set aside or simply ignored to meet the unusual demands of this all-pervasive war. In addition to undertaking the usual functions of cooking, sewing, and foraging for supplies, many women, both black and white, served as saboteurs, scouts, and couriers. They blew up bridges, cut telegraph wires, burned arsenals and warehouses, and helped prisoners and slaves escape (1992, p. 9).

Furthermore, as of 1994, over 126 cases of women who disguised themselves as men in order to fight in the Civil War had been documented by the National Archives in Washington. As one National Archives staff member observed "They were not just ahead of their time, they were ahead of our time" (Meyer, 1994, p. 96).

c. World War I

During World War I, when it appeared that the United States would inevitably enter the war, the Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, recognized there would be critical personnel shortages. In 1917 he proposed bringing women into the Naval Reserve, in the ratings of yeoman, electrician (radio) or other such ratings considered essential to the war effort. The Naval Reserve Act of 1916, which authorized enlistment of "citizens" of the United States without reference to gender, provided a loophole through which the Navy could legally induct women. Thus, when the United States entered the war on April 6, 1917, the Navy was able to rapidly enlist women (Holm, 1992, p. 10). This move freed men from land-based office jobs and permitted their assignment to combat. The Marine Corps followed suit in 1918.

The number of women serving in each branch varied according to that branch's policies. A total of 34,000 women served: 21,000 were nurses, while over 12,000 served in the Navy. Despite serious shortages of administrative personnel

and recommendations from Congress, when pressed by the Army to establish a dedicated Corps for women, Secretary of War, Newton Baker, rejected the idea considering it "unwise, undesirable, and exceedingly ill-advised" (Holm, 1992, p. 14). Therefore, after the war ended enlisted Navy and Marine Corps women were discharged. Army and Navy nurses, granted the status of officers with "relative rank" from second lieutenant through major, but without full military benefits, could retain their military status but were reduced to peacetime end strength.

d. World War II

In the intervening years between World Wars I and II, Japan, Germany, and Italy expanded and modernized their armed forces. As these countries began displaying political aggression, American military leaders recognized that if U.S. forces were drawn into another major conflict there would be manpower shortages similar to those experienced during World War I. Following his appointment as Army Chief of Staff on September 1, 1939, General George C. Marshall directed subordinates to prepare plans for a corps of women to serve the Army. The resulting recommendation was that, "under no circumstances were women in any such corps to be given full military status. They might serve with the Army but certainly not in the Army" (Ebbert and Hall, 1993, p. 27). Resistance

to the plan within the War Department was widespread and ultimately prevented the establishment of a women's corps.

With the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and the threat of war on a global scale, resistance to inducting women into the armed services quickly dissolved. Women, once again, answered the military's call to service. This time, however, mobilization of women would be much more difficult for the Navy due to the Naval Reserve Act of 1925, which precluded women from serving. What Josephus Daniels had accomplished twenty-five years earlier with a stroke of the pen (Ebbert and Hall, 1993, p.25), now required a legislative battle. In July 1942, legislation finally established Army, Navy and Marine Corp women's auxiliary and reserve units, respectively.

As war casualties mounted, exacerbating manpower shortages, more men were needed for combat and, consequently, the demand for women in non-traditional roles increased. Before long, women served in virtually every occupation except direct combat--as metalsmiths, camera repairmen, printers, machinist's mates, control tower operators, Link-trainer instructors, radio operators and repairmen, parachute riggers, gunner instructors, naval air navigators, engine mechanics, celestial navigation instructors, aerophotographers, as well as clerical workers (Holm, 1992, p. 60). Women officers were assigned to civil engineering, communications, intelligence, supply, legal, electronics, medical, and dental occupations.

During World War II the Army and Navy Nurse Corps expanded from a peacetime strength of 1370 to over 14,300. For the first time women were forward deployed in direct support of combat units. They served in the Philippines, Guam, Bataan, and Corregidor. Sixty-six Army nurses and eleven Navy nurses were held in Japanese prison camps in the Philippines for more than three years, while another five nurses were imprisoned in Japan. Over 200 Army Nurse Corps paid the ultimate price for their service:

Of those who lost their lives, six were on Anzio beachhead when the Germans bombed the hospital [in February 1944]. When conditions at the beach were at their worst, an evacuation of the nurses was considered but abandoned because to have removed them in thick of action, it was reasoned, would have been interpreted as an admission of defeat in the eyes of the American combat troops, which would have devastated morale. So the nurses remained--six of them never to depart. Of those who survived, four wore the Silver Star, the first women ever to receive that decoration (Holm, 1992, p. 92).

In all, over 1600 women received decorations including the: Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star, Air Medal, Legion of Merit, Commendation Medal, and Purple Heart in recognition of their contributions and sacrifices.

In addition, over 1000 civilian women pilots served the military as members of the Women's Airforce Service Pilots (WASPs) program. They flew every plane in the U.S. inventory, performing missions that included: plane ferrying, target towing, and pilot training. Thirty-eight of these

women died in the line of duty before the WASPs were disbanded in 1944 (Holm, 1992, p. 64).

At the end of the war military leaders recognized the advantages of retaining women in the military on a "permanent" basis however they were uneasy with women's encroachment into nontraditional fields, formerly populated exclusively by men. Although they provided additional trained resources for future mobilizations, potentially eliminating the need for a peacetime draft, women's future participation was restricted to those traditionally occupations defined as "female."

In June 1948, after long and heated debate in Congress, the Women's Armed Services Integration Act (Public Law 625) was passed giving women permanent status in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Although it granted women permanent status, its provisions actually established institutional segregation and inequality based on gender. Restrictions included:

- Limited enlisted women to 2% of total force. Authorized limited percentages of female commissioned officers and warrant officers (only one woman O-6 per service).
- Career opportunities for women were limited. Each service was allowed to have only **one** woman O-6 on active duty, otherwise women could not promote above the rank of O-5 (limited to a total of 10 percent of women officers).
- Women had to prove their husbands and children were dependent upon them as their "chief support" to receive dependent compensation (wives and children of male members were automatically considered dependents).

- Many ratings which had been open to women during the war were now closed to them.
- Minimum enlistment age was 18 years old, parental consent required if under 21. Male age limits were 17 and 18 respectively.
- Authorized service Secretaries to discharge women from the service involuntarily. (This facilitated dismissal for pregnancy and the services ensured their instructions detailed this policy. No similar blanket authority existed for the dismissal of men).

Additionally Section 6015, of Public Law 625, prescribes the restrictions on duty assignments for Navy and Marine Corps women. It is still in effect and states:

6015 Women members: duty; qualification; restrictions

The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the manner in which women officers, women warrant officers, and enlisted women members of the Regular Navy and the regular Marine Corps shall be trained and qualified for military duty. The Secretary may prescribe the kind of military duty to which such women members may be assigned and the military authority which they may exercise. However, women may not be assigned to duty on vessels or in aircraft that are engaged in combat missions nor may they be assigned to other than temporary duty on vessels of the Navy except hospital ships, transports, and vessels of a similar classification not expected to be assigned combat missions.

It is important to note that this limitation is **not** applicable to women of the Dental, Nurse, Medical Service, and Medical Corps as women in these occupations are needed at the front both to save soldier's lives and to free men to fight. Viewed in the context of current society, Public Law 625 would be considered an example of extreme sexism and gender discrimination. However, as Holm says:

That would be an unfair judgement based on hindsight. This law accurately reflected the prevailing cultural

attitudes of the postwar period concerning women's roles and legal status. To have completely integrated them into the armed forces in 1948 with fully equal status would have been totally out of character with that stage in the evolution of women's roles in American society (Holm, 1992, p.127).

e. Korean War

When war broke out in Korea there were only 22,000 women on active duty--less than one percent of the total force--and a third of those were in the health professions (Holm, 1992, p. 149). Accordingly, women nurses deployed again and this time were assigned to Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH) units located close to the battle front in direct support of combat units. Although military leaders were eager to utilize women to fill other crucial positions, they were unable to enlist them in sufficient numbers for a variety of reasons: First, DoD over-estimated the number of women who would seek enlistment. This was thought to be due to a general decline in public support for the war and less patriotism than was evident during World War II. Second, the American public perceived women in the military to be immoral, of dubious sexual orientation, or both. Third, low military pay and standards of living could not compete with the burgeoning civilian industry. Finally, and most significantly, the military, which held women to more stringent entrance standards than men, screened out many of the women who were interested.

The end of the Korean War the military and society underwent many changes. Industrial growth and economic recovery, combined with a sense of world peace, led to a reduction in military personnel resulting in a total force of about 2.9 million, and a corresponding increase in the civilian work force. As the decade drew to a close, the number of women in the military dropped to 2,600 officers and 23,800 enlisted from a combined wartime high of 48,700 (Holm, 1992, p. 157). Although the ceiling for enlistment of women remained at 2% and had not yet been reached, the services were unwilling to recruit more women. Despite large numbers of vacant billets overseas, the services refused to recruit more women, preferring to rely on the peacetime draft of men. Those women that did remain on active duty during the decade were funnelled into stateside administrative and clerical duties, with the exception of nurses or medical specialists who provided care to U.S. troops overseas.

f. Vietnam Era

In 1963 a Government Accounting Office (GAO) study determined that the armed forces were spending \$12 million a year to replace women who failed to complete their first enlistment due to discharges for marriage, pregnancy and "unsuitability" for military service. The GAO, without conducting cost-benefit analysis or examining turn-over rates, suggested that military women be replaced by Civil Service

employees. Despite the tremendous economic cost and inequities inherent in the practice of involuntary discharge for marriage, and pregnancy (or parenthood occurring when a woman married a man and became a custodial stepparent), the services did not rescind the policy of involuntary discharge based upon these conditions until 1976.

The mid-1960s saw a major shift in the role and status of women in the military. As the war in Vietnam escalated, and men were reluctant to volunteer to fight in an unpopular war, interest in military women was renewed. As in previous wars, the decision to mobilize women only came after all other options had been exhausted. In 1967, over 114,000 military jobs were converted to civilian positions and enlistment standards for men were lowered significantly under "Project 100,000" guidelines before the DoD announced that it would augment the services with over 6,500 women.

The personnel shortages experienced during the mid-1960s led President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1967 to remove restrictions on the careers of women officers with Public Law 90-130. It removed the 2% ceiling on women in the services and allowed women to promote to high ranks without limitations. After he signed the bill on 8 November, President Johnson remarked: "There is no reason why we should not some day have a female Chief of Staff or even a Commander in Chief" (New York Times, 9 November, 1967, p. 3).

Of the nearly six **thousand** military women who served in Vietnam, 80 percent were either nurses or medical specialists (Holm, 1992, p. 214-218). The Marine Corps, which has no nurses, sent 36 women to Vietnam and although the Navy sent hundreds of women nurses into Vietnam, only nine women line officers were selected for duty in Vietnam from the many who requested assignment there.

Women whose requests for duty in Vietnam were denied on the basis that it was "inappropriate", found it illogical that the military could send thousands of women nurses and women civilian employees, Red Cross workers, and USO employees to the combat theater, but hesitated to commit trained military women. The difficulty the services experienced defining "combat" and "combat-support" jobs was becoming more and more apparent, and women's response to such limitations on their service was increasingly vocal and expressed to their commanders.

Women who did serve in Vietnam experienced the same evanescence that women in other conflicts and war experienced:

Nurses who have served on or near the front of men's wars have suffered from their invisibility. They have been pushed to the back of the bureaucratic filing cabinet. For example, when it uses the term 'Vietnam Veterans,' the U.S. Veterans Administration usually means **male** veterans...By contrast, American women who served in the U.S. military in Vietnam are scarcely acknowledged to exist (Enloe, 1983, p.109).

The "invisibility" of American military women's service in or near combat, is apparent in a speech given by President Ronald Reagan on 15 March 1981 at a Medal of Honor ceremony at the Pentagon:

Several years ago, we brought home a group of American fighting men who had obeyed their country's call and who had fought as bravely and as well as any Americans in our history. They came home without a victory, not because they'd been defeated, but because they'd been denied permission to win. They were greeted by no parades, no bands, no waving of the flag they had so nobly served. There's been no thank-you for their sacrifice. There's been no effort to honor, and thus, give pride to the families of more than 57,000 young men who gave their lives in that faraway war--there's been little or no recognition of the gratitude we owe to the more than 300,000 men who suffered wounds in that war (Holm, 1992, p. 242).

Women, who had contributed significantly to the war, often under direct hostile fire, who had received combat pay and combat decorations, and who had given their lives, were not even mentioned by their Commander-in-Chief. It wasn't until 11 November 1993, that a memorial was finally dedicated to the Vietnam nurses in recognition of their contributions.

g. Post-Vietnam

As the Vietnam war ended the American military returned to peacetime end strength and commenced a decade of unprecedented change. In 1970, as Congress was debating passage of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and President Richard Nixon contemplated going to an All Volunteer Force (AVF), women began to sue the military for sex discrimination in its policies and practices. Leaders of the armed forces

watched intently as the ERA marched toward ratification, for when it became part of the Constitution, as seemed likely, many service policies and practices regarding women would be subject to legal challenge (Ebbert and Hall, 1993, p. 160). The services became convinced that a **voluntary** review of women's policies and programs was preferable to one thrust upon them by the courts.

In August of 1972, the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, a strong supporter of equal opportunity with regard to both gender and race, issued a message, "Z-Gram 116," to the fleet that would have a lasting impact on the retention, career opportunities, and assignment of women in the Navy. His policy letter, entitled "Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women in the Navy," detailed the following:

- All 70 of the Navy's ratings were opened to women albeit in limited numbers, increasing the number of ratings open to women by 46.
- Staff Corps and Restricted Line were open to women.
- Women could be assigned to billets such as; executive assistants and briefers, aides, action officers for CNO's staff.
- Service colleges were opened to women.
- More operational commands opened to women.

h. Recent History

By 1973 the draft ended and the American military entered the era of the All Volunteer Force. Unprecedented

changes and challenges to the military establishment took place during the next decade. Major milestones in the Navy included:

- 1972 Program for assignment of women at sea initiated. Navy announced it will begin training women as Naval aviators.
- 1973 First women earned aviation wings.
- 1976 Women appointed to the Naval Academy. Women attend Aviation Officer Candidate School.
- 1977 Navy sponsored amendment to 10 U.S.C. Sec 6015 to allow permanent assignment of women to non-combatant ships and temporary assignment to any ship not expected to have a combat mission during the period of assignment.
- 1978 Surface Warfare and Special Operations opened to women.
- 1979 Naval Flight Officer program opened to women. First woman Naval Aviator obtains carrier landing qualification.
- 1981 Jet training pipeline opened to women.
- 1982 First women selected for Test Pilot School.
- 1983 First women Surface Warfare Officers (SWO) screened for Executive Officer (XO) afloat.
- 1984 Operational VP (patrol) squadrons opened to women.
- 1986 Pregnancy policy modified to allow women to remain aboard ships until the 20th week of their pregnancy. First woman SWO assigned as XO afloat. Assignment to Military Sealift Command ships authorized.
- 1987 First woman Naval Aviator screened for command. First woman SWO selected for command at sea.

In September 1987 Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger established a DoD Task Force on women in the

military. The Task Force was directed to study a wide range of issues impacting women's: careers, morale, utilization, and quality of life. The Task Force reported that the services were not consistent in their interpretation or application of the combat exclusion statutes in their assignment of women. It recommended that DoD adopt a clear standard for evaluating which positions or units should be closed to women.

Based on the recommendations of the Task Force, the DoD Risk Rule was adopted in 1988 to aid the services in identifying combat support positions in which women could serve. By standardizing the method to identify combat support positions many new jobs and opportunities opened for women.

The Risk Rule stated:

Risk of direct combat, exposure to hostile fire, or capture are proper criteria for closing non-combat positions or units to women, when the type, degree, and duration of such risk are equal to or greater than the combats unit with which they are normally associated within a given theater of operations. If the risk of non-combat units or positions is less than comparable to land, air, or sea combat units with which they are associated, they should be open to women. Non-combat land units should be compared to combat land units, air to air, and so forth.

All branches of the U.S. military were subject to DoD Risk Rule policy in their assignment of women from September 1988 until January 1994, when the Risk Rule was modified.

As history illustrates, however, when military necessity dictates, the services interpret the Combat Exclusion Law and Risk Rule policy using the "Humpty Dumpty"

Rule first postulated in Lewis Carroll's children's tale Through the Looking Glass (quoted in Holm, 1992, p. 398). In the fable, Alice asked Humpty Dumpty to further explain a vague point.

