ABSTRACT

Title: BREAKING THROUGH THE "BRASS" CEILING: ELITE
                         MILITARY WOMEN'S STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS.

                         Darlene Marie Iskra, Ph.D., 2007

Directed by: Professor Mady Wechsler Segal, Department of Sociology

        People who rise to the top of any organization must have a dedication and

determination that distinguishes them from their co-workers. White men historically

have held these positions due to discriminatory practices by employers, protectionist

legislation, and social constructs about their leadership capabilities and motivation.

Inroads into these elite positions are being made, however, both in the corporate world

and in the military, by women and minority men. This study examines the women who

have risen to the top of a masculine institution, and the strategies they used to "break

through the brass ceiling" and become General and Flag Officers. Data were collected

through several methods, including content analysis of their military biographies, self-

administered surveys, and selected interviews. Results generally indicate that the women

overcame the challenges they faced and took advantage of opportunities that arose. They

rarely said "no" to a challenge; they did not question their ability to succeed simply due

to gender, and they overwhelmingly had a positive attitude and loved the military

institution. However, the ability for the women to navigate the masculine organization of

the military would not have been possible without a vibrant support system, which

included mentors, and supportive spouses and family. Mentorship was an important

factor in the women's ability to navigate the system; mentors provided career guidance,

opened opportunities, and provided personal support and advice when needed. Many also had an active family life. This was especially true for those in the Reserves; family formation was the most obvious difference between Regular and Reserve respondents. Results primarily varied by cohort, with earlier cohorts limited by institutional and legislative impediments to both their professional and family lives. This research is sociologically important because it helps to fill the gap in knowledge about the situations and behaviors that lead to career success for executive women. It is limited in that it looks only at the women in these elite positions and does not compare these findings with male generals and admirals or to women who did not rise to these levels. Suggestions for further research are provided.

BREAKING THROUGH THE "BRASS" CEILING: ELITE MILITARY WOMEN'S

STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS.

By

Darlene Marie Iskra

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2007

Advisory Committee:

      Professor Mady W. Segal, Chair
      Professor Kathryn M. Bartol
      Associate Professor Joan Kahn
      Associate Professor Melissa Milkie
      Professor David R. Segal

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Jerry and Manola Scovel. Without their unconditional love and support, my independent and adventurous spirit would not have thrived, and this accomplishment would not have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The military is not commonly perceived as a career that women would voluntarily pursue. And yet, many women have voluntarily served in all of America's wars since the beginning of our history. Today, military women seek out and accomplish jobs that were not available to them 30 years ago, such as commanding troops in a combat zone (Santana 2006). The demands and structure of a military career, including long hours, geographic relocation, separation from loved ones, and participating in military conflicts, are not seen as conducive to the social expectations of women, especially if they wish to pursue marriage and family (Jeffrey 2007). Yet some women have been able to maintain a fulfilling personal life and still thrive in a military career.

This dissertation is a study of the small group of women who have broken through the "brass ceiling" to achieve the highest ranks in the military, that of General or Flag Officer (GFO). This term is based on the metaphor of the "glass ceiling" that was coined by Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt (1986) who depicted it as a goal that was within sight but somehow unattainable. It was an invisible barrier that women seemed to face when aspiring to high-level corporate positions. In the military, the barrier was opaque for many years, thus the term "brass" ceiling to depict the structural impediments to promotion. It also a play on words that refers to the common usage of "top brass" to describe the senior officers in the military.

Using biographical questionnaires and selected in-depth interviews, I uncover the personal and professional support structures and subsequent choices these women made within the structural demands and barriers of the military organization to achieve highly

successful military careers. I also investigate the individual behaviors and social processes that enabled these women to compete in a highly masculine and hierarchical environment. The primary research question asks: "How do elite women of the military achieve career success in a traditionally male environment?" The purpose of the study is to help fill the gap in research on executive women in the workplace.

Career success can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Many women officers have been satisfied to serve their country, and then leave the military after their initial obligation to pursue other goals. Others remain until they are eligible for retirement benefits, twenty or more years. Still others stay and compete until they are no longer promoted, leaving the military when it is clear they have reached their last promotion opportunity, yet still retiring with a good pension and senior rank. None of these situations can be defined as being *unsuccessful*. However, in this study, I define career success as having risen to the upper echelon of the military: General and Flag Officers,[1] referred to as GFOs in this study.

The men and women who have achieved this status are a very rare group of individuals. There are only about 900 GFOs on active duty in the Department of Defense (DoD),[2] out of an officer corps of about 220,000 (Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] 2007). The officers at this level of the military are equivalent to corporate executives (CEOs, CFOs, or company presidents) who have responsibility for millions of dollars and thousands of people. Only a few of those who have dedicated themselves to the military make it into these upper echelons.

---

[1] See Appendix A for an explanation of military rank structure
[2] There are about 40 active duty (regular) Flag Officers out of an officer corps of about 8000 in the Coast Guard, in the Department of Homeland Security.

Studies on women and work have focused on a variety of subjects, including work-family balance, gender integration, occupational segregation, sexual harassment, "glass ceilings", and the like. Few of these studies have focused on women who have successfully negotiated the organization's structural and cultural barriers and opportunities, or interpersonal resistance and support to be promoted to the highest positions within their respective companies. This gap is slowly being filled. There is a growing literature on women executives who confront the dilemmas and issues they face trying to conform to the executive worker model in male-dominated work institutions (See Blair-Loy 2001 and 2003; Davies-Netzley 1998; Eagly and Carli 2007; Gomez, Fassinger, Prosser, Cooke, Mejia, and Luna 2001; Moore 1998; Richie, Fassinger, Linn, Johnson, and Prosser 1997). Little research has looked specifically on the breadth of choices and constraints that affect the decisions women make to enable them to succeed to elite levels in a military environment. This project is designed to fill that gap.

Active duty elite military women pose a challenge for the researcher, not only because they are very busy executives, but also because they may have relocated, transferred, or deployed out of the country into a war zone. Additionally, they may be reluctant to discuss issues of gender due to the structure of power as described by Kanter (1977a), which may constrain them from being honest and candid. Nevertheless, the experiences of military women executives are central to the understanding of the military as a significant occupational institution; the structures of opportunity and barriers (Kanter 1977a), and interpersonal relationships needed to negotiate the masculine cultural model to achieve career success. As Blair-Loy (2003: 203) noted, this is vitally important for

understanding the construction and reproduction of dominant structural and cultural models in our society.

In a recent study, Eagly and Carli (2007) argue that the term "glass ceiling" is no longer correct. This is due to the myriad of choices women make along their career paths. They state, "…by depicting a single, unvarying obstacle, the glass ceiling fails to incorporate the complexity and variety of challenges that women can face in their leadership journeys. In truth, women are not turned away only as they reach the penultimate stage of a distinguished career. They disappear in various numbers at many points leading up to that stage" (2007: 64). The metaphor they use for this struggle through the corporate ladder is "labyrinth." This word clearly articulates the multiple decisions that military women must make, the challenges they must face, the structural barriers and discrimination they must fight, and the strategies they must use in order to work around the various impediments to that goal.

The number of women joining the military has dramatically increased in the last 30 years, they have had increased responsibility, they have risen in rank, and some have had combat experience. However, there has been a lack of female role models and mentors in the highest echelon of the military branches. How the women GFOs have worked through these challenges, negotiated the labyrinth, is the focus of this research.

This study is divided into nine chapters. Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical aspects of the structure of women and work, the culture of work and family, and the interpersonal challenges of women as tokens in the workplace. These three factors, and the respondents' reaction to them, form the basis for analysis of the research question. The last section is an explanation of the organizational, cultural, and interpersonal

challenges to a career in the military. This section also discusses the structure and policies that affect the selection for General and Flag Officer.

Chapter 3 discusses the literature that frames the discussion of career women in executive positions, the glass ceiling effect, work and family issues, and strategies used by executive women to succeed. Chapter 4 frames the discussion about women in the military by analyzing the organizational, cultural and interpersonal barriers they must face in order to negotiate career and opportunity structures to succeed.

Chapter 5 is a case study of Lieutenant General Claudia J. Kennedy, the first woman to attain three-star rank in the Army. This case study is based on her memoir, *Generally Speaking,* which addresses many of the questions posed in my research. This case study sets the foundation for possible commonalities of background, motivations, strategies, and tactics used by women breaking through the brass ceiling of the military elite. It also guides some of the survey questions used in the research.

Chapter 6 presents the methods used for obtaining the data. Chapters 7 and 8 present the findings and analyze the results of the biographical demographics, the surveys, and the interviews. Chapter 9 provides a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

Theoretical Perspectives

There are a number of perspectives that can be used in developing questions and analyzing qualitative data. For my study, Kanter's (1977a, 1977b) work on an organization's opportunity structure, as well as "token women" (See also Liff and Ward 2001; Spangler, Gordon and Pipkin 1978; Yoder 1994, for example) provide a model for comparison with regard to impediments to promotion and success, cultural norms that

inhibit non-traditional roles for women, interpersonal relationships with coworkers, the behavioral responses of token women, and types of gendered issues with which military women have had to deal as a result of the masculine military culture. How did the respondents negotiate the limited opportunities for women in the military structure and yet still manage to succeed?

Organizational and structural impediments for women pursuing executive careers include policies and legislation that have kept women from pursuing certain types of jobs. Until Civil Rights legislation in 1964, it was legal to discriminate in hiring practices, and it was common to see gender-segregated want ads. Women also faced marriage bars, in which employers did not hire married women, or fired women once they married; and later, pregnancy and motherhood bars, in which employers fired, or did not hire, women who were, or could become pregnant (Goldin 1990). Other discriminatory practices included barring women from pursuing certain occupations reserved for men, like police and fire fighters, lawyers, doctors, and other professions. While many of these legal impediments have been rescinded for the civilian workplace, there are still legal occupational restrictions for military women.

The cultural aspects include the social construction of gendered roles and expectations. For example, the executive-type schedule to which most elite workers must conform assumes a person who can devote him or herself to career issues to the exclusion of family responsibilities. It assumes that the family responsibilities are taken care of by a behind-the-scenes wife who provides a "flow of family support" that includes housekeeping, child care, and other domestic chores (Williams 2000). Thus women who pursue executive careers face a dilemma that most men do not: a cultural expectation that

they will continue to take care of the family and household even if they pursue other occupational goals. Negotiating this "work-family balance" is the subject of much research on women and work.

Interpersonal aspects are a result of structural and cultural factors, which influence the perceived behaviors and attitudes of male coworkers to which women react in various ways. The interpersonal relationships formed at work can either be supportive or destructive. Supportive relationships, such as mentors and good working relationships with peers and subordinates, help women succeed; negative relationships, such as poor leaders or difficult co-workers, may lead to women's attrition from the workplace.

Like Blair-Loy's (2001, 2003) work on elite women, competing work or family devotion schemas is a major theme of this research. It is obvious that the military women in question had a strong work-devotion schema. But how did they come to follow that path rather than a family devotion schema? Of those who managed to marry and/or have children, what strategies enabled them to balance work and family? Finally, I will use the findings of Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988), Davis-Netzley (1998), Goldin (2004), Gomez et al. (2001), Richie et al. (1997) and others to provide a baseline of strategies used by executive women to succeed in a male-dominated work environment. These baseline findings provide both the starting points for comparison with strategies used by military women, and the framework for the questionnaire design and interview questions. They also serve as background for the research questions for my research. By comparing strategies used by both civilian and military women, I add to the literature about women's leadership and family balance.