Humpty Dumpty grandly asserted: "When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less."

"The question is," protested Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," replied Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master--that's all."

Ignoring historical fact that proves women are not always in the role of the "protected," military leaders have struggled to define "combat" and "the front." Their difficulty in arriving at a conclusive definition is evident in Assistant Secretary of Defense, Lawrence Korb's struggle in 1982 to explain why certain jobs had been "redefined" as "combat" jobs and therefore became off limits to women:

Basically what you're talking about is the main battle area in the front. This is where people engage in direct combat. The combat exclusion here is applied here to keep people who . . . are permanently in the main battle area, to apply that to women. Up to now they've been kept out of it primarily because in the main battle area you have people primarily in the combat areas, but there are other people who are behind the main battle area or the so-called EAC, Echelons Above Corps in which people are in units which are not combat but are permanently stationed in the main battle area (Korb, U.S. DoD, 26 Aug 1982, press conference transcript, p. 3).

This illustrates that even the most senior military leaders cannot articulate what constitutes "the front" and "combat." Despite impassioned efforts to keep "combat" an exclusively

male preserve, defenders of the combat exclusion policy have not demonstrated empirically or otherwise that women are inferior combatants (Britton and Williams, 1991, p. 12).

i. A Decade of Change

Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s women served in combat areas and, in some cases, combat positions. Women received nationwide press for their involvement and accomplishments in 1983 in support of Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada, and again in 1989 in Panama in support of Operation Just Cause. During Operation Urgent Fury, military policewomen who patrolled in armed jeeps and guarded prisoners of war, were the most visible of the 170 Army women deployed to Grenada. Other women soldiers served as: helicopter pilots, crew chiefs, maintenance personnel, intelligence specialists, signal and communications specialists, truck drivers, stevedores, and medical personnel. One woman ordnance Captain was responsible for detonating unexploded ammunition (Holm, 1992, p. 404).

During Operation Just Cause, Captain Linda Bray, U.S. Army, ignited a firestorm of controversy over the new roles of women in the armed forces when her routine military police mission became a "three-hour, infantry-style firefight" that generated an onslaught of public interest (Holm, 1992, p. 434). Additionally, three women Army Black Hawk helicopter pilots came under heavy attack, resulting in their nominations

for the Army Air Medal, with two receiving the "V" for valor. The events in Panama became the "appetizer" for the "meal" about to be served in the Persian Gulf several months later when Iraq invaded Kuwait.

Recent history is rife with examples of the military's selective applications of the Combat Exclusion Law and the Risk Rule: In June 1987, the USS ACADIA (AD-42), a non-combatant repair ship, with a crew that included 248 women, was sent to the Persian Gulf to repair the USS STARK (FFG-31), that had been severely damaged by Iraqi missiles. The Acadia steamed into hostile waters, subject to the same risks as the combatant vessel she was dispatched to repair. Once again necessity dictated a liberal interpretation of the rules designed to limit women's exposure to danger.

Using the Combat Exclusion Law exemption for women in the Dental, Nurse, Medical Service, and Medical Corps, the Navy chooses to define "combat" and the "front" for select occupations. Women, such as nurses, in typically "pink collar" professions, but nonetheless critical to the mission are kept ideologically peripheral to the combat-masculinity core (Enloe, 1983, p. 213) of the Navy and are therefore permitted to serve where the need is the greatest. Although they are not subject to combat exclusion laws, they are often at equal or greater risk than the units they serve. As Caroline Becraft noted, these restrictions do not guarantee

safety to women:

They allow women to be shot at, but not to shoot. In light of this and the fact that serving in combat units enhances military and naval careers, one can understand that many women have grown increasingly skeptical about just who is being protected from just what--or whom" (Ebbert and Hall, 1993, p. 267).

In August 1990, in order to protect U.S. interests, President George Bush ordered troops to the Persian Gulf. Operations Desert Shield/Storm was the first major conflict involving the wholesale deployment of U.S. service women and continued to pique the public's interest in women serving in the armed forces and protecting the United States. Over 40,000 women were ordered to the Persian Gulf, the largest number of U.S. military women ever deployed so close to "the front." Thirteen were killed in the line of duty and two were taken as Prisoners of War, once again calling into question the contradictions between law and the policy that put "unarmed" women on the firing line (Eitelberg, 1990, p. 26).

Widespread media coverage of women's participation in the Gulf forcibly altered American public perception of women's role in the military and prompted questions regarding the validity of the argument that "war is man's work." Less than seven months later, in September 1991, on the heels of women's successes and contributions in the Persian Gulf War, 83 women, 24 of whom were active duty Naval officers, were sexually assaulted by Naval aviators attending the annual Navy Tailhook Association Convention in Las Vegas, Nevada. On June

24, 1992, when these assaults were made public, America learned that military women had as much to fear from their colleagues at home as from their enemies abroad.

As we have illustrated, American women have willingly and capably participated in every U.S. military conflict since the Revolutionary war. Their participation, contributions, and accomplishments, however, have been ignored or trivialized by historians. The military has permitted women to serve in the Armed Forces only as a last resort--when the available pool of men had been depleted. Prior to the last decade, women were demobilized as rapidly as possible after each conflict in order to return both the military and society to the pre-war status quo. Despite their recent, well-publicized contributions to American military efforts in Grenada, Panama, and the Persian Gulf, women's presence within the military continues to be viewed with skepticism and outright hostility by many men.

G. SUMMARY

As we have discussed in this chapter, there is a difference between gender and sex. Society and organizations are inherently gendered through:

- Divisions of Labor
- Construction of Symbols and Images

- Interaction Between Individuals (including those between women and women, women and men, men and men)
- Production of Individual Identity

We examined how gendering is achieved through the self-reinforcing processes of structure and practice. As R. W. Connell contends, "masculinity does not fall from the heavens. It is constructed by masculinizing practices which are liable to provoke resistance, can go wrong, and are always uncertain in their outcome" (Connell, 1987, p. 58). That is why so much effort must be expended in their maintenance. We have demonstrated how gendering occurs specifically within the U.S. Navy and discussed the idea of war as "man's" work. We explored the processes of masculine hegemony that embrace and sustain this premise. We conducted a historical review of women's role in American military operations and the social forces which have influenced their participation.

It is in their role as a marginalized and subordinated minority within the Navy that women's experiences reveal the full extent and effects of patriarchal domination and masculine hegemonic processes. In the next chapter we will explore women's experiences within the hyper-masculine environment of the U.S. Navy.

IV ANALYSIS

A. OVERVIEW

The analysis of the data in this study yielded nine major themes. These themes are presented along with supporting justifications drawn from the interviews. Each justification is reinforced by quotations, excerpted from the interviews, describing specific incidents and the organizational culture in which they occurred. The themes are presented in four subsections: In themes #1 through 4, women explain how they have experienced marginalization and subordination; in themes #5 through 7, women describe how they have responded; in themes #8 and 9, women explain the importance of full integration and recount instances where they felt the most accepted. Additionally, they identify the factors they felt aided their acceptance into the military.

B. THEME I: WOMEN EXPERIENCE OPPOSITION TO THEIR PRESENCE

1. Theme

Despite laws and policies mandating equal opportunity for women in the military, men frequently express opposition to and hostility towards women in the military.

2. Justification

The U.S. Navy is a predominately masculine hierarchy that has existed for over two hundred years. The women in this study have careers that in some cases span twenty-five or more years. They have seen changes in public law and U.S. Navy policies that were intended to provide greater opportunity for women in the military and to ensure that all naval personnel are treated with respect, dignity, and professionalism.

Despite laws and regulations mandating fair and equitable treatment of all naval personnel, a traditional bias towards women remains. Many times this bias is openly manifested, but it can also be covert. Men in organizations often view women who do not remain in traditional secretarial or clerical jobs as threats to the patriarchal power structure. Consequently, women in non-traditional positions often find themselves targets of attrition tactics used by men intent upon forcing them out. Men are often intimidated by women's entry into the military not only because it challenges their power, but also because it violates deeply held beliefs and principles (Powell, 1993, p. 26). The women in this study reported that they had been subject to varying degrees of opposition and hostility during their tours in the Navy.

One of the most significant and symbolic advances for women in the military occurred in 1976 when women were first

admitted to the nation's very traditional and previously all-male service academies. The greatest obstacle to integrating women at the academies was, and continues to be, the attitudes of men--faculty, staff, and students (Holm, 1992, p. 311). Women graduates of the Naval Academy who were interviewed for this study described the direct opposition and climate of hostility they endured throughout their years at the academy.

Whereas first year male students at the Academy were all called "Plebes," a GenURL Lieutenant Commander who was among the first women admitted to the Academy describes the name given to new women Midshipmen:

There's a label they had for women at the Academy called "WUBA," which is supposed to be "Working Uniform Blue Alpha," where alpha means a skirt. So it's a women's uniform acronym. But the men would say it meant "Women Used By All," making it a really derogatory term. It was used in the meanest sense, when you really wanted to get to someone or insult them. (MBM-01)

The name "WUBA" was quickly adopted and displayed in a variety of forms and circumstances. A Lieutenant, Helo pilot, recalls one such incident that occurred at the end of her first year:

Herndon is when the entire class proves their solidarity by working hard to climb up this obelisk and take off the Plebe hat and put on the combination hat. It's a very big deal. It's when you're out of Plebedom and really come together as a class. Well, the day we all formed up to go jump on this monument and do this very traditional thing, guys showed up in these t-shirts that said "NWOH," meaning "No WUBAs On Herndon." They had matching bandannas and everything. All these guys were out there yelling "No Women" and their goal was to pull as many women down as they possibly could. And these guys were my classmates, the ones that we had been sweating through this with the whole time. After about a 1/2 hour of getting pulled down and having [men] call you a lot of raunchy things; having them pull your hair and scratch you, there were the guys

climbing Herndon and the women sort of along the outside, arms folded, extremely angry, just watching it. And this is the way the following three years proceeded from there. (JMV-02)

This same incident was reported by women we interviewed who had graduated from the Naval Academy at various times over the 13 year period from 1976 through 1989. In each case their descriptions of both the event and the audience that witnessed it were remarkably similar. One recent graduate, described how shocked she was that no one intervened or objected to what was happening during the event:

It's open to the public, so there are lots of people there: the Superintendent, the faculty, civilians, families, and the press is there, too. You can't believe all these military people just stand there and watch this happen and don't say something. (MBM-07)

While some of the hostility directed towards women at the Naval Academy was open and occurred publicly, some of it was obscured and took place in relative privacy. A Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, describes the treatment she received at the Naval Academy:

I was in the third class [of women] to go in, and it was still so new that when we were Plebes, the last all male class was there as Seniors and they had "Omni severi" inscribed on their rings. It means "all male" in Latin, which they flaunted in your face, and it was the accepted thing to do. [It was] like being Black in an all White neighborhood in the 1960's. That's the best analogy I can give you. They really, truly, hated you. They hated [the] women [at the Academy]. They didn't want us there, and it was group mentality. It was the little boy peer pressure thing. (MBM-09)

Women felt that the men were used to "having the place to themselves" and viewed women as interlopers. But as one

graduate from the class of 1983 reported, there was another tactic used to discourage the women on a personal basis:

They'd call me in their rooms at night and say, 'Why are you here? You should be a cheerleader in some civilian school, you don't belong here--go home.' They'd say this behind closed doors, in their rooms, where no one could hear it. We were 18 years old and to us these guys were gods. (MBM-09)

The impact on the morale of the women was cumulative:

We were too young to fight back but I'm serious when I say every single day for four years some incident or remark occurred with every woman in my class. I know it, a day by day stripping of your dignity, integrity and ego, to the effect that we didn't belong there, and it added up after four years. (MBM-09)

The hostility men demonstrated toward women at the Naval Academy was not limited to the Midshipmen. A Lieutenant recounts how a visiting dignitary was treated:

One year we had Sandra Day O'Conner as a guest speaker, the only woman speaker I had in my four years there, a Justice on the Supreme Court. And because she was a woman these guys got up and asked questions afterward that were absolutely degrading and [they] were really rude to her. It was so bad that the Secretary of the Navy put the entire Brigade in hack [restricted to their quarters], called the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and personally chastised him because of the way these guys treated a Supreme Court Justice. So you see the fact that she was a Supreme Court Justice was absolutely overridden by the fact that she was a woman. (JMV-02)

Even after nine co-ed classes had graduated from the Academy, men's resistance to women's presence there still endured. Men had innumerable ways to let women know they didn't belong at the Academy and only the force of higher authority caused the male Midshipmen to tolerate women. Normally when Midshipmen reach their senior year they are

granted increased privileges and greater freedom based on their seniority. But women Midshipmen often found that they were not accorded the same rights as their fellow male Midshipmen. A 1989 graduate describes what occurred when, as a senior, she went to select a new room in the dorm:

There were still people who had problems with women in the military and at the Academy. Their attitude was, "you've invaded my institution." Everybody lived in dorms and there were passageways that were absolutely sacred, so when we picked a room down "Sleepy Hollow" we were told, 'In a hundred years that we've been around NO women have ever had their rooms down here--it's TOTALLY male!' (MBM-02)

Some male Midshipmen also displayed animosity toward aspiring women Naval officers who were not at the Academy. A Lieutenant, GenURL, described her Midshipman brother's reaction to news that she was going to Navy Officer Candidate School:

He was livid. He was not for it at all. In fact, he was a senior the first year they admitted women to the Academy. So he was all embroiled in that whole issue. He had become very traditional and when you look at the girlfriends that he had and look at the woman that he actually married, he went for the very traditional, 'I'll stay home and make cookies and babies and you can go off and work.' So he just was very, very against it and very threatened. I think he was very **threatened**. (JMV-01)

Women endured their four years at the academy with the hope that the attitude towards women would be different once they were part of "the fleet". One 1987 graduate recalls how

women Midshipman viewed the opposition to their presence at the Academy:

Discrimination is like wearing a uniform--you just accept it, and if you want to stay there and graduate, then you have to live with it. (JMV-03)

Those women who chose non-traditional career paths were disappointed to find that resistance to their presence in "the fleet" was again openly expressed. One Lieutenant, Helo Pilot, describes her experiences at flight school:

The only problem with sexism there was that guys would just come right out and tell you 'I'm going to try to "down" you on this flight because I don't think women should be here or flying in any US aircraft and if I had my way you wouldn't be here,' and they'd be telling you this while you were trying to land. You, of course, would be very annoyed, but you would try to land the aircraft and take off because you knew they were trying to mess you up. (JMV-02)

Another Lieutenant Commander, Helo Pilot, found the male instructors at flight school also opposed her presence:

Some of them were very honest, they really **did** want to run you out, but if you flew well then they couldn't do anything about it. As a matter of fact, most of the guys, the Marine instructors especially, were extremely surprised when you flew well. A lot of the Marine instructors after I was winged or while I was in my last stages said, 'Oh, we just can't believe that women are actually decent pilots.' (MBM-05)

Women in other non-traditional occupations experienced the same type of treatment and were not exempt from men's antagonism. A Lieutenant, Oceanographer, recalls a conversation she had with an officer during one of her

deployments aboard a research vessel:

I had this Commander telling me women really didn't belong in the Navy, basically [using] pretty much the same argument that the traditional males who were trying to protect us were using, but they were trying to protect us right out of a job. He was saying things like 'This job is just too hard for women.' And my comeback to him was 'Well, being a single mother with no money is much harder.' (JMV-03)

Many men do not feel constrained by Equal Opportunity policies, openly expressing their personal opinions on women in the military. Often their arguments are either illogical or unsubstantiated. One Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, recalls how her Commanding Officer felt about her assignment to his command:

My boss would say, 'I don't believe women should be in the Navy,' and make flat statements like that. And he'd say things to me like, 'Women shouldn't be in the military because they can't go into combat and into war! And how can I depend on the woman in the next foxhole if we're under fire?' And I thought, when was the last time this guy was even in or near a foxhole?! He is a **Naval** officer, not a Marine or Army officer!! We go on ships, remember?! It would be hard to drive that frigate up the beach and into that foxhole! (MBM-12)

Some women reported being ignored or ostracized by men at their commands. A Lieutenant Commander, Surface Warfare Officer, recalled how the Commanding Officer and Executive Officer onboard her ship reacted to the news that she was selected for promotion to Lieutenant Commander:

As a matter of fact I was selected for LCDR while I was still there. The message came out and the radiomen got it and I think every enlisted man on the ship congratulated me the day that the message came out and my peers in the wardroom, the junior officers, they all congratulated me. The CO and XO never said word one. They never even mentioned it. (JMV-04)

Another Lieutenant Commander, Helo Pilot, was disappointed when she was told she would not be making a planned deployment to the Mediterranean with the squadron as a result of publicity surrounding the particular event and the political issue of women pilots at sea. She was even more dismayed at a senior officer's comments in her presence:

When we sat in Admiral X---'s office, COMNAVAIRLANT was there, Admiral Y---, and Admiral Y--- said to Admiral X--- 'Well, I tell you I don't think these women have any place here [in aviation].' The other woman pilot was junior to me and she was so angry and upset that he would say that. I wasn't surprised, I had faced it [that attitude] many times before. (MBM-11)

In example she described an encounter that took place with another senior officer when she checked out of his command:

Before I detached the Commodore gave me my detaching Fitrep in an envelope and after I read it I requested a personal debrief with him. To this day I regret not having a tape recorder or someone listening in the next room because he sat down and said, 'As far as I'm concerned, the only reason you are flying is because you're a woman,' that I didn't "deserve" to fly and then launched into this tirade about how anyone who doesn't concur with him about women not belonging in the cockpit was a wimpy, ball-less excuse for a man.

Often even enlisted men feel free to express their views to more senior women. They preface their remarks with the statement that although they know the **official policy** on women in the Navy, they have their own **opinions** on the subject. A GenURL Lieutenant, recalls conversations she had

with a senior enlisted man who worked for her:

I had a male BMCS, who was my Leading Senior Chief Petty Officer. He told me over and over that he didn't care what the official Navy position was, he didn't believe women belonged in the Navy and especially not at sea. But then he wrote to me while on deployment, after 104 days at sea off the coast of Liberia, that maybe there was a place for women at sea [As sexual release for the men]! (MBM-14)

Despite intensive training and qualification in non-traditional occupations, many women found themselves stuck in traditional roles because of their gender. A pilot describes the attitude in her squadron towards the enlisted women:

The men had created a new job down in the shops called the "Paper work" Petty Officer. Of course it was not a real job. They made sure that one woman in each shop was in charge of paperwork. The guys were out on the aircraft getting their PQS signed off. They had other [operational] jobs like Safety, or Line Petty Officer [but] these gals were in the shop taking care of all this enormous paperwork. And when the First Class women confronted the Chiefs, the Chiefs said, 'Well, these gals are better typists and they have much better handwriting and it only makes sense that we would put them in there.' I [also] found out the First Class women weren't getting a fair shake at billets with the First Class guys. The First Class guys would always be chosen to be in Maintenance Control, which is very prestigious, a Chief's job. They wouldn't let the women do it, and the women **knew** the reason they weren't doing it was because they were women. (JMV-02)

The assignment of jobs based on gender is not limited just to enlisted women as one woman officer discovered:

My Department Head in Norfolk, a female E-2 pilot, LCDR, a very sharp person, went in to meet the XO who asked her what she wanted to do, and she said, "Operations Officer." It was something she hadn't done yet. She'd been a LCDR for a couple of years and she wanted a shot at it. The XO said, 'Well, of course you're going to Admin.' (MBM-02)

Another officer describes how one woman, a more senior officer, was treated at one of her commands:

Although she was just coming off an XO tour and was coming in to take a department head job, which is really kind of a step down, they [the CO and XO] wouldn't let her assume that position. They made her act as the division officer until the other woman, who didn't have the credentials and the track record to be in the department head job, retired. So our new, not yet official, department head is on board, but she's sitting over with us for almost a year, playing division officer. (JMV-07)

Many men have problems dealing with women who are in billets normally filled by men or warfare specialists, even if the job does not require a warfare specialty background. One Captain, GenURL, encountered opposition from Surface Warfare Officers when she was assigned as the Training Officer at a major Naval Station:

I was filling an 1110 [Surface Warfare Officer] billet and loved the job. I encountered a few problems with COs who, when I'd try to set up specialized training for their crews, would balk and say, "What does an 1100 female know about ship's training?" (MBM-06)

Another pilot, after transitioning from the General Unrestricted Line community and completing flight school, encountered resistance to her assignment despite recent changes to the policy that allowed women to fly helicopters:

I was accidentally picked for helos because they only had our initials and didn't know I was a female. At the time they were only letting women go to fixed wing props, so they accidentally picked me for the helo squadron and when they realized their mistake I argued that there was a new appropriations bill that was allowing women to go TAD on ships. Even though it hadn't been passed yet they agreed to call my detailer and check it out. So they confirmed it and agreed, **reluctantly**, to let me go to the helo squadron. (MBM-11)

After completing training and reporting to her first squadron, she learned firsthand of the aircrew's reluctance to fly with her:

I remember I went out on my first flight and I did really well [but] I remember one of the crew, he had to be ordered to fly with me because he had protested to his boss that he'd leave the Navy if it meant putting his life in the hands of a woman pilot, but he went because he was told he'd be court-martialed if he refused a direct order. After we got back he was saying, 'She's ok, she can really fly that bird!' and it really broke the ice.

Other women recounted incidents when their qualifications were questioned or resentment would surface that they had even **qualified** in their chosen warfare specialty. One pilot recalls the reaction of a fellow pilot to her qualifying as an Aircraft Commander:

I had one peer give me a hard time in the club one night, that I shouldn't be an AC [Aircraft Commander] since I hadn't done a six-month cruise, and I told him I didn't care what he thought, that I was an AC. It wasn't like I was given anything, I still had to earn it. I had a lot of responsibilities and I **had** been the Officer in Charge of a four-month deployment. (MBM-11)

She also describes her experience at a subsequent tour:

There were certain things that I had more experience in that they [the male pilots] did not want to acknowledge I had a lot more experience in. Every time I wanted to do anything that was different from the last Det it was a battle. It was a struggle all the time. A lot of time I gave in just in an attempt to promote teamwork or to get them to concede that the battle wasn't worth the negative emotions.

Although the Navy has established policies mandating fair and equal treatment of women in an effort to facilitate their integration into the force, men who view women as disruptions to "normal" operations and oppose their entry into

the military rarely change their attitudes or behavior merely on the basis of regulations. The women in this study all related at least one incident, and in some cases many incidents, which occurred over a span of time and at different commands, where men voiced their objections to women in the military. Women officers reported that they were continually reminded by military men that they upset the balance and harmony, as well as the bonding process normally found in an all-male military, not by their action or performance, but by their very presence.

C. THEME II: HARASSMENT IS PERVASIVE

1. Theme

In a predominantly male military, women are often verbally, physically, and sexually harassed. Such harassment is often viewed as an occupational hazard, intrinsic to the organization.

2. Justification

Extensive organizational research has revealed that harassment, especially that which is sexual, is not the result of men's unbridled sexual appetites but rather an expression of power. It is a warning to women stepping out of their proper place. It is a controlling gesture to diminish any sense of power they may be acquiring and to remind them that, no matter what power they gain in the workplace, they are

still women and are vulnerable, on that level, to **any** man (Cockburn, 1991, p. 146).

Catherine MacKinnon, in her detailed study of sexual harassment, *The Sexual Harassment of Working Women* (1979) maintains that "the problem is not epidemic, it is pandemic-- an everyday, everywhere occurrence." Acker asserts, links between dominance and sexuality shape interaction and help maintain hierarchies favoring men (1992, p. 253).

Nearly all the women interviewed for this study expressed initial shock and disbelief at the treatment they received from men upon their entry into the service. Most had not previously been subject to such a virulent form of harassment. As a result, such malicious behavior was difficult for them to understand.

Due to differing perspectives of what constitutes harassment, individuals' own definitions assume considerable importance. Some men, even when confronted and asked to stop the harassment, do **not** stop, insisting their behavior is not intended to offend. One Captain, Personnel Officer, Marine Corps, describes how a more senior officer at her first duty station treated her:

There was one guy in particular, he was a Major, who thought he was being cute when he'd get on the phone and call me up and talk about what we could do if we went out. He'd call me "sunshine" in front of my troops, even after I asked him to stop. So when I went to my boss and told him what was happening, he **ordered** me to call that officer "snookums" next time he called me "sunshine." That way I wouldn't get written up for disrespect. (MBM-13)

Many women described verbal as well as physical harassment. One woman recounted how her Commanding Officer would call her "Erotica" [her name was Erica] in front of junior and senior personnel. A Lieutenant, GenURL, recalls the verbal comments of her aviator peers and physical contact with a senior officer:

I had never been around men who felt free to make sexual statements and innuendos to women and I didn't know how to handle them. They'd talk about everything--sex acts, breasts, everything! One CDR would come up to me and he would put his arm around my waist and try to feel my breast!(MBM-12)

While the women interviewed had numerous stories regarding incidents of harassment in the aviation community, harassment was not limited to that community. Another woman related an incident wherein a senior Marine Corps Reserve officer assaulted her and describes her reaction:

He was dropping me off at my car at the command. I turned to him to shake his hand, to thank him for driving me. This man had **not** been drinking. He was a non-drinker. My hand was sticking out toward him and was almost in his stomach. He grabbed me by the shoulders so I looked up, he took my face and tongue-kissed me. French kissed me. I just kind of pushed back and I was just **stunned**. He said 'When can I see you again?' I said 'Good night. Never.' Then he said, 'What's wrong?' I just said 'Good night, Colonel. This is not appropriate, Colonel. Good night, Colonel.' I got in my car and was so livid and so crushed, that this man had done this. I just was so hurt because I had admired him. I thought he admired me **professionally**. I [believed] he thought 'Wow, isn't this great that this person really cares about the Reserves and takes the time and energy and everything else.' And on my way home I was just **devastated**.(JMV-01)

In the Navy, officers are not the only men who feel free to harass women. One Lieutenant, GenURL, describes an

experience at her first duty station when she was publicly harassed by both enlisted and officer personnel:

It was my first watch, in the OPCON and all these officers, Lieutenants up to a Commander, were joking around, teasing me. There was a lot of sexual innuendo, really razzing me, and this Second Class Petty Officer chimed in too. I turned to him and I said 'Petty officer so-and-so, I have to take this from them [the other officers were all senior to her], I **don't** have to take this from **you**.' At that point a Commander in the room turned to me and said 'You don't understand **Ensign**, you have to take this kind of stuff [harassment] from **everybody**.' My rank meant nothing. I don't think he ever would have done that to a male. I don't think it was an officer/enlisted thing. I think it was a man/woman thing. I think he saw me not as an officer, he saw me as a female slamming another male who was getting in on the good, friendly banter and he protected the guy. (JMV-01)

Many women experienced harassment of another sort and punishment when they rebuffed sexual advances. They recounted stories of retaliation or attacks on their character. A Lieutenant, GenURL, describes an experience with one of the male officers at her command:

He had propositioned me a couple times before and I had always turned him down. He came over and sat down one day and said, 'So, what's it like to be a dyke in the Navy?' When I told him to shut up, he said 'Oh, come on. You know that's what everybody says about you. You don't have a boyfriend. You're single. You like **women**. How do you like it? What kind of women do you like? I'm just really curious. How do you like to do this? What kind of women are your favorite?' (JMV-01)

In spite of standing policies intended to protect victims of sexual harassment, many women stated they nonetheless feared retribution if they followed formal grievance procedures. As one Lieutenant states:

The system in place did not protect me in any way. I did not feel that I could do what truly is the appropriate

thing, which is to just say, 'Look, no offense. I'm not interested. Leave me alone.' And then actually have them leave me alone and not retaliate. I felt fearful, I must admit. (MBM-08)

Regardless of the setting, women's rank, or the impact of recent events such as the fallout from Tailhook '91, many men continue to publicly make derisive comments regarding women in the Navy. A Lieutenant, Nurse Corps Officer, speaking of her experiences at the Naval Postgraduate School, following the mandatory Navy Sexual Harassment Stand down in July 1992, related an atmosphere of hostility and disrespect:

They [men] make comments on Tailhook, women and NPS in less than favorable terms. They were speaking very derogatorily. I'm disillusioned by how many officers aren't taking it [the sexual harassment stand down] seriously and that is evident by the comments they make to one another. Like the guys in the classroom, they didn't care if I was senior to them or offended by their comments. (MBM-04)

Despite the proliferation of Navy and Department of Defense regulations prohibiting sexual harassment; required yearly training on the prevention of sexual harassment; and strict penalties for personnel found guilty of sexual harassment; women in this study reported that the practice has not been eliminated. In a patriarchal society that rewards men for aggressiveness and women for passivity and compliance, sexual harassment can almost be regarded as a male prerogative (Powell, 1993, p. 127).

The real test of sexual harassment policies is how women who bring complaints are treated and the actions taken against the perpetrators. Regardless of the fact that 83

women and seven men reported being assaulted at the 1991 Annual Tailhook convention of Navy and Marine Corps aviators, as of March 1994 not **one** perpetrator had been court-martialed. The woman officer who initiated the complaint that led to the Inspector General's investigation of the assaults and, ultimately, to the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy as well as to the early retirement of the Chief of Naval Operations, recently submitted her letter of resignation, citing continuing incidents of harassment, threats, and character assassination. The women interviewed for this study expressed the common belief that until the Navy's culture is changed, women will continue to be subject to sexual and other forms of harassment.

D. THEME III: TRADITIONAL FEMININE STEREOTYPES LIMIT WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION

1. Theme

Women's professional relationships with men are often cast in historically familiar roles such as daughters, mothers, and wives. They are expected to clean, counsel, caretake, and to require protection.

2. Justification

Women who self-select into the military are rarely traditionalists in their views concerning women's roles in the military or society. They have already overcome the pervasive cultural conditioning which pressures women into submissive,

secondary roles. Conversely, the men who enter the military are very traditional in their views of women's societal roles (DeFleur and Marshak, 1985, p. 168), and expect women to fill stereotypical gender roles. This wide spectral range between military women's and men's views polarizes them and inhibits women's progress in achieving full integration within the Navy.

Stereotypes about women are almost ineradicable from the minds of contemporary military men. Fagenson (1989, p. 38), explains that the dominant group within an organization often characterizes "token" women using traditional feminine stereotypes. The majority's stereotypes of token women force women into playing limited roles. Men benefit from these practices because these roles provide them with a familiar context within which they may view and relate to women with whom they work.

Many women in this study reported instances where men would classify them according to feminine gender stereotypes, often relegating them to the same status as other women in their personal lives or to a gendered norm. Additionally, the question of women's attire, make-up, and appearance surfaces repeatedly as male leaders attempt to use women as an additional source of military labor without altering what it means to be a **warrior**, a **man**, and a **woman**. If women are made to wear uniforms that declare their "femininity," officials risk emphasizing the sexual differences of women in an

essentially masculine institution. However, if women wear uniforms designed to **hide** their sexual identity, to make them blend in with men, then whatever privilege men get from being warriors and whatever protection women are supposed to get from their "vulnerability" is sacrificed (Enloe, 1983, p. 119). One Marine Corps Captain, Personnel Officer described how her Company Officer at Officer Candidate School felt about women:

The man that we had as our CO didn't feel women should be in the Marine Corps and **he** had the Company with the women in it! He told us how he felt about women Marines and women wearing trousers, and he said he didn't like either idea. He was a 1950's sort of person, very traditional, very white-glove. He said he threw away his wife's blue jeans when they got married! And he told us **we** would not wear trousers. (MBM-13)

Women officers who joined the military in the 1970's related stories of getting etiquette and cosmetic courses during initial training. One Lieutenant Colonel, Disbursing Officer, Marine Corps, recalls Officer Candidate School and the priorities given to the women by the Drill Instructors in during training:

They were more concerned that we look pretty in our uniforms than whether we could shoot a pistol, hump a hill, or run a PFT, none of that. It was 'Are you a gracious, feminine lady with manners and bearing, and can you wear your face?' (MBM-08)

The military has internal and external needs for its women soldiers not to seem to violate conventional gender norms; they must be "feminine," that is smiling, pretty, and heterosexual, even while being loyal and competent (Enloe,

Academy were instructed that they shall keep their hair, "clean, neatly shaped, and arranged in an attractive, feminine, and professional style" (U.S. DoN COMDTMIDNINST, 1994). Male Midshipmen, however, are not similarly required to present an attractive, masculine, and professional style.