<u>Sociological Contributions</u>

This study makes an important sociological contribution to the field of women and work for a number of reasons. First, there is a paucity of research on women in elite positions, regardless of the organizational setting. Although a growing area of study in the business world, there is little research on elite military women. Further, this is the only study undertaken to date that encompasses data from all of the executive (GFO) women in the military, regardless of branch of service. It provides insights into women's organizational, cultural and interpersonal choices and behaviors in negotiating a male dominated workplace.

Second, this study provides a historical look at the strategies of successful women officers. Because many of these women are pioneers,[3] future women officers may not face the same issues or come to the same conclusions as the women in this study. However, it does help to provide a sociological explanation for women facing barriers in the workplace. Much like Kanter's (1977a) seminal work on women in a corporate sales force, this study may provide insight into an institution that socially constructs the epitome of Soldier (Sailor, Airman or Marine) as male. Often, both women and men confuse the perception of incompetence with individual deficiencies rather than unperceived structural, cultural and interpersonal barriers.

This research is also important as an exploratory study that encompasses the majority of the population of women who have risen to GFO, whether in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, providing fodder for years of future research. It is an overview that provides a comparison between women who were in or

---

[3] See Appendix G for a listing of female GFO "firsts".

joined the military in the early years after the Women's Armed Forces Integration Act of 1948 allowed women to become permanent members of the military, with those who joined during the era of the All Volunteer Force.

It also compares full-time workers (active duty or "Regulars") and part-time (Reserve) workers, and their loyalty to the organization (work-devotion schema) to their loyalty to family (family-devotion schema), an unspoken but understood requirement in the masculine world of work. It confirms the idea that "choice" is based on structures of opportunity and cycles of advantage or disadvantage, by describing the legislative and organizational policy barriers that many of the women faced, cultural opposition to their occupational choice, and interpersonal support or challenges they confronted when opportunities were opened, or offered to them. However, it does not delve into the specificities of branch of service and the peculiarities therein.

The study is an overview of the issues, problems, and solutions that women face as they rise in the corporate setting of the military. Although a small population of women have achieved GFO status, this study is qualitative in nature and may not be generalizable to a broader population. However, future researchers may find that the insights derived may be quantifiable as the population of women in this category continues to grow.

CHAPTER 2

STRUCTURES OF WORK AND FAMILY

Section 1: Theoretical Background

Many social scientists believe that gender is a social construct: though almost all of us are born with a defined sex of male or female, the concept of gender, i.e. masculinity and femininity, has come to be seen as something that must be developed. There appears to be a connection between sex and gender, if only to define the basis for the construction of gender, but the performance of masculinity and femininity is learned (West and Zimmerman (1987). This is how boys come to think they are made of "snakes and snails and puppy dog tails," indicating an adventurous, if somewhat naughty, nature, and girls are made of "sugar and spice and everything nice," indicating a nurturing and loving nature, as the old nursery rhyme tells them. It is a cultural construct. Although not all boys are daring and bold and not all girls are sweet and timid, these stereotypes persist and gender socialization patterns generally follow these constructs.

The social construction of gender also defines our "place" in society. For women, that place has been defined as the private sphere of the home, and for men, it has been defined as the public sphere of work outside the home (Kanter 1977b). Thus the culture of the work place is a middle class construct defined by ideology that privileges men, specifically white men. Historically, men as "breadwinners," required wages that enabled them to adequately support their families and their stay-at-home wives, resulting in a system in which the most meaningful and highest paying careers with the highest status and power are held by white men. Women and minorities are making headway into these elite ranks, but it is a slow process.

This project looks at the workplace, specifically the military workplace, through three factors or aspects: structural, cultural, and interpersonal. The military career structure presents several challenges to women intent on pursuing a military career. There used to be rank limitations as well as caps on the numbers of women allowed in the service. Historically and currently, there are policies and legislation that keep women from pursuing certain types of jobs, like ground combat positions, which hinder women from attaining the highest ranks in the military. As these structural limitations have been rescinded, women have eagerly pursued new opportunities. However, impediments remain, primarily with regard to occupational choice.

Second, military cultural is a bastion of masculinity. Women comprise only 15% of the active duty Department of Defense force, thus they are a very small, but growing, subset of the population. However, the military culture still presumes a male head of household and female caregiver. Many military policies and formal social support programs operate according to this assumption. Women in the military must contend with role reversal, not only because the military is considered a masculine institution filled with male workers, but also because military women are not filling the traditional caregiver role. In addition, the warrior ethic presumes a virile male fighter who protects women and children from harm. Much of the opposition against the increasing combat roles for women is due to this cultural construct.

Finally, the literature reveals that structural and cultural factors influence interpersonal relationships, and that women have reacted to negative interpersonal behaviors in various ways, from working through it or ignoring it (Miller 1997), to increased attrition and lowered morale (Harrell and Miller 1997). The literature on

11

positive relationship experiences and their aftermath comes mainly from autobiographies, such as Kennedy (2001) and Adams-Ender (2001), or panel discussions (Academy Women 2006; Foote 2005; Tracy 2005).

While this study measures variables on the individual level from the respondent's perspective, the organizational, cultural, and interpersonal barriers and opportunities help to explain the respondent's attitudes and past behaviors in their choice and ability to remain in the organization. They help explain how the women managed to negotiate the system, to work through the challenges posed by negative behaviors on the part of others, and to accept the help and opportunities offered by mentors, sponsors, peers and others, in order to succeed as a military officer.

<u>Organizations and the Gendered Structure and Culture of Work</u>

The concept of a breadwinner father and stay-at-home mother is a white, middle class construct that developed in 19th century America. Yet, it became the ideology of family life for the entire nation by the early 20th century (Landry 2000: 3). As a result, work became structured around the institutionalization of the nuclear family as the norm within American society. Good paying jobs with family benefits, such as full-time blue-collar jobs and high-level executive and professional jobs, that enabled the single-income breadwinner family, became the purview primarily of white men.

The "ideal worker norm" slowly developed as part of this social construct. It requires an employee who works full time, to be readily available to work overtime, and to take little or no time off for childbearing or caregiving (Williams 2000: 1). It also assumes a devotion to one's career that comes before family in a person's priorities, under the guise of supporting the family financially. It is a business construct that is

especially prevalent among elite professionals. Employers play a primary role in constructing and perpetuating the ideal worker norm and the subsequent gendered structure of the workplace. They often create new jobs, organize how work will be done, and determine working conditions based on a norm that assumes domestic chores are somehow otherwise accomplished.[4] Employers who plan to hire women as workers often organize jobs as part time and create pay and benefit systems that are inflexible and discourage long-term commitment (Reskin and Padavic 1994: 10).

In many elite jobs, an "apprenticeship" period is required; a period of learning, gaining experience, "putting in the time," and performing jobs of increasingly greater status and responsibility. This can take years. This is especially onerous for women who aspire to top leadership. One may not have to stay at the same corporation, but the devotion to work over one's personal life is standard (Blair-Loy 2003; Harrell, Thie, Schirmer, and Brancato 2004; Kennedy 2001; Kimmel 2004). As examples, there are standardized career requirements in a number of professions that can be a challenge for women who may want to combine work and family.

Doctors attend medical school after their undergraduate studies, with at least three more years of internship and residency, more if they specialize. This requires long hours, plus evening and weekend work. All requirements might be completed by the time they are in their late twenties or early thirties (Kimmel 2004:105). Lawyers just out of law school are expected to take jobs with large corporate law firms and bill fifty to sixty hours a week, a process that might require working between eighty and ninety hours per week. When combined with requirements for sleep and commuting, it may leave about

---

[4] This assumption also affects single men and women.

13

seventeen hours a week to eat, cook, clean the house, date, or spend time with family. If a person does not spend that kind of time at work, he or she may never be promoted to partner (Kimmel 2004:105; Williams 2000).

In academia, after spending four to seven years pursuing a Ph.D. after a Bachelor's degree, another six or more years of work as an assistant professor to earn tenure and promotion to associate professor are required. During that time, the professor must not only prepare and teach classes, but also conduct research and publish (Kimmel 2004). The requirements for tenure require long and intense working hours during these years.

In the military, a similar apprenticeship process is required to advance in both responsibility and rank (Kennedy 2001). One enters the officer corps as an Ensign or 1st Lieutenant (O-1), and many retire with 20 years of service as a Commander or Lieutenant Colonel (O-5), if he/she has met the criteria for promotion. The time between the initial service obligation of five or more years, and retirement, requires several decision points. Many men and women leave the service after the initial obligation, but may opt to stay for up to 10 years before they make the decision whether to stay in the military until retirement, transfer to the reserve force, or opt for a civilian career. The decision-making difference for women begins when they marry, since most women marry men who have their own careers and responsibilities, and many military women marry military men, which creates additional conflict due to dual work devotion expectations. This is different from the majority of male officers in the military who have wives who do not have their own careers (Segal & Segal 2004).

If a woman decides to have children, another decision point arrives, as the requirements of a military job has a greater impact on military women than military men (Hosek, Tiemeyer, Kilburn, Strong, Ducksworth, and Ray 2001; Segal 1986). For men, the decision to stay or leave becomes one of family satisfaction with the military lifestyle (Segal and Segal 1999). For women, the decision is based more on family caregiving responsibilities, how it could affect her career in the military, and the desire to do well at both (Jeffrey 2007).

In a RAND study of military women officers in the support and line communities, Hosek et al. found that approximately 30% of women stay to the Lieutenant Commander/Major career point (approximately 9-10 years of service), as opposed to about 37% of men (2001: 45). This is due to either voluntary separation or inability to pass through the promotion window (Hosek et al. 2001: 41). A small percentage of both men and women continue their careers for up to 30 years (approximately 15% per OSD 1998), and even fewer become General or Flag officers (less than 2% of the officer population, Kennedy 2001).

In all these professions, military and civilian, apprenticeships begin during a person's early to mid-twenties and are completed by their mid-thirties, which is the prime fertility period in a woman's life course. The American Sociological Association (ASA) recently published a research brief on the question of timing of children for academicians. Although some colleges and universities have policies designed to allow junior faculty members to combine family and academic career responsibilities more successfully, they are underused because of the perception that they will not be considered serious scholars if they use them (ASA 2004). This seems to be a pervasive attitude towards work

responsibility, and it is the basis for the "work-family" conflict felt by executive women. Taking time off for childbearing can adversely affect tenure, promotion, or even job stability (Kimmel 2004: 105).

Kanter's (1977a) early work on men and women in corporations also discusses the structural determinants of career success, and the structure of opportunity inherent in the path to an elite position. The opportunity refers to expectations of and future prospects for promotion and other career-enhancing opportunities. The perception of opportunity for an individual in an organization can affect how an individual performs or behaves. Kanter theorizes that those individuals who perceive they have a low structure of opportunity would not even aspire to elite positions, much less work in a manner that would help bring that opportunity to fruition (1977a: 246-247). Of course, cause and effect have not been established, but Kanter's point is that the cycle may be a result of organizational hindrances to the opportunity versus individual behavior that precludes access to opportunity.

In addition, Kanter discusses the impact of organizational power and demographic proportions in an organization that, along with the structure of opportunity and cultural constructs, can create either a cycle of advantage or a cycle of disadvantage (Kanter 1977a: 249). Thus, the structural aspects of work, the apprenticeship periods, the time required, the underlying organizational cultural expectation that work will take priority over family for executive workers, organizational opportunity for selected people, and selective delegation of power can have negative impacts on the ability of women to pursue upwardly mobile, satisfying careers.