A number of women spoke of having great assignments but nearly all the women had stories of being put into gendered roles in a command until they "proved" themselves, or until the men they were assigned with saw them as individuals and not as a gender stereotype. One Captain, GenURL, describes her first duty station:

It was a great duty assignment. First of all, I was the only woman assigned there. They didn't know what to do with me at first! I was everyone's daughter, sister, girlfriend, wife, etc. And I didn't have a job! So eventually I went to the CO after a couple of months and said, 'Play me or trade me, I came onboard to work!' So finally he did give me a good job. Then it was just a matter of integrating me into the squadron. (MBM-06)

She comments on the attitude men have had towards her during her career:

There are two categories they like to put us in, and if you don't fit the wifely, motherly role, then what's the alternative? Male-chasing, low-morals whore? Or something in between? Hardly!

Some incidents of sex-role stereotyping left women puzzled.

A Captain, GenURL, spoke of an incident that occurred during her second tour:

I'll tell you an interesting story, something that I don't think would've happened if I wasn't female. The Admiral and his wife had to go out of the area and they had an aging mother living with them. And I was approached and asked if I would mind staying at their home and

"babysitting" this aging mother. I thought at the time, if I was a male officer would they have asked me? (MBM-06)

Another woman, a Marine Corps Lieutenant Colonel, Disbursing Officer, was also puzzled by a supervisor's advice to her and wondered if a man would have ever been given the same advice:

I remember being told that if a woman is attractive and dumb, men know how to treat her and act around her. If you are unattractive and bright, you fit a mold and men know how to react to you. But I was told that I was an anomaly. I was intimidating to men because I was attractive **and** I was intelligent. This Major thought I should not act so assertive around the men because I had the nickname, behind my back of course, of "the lioness," [and the reputation] that no one could get by me with anything. I couldn't believe he had the audacity to tell me I should act dumb. I asked him if he thought I was doing my job and he said 'oh yes, no problem there,' so I asked if he wanted me to make mistakes in order to fit the dumb and attractive role? He got the point! (MBM-08)

Other women reported how stereotyping during their tours resulted in a division of labor along gender lines. One Lieutenant, after she was asked to wash the coffee cups following a conference, did so but placed a note in her Commanding Officer's cup that said, "If I am going to be employed as a waitress, tips would be appreciated." She used humor to get the point across that she did not feel she should be doing a job the Commanding Officer would not, and did not, ask of her male peers. Another woman described a division of labor by gender in her first command that continued for years, even after the women requested that the men in the work center be included in the task:

The women did the coffee, they did the cleaning, we had roles and jobs to do and it didn't matter that you weren't

the junior person, you just did it because you were a woman. (MBM-10)

The women in this study also commented on how women in each command ended up being responsible for ensuring flowers were sent after the death of family members or the birth of children, and were often tasked with coordinating command picnics or social events.

Because of gender stereotypes women often found themselves filling roles as "mothers" or "counselors" to the personnel in the command. In particular, one Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, described her relationship with the men in her command in a positive light:

I was the counselor to all these guys. Whenever they had problems they would come to me because I would listen. And sometimes I think it helped to be a woman, because sometimes guys don't want to talk to the guys. So I was the "mother." I have known other men who think women are here to serve them, like we are something to do the Admin stuff and to make the Ready Rooms smell nice with our perfume. I think we aren't always taken seriously or valued for our contributions. We are always an after thought, 'oh yeah, let's have a hand for the gals, they helped too.' (MBM-09)

But another woman, Lieutenant Commander, Surface Warfare Officer, did not like the role she was forced into when her fellow officers lacked leadership skills:

I hated the big "mom" role I had to take. Their [fellow officers'] enlisted men didn't like working for them because they didn't know what they were doing. So I would end up "mother hen-ing" the enlisted guys from the other departments because they would come over whining about, 'Oh, LT---, he did this and he did that.' (JMV-05)

Many women spoke of having limited options in responding to gender stereotyping. If they accepted the

"roles" they were being forced into they risked being limited in their participation in the organization, but if they fought them they would be rejected by their peers and also risked being stereotyped as angry, "pseudo--men." In the case of women entering nontraditional jobs, men see women as women first, workers second, and they respond to women as if they are filling familiar social roles, e.g., as mothers, wives or daughters (Gutek, et al., 1983, p. 138). For many women it is a constant condition they encounter in the course of their careers.

E. THEME IV: WOMEN'S BODIES AND SEXUALITY ARE USED TO EXCLUDE THEM

1. Theme

Their gender, reproductive capability, and their sexuality sets women apart from their male peers and often prevents their acceptance as full members of the organization.

2. Justification

Women's biology and sexuality is often used to punish those women who are seen to violate gender or organizational norms. That which constitutes such a violation, however, is subject to constant change over which women have little or no control (Sheppard, 1989, p. 154). Thus women in male-dominated organizations, such as the Navy, are vulnerable to having their status in the organization overridden by their sexual identity. No matter what role they fulfill within the

organization, they are first and foremost identified as "female."

Sometimes women's bodies are considered barriers to their integration without consideration for their actual qualifications. A Lieutenant, GenURL, found the men at her command reluctant to train and integrate women into the work center:

A female Airman came to see me because she was striking for a rate with the Air Frames shop. She was new and was anxious to get started in the shop, but kept being told to just sit in the corner and wait for instructions. We resolved it, but not without some heartburn from the supervisor. One of his comments was, 'Well she's very tiny. I don't think she can handle a lot of the stuff we're doing.' She was the only female, and he viewed her as more of an intrusion than an asset. (MBM-02)

Concern with women's bodies also extends to their physical appearance. A Marine Corps Lieutenant Colonel, Disbursing Officer, describes what her Department Head thought of her replacement in the unit:

He decided that the woman who replaced me didn't wear her skirts short enough and her legs weren't as pretty as mine. He couldn't tell me enough how unhappy he was about it. He actually thought I should counsel her to hem her skirts up and start a PT program that would shape her legs up! It wasn't [like he was doing it in a friendly, complimentary way, but more of a 'Hey, all you are is office decoration, and we don't care if you do a good job, just keep those skirts hemmed and legs in shape an you'll have done the Corps proud.' (MBM-08)

A Lieutenant, Helo pilot, describes her Executive Officer's "Welcome Aboard" brief, when she learned of his preoccupation with the chance that women assigned to the squadron might get

pregnant. In response to that possibility, the Executive officer had devised his own "solution":

He said we want you to march right down to the flight surgeon because you're not going to get pregnant while you're here, I'm going to make you go out to sea. And I said, 'Look, I'm not married and I don't plan to start a family.' And he said, 'Well, you know the facts of life.' And I said 'NO! You don't understand. I said **I'm not married and I don't plan to start a family here on Guam.**' (JMV-02)

A Lieutenant, GenURL, recalled her boss's reaction to the news that she was going to have a baby:

When I first became pregnant, I told my Department Head, a male aviator. I had planned to go in and tell my CO and XO. But my Department Head's reaction was, 'Oh God, you're pregnant,' and I just shriveled down in my chair. He asked if I had told the CO and XO so I said 'no, but I planned to after I had informed him.' 'Well,' he said, 'I'll handle it.' I thought to myself, 'I didn't think this was a big problem.' Then his reaction started me thinking. What if I get sick, or have a problem, or he sees me going to the bathroom every hour, or something happens and I can't come to work? I didn't want him to think that I'd be unable to work. So I decided to work a little bit harder to let him know that I wasn't like those few women who exploit their conditions. I felt that I had to go beyond, go overboard, compared to what I usually did, just to prove I wasn't incapable. (MBM-02)

A woman pilot recalled how the Officer in Charge of her Detachment reported his misgivings about having women in his command during Operation Desert Storm:

The CO called him in and asked 'Why haven't you listened to what X--- is telling you? She's trying to help you out here.' And he responded, 'I can't. I'm sexually attracted to her. She's an attractive woman and I'm a married man. And I feel like I've sinned whenever she's around, she's going to die and go to hell because the bible says she should be at home.' So he started talking how the bible said women should be at home. And I'm going to be punished because I'm not at home having kids, where I belong. And also that the bible says that men are

sexually aroused visually and that he can't concentrate with these women in the wardroom. (JMV-05)

Reproduction and sexuality are considered disruptions and threats to an organization's accomplishment of its mission. Women's bodies, procreative abilities, and sexuality are used as grounds for exclusion or objectification (Acker, 1992, p. 254). In the Navy, women and their bodies are viewed as distractors and threats to unit effectiveness and military readiness. As a result, biology is used to consign women to roles that keep them marginalized and excluded from the inner circle and the power track.

F. THEME V: WOMEN DECONSTRUCT AND RECONSTRUCT THEIR FEMININITY TO FIT INTO THE ORGANIZATION

1. Theme

Women react and adjust their femininity to fit into the organization. Some women believe that their femininity is stripped from them. Many reconstruct themselves as "professionals."

2. Justification

Sociologists have described a process in organizations wherein women perceive themselves and other women to be constantly facing the dilemma of being "businesslike" and "professional," yet "feminine"--a contradiction men do not experience. Numerous books, magazines, and articles are written each year giving women "guidance" on the correct

attire and cosmetics for the work world in an attempt to bridge the chasm between the two spheres. Upon entry into the military women are systematically stripped of most vestiges of their "femininity" when they receive their first military haircuts and are given a copy of the extensive regulations that govern their appearance. The contradiction women face in their struggle to be feminine yet professional is magnified within the U.S. Navy where the ideal of the masculine warrior is revered and femininity is abhorred.

Once women have made the decision to compete with men there is a tendency for them to gradually take on masculine traits--and it is not surprising that they often alienate women who are not like them (Cockburn, 1991, p.69). One Captain, GenURL, described what she observed when she taught the first class of women at the Naval Academy:

Language got very foul, women became worse in their language, and if they de-feminized themselves, [by] gaining weight, and they merged into the majority, then they became invisible--as much as that was possible in that environment--and they took less pressure. With that transformation they could then get on with the business at hand. (MBM-06)

Another woman describes the effect the environment had on some women:

A good friend of mine was very good at putting her make-up on, she looked great, and always wore perfume. But you could see as the year wore on, it was very long first year, and most of the male upper class were always harping on her and like with all the women, they stop wearing make up all together. They stop wearing perfume and slowly the language got worse. My two roommates who never cursed, by the end of the year, after hearing the males in the

company, would just slip into that kind of language very easily. (GFT-02)

Another woman describes how everything appeared when she first entered the Academy:

When you got there everyone was supposed to look alike whether you were male or female. WE were all supposed to act alike, everyone was supposed to think alike. I wouldn't call myself a "high maintenance" type of woman, but they wanted to mold you into this one thing and any deviation from that was bad. A lot of women tried as much as possible to be more male like that in order to fit into this male dominated environment (GFT-01).

She goes on to describe her first experience with the barbers at the Academy:

I had hair down past my butt and before I came in I talked to a friend who was there and she said get your hair done professionally before you come in because if they see all that hair they'll just try and destroy it. So I went and had it cut and it was well within regs and they still lined you up at this all-male barber shop. They only had razors, no scissors, and what they did to other girls was worse than what they did to me. Not that you could complain. It was partly an initiation, partly a rite of passage, like "you're ours now"! You didn't see any **female** facilities, everyone was treated the same which means everyone was treated **male**.

She recalled how women would try to adopt more masculine traits to fit in:

Part of the criteria you were graded on there is your voice projection. And one girl had a real problem when she had to stand and yell out "series." It is information that is shouted out 10 and 5 minutes before formation to the Company. She would get out there, poor thing, and just start yelling in this voice that was really high and kind of squeaky, and didn't have a lot of GUT to it. It was like ants on an anthill. Upper class would come swarming out or would stick their heads out of their doors and say, 'WHO is that?!' They would just swarm and pounce on this poor girl. And there wasn't a lot she could do about it. She'd try to make her voice male and deep which would sound really ridiculous but it kept people off her back. So something that became ingrained in her that it's

not okay to have a voice that's soft and a little bit feminine. The message was to be assertive, talk deeply, husky, that's the way to be so people will leave you alone. (GFT-02)

In the military, where the ideal physical image is of "a lean, mean, warrior" the focus on physical fitness and weight become intensified. A majority of the women in this study spoke of trying to reach maximum physical fitness and to keep their weight within or below standards in order to avoid negative stereotyping. At the Academy women's weight became a subject of intense scrutinization by male Midshipmen. One woman describes how the men focused on the women's weight:

There was a large push there that the upper classmen would pay a lot of attention to what the younger women ate. In any college it's normal to see women gain 10-15 pounds. But when you got to the Academy they don't want you to gain even 1 pound. Matter of fact, they want you to lose weight--SLIM DOWN, TRIM UP, CUT THE FAT--that's what they want. (GFT-02)

She recalls an incident with one upper classman who commented on her eating:

My boyfriend and I went to the gedunk machine, it had granola bars and candy in it, and it happened to be next to an upper classman's room. He heard the money go in and sort of popped his head out to see what Plebe was getting a candy bar and he saw my boyfriend. 'Mr. X---, what are you getting there?' My boyfriend was getting a candy bar just laden with calories and the guy said, 'You gotta keep that strength up,' we were just getting ready to start Study Hours and he said, 'Ya, that's brain food you know, gotta keep up that strength.' My boyfriend was real proud and said, 'Oh yes sir!' So now it was my turn so I went to drop my money in and he asked, 'And what are you getting, Miss X---?' And I said, 'Well I haven't decided yet, sir.' He said, 'All of those things have calories, lots of empty calories,' and he kept on saying 'EMPTY calories, just sitting there during study hours doing nothing.'

She remembers the appearance of the women at the Academy:

I remember when I went to graduation I saw many thin, thin women. Thin, unhealthy, thin women who were there. There were lots of cases of bulimia and anorexia. And no one will admit to it or talk about it because it is considered a mental disorder and you can be discharged for it.

A Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, describes why women willingly tried to adapt to male Midshipmen's standards:

Women were afraid to complain, they wanted to fit in and they didn't want to be singled out, they didn't want to make waves, they wanted to be liked, they didn't want to make trouble. I think this is a mistake a lot of people made there. We didn't want to be stereotyped. We didn't want to be classified. We wanted to retain our identities. It's not like we wanted to blend in with the **men**, we just **didn't** want to blend in with the **women**. (MBM-01)

Women who had jobs in traditional fields once they reached the Fleet found that even they had to adapt to a hyper-masculine environment. One Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, describes what it took to be accepted:

There were a couple of single guys on the base and we were all buddies. We had quite a few social things every week. That's all you did out there is party and drink hard. So I guess I was trying to fit in. I had learned I didn't want to be a wimpy girl, I wanted to be one of the guys. You had to be one of the guys. If they told dirty jokes you laughed, you didn't let it bother you. Nobody ever objected. One of the wives got really upset because they wanted to decorate the O' Club for Christmas, and she brought her kids in with her! Well the guys are all in the bar drinking and she got upset because they were vulgar in front of her kids. So I told her she fucking deserved it because she shouldn't bring her kids into the Club when the pilots are in there drinking! What did she expect? So she went home and told her husband who told me I should never talk to his wife that way! I thought she was out of line, but he reamed me good for it! But I enjoyed being one of the guys. (MBM-10)

And another Lieutenant, GenURL, a prior enlisted woman, described how she adapted to being the only woman fire fighter at her first command:

X--- is a place where you do a lot of drinking. I was there with all these guys, like a bunch of brothers, forty-eight hours of work with them and then home to our barracks as a group, like family walking back and forth each day. In order to fit in, I started drinking with the guys. And I remember them daring me to hit someone. They thought I wouldn't have the guts to do it; they were wrong! And I knocked someone off his chair and after that I was accepted--one of the gang. (MBM-05)

Not all women tried to defeminize themselves. Some recalled how they tried to do just the opposite in an attempt to retain their femininity. One Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, describes how she and her roommates reacted to the masculine Naval Academy environment:

We did the opposite, we were very feminine, or tried to be. You know, they neutered you. We were eunuchs. They didn't even have women's uniforms when I went there. We wore male uniforms, and they weren't tailored--so they were huge in the neck, tight in the butt, huge in the waist, and we had to cut our hair real short. No one had time for make up and stuff, so we felt really stripped of our femininity and stripped of our identities. So we went out of our way to fight that. We would wear make up and we would wear pretty underwear. We would wear perfume and we would be very feminine which I also think was wrong. If you aren't that way normally, why try to be that just to be the opposite? We were faced everyday with the guys talking about their BEAUTIFUL girlfriends, with their LONG hair. (MBM-09)

She recounts how the other women she knew responded:

I think the women that were fat or unattractive probably suffered more by it, but my roommates and I did the best we could to make ourselves look good. I think that messed us up because then it became all about what we looked like. It was like all we wanted to do was be attractive to these men, the same pigs who were putting us down at every opportunity. It was ok to be cute, to be fun and

giggly, and I tried to fit that mold, like the dumb blond syndrome. I was then "ok" because I was a cute and fun female, not one of those ugly, bitchy, fat, radical feminist Midshipmen. Which now, looking back, I respect them so much more than I do myself.

Many women spoke of themselves as "professionals"--reconstructing themselves as neither feminine nor masculine. A Helo Pilot, describes what it meant to be professional:

I didn't laugh a lot or joke around because I was very concerned about acting too much like a girl so I totally went the opposite. I tried not to smile. I tried to be **extremely** professional. I always squared my corners and yelled as loud as I could. I knew my rates cold. It was really obnoxious now that I look back on it. I tried to do everything perfect but I tried not to let down my guard. (JMV-02)

She proceeds to describe how she felt as the supervisor of enlisted men at her first duty station:

I always felt as though they automatically assumed that you were going to be weaker or nicer as a woman so I would always compensate by not ever trying to come across that way. So I made a real effort to never be too pal-sy, joking around, etc. I was always on very professional terms with them.

Lieutenant, Aviation Maintenance Officer, recalls how she interacted with her male shipmates:

I'm usually more direct but you have to kind of roll with the punches a little bit. Rather than making an issue of **everything** that's said, kind of roll with it or counter it with something sarcastic or just say things back to kind of get their attention. You know, not pointing out to them 'Hey, what you said was stupid,' but 'Hey, what about so and so?' Just kind of tactfully work things in about how you feel rather than putting your finger on somebody's nose and saying 'Look pal, this isn't gonna work.' I think that men, when you point things out to them [directly], are more apt to either do it again [intentionally] or totally tune you out. Whereas, if you're kind of tactful and work things into the conversation, then you get along OK. (JMV-05)

When it came to uniforms and appearance, many women recalled having to constantly adjust to the expectations at each new command. One woman, Helo Pilot, recounts her first meeting with a squadron Executive Officer:

He started in with why you had to wear pants and 'You can't make the enlisted women jealous, that you're trying to look pretty. You're supposed to be acting like a man,' and he said 'LTjg--You know when you're walking up a ladder, men are going to look up your skirt, and not just enlisted men either.' And I'm sitting there thinking 'I cannot believe this.' So I said to him 'My father and mother had 2 sons and I'm not one of them. I'm a woman and I'm going to look like one. I'm going to wear a skirt, earrings, make up, do my hair, wear hose and heels, sir, and that's just the way it is because if I try to be a leader who's pretending to be something that she's not then, I can't be an effective one.' I said, 'I'm a woman and I'm going to look like one and act like one.' (JMV-02)

This contrasts sharply with the policy of another Commanding Officer at a higher echelon command in Washington, D.C.:

At one of my commands, I was working for an O-6, who was prior enlisted, who thought women should wear skirts to work--period! And when I showed up, I wore slacks. When men are in an office, and it's air-conditioned for their comfort zone and not mine in a skirt, then I have very little choice but to freeze. So I wore slacks. I'm very meticulous with my appearance in uniform. I don't think whether I wear a skirt or slacks to work should have any impact on my overall work performance or production. He sent out a memo stating if you wore skirts you could leave early! (MBM-01)

When dealing with men in their commands many women said they used a common strategy, one that this Lieutenant has employed at each of her commands:

I have taken, because of my experience at the Naval Academy, and I think that's carried over, a very professional, "no nonsense" **first** approach to anything. My mother did the same thing in teaching. You know you don't smile for the first 2 weeks as a teacher. And when the kids learn to respect you, then you can lighten up.

If you go in there pals with the students, then they don't [respect you and] they'll take advantage of you. So I don't know [if] that's covering up my being a woman so much as it's just that I always to go in serious and professional, right off the bat, and then later, if you want to you can let your guard down. (JMV-05)

Lieutenant, GenURL, commenting the "tightrope" she walked at Officer Candidate School when male instructors singled her out:

I felt like I had to walk this tightrope, playing this game. You know, being nice but not nice enough to encourage somebody. I mean nobody wants to **not** be nice to senior people, who have control over you, but at the same time not so nice that it would encourage them to come on to me. (JMV-01)

Another woman, Lieutenant Commander, Nurse Corps, also felt that in order to be "professional" she had to act in a specific manner:

I try to be totally professional. I'm asexual, if you will. And I think the males thought I came off kind of strong and yet I was neutral. And the females thought I was bossy. I didn't go to the extreme. I didn't flirt or bat my eyes. I didn't speak of personal things at work, and I looked at people, not a male or female, but as senior or junior personnel. More of a sense of their rank. If you're not all prissy and fussy, meaning like **they** think females should be, then that means you're a dyke or a ballbuster. (MBM-04)

A Lieutenant Commander explains how the reality and the perception of women actions follows women throughout their careers:

You also have to be very careful about perceptions...it doesn't matter what reality is, if people perceive you as a flirt, or a dumb blond, and even if you know otherwise, that doesn't matter (MBM-09).

The women in this study spoke of the unquestioned assumption that it was **their** responsibility to conform to

existing gender norms and they modified their behavior or dress, accordingly. Many women described their modified behavior as "professional." Other women spoke of their determination to **retain** their femininity and of their belief that women could be credible members of the military even if they are, and remain, feminine.

Men, who set the criteria for acceptance, win in several ways simultaneously. They select women with masculine traits and actually succeed in defeminizing some women as they filter them through (Cockburn, 1991, p. 69). Yet, men are suspicious of women who appear too masculine, whose sexual orientation is suspect. A woman who is successful in the military **confirms** the stereotype of the lesbian. Women are subject to this closer scrutiny because their very presence in the military raises suspicions that they are not "real" (i.e., truly feminine) women (Britton and Williams, 1991, p. 20). As a result, women are forced to reconstruct their femininity to fit into the organization.

G. THEME VI: WOMEN MAKE DECISIONS TO SUCCEED AND TO NEGATE GENDERED STEREOTYPES OF MILITARY WOMEN

1. Theme

Women officers often feel representative of all women officers, and as such feel compelled to set a flawless professional and personal example in order to refute negative stereotypes of women officers.

2. Justification

As a minority group in the Navy, women officers are tokens and therefore subject to intense performance pressures and greater overall scrutiny because they differ from the majority. Many women in this study spoke of working twice as hard as their male peers to have their contributions acknowledged and to overcome negative stereotypes of less capable women officers.

Many women in this study verbalized their conscious decision to succeed and even excel at their chosen profession. One woman told of her experience at Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape school:

I was the only woman officer there. There were some enlisted women there, air force women, air crew. When it was all over, one of the instructors came up to me at the bar where we were having our going away party and said, 'What is it about you Navy **women**?' I asked, 'What? What do you mean?' He said, 'Well we have Colonels and guys who have flown here and there, and the gnarliest and hardest Pjs,' as the Air Force calls them 'and we can reduce them to tears. There's always something that we can do to absolutely reduce them and break them. But we've had Navy women pilots coming in here for years and we've never been able to break any one of you. I mean, you sit there, and we give you everything we've got. We pull out all the stops. And you sit there, like doing your nails or something. It doesn't bother you. **Why?**' I said, 'That's really funny that you should mention that. I don't know the answer.' JMV-02)

But after reflection she did have an answer:

The best answer I could come up with was, 'I've heard that discrimination in the Navy is worse than in the Air Force and the Army.' I've heard it said that discrimination at the Naval Academy is worse than the Air Force and Army. In order to overcome it you have to have something inside yourself that constantly says 'They're wrong. They're

just saying that to break you. You're better than that. Keep going. You can succeed.' There's something inside you that has to overcome that. By the time you get to SERE school and they try to psych you out, because that's the whole point of torture, is to psych you out, to break you, to get the information, that you're so good at saying 'You know it's a ploy, they're wrong, keep going, you can succeed,' that you just do it. (JMV-07)

A Marine Corps Captain, told of her own psychology for success:

You can kind of peg the people who have the attitude or who don't have the attitude, those who have some sort of hang up with women or those who really could care less. And I suppose there's something in you that **reacts** to that prejudice, I mean if you come up against it, because you can just tell. And I suppose something in me reacts and wants to **prove** them wrong. You know there's always that desire to prove them wrong and to do better and to succeed so that they can see that they're wrong. (MBM-08)

Another woman, Captain, Personnel Officer, Marine Corps, concurred:

I felt I had to work longer or harder to prove I was worthy of being in the Marines. But I know the guy who had this job before me used to take half a day off each week to golf. I can't imagine feeling that I could do that! I even schedule my doctor and dental appointments for first or last thing during the day so I won't be out of the office too long! (MBM-13)

A Lieutenant, GenURL, felt that she always had to fight being categorized with women who weren't professional:

I came in behind this Ensign who was fooling around with a Commander in the wardroom, playing sexual politics. And I walked in behind these females that are playing these games. I try to play it **straight**. Do you see what I'm saying? So it's kind of, you know, it's not **just** the **men**. There are women out there sabotaging what we're working for. (JMV-01)

And a Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, described how another woman officer's behavior impacted on her own relationship with the men in the command:

If the CO or XO exempted me from an AOM (All Officers Meeting) because it was about aviation stuff or they were going to get chewed out for some dumb aviation stuff they did, it was like, 'Oh, sure, did you bat your eyes real nice to get out of this one?.' And even though they all knew I didn't play those games, it was still uncomfortable to be put in the same category as someone who did. (MBM-12)

A Marine Corps Captain, Personnel Officer, also felt she had to overcome the negative impressions left by other women:

After a while, when they saw I was there to do my job, I felt accepted. And that was good because there had been a couple of women there before me who had been pregnant two of their three years there, and one of the gals tried to be one of the guys too hard. She was the one I took over the job from, so I felt I had a lot of stuff to live down. (MBM-13)

She also describes the fear that a senior enlisted woman at her command expressed to her:

I think she was afraid I was going to be an incompetent female and that would ruin her credibility and reputation. It sounds stupid but that is how women think, that they have worked too hard to get this far to let some bimbo come in and tear down their reputation. We tend to be grouped so much and we don't like it if we get grouped with the flakes!

Then explained how she treats the women that work for her:

Well, we tend to be much harder on each other as women, there are times when I'm much tougher on my females because of the expectations that we have to be tougher and better than the guys to succeed in the Marines, a male world.

Many women used the adage, "One bad apple spoils the bunch" to describe how they felt about themselves and other

women. A Lieutenant Commander, Helo Pilot, elucidated what it was like to be one of the first women pilots in the command:

I realized that our efforts were what the men would be judging all women pilots by, so we had to be the best and flawless. We knew as they went to other squadrons that hadn't gotten women yet, they would use us as a measure of whether getting women was a burden or just like getting any other pilot. And I think you will find that the women in HC squadrons are integrated really well, in every way, socially, professionally and as aviators. Not to say there aren't ever problems, because there is always that one bad apple that spoils and stands out. (MBM-11)

A Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, describes the prevailing attitudes about women, their appearance, and pregnancy:

I think attitudes have changed, but there's always that one malingerer that capitalizes on their pregnancy to the point where one bad apple spoils the whole bunch. I know I get annoyed when I see a fat woman officer because she reflects badly on the rest of us. I just want to go up, smack her and say, 'Drop some pounds you cow!' (MBM-01)

One Captain, GenURL, found mixed reaction to her assignment to the Naval Academy staff:

When I got there, there were mixed reviews. I worked for a Marine Major who had never worked with women before. His regard for women officers was based on the one poor example assigned to the Psychology Department. He didn't think very highly of her so I came onboard with a stigma that they didn't need me there. (MBM-06)

Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, describes her first Commanding Officer, a woman:

She had the worst mouth of anyone I've ever met. It was also a widely accepted fact that she slept with a lot of the enlisted men. So here I had this nympho department head, who had all these problems, the psycho bitch from hell, and that is what I dealt with every day. I learned at that command, that as a woman I had to do 120% to be noticed and that meant every Fitrep period I had everything I did spelled out and documented. I also learned that as a woman I had to be above reproach in

every area of my professional and personal life, or I would suffer for it. (MBM-09)

The bottom line for most women officers is that they must excel, they must out-perform their peers and that bad impressions are **lasting** ones. As one Lieutenant, GenURL, stated:

As we go through our careers we are trailblazers. We have to work harder just to get the same recognition. As soon as you get a ditz in who bats her eyes and wriggles her hips, then that undoes everything I've done and worked for--to show them that we should be on equal footing--well then we're back to square one. (MBM-05)

H. **THEME VII: WOMEN INTERACT WITH MEN AS "PROFESSIONALS" TO AVOID THE APPEARANCE OF FRATERNIZATION OR IMPROPRIETY**

1. **Theme**

Professional and social interaction between men and women is often perceived by members of the organization to be sexually motivated. Women are sensitive to allegations of sexual politics and fraternization in their associations with male colleagues.

2. **Justification**

Interaction between men and women reflects differences in organizational experience. Women are singled out and their visibility heightened through verbal strategies of boundary maintenance, i.e., "Good afternoon, gentlemen, oh, and you too, Miss X---", as explained by Kanter (1993, p. 229). The women interviewed for this study spoke of modifying their behavior to avoid the appearance, or perception, of

fraternization with male colleagues. Women's presence in the workplace is a highly political issue for men. In the original terms of the sexual contract, a woman's proper place is at home (Cockburn, 1991, p. 142). When the social contract is rewritten by women leaving the home, their presence and potential for sexual relationships with men in the workplace threatens normal social boundaries of behavior.

One Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, described an unwritten rule at the Naval Academy:

My husband was two years ahead of me at the Academy, and the first time we went out his classmates found out he had taken me out that evening. I was a sophomore and he was a senior, and his classmates dragged him to a kangaroo court to put him on trial for dating a Midshipman. (MBM-01)

Another woman, Lieutenant, GenURL, recalled the same experience at the Academy with her husband:

We met and started dating at the Academy and stopped dating because it was viewed as an "act of desperation" for a male midshipman to date a female midshipman. We stopped dating when his friends started giving him a hard time for dating me so he stopped coming around. That happened to a lot of people at the Academy. It's a strange environment to have a relationship in anyway. But it's really, really looked down upon for the men [to resort to dating women whose sexuality is suspect by their presence at the Academy]. (MBM-02)

Association with women Midshipmen was generally frowned on. One woman recalled how the men in her company, fellow Plebes, were indoctrinated by the upper classmen:

I remember the male Plebes had a meeting with the other males in the Company and they were told that any male that dated or hung around with the female Plebes were looked down upon by the rest of the Brigade. (MBM-01)

A number of women spoke of maintaining a distance from their colleagues to avoid allegations of sexual politics or fraternization. One Lieutenant Commander, Nurse Corps, described her professional relationships:

I did not interact socially with them [her co-workers]. I kept it strictly professional and my peers didn't respect me for it. Neither did the enlisted, because basically, I kept that professional distance, which I feel we are obligated to do. Maybe one or two said, 'Well I can understand why she does that, she's an officer and she's in charge.' But there were more that viewed it as stand-offish. (MBM-04)

Another Captain, Personnel Officer, Marine Corps, felt that she had to walk a fine line in her relationships with men:

I just had to be myself and to know when to back out, and that was one thing I learned pretty early. Like when we'd be sitting at the bar, or when they'd start to do things and you would know things were going to devolve and it would be like I got a sense of, 'well it's male bonding time, and I don't need to be here.' It wasn't anything against me, it was just that I didn't need to be there, for myself or for them, it was just time to back out. (MBM-13)

Other women recalled incidents in which men would try to test women and break down social barriers. A Lieutenant, GenURL, describes an incident at her first command involving senior officers:

We were attending a school in Germany, a couple of men from my command and I, all senior to me, and we were swimming in this big heated pool and then they said, 'Let's go into the sauna.' And I thought, this is kind of neat, they're treating me kind of like an equal, we were talking shop and stuff, so I said, 'Okay, I'll go through the Ladies locker room and meet you in there.' When I walked in I saw I was the only one with clothes on. It was a nude sauna and here were all these senior officers that I not only still had to go to school with for another week, but people I'd have to see back on the base in Italy--officers I'd be saluting in the Quad--so I left.