Finally, people who aspire to the top leadership positions of their organizations are held to cultural and organizational standards that are highly normative and masculinized, though operating under the guise of gender neutrality (Williams 2000). Expectations for behavior, dress, speech, presentation of self, criteria for job performance, promotion, effectiveness and power relationships are gendered, and all are based on a masculine model. When one thinks of a person in a powerful position, such as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a business, the image that comes to mind is of a handsome and well-dressed man who is strong willed, assertive, and exudes leadership. The military has a culture that is unique in the sense that it has a structured resocialization process designed to instill its norms, goals, traditions, and expected behaviors in new members beginning on the day they enter the military, i.e., "boot" camp for enlisted personnel and the various commissioning sources for officers (OSD 1998:86). Of course, less formal cultural socialization continues throughout one's military career.

While women in elite positions must adhere to similar behavioral standards or be dubbed ineffectual, incompetent or weak (Kimmel 2004), a woman who tries to act exactly as a man would in a leadership situation may also find that she is not effective. It becomes clear that women may do leadership differently from men. What is effective for men may not be effective for women, and the leadership techniques used may differ based on the context. In a setting that is male-dominated and task-oriented, and where hierarchy and power are stressed over egalitarian principles, women may find negative responses to their leadership unless they can find a fit between being too masculine and too feminine (Yoder 2001).

There are structural opportunity and power impediments for those who are a demographic minority, particularly for women in the military. "Opportunity refers to expectations and future prospects" (Kanter 1977a: 246). Structural impediments to opportunity include the inability to be promoted past a certain level and the inability to compete for certain jobs solely because of gender. "Power refers to the capability to mobilize resources" (Kanter 1977a: 247). Structural impediments to power include the inability to use one's own decision-making discretion, within the confines of organizational policy, because of the inability to serve in the positions that make those decisions. Hosek et al. (2001) found additional issues that constrained women's careers. They found a "lack of clear roles for women in the institution" (p.77), such as the ongoing prohibition of assigning women to some combat occupations, thus keeping them out of occupations with the greatest career opportunities. The inability to aspire to higher levels of opportunity and power negatively affects a woman's performance. These structural limitations may encourage some women to conclude that it is not worthwhile to continue to invest in a military career.

The structural requirement to change jobs every two to three years to accrue increased responsibility and experience may lead to situations where women have to prove themselves to their peers and superiors many times over, causing frustration, resentment, and decreased motivation. It is logical to conclude that when someone does not feel like he or she is making a difference, and that their talents and sacrifices are not recognized and appreciated, he or she will tend to look for another line of work.

Hosek et al. (2001) found that the ongoing issue of gender harassment creates an uncomfortable, and potentially demoralizing working environment for women. There is

18

the fear among male superiors and peers of not being able to refute unwarranted charges of sexual harassment, which negatively affects the interactions and interpersonal relationships between men and women, and may lead to women having difficulties in forming peer and mentoring relationships (pp. 76-77). They also found that military men had the perception that women are "inherently less capable, physically and mentally, to perform a military job and lead troops" (p. 76), a cultural construct that also may discourage women from staying in the military. Any combination of these structural, cultural, and interpersonal variables could lead to either voluntary separation or involuntary separation due to the inability to be promoted, reducing the number of women who will reach the rank of Captain or Colonel (O-6), a must for the ability to be promoted to General or Flag Officer rank.

Cultural Constructs of Work and Family

The ideal worker norm has created a division between those who have a *job* and those trying to establish a *career*. In order to perform the required apprenticeships and exemplify the proper devotion to a career, the *necessity* to work long hours has become common within American society. But an individual's *willingness* to devote extraordinary amounts of time and energy to a job, and thrive in that environment, requires what Blair-Loy (2003) calls a work-devotion schema.

As defined by Blair-Loy (2003: 19-49), the work-devotion schema is a middle class, traditionally masculine, construct in which work defines one's life and gives it meaning. One needs to work in order to provide for the survival of oneself or family members, but to that end, one does not *need* to work sixty-plus hour workweeks, travel extensively for work-related business, or re-locate in order to gain a promotion or

19

increased status.   One's priorities become wrapped in a preoccupation with one's own advancement and personal transformation.   Work therefore becomes an end in itself rather than just a means for survival.

In contrast, there is a cultural construct for white, middle class women, which specifies that the family should be the overriding priority in their lives. Women who subscribe to this social norm have what Blair-Loy (2003: 51-90) calls a family-devotion schema. It is defined as a model that assigns responsibility for housework and child rearing to women, and it prescribes that women spend most of their adult lives focused on, and caring for, their families and their family's needs above their own personal desires. Like the work-devotion schema, the family becomes all encompassing. Unlike the work-devotion schema, however, the caring and priority of family, for women, becomes tangled in the emotion of love.   Thus, women who do not give their families, or a desire for family, priority over their own desires for personal enrichment via paid work, are made to feel guilty for their "selfishness." This underlying tension generally afflicts American women, but not American men. Women as a group are at a disadvantage in the workplace primarily due to their socially imposed responsibilities as the primary familial manager and caregiver.

Of course, both of these schemas are ideal types, i.e., abstract models that define the extreme. But, for many women in the upper echelons of American business, the dilemma and the guilt are real. They are torn between the desire to pursue a full-time executive career, which requires a work-devotion schema, and their desires for, or social expectations of, marriage and/or family, which has come to be regarded as an equally demanding job if done "right."   Although this is changing, social stigma may sometimes

20

follow an executive woman if she does not desire marriage and/or children. Her

motivations become suspect, and she can be labeled negatively. The most common

assumption might be that she is a lesbian. In the military, this becomes a problem

because homosexuality is cause for discharge.

Women who are not married, who have never been married, or who do not date

men, may find they have to monitor their behavior at work to avoid the suspicion of

lesbianism. Herbert (1998) calls this "gender management" (p. 81). One strategy is to

"minimize their sexuality while still maintaining some degree of 'femininity.' They must

strike a balance between femininity and masculinity in which they are feminine enough

to be perceived as women, specifically heterosexual women, yet masculine enough to be

perceived as capable of soldiering" (p. 82). Strategies to appear more feminine included

wearing earrings, using make-up on or off duty, wearing pumps instead of military

oxfords, and skirts instead of slacks while in uniform. Strategies to appear more

masculine included <u>not</u> wearing make-up on duty, wearing slacks instead of skirts, and

keeping hair trimmed above the collar (Herbert 1998).

Other than the use of clothing and personal appearance to strike the balance, some

women also used behaviors to try to fit in. A more feminine approach was to date men,

or claim a boyfriend or husband, or only socialize with men to prove they were not

lesbians. More masculine approaches were to use profanity, drink alcohol, or concentrate

on physical fitness. The study noted that more senior personnel tended to engage in

strategies of femininity rather than masculinity, but it does not break it out by officer or

enlisted ranks. Most women (70%) who consciously used gender management

techniques tended to employ feminine strategies only. Only a few (13%) used masculine strategies only and some (17%) used a combination of strategies (Herbert 1998).

<u>Interpersonal Issues and Attitudes at Work</u>

Women who are in positions or organizations in which they are a very small minority (i.e.,"token" women, Kanter 1977a), face several challenges that are not limited to work structure or requirements. Regardless of a token's position in the organization, she most likely will have experienced many of the situations Kanter discusses. Tokenism becomes less apparent as one becomes more senior, but women in leadership positions may face challenges to their authority, both from below in the form of passive-aggressive behavior, or from above in the form of non-support (Kanter 1977a; Miller 1997).

Gender becomes an overriding issue in work and interpersonal relationships. Men may affirm their masculinity by discussing "male" concerns such as sports, or by participating in gender displays.[5] These displays include sexual language, jokes and teasing, conversations about sex, macho behavior, swearing, exaggerated displays of aggression, potency, and prowess-oriented "war stories" (Kanter 1977a; Reskin and Padavic 1994). While men may not be totally conscious of these behaviors, they do signify to women that they are outsiders.

Since tokens are highly visible, performance pressures are created. Women in this situation are treated as representatives of women as a group, so when they make a mistake it is not only highly visible, but interpreted as a reason why women should be excluded from that work place. Tokens must put in extra effort to make their skills known and work harder to prove their competence. One reaction to this is to become an

---

[5] Gender displays are "language or rituals so characteristic of one sex that they mark the workplace as belonging to that sex" (Reskin and Padavic 1994: 11).

22

overachiever. This has the disadvantage of bringing more attention to the woman, which may have possible negative repercussions such as being the subject of vicious rumors or result in a lack of group support. A token's more common response is to try to blend in, adopting conservative dress, avoiding public events, working at home, keeping silent at meetings and avoiding conflict, risk, and controversial situations. Often, they allow others to take credit for their accomplishments (Kanter 1977a: 219-221).

Another challenge is being subject to informal isolation. This may consist of information being purposefully withheld, including information that may be required for a specific project, unwillingness of managers to critique performance constructively, or the inability to participate in informal networking where socialization occurs and corporate politics are exposed. Women may also be subject to "loyalty tests" where they are pressured by the majority to turn against members of her own group, i.e. other women. Examples are sharing jokes at other women's expense, or avoiding networking with other women in order to demonstrate that they are part of the dominant group (Kanter 1977a: 226-229).

A final challenge for tokens is that they may become entrenched in stereotypical roles and face erroneous assumptions about their abilities or status. This occurs when women workers are mistaken for wives or secretaries, or they are put in a role that limits their credibility. Kanter describes four such roles: mother, pet, seductress, and iron maiden. Mother is the stereotypical nurturer, disallowing any ability for her to "make waves." Pet is the "little sister" who is not competent, or needs to be protected. The seductress' perceived sexuality blots out all other attributes; and the iron maiden,

someone who stands up for herself, is sometimes forced to be colder and more distant than she otherwise would be (Kanter 1977a: 230-237).

Women are forced to live up (or down) to those images, and are not allowed to perform as individuals. The assigned roles are degrading, and are incompatible with the fulfillment of professional responsibilities (Kanter 1977a; Yoder 1985: 62). In addition, there are psychological and behavioral effects that may manifest in a desire to withdraw, becoming more isolated and perhaps jeopardizing the opportunities for other women by their failure to integrate (Kanter 1977a; Yoder 1985: 66-67). Thus, along with the structure of professional careers, the interpersonal problems of tokens, and the cultural expectations of the ideal worker, women's choices and opportunities are often limited.

Women in the military can be seen as "double-deviants," first as women in a male dominated environment and second as seekers of accomplishments and rewards usually sought by men (Kanter 1977a: 225; Yoder 1985: 62). Military women are highly visible in most occupational areas of the military because of their token numbers (with the exception of medical personnel, where they are a minority in most fields but a substantial majority in the nurse corps). Women's visibility and distinction from men is heightened by the authorized, and sometimes mandatory, differences in uniforms, hair length, and authority to wear jewelry and make-up. This visibility emphasizes the differences between tokens and the majority, and may make dominants fearful that tokens possess a competitive edge as a result, such as when a woman is touted for being a "first".

There is also a fear that the token will receive preferential treatment in assignments, leadership opportunities, evaluations, or training (Hosek et al. 2001; Yoder et al. 1983: 327-328). On the other hand, a token loses her individuality and simply may

become a member of a stereotyped group expected to act in certain ways, and subject to treatment as a generalized "other" (Yoder et al. 1983: 327).