Later a Lieutenant [another U.S. Navy officer] I knew accused me of being an uptight American. (GFT-01)

And a Marine Corps Captain, Personnel Officer, describes the motives her male peers attributed to the enlisted men who asked her out:

I'm single and at the time I wasn't dating anybody, but I would get enlisted guys hitting on me, and I'd ask my friends and they would have similar stories. So we decided it was probably just nature at work! With some of it, you'd think, 'Am I doing something wrong? Am I sending signals? Am I encouraging this somehow?' Later on, the male officers we worked with who had overheard our conversation told us the enlisted guys asked us out to impress their buddies. They said it was a status symbol among enlisted men to go out with a female officer, and had **nothing** to do with our attractiveness or desirability. Boy, what an ego deflator! (MBM-13)

Most women knew the consequences if they failed to maintain strictly professional relationships. One Lieutenant Commander, Supply Corps, describes how difficult it was at her first command:

Once we had more women officers onboard the first ship I was on, it got better. There is nothing wrong with wanting to go out or hang around with another officer as long as that officer is female. But for me to go out with, let's say, a male division officer from the Engineering department, that would not be a bright move. It would send a signal that I was trying to come on to him. So I wouldn't do it, and that made it hard if you didn't have anyone to talk to. (GFT-03)

She explains having to watch her every move:

No matter how good I am, or how easy I am to get along with, no matter what I am, I'm different. I was 28 when I went aboard my first ship and there were all these young men around, maybe 18 or 19 years old. And one wrong step can be misinterpreted. That's a classic thing in the Navy. It doesn't matter what your intentions are, but the appearance it gives. And if I made a wrong step, had a relationship with a male that was anything but

professional, it would have wrecked it for everybody coming after me.

Other women maintained that they couldn't act friendly or let their guard down with their subordinates for fear of losing authority. A Lieutenant, Helo Pilot, recalled her experience supervising enlisted men at her first duty station:

I always felt as though they automatically assumed that you were going to be weaker or nicer as a woman so I would always compensate by not ever trying to come across that way. So I made a real effort to never be too pal-sy, joking around, etc. I was always on very professional terms with them. (JMV-02)

One Lieutenant, GenURL, described the problems that occurred at one of her commands when officers became too familiar with each other:

The female Lieutenant that I replaced was very much a politician. She would go over to his [the boss's] house on a regular basis, like when he was sick, bringing him soup, doing all of this lovey-dovey stuff, sucking up kind of stuff. And there were so many women on that staff playing that game that it became very **confusing**, I think, for everybody. I wondered, 'What are the **rules** here?' I remember when I first got to the command, this woman grabbed me and said 'Come on, let's go see Captain X---.' He had just had dental surgery. 'Let's take him some ice cream or a milk shake. We're just one, big, happy family here.' I didn't know **what** was going on. I went along but I didn't like the feel of it. I was asking myself, 'What is this? This is her boss, right? This is my boss.' There's one thing about being one, big, happy, working family and helping each other out but there's another when those lines get crossed and there were enough men and women willing to play sexual politics that it got the rest of us all caught up in it and put into some really negative situations. (JMV-01)

As a minority, women are conscious of the scrutiny their actions receive in the organization and behave accordingly. The hyper-masculine, hyper-heterosexual nature

of the environment in which women officers work forces them to avoid the appearance of fraternization or sexual politics.

I. THEME VIII: WITHOUT FULL INTEGRATION WOMEN WILL REMAIN SECOND CLASS CITIZENS

1. Theme

As the result of assignment policies that exclude women from serving in Navy and Marine Corps combat specialties and billets, women are constantly "reminded" by their male peers that they can **support** the mission, but they cannot **fight** the mission.

2. Justification

The U.S. Navy is a war fighting organization tasked with protecting United States national security and ensuring international sea lanes remain open. Combat occupations, traditionally restricted to men, are considered the most dangerous, adventurous, and prestigious jobs in the military. Jobs not designated as "combat," are classified "non-combat support." These jobs are perceived to be less risky, and therefore require less sacrifice. Consequently, these positions are considered less important to the U.S. Navy's mission.

Women join the military expecting responsibility, education, training, job security, and equal employment opportunity. They are dedicated to their chosen profession and want to serve their country to their maximum capabilities.

But they are prevented from doing so by artificial barriers in the division of labor which are based solely on a gendered perspective.

Because they have been restricted to combat-support roles, women are perceived by military men to be less essential. This perspective extends throughout the U.S. Navy. A Lieutenant, Helicopter Pilot, recalls the primary reasons men gave as justification for their belief that women didn't belong at the Naval Academy:

You don't go into combat and because you're drawing down the standards of the Naval Academy. In other words because you don't have to run as fast or you don't have to do as many pull-ups or pushups you are drawing down the standards. And because you can't go into combat and this place [the Naval Academy] is here to train combat officers. (JMV-02)

And another woman, Lieutenant, GenURL, describes an incident that occurred when she was at the Naval Academy:

My last year at the Academy we were all together in the Auditorium, and the Deputy Commandant stood up at the podium and told us women weren't warriors and the Academy's mission was to train warriors, which implied that women really didn't belong at the Academy. I think as long as Navy leadership holds those feelings things like Tailhook aren't going to make a difference. People talk about women in the military a lot more but talk is cheap. (MBM-02)

Even out in the fleet the prevailing attitude is that women don't go into combat and therefore do not belong in the military. A Captain, Personnel Officer, Marine Corps,

describes her Commanding Officer's views on women in the military:

He told me that since we couldn't go into combat we didn't need to be in the military, that we could be civilians and do our jobs without impacting the organization. (MBM-13)

She described how any special treatment of women, even if women do **not** want it, fostered resentment:

I had to plead for the women to be allowed to wear pants while on Parade Detail. They would be out directing traffic, boarding busses, and setting up traffic barriers while in their skirts and it was very impracticable--not to mention freezing cold! But what he [the Commanding Officer] did to solve it was to pull them off the Detail, and that really built up resentment with the guys. So women were viewed as having the good deal jobs while the men had the hard jobs. It really divided up the unit. It hurt us all, it was so unfair to the men and as a result the women were resented.

And a Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, concurred:

Until women go into combat and deploy just like the men, as long as we are exempt, men will still see us as not carrying our fair share. I tell them, look it's the system, it's not me, but I still think that the feeling is there, especially in the Airedale community. (MBM-10)

Many women interviewed expressed the view that men's attitudes toward women won't change until men believe women carry their fair share of the burden. One Lieutenant Commander, Helo Pilot, explains men's hostility towards women because of the inequity of job assignments:

There's a lot of male hostility [to the effect of] 'Why should I be on this ship when I can be on that ship that doesn't get underway as much.' Simply because he's male he goes to a carrier whereas a female can go to a P-3 squadron for sea duty and only goes on land-based deployments. In the cockpit, we've proven ourselves as capable aviators and if you want to change attitudes the law has to change. (MBM-11)

A Lieutenant, GenURL, agrees that men's attitudes won't change until combat laws are changed:

You won't see a major change in attitude until Congress changes the law and lifts the restrictions on women on combatants. Because those particular laws prohibit us from shedding that second class citizenry status. (MBM-01)

As one Lieutenant Commander, Helo Pilot, observed:

As long as the leaders see us a second class, not good enough to fly jets or ride ships then you will always have "Tailhooks" or men thinking it is ok to put women "in their place". (MBM-11)

Still other women spoke of the inequality of a "separate but equal" military:

It's a volunteer force and nobody's making anybody do anything except selectively register. I think they should probably selectively register all the 18 year olds. I think currently it's male discrimination, I really do. (JMV-03)

I think that the biggest single problem in the Aviation community is that we [women] are perceived as being an unequal partner because we aren't doing the same job. If we do the same job then we'll be perceived as equal. (JMV-07)

I like the 1100 community, and I'm pleased with what we do. But if we all come in as a warfare specialty and go to a shore command in between, then maybe we'll be better accepted and viewed as just one of the guys and fighting equally for the same positions. "No separate but equal" military. (MBM-03)

Other women, when discussing greater opportunities for women, acknowledged that there might be problems associated with integrating women, but were confident they could be

overcome. As one Lieutenant, GenURL, stated:

I think we need to throw everyone into the same melting pot, and obviously we'll have some adjustments to make, but I don't think there is any other way to make a change except to do it. As far as I'm concerned, and my peers, it can be done--open it up to women and give us a chance. It can be done and there are women doing it now, so why not open it to all of us. There will be problems but we'll deal with them as they come up. (MBM-05)

And a Lieutenant Commander, Nurse Corps Officer, hypothesized what it would take to facilitate women's full integration:

I'm not a line officer, so I can't speak for all communities or address the combat issue, but I do think women are capable of carrying their load and in flying aircraft and doing jobs where physical strength isn't a critical factor. The bottom line is common goals and commitment, and the man accepting a woman's professional judgement being based on knowledge not her hormones. (MBM-04).

A Captain, General Unrestricted Officer's experience confirms that women can be successfully integrated. She describes what occurred when the first enlisted women reported to her squadron in the late 1970's:

It didn't happen overnight but as women were assigned to the Flight Line, Operations, Maintenance, and other non-traditional jobs they were better accepted. It seemed we gained respect if we could handle the non-traditional jobs. (MBM-06)

The women interviewed for this study expressed a desire to be fully integrated but not at the expense of unit effectiveness. As one Lieutenant Colonel, Disbursing Officer, Marine Corps stated:

I also would say that women have the right to be judged on their capabilities and potential. If you can integrate fully without disrupting morale and combat effectiveness, then full integration should occur. I have faith that the

Corps will survive and become even better if qualified women are allowed to reach their potential. (MBM-08)

But they all concurred that if a woman was qualified she should be allowed to fill any billet for which she meets the standards. As one Lieutenant Commander, GenURL explains:

As far as discrimination goes, it will always exist as long as narrow-thinking men are in power. It has to be slow, and carefully studied, but the Navy has done more to advance equal opportunity for Blacks, foreign nationals and other groups, and we should be able to do it for women. I would also say, don't judge me by what your perception of what I am capable of is, test me. Give me an opportunity to prove what I can do before you slam the doors shut on me. Get job standards for the jobs and if I meet them, then let me do the job. (MBM-09)

The majority of women acknowledged that not **all** women would be qualified for **all** jobs, but just as with any man, they wanted to be judged on their individual qualifications. A Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, mentioned qualifications and the effect of gender discrimination on women:

I think I would say that we deserve a shot at whatever we are capable of. I think there is a mentality in the military that sees women as a lower class because we don't do the same things as the men. Now, I'm not saying all women are capable of doing the same job as all men, but in most areas we are right up there. I wouldn't want to weaken the infantry for instance by sending in men or women who aren't capable of carrying a pack or firing a weapon, but I have worked with women pilots in the Adversary squadron who were as good if not better pilots than the men, yet they were relegated to being "spin" pilots simply because of their gender, and that's stupid, ineffective, and a waste of talent. (MBM-12)

One woman, a Lieutenant, Oceanographer, agreed that women who are qualified should be permitted to fill any job, and

expressed what she would do if ordered to a ship:

If a woman physically can handle the job they should have it. If they are qualified to do the job, they should be able to do it. I think the PRT standards should be equal. You shouldn't be on board a ship if you can't lift a hose and fight a fire when it needs to be done. If they lift the combat exclusion law and say you've got to do carrier duty, I'd go. Let us do what we can. Take the combat exclusion off. That will make things more equal in the Navy. (JMV-03)

Historically, the military has dealt with issues relating to women's integration in a **reactive** rather than **proactive** manner, often responding only when forced. A Lieutenant, GenURL, believes the U.S. Navy has a chance to change its pattern of avoidance:

I don't think problems of sexual discrimination **can't** be overcome. We have a perfect opportunity to **lead** instead of being dragged along. A cohesive unit can be stronger when all the qualities of its members are integrated. Women do bring a different perspective to the job and it will work. (MBM-03)

One woman described the "good old boys" club mentality, double standards, and lack of respect that she felt prevented women from reaching their potential:

Even though women may not like to go into combat, neither do the men. When I came in women didn't go on ships, and if you got pregnant you could get out, so all that stuff has changed and women have done well. I think society isn't ready to see it, and until we get rid of the double standard we won't be fully accepted. Because it is a good ol' boys club. I am a good administrator and I know people respect the work I do, but there is still a lack of respect. Like from the aviators and the ship drivers who think they are better than we are because they are operational and we are there just to support them. They probably say the same thing to a male 1100 or a Supply Corps guy, but I think it comes out more with us. So I would like to see women have true equal opportunity with the men. (MBM-10)

Many women, like this Lieutenant, Aviation Maintenance Officer, thought it was ridiculous to keep women limited in number and to restrict their participation in the Navy:

I think that the population is 51% women in the world and to be only 10 or 11% in the military is ridiculous. I think there's no reason why women can't do the same things and it should be a lot higher percentage. I think we wouldn't be viewed as such a novelty or such an oddity or have to break such ground if we had equal numbers or at least closer to equal numbers. We should have equal say in things that are going on, in decisions that are made. So I just think the numbers need to be a lot higher. (JMV-04)

And a Lieutenant, Helo Pilot illustrates her conviction that women should be allowed to fly combat missions:

An aircraft doesn't care who's flying it as long as you can operate the controls and be smart. So there's no weight to the arguments that women can't fly combat or women can't fly certain aircraft. I think it's simply ridiculous. Having flown now and having seen women who were just really good, because there are some just really spectacular gals out there, like my room mate. It's completely ridiculous not to have women filling these billets. (JMV-02)

Another officer stated her desire to deploy:

Well, there's no reason we shouldn't be on the same ships or flying the same airplanes. I knew women in Hawaii that were part of the squadron that flies the A-4s, and they were the make-believe bad guys. They had Russian markings on their planes and they fly their jets against the U.S. guys for fighter pilot training. There's women out there who can land on carriers and do everything. I don't think there's any reason for the combat exclusion law. I think they ought to just go ahead and make everybody equal, give everybody the same shot. I'd go on a carrier. I'd go on a carrier in a heartbeat! (MBM-10)

Many women mentioned that the time had come to stop organized discrimination and cited Tailhook '91 and other

public events as evidence that it was time for change. As one Lieutenant, GenURL, stated:

Throughout history, time and time again, people have proven to have superior warrior spirit, regardless of their gender, their race, even their sexual orientation. To continue organized discrimination because of society's past discrimination is not only wrong, it doesn't make sense financially. It is time to wake up and realize that idea is outdated. It's time to shift our paradigms to say, 'What do we need? What works? What do we have to fill this slot.' There are warrior women out there and they deserve a chance to live out that existence, despite what the men say. (JMV-01)

The bottom line for the women interviewed in this study was a desire to see the Combat Exclusion Law and Risk Rule repealed. They are convinced that the mantle of second class citizenship women are forced to wear will remain until they serve fully, without restriction, in any billet for which they are qualified. As one Captain, GenURL, succinctly explains:

Until you lift the laws that prevent women from doing the "sexy things" in the Navy, and the "sexy thing" in the Navy is like the "sexy thing" in the other services and that's going into combat. Until you lift those laws we will **always** be second class citizens. We will never be Chief of Naval Operations and we will never have the **chance** of being CNO. Until they allow us command a cruiser or command an aircraft carrier we will always be, in the eyes of vast numbers of people in the Navy both subordinates as well as superiors, we'll always be second class citizens because we don't do the "sexy things." So you might as well quit talking about this topic or get on with repealing the combat exclusion law. There ain't no in-between. (JMV-06)

**J. THEME IX: SUPPORTIVE LEADERS, ALLIES, MENTORS AND A
POSITIVE COMMAND CLIMATE FOSTER WOMEN'S INTEGRATION**

1. Theme

Women officers describe the factors that aided their acceptance within the military and the instances when they felt most successful.

2. Justification

Researchers have identified factors that have a strong effect on the career successes of women. Three of the most important are: allies, mentors, and feedback practices (Powell, 1993, p. 204). In the military, where women officers are a minority and have few role models, women need mentors and allies in order to navigate the choppy waters of a male-dominated profession. Allies provide peer affiliation as well as moral and professional support while mentors provide the career-enhancing support of individuals in power.

Many men are reluctant to select women protegees due to concerns surrounding the issues of intimacy and sexual attraction. They prefer to mentor and promote people who are like themselves, men. The difficulties associated with establishing and carrying out cross-gender mentoring relationships present a major barrier to women's career success (Clausen and Kram, 1984, p. 36). Many upper management women, tokens who often had to expend tremendous energy to reach that level, view others, both men and women,

as potential threats to their status in the organization and may be reluctant to mentor more junior women.

Women in this study recalled experiences in commands where a positive command climate, proactive leaders and supportive male allies existed. In sharp contrast to the negative experiences of women who attended the Naval Academy, women in this study who were commissioned through the Navy's Officer Candidate School described a more cohesive environment. A Lieutenant, Oceanographer, recalled:

I started in the summer session and so we had a lot of the Nuke [nuclear power] guys and they were really very open to women. I only noticed them being incredibly supportive. It was kind of like straight out of "An Officer and A Gentleman." They were helping us through the obstacle course and it was always a team thing. Everybody really shared the experience. You shared your strengths and your weaknesses. We had a couple of gals who were really having a rough time of it and I've got to say, for the most part, I remember the guys being really very supportive, really rallying around to help them get through the curriculum. (JMV-03)

A Lieutenant Commander, Surface Warfare Officer, also enjoyed her experience at Officer Candidate School:

I loved OCS. I became a Battalion commander. I remember they wanted me to go to regimental staff but to go to regimental staff you had to leave your company. I didn't want to leave my company because we had all gotten really tight. So I got to be Battalion Commander and I just had to move into the middle of the passageway. (JMV-05)

Another Lieutenant, Aviation Maintenance, describes her positive experiences at Officer Candidate School:

We all worked together. We had a pretty good company. Everybody helped each other out. It was a good atmosphere. (JMV-04)

For some women, Aviation Officer Candidate School was positive experience as well. As one woman described it:

In AOCS the whole team works together. You all come together. You really do become part of a team and everybody makes sure everybody does real well. It was funny because when we got out of AOCS we all went to different squadrons and I felt like I lost my support group. (JMV-03)

Although most women who attended the Naval Academy described it as an experience where they felt harassed and ostracized, one woman recalled a positive aspect of the experience. She described the support and team work of Plebe summer, before the rest of the Brigade returned and the men Plebes were told to avoid the women:

We had four women and twenty-six men in our class. In plebe summer, we were very, very close and had worked together. We all went through the same stuff and became a unit while we had the school to ourselves, except for the four or five seniors who ran it. I felt that people had been supporting me not just because I was a woman but because I was a member of the team. (MBM-02)

Other women recalled training situations where men and women pulled together:

This school [Naval Postgraduate School] is a great example of men and women pulling together. It's you versus the exam, the final, or the Profs, or something. It's the students banding together to study, or it's the individual trying to do the best that he or she can. This school is a great place for men and women to work together. It's a wonderful place. (JMV-04)

At the RAG [Replacement Air Groups, now known as the Fleet Readiness Squadrons] I think men and women worked really well together because you're all students and you're all studying very hard. You're just trying to get through and get the best grades you can. It's sort of "us versus them," it's the student versus the instructor. You all band together. Any circumstance where you're banding together against a common foe is good. (MBM-11)

But another woman recalled the transformation of her fellow students as they moved through the flight training pipeline:

We watched guys that we knew in flight school who were pretty nice, go the F-14 route and really become the machismo, "pain in the butt," kind of guy. Like "we're F-14 fighter pilots and we're gods." I think they treated everybody the same whether you were female or if you were a non-F-14 pilot. They did develop more machismo, or whatever, as they went through the pipeline. Some guys came in with that attitude. But I think they were in the minority. I think you had the bell curve. You had some guys who were way off on the left and some guys who were really very supportive and would bend over backwards to help a woman. (JMV-02)

Many women officers spoke of their desire to be thought of as officers first, and women second. They appreciated those men who were able to view them in the same manner in which they viewed men officers. A Lieutenant Commander describes reporting to her first ship, as one of the first two women Surface Warfare Officers:

The CO of the USS X--- then was Captain X---. He's now an Admiral. He was very together about it. I guess the X--- television station was asking to televise our arrival and they wanted to do interviews since we were the first women coming. And he said, 'Nope, these are just another couple of officers coming to my ship and they're to be treated like any other officers.' And I thought, 'Oh, thank God, Captain X---, what a wonderful guy.' (JMV-05)

A Lieutenant, GenURL, describes her experiences as a fire fighter when she felt accepted fully by her peers:

Your adrenalin starts pumping [when you're fighting a fire] and you're high on it for a couple of hours after you get back to the station. Even if it were in the middle of the night, we'd all come back and just sit up talking for a few hours until finally we'd gotten everything back down and you could go ahead and get some sleep. And my acceptance by the guys, or our bonding, wasn't **just** the commonality of the experience but by each of us doing our full load. (MBM-05)

Another Lieutenant describes the cohesiveness of one unit on the base where women's gender was secondary to their affiliation with the group:

We had a big Seabee Construction Battalion over there and they had women Seabees. Some of the junior women had a bit of a hard time because they had to stand the barracks watches in all-male barracks that were on a different island. But the senior Seabees, the men, looked out for the young gals. They said, 'Look, don't you mess with our Seabees.' You know, Seabees are **Seabees**, and nobody messes with a Seabee whether they're male or female. So they'd set the guys at the barracks straight when the gals had watch. (JMV-04)

A Lieutenant Helo pilot relates the transformation in her Commanding Officer's attitude toward her and his ultimate recognition of her flying skills:

I got to rescue people out of a erupting volcano. That was fun. The same CO who gave me such a hard time when I got there said, 'I want you to come with me.' I said, 'OK sir, I'm with you.' He chose me because he thought I'm a good pilot and he knows I have a level head, and that I'm not squeamish about doing stuff that you shouldn't probably do, like flying into a volcano. But you have to get these people out because it's about to erupt, and we had to drop off scientists. We had to put them into these Lzs (landing zones) at all these various places around the volcano. Nobody's ever flown up there before so you're going into places where you don't know if it's safe or not. When we had to go back up there to get the scientists off the island, this same CO said, 'Look, either I'm going or she's going.' He let the XO go finally but he said, 'XO, if you're gonna fly you have to put her in the right seat because she knows the island, she knows how to do it.' So at this point I was feeling kind of good. This guy's turned around. He's gone from 2 years ago saying we're [women are] idiots to saying now 'She's flying that mission no matter what.' (JMV-02)

Lieutenant Commander, Helo Pilot, describes her Executive Officer who encouraged her to apply for the Aviation program:

I was at a Communications Station in X---, and my XO at the time was an aviator. He liked me a whole lot, and

when they came out with a message about applications from the fleet for women to go to flight school, he said to me, 'Have you ever thought about aviation?' I told him, 'Not really, I mean as a kid I thought about being a stewardess but to be perfectly honest it never occurred to me that I could be a pilot.' He said, 'You should give it some thought. Why don't you go take some flying lessons and see if you like it.' As soon as he asked me, the idea appealed to me. So I enjoyed the flying lessons and applied and, to my amazement, they accepted me. (MBM-11)

Other women specifically pointed out their positive experiences with senior officers who had prior enlisted service. Prior enlisted officers in these cases were described as displaying great concern for and genuine interest in the career successes of their people. Their philosophies influenced others within the chain of command, resulting in a positive command climate for equal opportunity. One Lieutenant Commander describes her experiences:

The Commander I worked for at X--- was the most level-headed commander. He wasn't an aviator, he was a ground pounder, Aviation Engineering Duty Officer. He valued my ideas and accepted me as a thinking person. That was extremely refreshing after dealing with the Chief Warrant Officer at my previous command. The Commander was prior enlisted, who had come up through the ranks and fortunately the system works and he's now an O-6. Just a great guy to work for. His staff, very senior enlisted, they accepted me, and even though I was pregnant, they never gave off the attitude of 'well, she can't or won't carry her weight.' (MBM-01)

Another Lieutenant describes a fellow officer:

And the new OPS O was one of the best guys and best managers I think I've ever worked with. He was a prior-enlisted Lieutenant Commander. He knew the system inside and out, but he was somebody who would stop and talk to **everybody**. He knew everything that was going on in the command, down to the newest seaman coming aboard, knew what they were going through, could talk to them. He took input from everybody. And he didn't let just one side

win. He was willing to learn, and he made everybody feel special or a part of the team. (JMV-04)

Yet another officer describes the sense of camaraderie she felt with one of the men on her ship:

There was one Warrant Officer, a weapons guy, gunner, who took no shit from anyone and he gave it to everyone, including me. But he was such a wealth of knowledge that I'd sit with him at meals or in the lounge and ask him questions. Career-wise I've never had a mentor and he certainly couldn't be a mentor for me. I mean he knows nothing about 1110s. But for the functioning of the ship I found, maybe it's because I was asking questions, and wanting to learn from their vast experience, he was perfectly willing to help me and no one was stabbing me in the back or anything like that. (JMV-05)

Several women described the positive impact supportive Commanding Officers had on their careers. In particular, those who were open to women in non-traditional roles were highly regarded. A Lieutenant describes how her Commanding Officer pushed her to experience the operational aspects of the Navy:

The skipper liked me real well. He was an O-5, pilot, and he let me go through all the deep water survival training and stuff so I could fly with the squadron once in a while. I went out on the Lexington (training aircraft carrier) for a week and did carrier quals, so I had a good tour.

Another Lieutenant, GenURL, recalls a Commanding Officer and Executive Officer who didn't constrain her to traditional women's jobs:

My CO and XO were very encouraging and I was assigned to the Maintenance Department and worked as a Division Officer. Most of the time women 1100s are kept in the Admin, Public Affairs, Legal Officer jobs. (MBM-02)

Still another woman describes the extent to which her Commanding Officer trusted and depended upon her professional skills:

The new CO, terrific! Wonderful guy! He let me run everything the way Xos are supposed to on a ship. Everything I did, he'd say, 'OK, great.' He'd say, 'Is it done?,' and if I'd say, 'Yes.' He'd say, 'OK, you sign it.' He barely even read anything and definitely didn't change it. So that actually gives you more responsibility because you have to check and catch everything. There's nobody else double checking it so you better have it squared away. So he was wonderful. You know when you get to be XO, you run your own thing, and if you're lucky you have some great people who watch over you but let you do your job. (JMV-03)

Most women discussed the qualities and values they admired in officers who chose to mentor them. A Lieutenant, GenURL, described why she thought her first Commanding Officer was a good mentor:

He was always interested in everybody's professional growth. He took all the officers under his wing and helped them, whether it was showing them how to write or whatever. He had been in DC and he'd been on all the selection boards and so he knew what was going on in the Navy and how to get things done. As the skipper, he took care of "the kids." He was a good mentor. (MBM-05)

Captain, GenURL, relates how one Commanding Officer championed her, ensuring she had career opportunities based on her qualifications:

My CO was very fair and positive. He regarded what we did by professional performance standards and was very supportive in my career. In fact, he was a champion for my cause when I was up for an assignment at the Naval Academy and it was a choice between a man and I. He stated that the best qualified person should be considered. He supported me since the job was as Professional Development Instructor and I had the training background. He also believed I could provide a role model to the first class of female Midshipmen. (MBM-06)

Many women discussed how they received, or did not receive feedback, and the impact that had on their careers or personal outlook. Women felt the positive feedback they received from peers and subordinates gave them incentive to continue their careers, confident that they made a positive difference in the day-to-day lives of other Naval personnel. Many women suggested that this "unofficial recognition" gave them the motivation and resolve to endure an inhospitable work environment. Even in the absence of official acknowledgement of their contributions by more senior officers, knowing that their efforts were valued and appreciated by those who worked for and with them gave women a sense of job satisfaction. A Lieutenant Aviation Maintenance Officer, contrasts the leadership styles of two of her Commanding Officers, and describes the lack of feedback she received on her professional performance:

I couldn't imagine how he [her second CO] didn't get shot out of a torpedo tube, he was 180 degrees out from my first skipper. He wasn't a people guy. You never knew what he was thinking. I mean I got my first fitness report from him and I had no idea what it was going to say. I had no idea what he thought of me, until I got it and I was like, 'Oh, this is nice. Thank you.' Nobody was under his wing. You were completely on your own. (JMV-03)

A Lieutenant Commander, Helo pilot describes how gratifying positive feedback was to hear in the midst of what seemed like an endless verbal battle against women in aviation:

There were some guys, especially kids that you'd taught to fly, that would come up later and say 'Wow, thanks so much for teaching me how to fly. You're just great. And I

know that you were tough on me but you really are one of the most supreme teachers and I'm really glad you taught me to fly.' They were just very glad, and it had nothing to do with your gender.

Another Lieutenant Commander, GenURL, who had the opportunity to teach junior women officers, describes the positive feedback she received as one of the peak experiences in her naval career:

Oh, it was wonderful! I got letters from some of them after they had been in the fleet, telling me that it was the best Navy school they had attended and that I was a great role model and mentor, things that made me feel so proud and brought tears to my eyes. I had affected their lives for the better. They were so bright eyed and full of energy. I saw myself in them; I saw myself as an Ensign. (MBM-09)

A Lieutenant Commander, Surface Warfare Officer explains why she valued the positive feedback she received from enlisted personnel throughout her career:

Throughout my career, while I might not get kudos from my seniors or peers, every single tour I've been at the enlisted people tell me that I'm the best officer they have ever worked with and that, to me, is the most important thing because they're the ones that do all the work and if they like the way you lead them that's what we're supposed to be all about. So they were always good to me. (JMV-06)

Women officers, while non-traditional in their career choices, independent, and used to working outside the gendered norm, nonetheless require the same organizational support structures as men in order to succeed. Researchers argue that due to their relatively small numbers and "token" status, it is even more critical for women to have the support of influential members of the organizational hierarchy. The

women in this study recognize the importance of mentors, allies, and feedback in their careers and actively seek these factors to aid them in their career progression.

CHAPTER V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

A. SUMMARY

In the military, masculinity is revered. Although a review of American military history shows that women have participated in every American conflict, in any area where they were needed, their contributions have often been trivialized. Furthermore, with every gain women have made in their military participation, there has been a corresponding backlash by men who feel threatened and are openly opposed to women's presence. Some men have fought to keep military women from entering their sacred realm, "combat."

For women in the U.S. military, achieving job equality and acceptance in a male-dominated environment is difficult for a number of reasons. Attitudinal and societal barriers, based on sex differences and gender stereotypes, and shaped by the concept of "women's work" and its corollary, "war is men's work," have kept women marginalized and limited to traditional, gender-based, support roles. The military perpetuates and rationalizes its internal gendered divisions of labor based on its unique relationship with the state and its national defense mission. Masculine hegemonic structures, practices, and ethos foster and support a culture in which

women are marginalized and subordinated, while men are privileged.

This study of women officers' experiences in the U.S. Navy produced nine major themes that reveal, in three broad categories, how women are marginalized and subordinated, how women respond to this treatment, and the importance of the following factors: supportive leaders, allies, mentors, a positive command climate, and equal employment opportunities in achieving full integration of women. The following section will present the conclusions drawn from these themes.

B. CONCLUSIONS

The women officers in this study gave a variety of reasons for joining the military including: economic security, training and educational opportunities, responsibility, travel, and a desire to serve their country. While the military is viewed as a natural career choice for men, a cultural dilemma results when women choose to make the military a career. A man's identity is traditionally synonymous with what he does for a living, therefore, when a woman chooses to join the military, she not only challenges the precept of the "manliness of war" but also confronts the exclusive preserve of the "masculine warrior" ideal. Women are reminded by men colleagues that they can be **in** the military but they cannot **be** the military and are marginalized and limited in their participation. As a result of these

dynamics, women's presence in the U.S. Navy is met with resistance, opposition, and enmity.

Harassment and opposition to women's presence is manifested both overtly and covertly. Sexual harassment, the most base form of discrimination, is viewed by most women in the study as an "occupational hazard." More insidious forms of opposition and hostility, manifested in day-to-day verbal and psychological attrition tactics are more commonly employed.

Stereotypes based on biological sex differences often prevent men from judging women on their individual qualifications or capabilities. Women in this study reported that men tend to relate to women officers based on their own personal, familial relationships with women. They view women officers in stereotypical gender roles--as wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters. Men's stereotypical notions of what women should or can do limits women's opportunities within the military.

Women's bodies and sexuality are also barriers to their acceptance and opportunities within the military. Women's reproductive capacity and potential sexual interaction with men of the organization is viewed, by men, as a potential threat to military effectiveness and operational readiness. As a result of these practices, women's sexuality becomes a daily struggle, a reminder that they are different, and are therefore excluded from full participation in the military.

In the U.S. Navy, women constitute approximately ten percent of the total force. As such they are tokens, limited in number but highly visible in their status as a minority. As tokens they are expected to adapt and conform to the masculine norm in order to fit into the organization. Women in this study deconstructed and reconstructed their femininity in a variety of ways in response to this expectation.