Visibility, isolation, and role stereotypes (Kanter 1977a) are the bane of military women. Regardless of its ad campaign for "An Army of One," the military is still an institution and work environment that relies on teamwork and cooperation. It is also an institution for which tradition and routine is highly valued; change is initiated only through very hard lessons learned. Changes in institutional policies, group demographics, attitudes, and opportunities for peer support and networking are important for women's ability to succeed. Interpersonal processes and structural impediments that affect women's motivation and self-esteem reduce their effectiveness, and are harmful to both the military and to the individual (Hosek et al. 2001).

Section 2: The Structure of a Military Career: Organizational, Cultural and Interpersonal Challenges

The United States military is the nation's oldest, largest, busiest, and most successful "company." Globally, it employs over 3 million people in over 146 countries within four main branches of the Department of Defense (DoD): Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. There are approximately 1.4 million active duty, 1.2 million National Guard and Reserve personnel and 650,000 civilian workers. In addition, there are over 2 million retirees and family members who receive military benefits (DoD 2006). This does not include the Coast Guard, a military service within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Coast Guard is the smallest service, with 40,150 men and women on active duty, and a Selected Reserve strength of a little over 12,000 (USCG 2007a).

Structural Requirements for Entrance, Career Continuity, and Promotion

Today's military consists of a diverse group of people from almost all sectors of society. The mission of the military, to protect the country with as-needed state-sanctioned violence, requires that the personnel working for the organization have, and maintain, certain standards. There are physical, educational, age, sexuality, and mental ability criteria and restrictions that are imposed on all recruits and officer candidates.

There are other aspects of the organization that, when combined, create a unique work environment, different from almost all other civilian work organizations. It is a hierarchical organization that promotes personnel from within its ranks, making it an "internal labor force." An internal labor force is one in which there are few ports of entry for new personnel into the system, and job mobility and promotion is from within. There is virtually no lateral entry (Rosen 1992). Almost all new personnel start at the bottom and "work their way to the top." As in any system, there are exceptions, and in the military this is true for personnel who enter with advanced schooling or education.[6] However, to be promoted to the highest ranks of the organization, it is important to meet certain criteria that can only be earned while working within and through the hierarchy. Unlike the top jobs in civilian industry, the military's Admirals and General Officers are never recruited from other organizations.

There are two careers systems available: officer or enlisted.[7] Officers make up about 15% of the force, and fill combat leadership, managerial, technical, and

---

[6] Physicians, lawyers, or other professionals may enter at O-3, and some enlisted personnel may start at E-3 if they have some previous college education.

[7] Warrant Officers are not commissioned officers. They are a special category of prior enlisted personnel (except for Army aviator warrant officer) who are technical experts and tactical leaders. Selection is highly competitive, and allows extended career opportunities, worldwide leadership assignments, and increased pay and retirement benefits (USDL 2006).

professional specialty areas, such as medical and dental, media and public affairs, law, engineering, the ministry, and logistics. Enlisted personnel make up the vast majority of the force (about 85%), and fill administrative, combat, construction, repair, health care, public affairs, military police, support services, transportation, supply, mechanical, and human service type jobs (USDL 2006). Each career system is, in effect, its own internal labor market. It is possible for enlisted personnel to transfer to the officer corps through various programs, but officers are commissioned primarily through the college officer accession programs described below. Enlisted personnel have a different set of criteria for career and promotion, which will not be addressed in this study.

Commissioning Sources

Although this criterion has changed over the years,[8] a Baccalaureate degree, as a minimum, is required prior to applying for a commission in the military. This can be achieved through the federal service academies (U.S. Military Academy at West Point, U.S. Naval Academy, U.S. Air Force Academy, U.S. Coast Guard Academy, or U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, NY) or state military schools (such as the Maine or California Maritime Academies, the Citadel or Virginia Military Institute), college Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programs at selected colleges and universities, the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences in Bethesda, MD, and other programs.

Though some requirements vary by branch, in general, a person must be 18 years old, a high school graduate, be in good physical condition, of appropriate weight, and be able to pass a physical screening entrance exam to enter college sponsored officer

---

[8] For example, the Military, Naval and Coast Guard Academies did not confer Bachelor's degrees until the 1930s, and nurses were not required to have a Bachelor's degree until 1972 (Army) and 1982 (Air Force) (Sarnecky 1999; Smolenski et al. 2005).

training. While it is not required that a service member be a U.S. citizen, there are certain restrictions on the types of jobs non-citizens can hold due to security concerns. In order to be competitive for a military college scholarship, leadership aptitude and athletic abilities are also very important (*Today's Military* 2005).

To become a candidate for appointment in one of the federal service academies, a nomination from an authorized source, such as a member of Congress or alumnus/a of the Academy, is required.[9] The service academies will not accept applicants who are married or who have one or more minor dependents. Students, called midshipmen (Navy and Merchant Marine) or cadets (other services) are provided free room and board, tuition, medical and dental care, and a monthly allowance (USDL 2006).

Those who wish to join the military as officers and already have, as a minimum, their Baccalaureate degree, can receive a commission through Officer Candidate School (OCS), Officer Training School (OTS), or the National Guard State Officer Candidate School programs. Officers in the "professional" fields, such as the nurse corps, medical corps, medical service corps, dental corps, or Judge Advocate General (JAG) corps, are usually commissioned directly, at a rank commensurate with their education, usually Lieutenants or Captains (O-2 to O-3). Nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force can also earn their commissions through ROTC. Newly commissioned officers from sources other than the federal service academies need not be single, but age and other constraints remain applicable.

Earlier cohorts of women (in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s) were either commissioned via Direct Appointment or through the various branch's Women

---

[9] Appointments to the Coast Guard Academy are based strictly on merit and do not require a nomination (USDL 2006).

Officer Training schools. Appointments for women to the federal service academies did not occur until 1976. The first group of academy women to graduate is in year group 1980, and has only recently become eligible for GFO rank. ROTC was opened to women only a few years prior to that.

A perceived impediment in the military structures of opportunity is the officer's commissioning source. It was believed by many that when OCS or ROTC graduates have to compete for a job or promotion with an academy graduate, they invariably lose out. Of course, most officers are commissioned through ROTC, and as described above, women were precluded from an Academy education until 1976. Reyes (2006) examines this perception for Army officers and concludes it is due to the difference in the quality of instructors at the West Point and ROTC. There are two reasons.

First, a tour as an instructor at an ROTC unit is considered a career-ender while a tour at West Point is considered a career-enhancer. This was supported by a 1998 study in which it was determined that officers assigned to West Point were more often selected for Command and Staff College and subsequent promotion than those assigned to ROTC units (Kendrick 1998). Second, when an officer is assigned to West Point as an instructor, an advanced degree (usually Masters) is required. The Army pays full tuition for the officer to earn that degree if it is not already in hand. This is not the case for ROTC instructors, where only the professor of military science has had to have an advanced degree. For these reasons it has been perceived that West Point has had higher quality instructors than ROTC and that a West Point degree is more competitive (Reyes 2006).

Minimum Service Requirements and the Internal Labor Market

For all commissioning programs, there is a mandatory "pay back" period of obligated service from 4 to 7 years. Additional service time is added for further specialty training, such as for aviators, nuclear engineers, doctors, or follow-on graduate school education. This ensures that there is a cost-benefit to maintaining the internal labor market system (USDL 2006). Officers are usually commissioned in the active reserves, and then augment to the regular military after completing their apprenticeship requirements (or up to 11 years in service - Rostker, Thie, Lacy, Kawata and Purnell 1993) and deciding to remain in the military as a full-time career. Retirement points vary with rank, with a minimum time in service for retirement eligibility of 20 years (Rostker et al. 1993), see Table 1.

There are constraints on job and promotion mobility for all personnel in the military as a result of the internal labor market system, the up or out policies, and the hierarchical organizational structure. The military is also a closed or "fixed job" system in which there are a finite number of jobs, more at the lower ranks than at the higher ranks (White 1970). Congress sets the number of people within each of the branches and total Department of Defense. Mobility within a fixed job system is highly constrained: an incumbent must leave a job before a vacancy can be filled (White 1970). The 1980 Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) provided for an "up or out" system, which places constraints on all workers to perform and be promoted within a given period of time (usually 2 reviews), or risk being discharged or forced to retire (Rostker et al. 1993). Yet, in a closed system, one cannot be promoted until someone

					Cumulative Career Promotion Probability[10]
Promote to:	**Minimum Time in Service**	**Time in Grade**	**Promotion Opportunity**	**Selection Process**	
O-2	**2 years**	**2 years**	**100% if Fully Qualified**	**Appointed by Service Secretary**	96% 2x Nonselect= separation
O-3	**3.5-4 years**	**2 years**	**Qualified 95%**	**Board Selection**	82% 2x Nonselect= Separation or retirement at 20 years
O-4	**10 years +/- 1 year**	**3 years**	**Best Qualified (80%)**	**Board Selection**	66% 2x Nonselect= Separation or retirement at 20 years; can stay to 24 years.
O-5	**16 years +/- 1 year**	**3 years**	**Best Qualified (70%)**	**Board Selection**	41% Retirement at 28 years; 30% can retire earlier
O-6	**22 years +/- 1 year**	**3 years**	**Best Qualified (50%)**	**Board Selection**	18% Retirement at 30 years; 30% can retire earlier.
†O-7/O-8	**25 years +/-**	**~3 years**	**Approx. 2%***	**Board Selection**	Must retire at 35 years or age 62^
†O-9/O-10	**25 years +/- (fast track)**	**~2 to 2.5 years**	**Approx. 1%***	**Nominated by SECDEF[11]**	Must retire at 35 years or age 62^

Table 1
U.S. Military Commissioned Officer Promotions

Sources: Rostker et al. 1993; † Harrell et al 2004; *Kennedy 2001; ^ percent unknown.

---

[10] From original cohort less attrition (Rostker et al. 1993).
[11] Secretary of Defense

more senior retires or leaves the service.   In order to be considered for promotion, there are also time in grade (rank) and time in service requirements. Promotion opportunities for commissioned officers are approximately the same for each of the service branches, as shown in Table 1, but may differ by occupational specialty.

Requirements for Promotion

Each person receives an annual evaluation by his/her superior in the chain of command. This evaluation can and does have an impact on the future of an individual officer. It affects future assignments, which affect advancement or promotion opportunities, eventually affecting career intentions and retention.

To be competitive for promotion, candidates must first ensure that they have gathered the set of basic credentials: completion of appropriate Professional Military Education (PME) courses or civilian postgraduate degrees, and consistently top marks in their performance evaluations. Beyond these basic credentials, candidates must demonstrate credibility in their career field, a sustained manner of excellence in performance, and a potential for future leadership. Promotion boards then assess these three qualities primarily through a review of the candidate's assignment history and performance evaluations (OSD 1998).

Due to the nature of the closed system hierarchy, the criteria for selection of personnel to higher ranks become more selective and competitive as the rank increases (Rosen 1992). The promotion opportunity for personnel at lower ranks is greater than the promotion opportunity for personnel at the highest ranks. Along the way, personnel fall

out through voluntary attrition, forced attrition,[12] stalled promotions, or retirement. So there is a continuous cycle of accession, promotion, and attrition or retirement. The actual promotion opportunity (listed in Table 1) can vary as a function of changes in personnel authorizations by Congress, losses (through attrition or retirement), and promotions.

Employment in the military must be continuous; there can be no time gaps in the officer's evaluations. There is generally no opportunity for a "leave of absence" or a sabbatical from employment.[13] Career progression must be such that each transfer places an officer in a position of greater authority and responsibility. The competition is difficult, and a "zero defect" mentality has risen as a result. Unless the unit has a commanding officer who allows personnel to err, and learn from their errors as part of the development process (as long as it does not cause a major catastrophe or kill someone), officers who are "slow learners" are not given an opportunity to mature into successful officers. Mentors can help junior officers through this process, but not all officers are fortunate enough to find a senior officer or senior enlisted person willing to guide them (OSD 1998).

Finally, there are job requirements, or "tickets to punch," that must be attained in order to be competitive for promotion to each higher rank. Officers must have an increase in their level of responsibility from one job to the next. Lack of significant leadership responsibility may result in non-selection for promotion. Regardless of the specialty area or branch of service, all officers who wish to make the military a career

---

[12] Forced attrition is reaching maximum time in a certain rank. The military forces personnel out if they are not promoted to the next rank within a certain amount of time.

[13] An exception is the Coast Guard which has a sabbatical policy that allows any member, once approved, to take up to two years off without pay or benefits, and return to service at the same grade as they left (GAO 2002). The Navy has considered a similar benefit, but to date has taken no action.

(minimum of 20 years of service, 10 years as a commissioned officer) know those specific jobs, or types of jobs, that must be performed in order to be promoted. Many of these important jobs require a certification process, which may include job prerequisites, schools, performance levels, and/or selection by a board.

Limitations due to Occupational Category

There are three broad categories of officer occupations and skills: professional, technical and support, and line. The professional category includes the specialty areas of nursing, medical doctor, dentist, medical service corps, chaplain, and judge advocate general (lawyer). Due to their additional education, officers in these fields usually enter at Lieutenant/Captain. They remain within their professional specialty area throughout their careers; there is little to no horizontal movement between the professional specialties until the most senior levels of command in the medical fields, when GFO nurses, doctors, or even dentists can command a medical center. Almost never will a professional laterally transfer to the line or support communities.[14]

Technical and support positions include public affairs, supply, ordnance, communications, maintenance, transportation, logistics, intelligence, and non-combat engineering. Officers enter these fields directly from commissioning source, or may transfer from other occupational areas later in their careers, at the Lieutenant/Captain or Lieutenant Commander/Major level.[15] It is rare, though possible, for officers in either the professional or support areas to be promoted to the highest military rank, four-star

---

[14] There are always exceptions. For example, the Army allowed nurse Clara Adams-Ender to transfer to the "line Army" when she took command of Ft. Belvior, Virginia, in 1991 (Adams-Ender 2001: 231).
[15] Most lateral transfers are usually from the line or support communities into a support or professional community. Once a person transfers, however, there is no further movement from one area to another.

General or Admiral (Harrell et al. 2004: 5-7). Since the vast majority of women in the

military serve in these two specialty areas, no woman has yet been promoted to that rank.

The line communities are perceived as the backbone of the military organization.

For the purposes of this paper, they are defined as the combat arms of the military

(infantry, armor, artillery in the Army and Marine Corps; surface, submarine, aviator in

the Navy; pilots and navigators in the Air Force, Army, and Marine Corps, combat

engineers, and all Special Forces). They command at the tactical, operational, and

strategic levels of the military. Officers enter as Ensigns or First Lieutenants and their

early careers are spent becoming experts in their specialty areas. Their career

advancement depends on a combination of their military/naval skills, organizational

skills, corporate/leadership skills and potential, understanding of the national security

environment, and military experience (Harrell et al. 2004: 5-7). All of the GFOs who are

at the highest level in the military, four star Admiral or General, are in the line

communities.

Women entered the line communities as early as 1972 (aviation) and 1978

(shipboard duty), but it was not until 1993-1994 that women in the Air Force and Navy

were authorized to serve in combat units (with the continued exclusion from submarines

and certain positions that require collocation with ground combat units) (Ebbert and Hall

1999). Women in the Army and Marine Corps continue to be precluded from serving in

the combat communities of infantry, armor (tanks), and field artillery; and women in all

branches are precluded from serving in the Special Forces. As a result, women in the

Army and Marine Corps find their structures of opportunity are halted at the two- or

three-star level. Women who entered the combat line communities in the Navy and Air

Force in the mid-1990s are still too junior to be eligible for promotion to GFO rank.

Table 2					
Military officer personnel by broad occupational category and branch of service, February 2005 (Regular, active)					
Occupational Group - Officer	**Army**	**Air Force**	**Coast Guard**	**Marine Corps**	**Navy**	**Total, all services/PCT**
Line (Combat specialty)	18,835	6,007	0	4,662	5,463	34,967 (16%)
Support						
Engineering, science, and technical	19,137	17,503	1,576	3,576	9,778	51,570
Executive, administrative, and managerial	11,262	10,395	282	2,582	7,450	31,971
Human resource development	2,128	2,418	213	299	3,258	8,316
Media and public affairs	224	500	20	44	282	1,070
Protective service	2,237	1,410	104	309	890	4,950
Support services	1,525	830	0	38	1,003	3,396
Transportation	13,216	19,729	2,250	7,082	11,975	54,252
Total Support and Technical	49,729	52,785	4,445	13,930	34,636	155,525 (72%)
Professional **Health care**	9,792	9,413	43	See note[16]	6,983	26,231 (12%)
Total, by service	78,356	68,205	4,448	18,592	47,082	216,723
Source: U.S. Department Labor 2006						

Note: Column headers are Army | Air Force | Coast Guard | Marine Corps | Navy | Total, all services/PCT.

Table 2 shows the numbers of officer personnel by occupational groups and

branch of service. A breakdown of the professional category, other than health care, was

not available. As can be seen, the support, technical, and medical occupations make up

84% of the officer specialty areas, while the combat arms make up only 16% of the total

---

[16] Marine Corps is served by Navy medical and dental personnel.

officer occupations. This "tooth to tail" ratio (16:84 or 1 to 5.25) is indicative of military culture, in that it celebrates the combat arms as the most important, and most prestigious, aspect of the military, yet it requires more than 5 people to support each combatant in their war fighting efforts.

Clearly, the combat arms are most advantaged in both the occupational opportunity structure and the occupational power structure, in that all of the four-star positions in the military are held by those in the combat arms. Those who enter the combat arms have a clear opportunity to progress to the highest levels of the military, and until relatively recently, women were excluded from pursuing those occupational specialties.

Service Status - Regular, Reserve or Auxiliary

As previously described, the military consists of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps in the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard in the Department of Homeland Security. What has not been described, however, is the difference between regular and reserve status.

Simply speaking, regular status is a designation given to those who are on active duty, and who intend to make, or have made, the military a full-time career. A reservist is one who is on a stand-by status, ready to augment the regular forces during times of conflict or national emergency. Traditional or "ready" reservists are part-time, required to "drill" one weekend a month and 2 weeks during the year. Although there are full-time reservists who stay on active duty for their full careers, they are usually personnel who administer the training and management of ready reserve personnel.

The "traditional" pattern of reserve service has changed almost completely due to the current War on Terror, with reservists being called up (activated) by unit, or as an individual augmentee (IA), for an extended period of time over and above their expectations. There are differences in benefits for regular and reserve officers, which is not within the purview of this research. However, the main traditional difference between regular and reserve personnel is full-time and part-time status, respectively. All of the services, including the Coast Guard, have an affiliated reserve force.

Most officers coming onto active duty from OCS or ROTC are commissioned in the Reserve force. After a period of probation, they can "augment" into the regular force. This is an indication that the individual has considered his or her career options, and has decided to make the military a career. There are benefits associated with Regular status as compared to Reserve status, and with the current operational environment, those differences are becoming more pronounced. These include differences in retirement and health care benefits for members and their families, availability of on-base services such as commissary privileges, as well as family support and educational services. There are also additional career opportunities to being in the regular force; all of the four-star GFOs, besides being line officers, are in the regular component.

There are auxiliary units or personnel who may be affiliated with the armed services, but are not considered military members. They have a viable mission within the services, but have no veteran status. A prime current example is the Coast Guard Auxiliary. The U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary is a civilian, non-military component of the Coast Guard. The 30,000 volunteer men and women of the Auxiliary assist the Coast Guard in boating and water safety (USCGA 2007).

Due to cultural constructs, it was preferred that women serve the military in an auxiliary or civilian status rather than in a regular status. Many non-military yet military-like organizations operated under this guise during World War II. Examples of these include volunteer organizations like the Red Cross, the USO, and the Office of Civilian Defense, and quasi-military groups like the Women's Land Army, and Cadet Nurse Corps. In fact, even Army and Navy nurses were considered contracted civilians until Army nurses were given military ranking in 1920. Navy nurses did not get military ranking until 1942 (Yellin 2004). Women in the Army were first enlisted as the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) in 1942, but when the Navy and Marine Corps opted to enlist women in the reserve forces in 1942, recruiting for the WAAC came to a standstill. The Army relented and formed the Women's Army Corps (WAC) in 1943 with full military status (Holm 1993).

The National Guard (NG or simply The Guard), which consists of the Army National Guard (ARNG) and the Air National Guard (ANG), is a related but separate entity of DoD. The Guard has its roots in the states' militias of the colonial era, but was also used for federal service. The Guard continues to be a dual state-federal force. It is the Governor's military arm, and since 1903, is considered a reserve force for the Army. The Guard has participated in all of our nation's wars, including our current War on Terror (National Guard Bureau 2007). Women were not authorized to serve in the Guard until 1956, and then only as nurses or other medical specialties such as dieticians, therapists or laboratory technicians. No women were permitted to serve in an enlisted capacity. In 1967, women were authorized to enlist and women officers other than nurses

were also authorized. All enlisted women and Army Guard officers not in the Army

Nurse Corps were members of the WAC (Listman 1998).

Promotion Performance Measures and Obstacles

In a 1998 study of the structural impacts on the careers of women and minority

men, researchers commissioned by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for

Personnel and Readiness (OSD 1998) found that there was near uniform agreement

among officers interviewed that an officer's success is driven primarily by job

performance and its recognition through the officer evaluation system. Promotion board

members also felt strongly that the primary factor they looked for when reviewing a

promotion candidate was a sustained manner of performance.

However, there was also near uniform agreement among officers that factors other

than an individual's ability can affect one's performance. While individual skills are

important, other service members, and the institution itself, can create or limit

opportunities for officers to apply their abilities. The formation of work, peer, and

mentoring relationships is an example of some of the factors that can impact an officer's

performance and recognition. Yet these relationships develop for many reasons other

than an officer's ability. Work, peer, and mentor relationships can develop from common

social interests, family ties, friendships, "seeing oneself" in a younger officer, or being an

alumnus of the same college or academy (OSD 1998).

The prevalence of these networks and mentoring relationships can be a

disadvantage if one does not have such a relationship. Reyes (2006) found that of the

officers he interviewed, those who did not have mentoring relationships often had shorter

careers, while those who did have mentoring relationships were more often promoted to

higher ranks, and in some cases to GFO. The disadvantages that women may experience

in the course of interpersonal interactions cannot always be regulated by policy. While

exclusionary behaviors can be prohibited, inclusive behaviors cannot be regulated.

Policies that are designed to counteract disadvantage sometimes reinforce the stereotypes

that cause disadvantage (OSD 1998), such as the perception of the development of a

double standard or reverse discrimination, where women and minorities who are "less

qualified" are seemingly promoted over "more qualified" white men.