In an attempt to overcome stereotypes of feminine physical weakness, women strive to exceed minimum required physical fitness standards and to achieve lean, athletic physiques. By altering their voices, behavior, appearance, vocabulary, and dress, women become neither feminine nor masculine, but instead, what they describe as "professional."

Women in this study verbalized their conscious decision to succeed and excel at their chosen professions. They described intense performance pressures and greater overall scrutiny because of their status as a minority. As a result they felt compelled to behave flawlessly in order to refute negative stereotypes of women officers.

While professional and social interaction between men in an organization is considered a normal part of doing business, women's interaction with men in the military is often perceived by others to be sexually motivated. Consequently, women in this study attempted to avoid allegations of sexual politics and fraternization by maintaining a "professional" distance in their association with male colleagues.

Assignment policies that exclude women from serving in combat specialties and billets also act as barriers to full acceptance for women in the military. Restricted to combat support roles, women are perceived to be, and are treated as, less essential to the military's mission--its core, of course, being combat.

Proactive leaders, allies, and a supportive command climate had a positive impact on the morale and success of the women interviewed. Commanding Officers who viewed and treated their officers the same, regardless of gender, were highly regarded. Commanding Officers set the tone by which subordinates and peers viewed military women. Subordinates frequently follow the example set by senior leaders, and even in instances where they do not personally agree on the issue, subordinates still maintain the standards set by their leaders.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

The military must provide the best possible national defense. In the midst of large-scale down-sizing and significant budgetary reductions, it is imperative that the U. S. Navy retain and fully employ its highly qualified and highly trained personnel. As women are assigned to traditionally all-male combat units, the identification and elimination of gender discrimination becomes even more critical. This is necessary to ensure that **all** military

personnel have equal career opportunities and that select members are not driven from its ranks by persistent and hostile treatment. The military benefits by retaining its most talented, dedicated and motivated service members. Integration of women into non-traditional fields, when combined with their full acceptance as full members of the Navy and Marine Corps team, will increase overall mission effectiveness and operational readiness.

This study produced five primary recommendations derived from the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Eliminate assignment restrictions based solely on gender.

Combat exclusion laws and Risk Rule policies that institutionalize sex discrimination within the military, prevent women from serving in occupations for which they are qualified. Restrictions based solely on gender, without regard to capabilities of the individual, perpetuate the belief that women's contributions to the military are less significant than men's. Full integration of women into all occupations and specialties will contribute to the elimination of institutional bias and restrictions on the number of women permitted to enter the military. As a result, the Naval services will be able to select the best qualified candidates and draw upon all personnel resources to accomplish their missions.

2. Establish gender-neutral job standards.

The women in this study want full integration but not at the cost of diminishing unit readiness. Therefore, it is necessary to establish gender-neutral job standards based upon minimum requirements for each task. It is essential that these standards be established and applied from initial training and throughout an individual's career progression. Without application of equal, gender-neutral job standards, women will continue to be viewed as "tokens," who are not held to the same stringent requirements as their male peers.

3. Conduct research on units, both military and civilian, where integration has been successful and attempt to duplicate conditions and practices which foster integration.

This study has revealed situations and commands where women were viewed as equal members of the unit and were not limited in their acceptance or employment based on gender. The military is not the only traditionally all-male organization that have integrated women. Civilian organizations, such as police and fire departments, as well as the militaries of other countries have all undergone the process of integrating women into their units. It is recommended that further study be conducted into those activities where full integration was achieved to determine the factors which contributed to their success. Those conditions and practices which fostered integration in other

organizations can be studied for adaptation to, or duplication in, the Department of the Navy.

4. **Incorporate gender interaction training, aimed at eliminating gender stereotypes and bias, into annual training requirements for all members of the sea services.**

Gender stereotypes are deeply imbedded in the policies and practices of both society and the military. Because they are so ingrained, subliminal, and self-perpetuating, it is impossible to eradicate sexual harassment and hostility towards women in non-traditional occupations without considerable effort. Education efforts should not be directed solely at the issues surrounding sexual harassment but should also target the underlying cause of sexual harassment--gender discrimination. Without training aimed specifically at identifying and eliminating the cultural bias against women, it will be difficult to identify and eliminate inappropriate behaviors directed against military women.

5. **Conduct similar research in the area of enlisted women's and men's perspectives on gender bias and discrimination.**

This study focused solely on the experiences of women officers in the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. Interviews conducted with prior-enlisted officers indicated that their experiences as enlisted women, especially in the areas of sexual harassment and gender discrimination, were much worse due to their lack of authority and power. Because enlisted women and men comprise the majority of the sea services'

personnel, it is necessary to explore the environment in which they serve. Also it is important for leaders to understand the issues enlisted sailors and Marines face in order to improve working conditions and to build a more effective military.

D. PROGNOSIS

The burden of the nation's defense has long rested on the shoulders of one-half of its population, its men. Women who enter the Navy and Marine Corps have demonstrated that they are ready and capable of assuming the risks and sacrifices required of full citizens of the country and of the organization. However, as demonstrated by the findings in this study and as articulated by Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt, USN, Ret., "For many Navy traditionalists, it is even harder to give up the notion that their beloved service should be all male, than to give up the notion that it should be all white" (Ebbert and Hall, 1993, p. 155).

APPENDIX A INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

How long have you been in the military?

When and how did you receive your commission?

What is your designator?

Tell me about your family background and growing up.

Are you married?

Is your spouse in the military?

Do you have children?

Do you and your husband share domestic and parenting duties?

As you grew up did you have any "heroes" that you tried to emulate?

Who? Why? What traits/characteristics did you admire?

Would you consider your parents traditional in their career choices?

Did your parents teach you that you were limited/unlimited in your career aspirations (or your choice of games or hobbies) by your gender?

Why did you join the military? (Any relatives in the service)

How did your family react when you told them you were joining the military?

Did you have work experience prior to college/the Naval Academy/Officer Candidate School?

Tell me about your experiences at college/the Naval Academy/Officer Candidate School.

Did you get the impression that you were or were not accepted by male peers in Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps/Naval Academy/Officer Candidate School?

Can you give specific examples of any positive or negative incidents that made you feel accepted/not accepted?

Following commissioning, where was your first duty station?

Repeat the following questions for each command/duty station:

What was your position/job?

Were there other women there--officers? Enlisted?

What was that job like for you?

Did you like your job?

How did your Commanding Officer and Executive Officer treat you? How did they treat your male peers? How did your male peers treat you?

How did your experiences make you feel?

What was a typical workday like?

Did you perceive any resentment from your male peers over your presence as a woman in a military unit? Subordinates? Superiors?

Did you ever observe any incidents of gender discrimination or sexual harassment at your commands? If so, can you give specific examples?

Have you ever experienced sexual harassment or gender discrimination from peers? Superiors? Subordinates?

If so, how did you react to those people?

What action did you take to avoid future problems/confrontations of this sort?

Have you noticed any change in attitudes of your men or women colleagues/superiors/subordinates since you first entered the military? Since the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill hearings? Since TAILHOOK '91?

If so, do you think that you're more aware, sensitive, and/or outspoken against incidents of gender discrimination or sexual harassment that you have witnessed or experienced?

Do you think the men you work with are more aware, sensitive, and/or outspoken about women in the military?

In order to be successful do you feel you've had to neutralize (neuter) your femininity?

As an adult, do you have any heroes or mentors that you respect and try to emulate?

If so, who? What traits/characteristics do they possess that you value most?

What is your spouse's attitude about women in the military?

Is he supportive of your career?

If both of you are in the military which of you makes the most career sacrifices to stay together?

How does all this make you feel?

How do you think women are treated in the Navy?

What advice would you give women entering the Navy today regarding gender discrimination and how they should react to it? Combat it?

Have you seen or experienced a professional relationship between men and women in the military that worked well?

Can you give a specific example(s) and the reasons why you think things ran well?

When you look to the future what role do you see women having in the military?

What role do you see yourself having?

If you could speak directly to our military or congressional leaders, what would you say to them about women's participation in the Navy/military and their future roles?

APPENDIX B DEMOGRAPHICS

UNITED STATES NAVY

<i>COMMUNITY</i>	<i>RANK</i>	<i>0-3</i>	<i>0-4</i>	<i>0-5</i>	<i>0-6</i>	<i>TOT</i>
General URL		10	10	6	2	30
Surface Warfare		3	1	1		5
Naval Pilot		1	1			2
Aviation Maintenance Duty		2	1			3
Naval Flight Officer			1			1
Oceanographer		1				1
Medical Service Corps		1				1
Nurse Corps		1	1			2
Supply Corps		3				3
Totals		22	17	7	2	48

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

<i>COMMUNITY</i>	<i>RANK</i>	<i>0-3</i>	<i>0-4</i>	<i>0-5</i>	<i>0-6</i>	<i>TOT</i>
Public Affairs			1			1
Financial Management			2	1		3
Personnel		2	1	1	2	6
Motor Transport		1				1
Judge Advocate General Corps			1	1		2
Totals		3	5	3	2	13

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Acker, J., "Hierarchies, Jobs, and Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations," *Gender and Society*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 152-163, 1990. *
- Acker, J., "Gendering Organizational Theory," *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, Mills, A. J., and Tancred, P., (Eds.), pp. 248-260, Sage Publications, 1992. *
- Acker, J., and Van Houten, D. R., "Differential Recruitment and Control: The Sex Structuring of Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 152-163, Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Bell, E., and Nkomo, S., "Re-visioning Managers' Lives," *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, Mills, A. J., and Tancred, P., (Eds.), pp. 235-247, Sage Publications, 1992.
- Bem, S., "Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex Typing," *Psychological Review*, Vol. 88, pp. 354-364, 1981.
- Britton, D. M., and Williams, C. L., "Looking For A Few Good Men: Military Policies of Exclusion and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity," paper presented at the 86th Annual Meeting of American Sociological Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, 23 August 1991. *
- Burrell, G., "Radical Organization Theory," in *The International Yearbook of Organization Studies 1979*, Dunkerley, D., and Salaman, G., (Eds.), London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Burrell, G., "Sex and Organizational Analysis," *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, Mills, A. J., and Tancred, P., (Eds.) pp. 71-92, Sage Publications, 1992. *
- Chodrow, N., *The Reproduction of Mothering*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Clausen, J. G., and Kram, K. E., "Managing Cross-Gender Mentoring," *Business Horizons*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 22-31, May/June 1984.
- Cockburn, C., *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*, ILR Press, 1991.

Connell, R. W., *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*, Stanford University Press, 1987.

Davidoff, L., "Adam Spoke First and Named the Orders of the World: Masculine and Feminine Domains in History and Sociology," *Politics of Everyday Life*, Corr, H., St. Martins Press, 1990.

DeFleur, L. B., Marshak, W., et al., *Four Years of Sex Integration at the United States Air Force Academy: Problems and Issues*, U.S. Air Force Academy, August 1985.

Devilbiss, M. C., "The Tailhook Debacle: Sex Discrimination and Military Values," paper presented at the biennial conference of the Inter-University Seminar on the Armed Forces and Society, Baltimore, Maryland, 23 October 1993.

Ebbert, J., and Hall, M., *Crossed Currents: Navy Women from WWI to Tailhook*, Brassey's, 1993.

Eitelberg, M. J., "Your Mother Wears Combat Boots . . . But Should She Pack A Gun?" paper presented at the 98th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 1990.

Enloe, C., *Does Khaki Become You?*, Pandora Press, 1983.

Epstein, C., *Women's Place*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Fagenson, E. A., "At the Heart of Women in Management Research: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches and Their Biases," *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 9, pp. 267-74, 1989.

Ferguson, K. E., *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*, Temple University Press, 1984.

Fox-Genovese, E., *Feminism Without Illusion: A Critique of Individualism*, University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Glaser, B., and Strauss, P., *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Widenfeld and Nicholson, 1967.

Gross, E., "Plus ca change . . . ? The Sexual Structure of Occupations Over Time," *Social Problems*, Vol. 16, pp. 198-208, 1968.

Gutek, B., and Cohen, A., "Interpreting Social-Sexual Behavior in a Work Setting," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 22, pp. 30-48, 1983.

- Holm, J., *Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution*, (Rev. ed.), Presidio Press, 1992.
- Huff, A. S., "Wives--of the Organization," paper presented at the Women and Work Conference, Arlington, Texas, 11 May 1990.
- Kanter, R. M., *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Basic Books, 1977.
- Kanter, R. M., *Men and Women of the Corporation*, (Rev. ed.), Basic Books, 1993.
- Korb, L., United States Department of Defense Public Relations Office, Washington, D.C., "Press Conference Transcript of Appearance of Assistant Secretary of Defense, Lawrence Korb on 26 August 1982."
- Larwood, L., and Wood, M., *Women in Management*, D. C. Heath, 1977.
- Lorber, J., "Dismantling Noah's Ark," *The Social Construction of Gender*, Lorber, J., and Farrell, S. A., (Eds.), 1991.
- MacKinnon, C., *Sexual Harassment of Working Women*, Yale University Press, 1979.
- Meyer, E. L., "The Soldier Left A Portrait and Her Eyewitness Account," *Smithsonian*, pp. 96-104, January 1994.
- Miles, M. B., "Qualitative Data as an Attractive Nuisance," in Van Maanen, J., (Ed), *Qualitative Methodology*, 1983.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M., *Qualitative Data Analysis*, Sage Publications, 1984.
- Mills, A. J., "Organization, Gender and Culture," *Organization Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 351-369, 1988.
- Mills, A. J., and Tancred, P., *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, Sage Publications, 1992.
- Mitchell, B., *Weak Link: The Feminization of the American Military*, Regnery Gateway, 1989.
- Mumby, D. K., *Communication and Power in Organizations: Discourse, Ideology, and Domination*, Ablex, 1988.
- "Johnson Signs Bill for Women Generals and Pins Medals on 2 Nurses," *New York Times*, p. 3, 9 November, 1967.

- Nieva, V. F., and Gutek, B. A., "Sex Effects on Evaluation," *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 267-276, 1980.
- Oakley, A., *Sex, Gender and Society*, Temple Smith, 1972.
- Oppenheimer, V. K., *The Female Labor Force in the U.S.*, (Population Monograph Series No. 5), Berkeley: University of California, 1970.
- Powell, G., *Women and Men in Management*, Sage Publications, 1988.
- Powell, G., *Women and Men in Management*, Sage Publications, (Rev. ed.), 1993.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., and Dickenson, W. J., *Management and the Worker*, Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Rowbotham, S., *Hidden From History*, London: Pluto Press, 1973.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C., "Dual Linkage Between the Occupational and Family Systems: A Microsociological Analysis," *Women and the Workplace: The Implications of Occupational Segregation*, Blaxall, M., and Reagan, B. B., (Eds.), University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Sheppard, D. L., "Organizations, Power and Sexuality: The Image and Self-Image of Women Managers," *The Sexuality of Organization*, Hearn, J., et al., (Eds.), Sage Publications, 1989.
- United States, Department of Defense, Military Pay and Allowance Entitlements Manual (DoD) 7000.14-R, *DoD Financial Management Regulation: Military Pay, Policy, and Procedures*, Vol. 7, Part A, 1993.
- United States, Department of the Navy, Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERSCOM-213) Statistics, 1994.
- United States, Department of the Navy, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations: Navy Women's Study Group, *An Update Report on the Progress of Women in the Navy*, 1990.
- United States, Department of the Navy, United States Naval Academy Commandant's Standard Organization and Regulations Manual, COMDTMIDNINST 5400.5A of 01 January 1994.
- United States, Manual of Navy Officer Manpower and Personnel Classifications, Vol. 2, 1990.

Wright, M., "The Marine Corps Faces the Future," *Time Magazine*, pp. 71-75, 20 June 1980.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria VA 22304-6145	2
2. Library, Code 052 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5002	2
3. Gail Fann-Thomas, MS/FA Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5002	4
4. Commander Michael P. Tryon, SC, USN Curricular Officer, Systems Management Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5002	1
5. Patricia Thomas Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego CA 92152	1
6. Bureau of Naval Personnel Washington DC 20370-5000 Attn: Code 4419-A Room 4728	1
8. Lieutenant Commander M.B. Margosian, USN 3215 Twenty-third Avenue Portland OR 97212	9
9. Lieutenant J. M. Vondrzyk, USN U.S. Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico PSC 1008, Box 3004 FPO AA 34051	10

DUE
NAY
MON

RY
ATE SCHOOL
43-5101



DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY



3 2768 00307945 0