OSD (1998) researchers also note that women may face potential disadvantages in

how performance is measured due to their status as non-traditional workers. One can

clearly measure an officer's performance by the outcome of whether or not the mission

was accomplished, but how well it was performed is harder to measure. They note that

performance is often measured by the process of how the job was done, or by other non-

substantive measures (proxies) for outcomes, such as does the officer fit the "traditional"

image, which is often masculine. So those who have difficulty applying the traditional

approach or meeting the traditional image are likely to be evaluated less favorably than

others, regardless of whether they are equally able to attain a similar outcome. For

example, female officers may be less able to project a physical leadership style and

therefore tend to rely on less confrontational styles of leadership. Leadership is an

important skill on which officers are regularly rated, yet the style of leadership is a

process rather than an *outcome*. While women officers may be able to achieve similar

outcomes with their unit, they may be evaluated as having weaker leadership skills

because they employ a less traditional style of leadership (OSD 1998).

Selection to General/Flag Officer

The proceedings of selection boards for General and Flag Officers are secret, but the requirements for promotion are common knowledge. In addition to a minimum requirement of 20 to 25 years of service and the rank of Captain or Colonel (O-6), a person who is competitive for promotion to GFO rank must have a stellar performance record plus a combination of skills, job experience, leadership experience in command, post-graduate education, attendance at professional military schools, such as one of the War Colleges or General and Staff College, and cross-branch assignments (known as "joint" assignments) before even being considered. Graduation from a military academy is perceived as a plus, as discussed earlier, and has been shown to be so with regard to the Navy (Danskine 2001) and the Coast Guard (USCG 2007b).[17]

Combat experience and combat awards are also highly rated and important for selection to GFO rank (Holm 1993: 277; Reyes 2006). The latter had been available only to men prior to 1993, when the combat exclusion laws for women in the Navy and Air Force were repealed. Since then, a few post-1973 year group[18] women line officers, primarily pilots in the Air Force, have attained the rank of Brigadier General or Rear Admiral. Since the combat arms branches function as the predominate pipeline to senior ranks, women officers in the Army and Marine Corps cannot fairly compete with men for promotion to these ranks (Reyes 2006).

---

[17] Danskine (2001) found that 59.4% of Navy Admirals were commissioned through the Naval Academy. A review of the official biographies of the 41 Flag officers in the Coast Guard indicated that 66% of them were commissioned through the Coast Guard Academy.

[18] Officers are grouped by "year group," which is the year they were commissioned into the military. In 1973 the armed forces became an all-volunteer force, and women's participation and opportunities in the military increased. Women who are currently GFOs were commissioned in the mid-to-late 1970s and early 1980s.

The vetting process for GFO consists of board selection, and, for three or four-star rank, nomination by the President for Senate confirmation. Congress limits the number of GFOs who can serve, so less than one percent of career officers will ever be promoted to GFO (See Table 1). A very small percentage will be promoted to four star GFO and become one of the Unified Commanders,[19] Chiefs of Staff of the Army or Air Force, Chief of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Harrell et al. 2004: 7-8).

General Claudia Kennedy describes the process of selection as "about as close to a meritocracy as you'll find" (2001: 22). Without noting the structural impediments delineated earlier, she suggests that diligence and persistence are important factors in success. To succeed, she believes,

> A person needs to have innate talent and be willing to devote one's full energy to each job for many years. I also think that most success stems from one's basic work ethic and emotional makeup (resilience and adaptability) rather than from the sole intentional activity of planning and setting distant specific goals…If a position of high leadership is your goal, you must lay the groundwork early and not waste time (Kennedy, 2001: 24-25).

General Clara Adams-Ender understood the importance of having a mentor, someone to call on for advice. In her 2001 autobiography she describes the investigation and maneuvering she undertook to fulfill her quest for promotion to General:

> Getting to general would call for a lot more finesse and back-room maneuvering than moving from lieutenant colonel to colonel, however. First, I would need to see which of my influential allies would be willing to throw their support behind me. I talked with many general officers about how one gets to be a general…They all encouraged me to keep up

---

[19] There are nine Unified Commanders, four with worldwide responsibility (Transportation Command, Strategic Command, Joint Forces Command and Special Operations Command), and five with geographical responsibility (Northern Command, Southern Command, European Command, Central Command and Pacific Command). They are the direct link from the President and the Secretary of Defense to the military forces (DoD 2007a).

my high level of performance and the rest would work out. Most of them also told me what they would do to influence the situation.

It was suggested that I contact the Honorable John Shannon, a brother [fellow African American] who was Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installation and Logistics at that time. He was a retired army colonel who had a reputation for being frank and candid with everyone. I visited him at the Pentagon. Mr. Shannon asked if I knew any of the generals who would be likely to sit on my promotion board. I told him that I didn't. "Let me tell you something," Mr. Shannon said wryly. "If you've got a choice between having a good record and having friends on the board, choose friends. Everybody trying to get promoted from colonel to general has a good record."

Another valuable bit of advice. And so it went, with my bending ears and cashing in chits in an effort to talk brigadier general to life. I easily talked to about thirty generals, most of whom offered to lend a hand (Adams-Ender 2001:214-215).

While hard work, increasing responsibility, and exceptional performance are expected of all in an executive career path, whom you know appears to be as important as what you know. Not only are mentors helpful for advice, but sponsors may be even more important; these are more senior officers who recommend an officer to others and may directly provide career-enhancing assignments. As objective as the promotion process purports to be, there will always be a bit of subjective reality that either helps or hinders one's progress, whether it involves a military or a civilian career. These structures of opportunity, advantages such as mentoring and sponsorship that are available to a select few, must be figured into strategies that will, or will not, lead to promotion.

Appointment v. Selection: Early Structural Obstacles

Women were not eligible for selection to Flag or General Officer until 1968 when President Johnson signed into law a bill that enabled women to compete for those ranks. Because women could not compete with men due to their non-combat status, all but the Air Force maintained separate promotion lists. The first women Generals and Admirals

were carefully selected by the individual service Chiefs rather than by board selection. The services scrutinized positions that were the equivalent of a flag level job, such as the Directors of the various women's corps and the Chiefs of the various nurse corps, and those women were "spot promoted" (appointed) to Rear Admiral or Brigadier General (Holm 1993).

The "appointment to" rather than "selection for" GFO rank for women continued throughout the 1970s. This changed in December 1980 with the enactment of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA), which called for consolidation of the officer promotion systems and uniform laws for managing the different services' officer career structures. Included in DOPMA were provisions to abolish gender-separated promotion lists and to integrate them into one list (Holm 1993: 276). Since that time, women have competed with men for promotion, and have been selected by the same promotion boards.

Although the structural impediments to women's advancement were being abolished, it was without the concurrent ability of the service to allow women into the most competitive jobs. DOPMA was designed with the assumption that it was beneficial to create uniform requirements about assignments, promotions, and retirement across the services (Rostker et al 1993). Yet women were competing with men but did not have equal career opportunities, so this system put them at a disadvantage for promotion (Holm 1993: 277). The structures of opportunity and power (Kanter 1977a) were slowly being opened, but there were still many obstacles to women being able to attain actual opportunity and power. Combat exclusions laws were prevalent for all of the branches. Women were still an anomaly at the service academies and ROTC, and new career paths

had certain dead ends. This was especially true of the women at sea program, which, by 1980, still had only 14 ships that could accommodate a very small number of women officers. Many women who were excited at the prospect of participating in the Navy's primary missions at sea, soon became discouraged when it was apparent there was no viable career path. Also, women officers who had navigated the promotion system under the old rules did not feel they could compete, since they had been denied equal job opportunity early in their careers (Holm 1993).

Nevertheless, all of the services managed to negotiate the transition. The abolition of the women's support structure was necessary to eliminate a "separate and unequal" attitude about women in the military, and to promote the military as a gender-neutral team. However, it led to a false assumption that all the issues concerning women were being dealt with effectively, that total integration had been achieved, and there was no longer a need for oversight (Holm 1993).

It has been over 25 years since DOPMA was enacted, and even though women still are not fully integrated into all military occupations or positions, they are successfully competing. Each year the number of women who achieve Flag or General Officer rank grows, and the number of women in "operational" rather than "support" jobs also grows. In the military, strides continue to be made towards equality of opportunity and responsibility. Even though a few formal structural barriers remain, and the military culture still views women in mostly stereotypical roles, some military women are successfully navigating through this maze and achieving their career goals.

Summary

This chapter has provided a brief description of the structural requirements of executive as well as military careers, and the resultant opportunities and limitations. The work structure and culture disadvantages women due to its reliance on an ideal worker who has a family support system in place so that he can concentrate on the job and not on his daily logistical needs. The work structure also disadvantages women because of the work-devotion schema that is inherent in an executive position. This schema is also highly relevant to pursuing a career in the military, where it has been called a "greedy" institution. This is particularly salient for women as the family has also been considered a greedy institution (Segal 1986). This work-family devotion dilemma is the crux of the matter for women who pursue an executive career, whether civilian or military.

Unique to the military are legal limitations that will be further analyzed in Chapter 4, but which inform any discussion of opportunity structure in the military. Legal restrictions in the past included exclusion of women from highly desirable commissioning sources, such as fully funded ROTC and the federal service academies, until the mid-1970s. They also included restrictions on women's occupational specialty options, which reduced opportunities for combat roles, which further reduced promotion and retention options.

The military is also unique in that it requires a period of indoctrination into its cultural norms, values, and behaviors which negatively impact a woman's ability to "fit the mold", since the ideal military warrior is male. Although the requirement of uniforms somewhat softens this effect, an unspoken requirement is for women to not only "do

gender" but to do it in a way that requires a fine balance between femininity and masculinity. Civilian executive women also have a similar challenge.

The next chapter examines the literature on executive women, and provides findings from the studies that were conducted on women's work-family balance strategies, strategies for negotiating the male dominated workplace, and more of the limitations women face in pursuing an executive career.

CHAPTER 3

CAREER WOMEN IN EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

It has only been within the past 30 years or so that women have made it to senior executive positions within the business community and in the military. This is a result of what was discussed earlier - the structural impediments that prematurely derailed many women's career advancement. Gendered work structures require that a man in an executive position be committed to his career and devote little time to other obligations. This work-devotion schema also has been the model of an officer's military career since inception. The ideals of "service to country" and "devotion to duty" are the patriotic calls to arms that inspire organizational commitment and the willingness to give one's life for one's country, if need be. Alternatively, women pursuing elite careers "collide head on with the family devotion schema" (Blair-Loy 2003: 2). If they devote too much time to the family, they violate the work devotion schema and if they delegate too much of their family responsibilities, they violate the family devotion schema. Elite women thus find themselves in a position where hard choices must be made. The work-family conflict seems inevitable.

Yet, women have made it to the top of many powerful organizations. *Fortune* magazine annually lists the "50 Most Powerful Women" in American business. The 2005 roster (all but one of whom are white) includes 49 year-old Meg Whitman, Chairman and CEO of eBay (#1), 51 year-old Oprah Winfrey, Chairman of Harpo [Entertainment] (#4), 64 year-old Martha Stewart, Founder Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia (#21) and the youngest on the list, 40 year-old Sallie Krawcheck, Chief Financial Officer at Citigroup (#7) (Yang and Levenson 2005). So, how do they do it? How have they negotiated the

labyrinth of choices between pursuing an executive career and managing the family? Do

they reject the family devotion schema and concentrate on their careers, sacrificing, or

perhaps never wanting, the family ties? Or do they somehow make it all work, becoming

the super mom on the super job? The following studies show the structural and cultural

impediments faced by college educated women, and the choices they made to negotiate

the work-family devotion conflict.

The Work-Family Dilemma

Goldin (2004) looked at the work-family issue from a cohort perspective. Using

the Current Population Surveys, National Longitudinal Surveys, and archival data, she

found that in the 20th century, the experiences of college women differed depending on

when they graduated from college. It is likely, although this is not specified, that the

majority of these women (at least in the first three cohorts) were white, upper or middle

class women. Her findings are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3						
Demographic Characteristics of Five Cohorts of College Graduate Women						
Cohort/College Grad Years	Family/ Career Path	Nonmarriage (by age 50)	No child (by age 40)	Work at Age 30*	Work at age 45*	Dominant Occupation
Cohort 1, 1900-1919	Family or career	>30%	>50%	Low	20%	Teaching, Office
Cohort 2, 1920-1945	Job then family	15%-20%	30%-35%	25%	50%	Teaching, Office
Cohort 3, 1946-1965	Family then job	8%	17%	25%-30%	75%	Teaching
Cohort 4, 1966-1979	Career then family	12%	28%	65%	80%	Varied
Cohort 5, 1980-1990	Career and family	**	26%	80%	**	Varied

*If married; ** too young at time of analysis. Source: Goldin (2004: 22-23)

For Cohort 1, those who graduated from college in the first two decades of the 20th century, the 30% non-marriage rate was four times that of non-college women, whereas college men had about the same marriage rate as non-college men. Among college women who married, 30% had no children. This, combined with those women who remained single and childless, reveals that more than 50% of this group did not have children. It is also important to note that, if married, these women usually did not work. Only 20% of married women were working at age 45 (Goldin 2004: 23). Women in this cohort could not have joined the military as officers, other than nurses.[20] If they enlisted during World War I, they were forced out of the military at the end of that conflict.

Cohort 2, those who graduated from college between the first and second world wars, began a trend that can be seen more vividly in the later cohorts. The fraction of those who never married by age 50 decreased by about half compared to Cohort 1. The percent who never had children also was smaller. They worked when young and married; however, they usually left the work force once pregnant with their first child (Goldin 2004: 24). The first women officers in the military would have been at the latter end of this cohort. Of course, if they stayed in the military, they would have been in the group of women who, even if married, had no children.

Cohort 3 graduated from college at the peak of the baby boom. They married and had children at an exceptionally high rate. Only 8% never married, and only 10% did not have children. These women returned to work after they started their family, as evidenced by the increase in working married women from age 30 to age 45. However, family came first in terms of priority and timing. This cohort became increasingly

---

[20] Nurses at this time were neither officer nor enlisted. They had a totally separate rank system.

frustrated with their opportunities within the labor force (Goldin 2004: 25), and probably contributed to the start of the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The first women to become GFOs would have been in this cohort. They would now be retired from the military.

Cohort 4 graduated during the beginning of the women's movement of the 1970s and were able to take advantage of new opportunities. They delayed marriage for several years after college, but only 12% remained single by their mid-forties. About 19% of those who married never had children, which, when combined with the never married group, resulted in about 28% of the entire group remaining childless (Goldin 2004: 25). These women continued to work, even after marriage and children, with 65% still working by age 30, rising to 80% at age 45 (Goldin 2004: 23). About 13% to 18% achieved "work and family" by age 40 (Goldin 2004: 26). Women who are at the end of their careers, or retired GFOs would likely belong in this cohort.

Finally, the last cohort is of women who are currently in the labor force, graduating from college between 1980-1990. Women in the early years of this cohort in the military would be those who are now being selected for GFO. This also includes those women who were the first to graduate from the various military academies. The data Goldin collected was from 1997, so the childlessness and work at age 45 rates were not yet available. It can be seen, though, that 80% of them remained in the work force at age 30. Other studies, as described below, though not quantitative, give some insight as to where this cohort is heading.

Blair-Loy (2001) conducted a qualitative study of 56 women in high-ranking, finance-related jobs in a large U.S. city, and discovered some interesting patterns with

regard to work and family decisions. Divided by cohort, she found that more than half (57%) of the women in the first cohort, who graduated from college before 1969, avoided marriage or children while 43% were able to manage work and family through sequencing tactics, starting work after the children started school and through marriages that evolved into more egalitarian unions. Of first marriages in this cohort, 33% did not survive the transition to less traditional gender roles; 10% never remarried. This is consistent with Goldin's finding for Cohort 3: sequencing of family, then work.

Of the women in the second cohort, who graduated from college between 1969 and 1973, Blair-Loy found that while only 13% avoided marriage, a full 77% married, but did not have children. Of first marriages, 53% did not survive, and the women did not remarry. Approximately a third (33%) developed an egalitarian-style marriage. Among those ever married, only 20% had children. This is consistent with Goldin's findings for Cohort 4, of which only 12% never married. However, Blair-Loy's respondents were less likely to have children.

The third and last cohort, the mid baby boomers who graduated from college between 1974 and 1980, had the most success in managing a successful career and an egalitarian marriage. Most of this cohort delayed marriage until their careers were well established and only 10% never married. Of first marriages, 65% survived and 50% of those ever married also had children. This cohort relied on full-time child-care, but remained responsible for the management of that care.

The ideology of an egalitarian marriage is an important one in this context, where women are working an ideal worker schedule, and many earn as much, or more, than their husbands. In the first and second cohorts, this ideology was problematic because

both the women and the men were raised under an expectation of traditional marital roles. The career expectations and aspirations of these women challenged those ideals and many opted to forego marriage and/or children. Those in the third cohort joined the labor force after many of the legal changes had become institutionalized in the public realm and egalitarian ideologies had grown more acceptable in public opinion (Blair-Loy 2001).

Yet, there remained some semblance of traditional gender roles in the management of the household. Blair-Loy (2001: 706) found that even when elite women executives "contract out" this family work to full time nannies and housekeepers, they, not their husbands, still retain ultimate responsibility for their children's care. She argues that this family responsibility will ultimately clash with their work devotion, and could compromise their work accomplishment.

In a separate qualitative study of elite women and men in positions of president or chief officer[21], Davies-Netzley (1998) found that women in this study also had to reconcile a demanding career with home responsibilities. Some of these women (22%) opted not to have children; though 55% had children, 60% of those children were adults by the time the women reached their elite positions. While working up to these positions, however, they relied on full-time childcare and supportive husbands. In this sample, although the women were the primary family breadwinners, they retained the responsibility for household management. They also took a more active role in caring for their families than the men in the sample. This trend shows how the norm of the family devotion schema for women impacts even women at the highest levels of corporate achievement.

---

[21] Although this study was quite small, with only 9 women and 7 men, the findings are quite relevant to the study of elite women in the military.

An earlier study, published in 1988 when women were first achieving executive level positions, appeared to have a more optimistic attitude about women's ability to have both a satisfying, high-achieving career and a successful marriage with children. Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988), themselves high achieving women, conducted a survey of 160 women listed in *Who's Who of American Women*. The study queried these women on their achievements and failures, joys, problems and disappointments encountered on the way to success. They discuss the choices they and the respondents made and why they made them, the importance of timing and flexibility, and the implications that the choices had on their lives. They conclude that the success that was achieved, and the rewards that followed, were worth the sacrifices and personal life-style choices required to attain those goals (1988: xi).

The study was a non-random study of women from law, medicine, academia, business, government (including the military), health services and nonprofit organizations. The typical respondent was between 41 and 50 years old, with an advanced degree, a salary well above average, a mother who did not work, average financial status as a child, one sibling, first in the family birth order, married from sixteen to twenty years, and with two children but no stepchildren (Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum 1988: 2). Of the group, 66% were married, 2% were widowed and 18% recently divorced. Only 14% had never married (1988: 61). Those who remained single indicated that the time required to nurture a relationship would have been taken from their work, something that they were unwilling to do. Others had same-sex relationships. In some cases, men were intimidated by their career success. However, many responded that they still hoped to marry, if they found the right person, or once they got older (1988: 64-65).

Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum also found that well over half (65%) had children (13% had stepchildren), while 35% did not. Of the 46% who had no children of their own, 24% said they planned to have children eventually, 58% said no, and 18% were not sure. Some mentioned they would like to find a man with children so they could share in family life, but not have to take the time to give birth. Questioned whether those who did not have children of their own regret that decision, of the 46% in this category, 28% answered that they regretted the decision, 50% said they did not, and 22% said sometimes (1988: 119-120). Thus only about a quarter of the entire group of 160 indicated that they did not want to have children, and did not regret that decision.

Many of the women had few role models, and by necessity had male mentors. Their husbands were generally supportive of their work and their achievements, and were equal, or near equal partners in performing household responsibilities. Work was a central part of their lives, much as it was for their male peers. Collins, Gilbert and Nycum (1988) determined that success in both work and family areas required determination, some sacrifice, and many choices. In addition, they note that women who are successful do not have a "superwoman" complex, but outsource as much of the mundane domestic tasks as possible. They may have it all, but they do not do it all, at least when it comes to housework.

Moore (1988) conducted a cross-national study of women from the United States, Australia, and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). These three countries were selected due to their similarities in their social and political structures. Using national elite surveys from the decade bounded by 1971 to 1981 provided a comparison between the men and women who responded to the survey. The small numbers of women in the

three surveys, (54 in the U.S., 25 in FRG, and 15 in Australia) reflect the scarcity of women in elite positions. However, caution is urged both due to the small sample size and the age of the data.

Moore (1988) found that the women in these surveys come from a somewhat more privileged social origin than the elite men, but their family situation was widely divergent. She found that nearly all the men in the American sample were married, compared to just over half of the women. She also found that about 20% of the women, but only 8% of the men had no children. The other studies did not gather this type of comparative data.

The Unspoken Burdens of Racial and Ethnic Minorities

Minority women face issues similar to white women, but have the additional burden of race with which to contend. In a qualitative study of 20 high achieving Latina women between the ages of 34 and 60, Gomez et al. (2001) found both similarities and differences as compared to both white and African-American women. They looked at contextual and cultural variables, personal variables, and the work-family interface.

These women were both native-born and immigrants (from Mexico, South America, and Puerto Rico). Their average educational achievement was the equivalent of a Master's degree; 12 were married or had a male partner, 6 were divorced or had been in a committed relationship. Only 2 had never had a serious relationship. More than half (11) had children, and 7 had children still living at home. Of the 12 married or partnered, all said their spouses were their most important source of support; 4 said their spouses shared equally in the housework, and 7 of them actually took on nontraditional male roles as primary family managers.

57

The career paths of the women in this sample "tended to be unplanned and nonlinear" (Gomez et al. 2001: 290). Most described their career success as a result of "created, encountered, or offered opportunity," and a mix of "hard work and luck", with luck being described as "where opportunity and readiness meet." The lack of a planned career path was not due to inability or ineptitude, but rather a "lack of opportunity" (p. 291). Most credited their parents for giving them strong self-esteem, although a few were helped in their development by mentors and their spouses or partners. For the most part, they had a strong work ethic, and tended to judge themselves according to an internal rather than external standard of success (p. 291).

Several strategies were used to try to attain a work-family balance. Most women acknowledged that the two can never really be "balanced. It's always going to be weighted on one side or the other" and "you can have it all, you just can't have it all at the same time" (Gomez et al. 2001: 297). However, they typically made life choices which either favored their careers, or placed their careers on hold. For example, 5 of the 20 waited until their children were grown before embarking on their demanding careers, "simply holding jobs" in the interim. Others created partnerships with their spouse, taking turns as primary caregiver. A third strategy was family-involved-in-work model, either working closely with family members, bringing their children to work, or including family members in important work events. They thus made life style choices that created the flexibility to enable them to pursue their dreams (Gomez et al. 2001: 297).

Gomez et al. (2001) found that the most salient difference between Latinas and other groups was their cultural awareness. Most viewed themselves as bi-cultural, straddling both the Anglo (white) culture and their Hispanic heritage. In order to succeed

58

in the U.S., they needed to act "Anglo" in speech, dress and behavior, but behaved differently when with family and friends. Some, especially those of Mexican heritage, felt like outsiders in both worlds, primarily due to the Hispanic cultural emphasis on being humble, and not drawing attention to oneself. Many saw their American female side as "very independent, determined, outspoken, feminist" while their Latina side was "obedient, virginal, extremely feminine, motherly [and] respecting authority" (2001: 292). Many felt a "double jeopardy," facing sexism not just in the majority culture, but within the Latino community as well. The Mexican-American women in the sample felt they "constantly had to assert their right to equal citizen opportunities" (p. 293).

In sum, the women in the Gomez et al. (2001) study faced a variety of challenges, including racial, sexual and cultural discrimination, limited opportunities, and financial obstacles. However, most had a wide network of social support, a strong sense of responsibility and a work ethic that helped them achieve personal success. When facing challenges, they also had a "noteworthy…ability to reframe negative events into positive ones. When doors closed, they opened new ones, forging a non-linear [career]" (p. 297).

Richie, Fassinger, Linn, Johnson and Prosser (1997) conducted a qualitative study on the career development of 18 prominent women across 8 occupational fields. The 9 white and 9 black women were matched as closely as possible on age, occupation and geographic location. Of the 18, 12 were married and 14 had children. The researchers were interested in the combined effects of sexism and racism on vocational development. They found that, like sexism, racism "presented barriers for these [Black] women in the workplace, through lack of opportunities, outright discrimination, prejudicial attitudes from others, and professional and personal isolation" (1997: 140). This was not just from

men, but also from their women co-workers. They sought support from other Black

women, and felt a strong responsibility to help other women and minorities (1997: 141).

The additive effects of sexism and racism were felt by both the Black and

Hispanic groups. A common thread as a result was their internal motivation to succeed.

Gomez et al. (2001) state "All participants felt a strong need to achieve their best in any

situation, having a strong work ethic and often working 'twice as hard' to prove

themselves in the face of sexism and racism" (p. 291). Similarly, Richie et al. (1997)

found that the women in their study were persistent in the face of sexism and racism and

had an increased determination to succeed (1997:140).   All had an "extraordinary

capacity to manage stress and overcome adversity" (p.143).   Not surprisingly, the white

half of Richie et al.'s sample exhibited a general lack of awareness of racism.

Nevertheless, the reactions to both sexism and racism were the same: increased

motivation, persistence, flexibility, support of and by other women, and the ability to turn

negatives into positives.

Although there were extrinsic rewards associated with success – wealth, fame and

recognition- most of the women described the intrinsic rewards as much more personally

satisfying (Richie et al. 1997: 139). They judged themselves according to internal rather

than external standards of success (Gomez et al. 2001: 291). This is a bit different from

that described by Blair-Loy (2004). In her study, the extrinsic rewards, especially

recognition and status, seemed to be the driving force. Yes, they "loved" their jobs, and

felt there was an intrinsic value to it, but the (mostly white) women in her study seemed

to exhibit more of the work-centered focus that is usually reserved for men. This may be

attributed to the nature of the job as a financial executive, concerned with the "bottom

line" of business, as opposed to the nature of jobs such as private business owners, lawyers, athletes, college president, judge, physician, scientist, journalists, newscasters, etc. in which the value of customer service is a common and important philosophy.

In the military, Hosek et al. (2001) found that race makes a difference in whether a person leaves due to voluntary or involuntary reasons. "White men and white women are more likely to leave than are black men and women during periods when their departure is likely to be voluntary. Black men and women are considerably more likely to leave at a promotion point" (p. 45). In other words, white men and women leave voluntarily, at a time of their choosing, to coincide with their career or family goals.

Black men and women, however, stay in greater numbers, but are forced to leave due to their failure to be promoted to the next rank. In the end, the percentage of white and black men who remain to O-4 are about the same at 37% and 36% respectively, and the percentage of white and black women who remain to O-4 are about the same at 30% and 31%, respectively. Apparently, although black men are less likely to be promoted at the lower ranks, once they reach O-5, they are as likely to be promoted to O-6 as white men. With that parity in promotion opportunity, it appears that there are virtually no differences in performance reports. Similarly, white women's promotion to O-6 compared favorably to white men. Since the data were derived from officers in cohorts 1967 and 1970, when the cohorts were less diverse, both racially and by gender, there were insufficient data for minority women to come to any similar conclusions.

Negotiating the Corporate Mobility Maze

Davies-Netzley (1998) found stark gender differences in her respondents' attitudes and strategies towards corporate mobility and their personal success. While the

men defined their success in terms of performance and individual drive, women noted that although individual drive, communication skills, and self-esteem were important, those characteristics alone did not account for their success. They perceived their success as depending on social variables such as social networks and peer similarities, and improving their human capital through educational achievement. Many of the women reported that without post-graduate degrees in their chosen fields, they would not be considered for the top position. Thus women relied on interpersonal relationships and increased human capital to boost their prospects.

Davies-Netzley (1998) noted that the women in her study emphasized the need to develop similarities with male peers to be successful. This included altering their appearance and behavior to conform to accepted norms, emphasizing the need to "fit in" and downplay their feminine qualities, such as discussing sports and politics, wearing suits, and pulling their hair back. They avoided social situations in which their differences as women might be emphasized, such as being seen in a bathing suit or tennis skirt. There appeared to be a need to maintain a certain decorum. They were "doing gender" but in a way that conformed to the cultural schema of the workplace. Women could not be too feminine, for risk of being considered ineffective, nor too masculine, for risk of being considered too aggressive, like Kanter's Iron Maiden (1977a). This was similar to the techniques that some military women reported using to negotiate the gendered ideology of the military (Herbert 1998) in order to be taken seriously.

In the military, women tend to downplay their femininity much like corporate women. They perform a variation of West and Zimmerman's (1987) concept of "doing gender," by maintaining a strict appearance and behavioral protocol. This is made

somewhat easier by the required uniforms and regulations concerning grooming. Grooming requirements vary by service, but in general forbid excessive make-up, overly long fingernails, unnatural hair color, unruly or faddish hairstyles, and tattoos. The uniform regulations also dictate the length of a woman's skirt, hair length, earring wear (not more than one pair at a time and of conservative post style), and limit the amount and type of jewelry that can be worn in uniform. Of course, uniforms are expected to be impeccable. Informally, women may decide to wear slacks instead of skirts, forgo wearing perfume, and eschew makeup altogether. They may wear conservative clothing while off-duty. Many also follow a fitness routine, both to maintain a healthy weight and to perform well on the physical fitness exam. Many women understand that men equate physical fitness with performance fitness (Cohn 2000; Kennedy 2001). Women who do not abide by these formal and informal standards are often not taken seriously, which may affect their evaluations and promotion opportunities.

The uniforms also give women an advantage that civilian women do not have – the instant credibility that comes with being an officer in the military. The uniform also instills pride and an understanding that in wearing it, she is representing something greater than herself. Thus, behavioral norms are established by both gender and place. The dress uniforms are decidedly different between the women and the men, resulting in greater visibility and performance pressures (Kanter 1977a). However, in recent years, the Army, Air Force and Marine Corps have gone to a more gender-neutral camouflage uniform that make it almost impossible to determine the gender of someone from a distance. The advantage to this is a sense of anonymity, the ability to blend in that women would not otherwise enjoy.

Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum note the importance of physical fitness in maintaining good health and a high level of energy. They found that executive women who schedule activity into their daily lives have some time in each day for themselves, and helps keep them in emotional balance. It also helps alleviate the stress inherent in an executive job, and, as in the military, maintains a physical appearance that contributes to competence perceived by others (1988: 15-16, 22; Kennedy 2001).

<u>Negotiating Social and Professional Networks</u>

An important variable in women's ability to succeed in elite corporate positions appears to be the extent to which they are able to negotiate the male social networks. The women emphasized that their success depended largely on how willing the men were to accept women into their network. The men in Davies-Netzley's (1998) study downplayed the importance of peer networks ("old-boy networks") but the women felt that these types of social relationships were important. They indicated a need to be mentored by and network with the men in power positions in order to become accepted. However, Moore (1988) found that women who achieve elite positions remain less integrated into informal discussion networks, and even when included in these groups, women still felt isolated and unaccepted.

Some women discussed establishing female-centric networks, finding camaraderie because of a shared history and the common experiences of blocked opportunities and gender discrimination (Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum 1988; Davies-Netzley 1998). Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum referred to these networks as "the 'New Girls' Network", and indicated that they are understood to be an important part of the total work environment. The networks help women become more effective in the work

world, gain clout, money, more knowledge, and self- confidence. They note that it helps women "beat the system" which tends to isolate women as they move ahead in a male-dominated environment (1988:25).

However, in some organizations women's networks may be cause for concern by men. For example, retired Rear Admiral Louise Wilmot, in a 2000 interview, indicated that when she started an organization called the Women Officers Professional Association (WOPA), many of her male bosses thought it was subversive. They did not see the need for women to get together for socializing and mentoring, even though men had many professional organizations that excluded women, such as the Surface Navy Association, which excluded women because they were not yet serving at sea. She eventually received the support and sponsorship of the Chief of Naval Operations, which legitimized the organization (Fagenson-Eland and Kidder 2000).

Yoder (1985) found, in a study conducted in the early days of women's integration at the United States Military Academy at West Point, that women were discouraged from forming friendships, let alone network with each other. She cites examples, such as a group of bowlers being branded lesbian because they frequently hugged when one scored a strike; or of the three female faculty, sitting together at a departmental meeting, being subject to comments such as being part of a "woman's club" or "plotting something" against the men (Yoder 1985: 69).

Even now, military women avoid supporting women-centered networks (Foote 2005), as one of the last things they want is to emphasize their gender by associating with other women (Yoder 1985: 68). Women want to be seen as part of the team, and not a separate entity requiring separate networks. Yet, Kanter (1977a) would call homo-social

65

networking a type of participation that is an "empowerment strategy", but also would liken it to a "mechanism for adjustment" (p.258) by the powerless, because this type of networking does not affect the structure of opportunity and power.

Pressure from their male peers, through disparaging comments and vicious gossip, discourage women from forming homosocial relationships. This may be part of the "loyalty tests" that Kanter (1977a) discusses in her study of token women, and certainly contributes to women's professional and personal isolation. It could also be a response by the dominant group to a tactic they themselves use to isolate the minority: lack of inclusion. By having informal gatherings or private meetings while at the same time condemning the minority group's participation in homo-social networking, the dominant group shows a lack of trust of the minority group. They secretly exclude them from power networks, and they censure them by suggesting they are not playing by the rules of inclusion (p.226).

The need to network with men in power positions is salient even in the military, where there is a perception that promotion is based on objective criteria, i.e., their service record. Selection to GFO is made by selection boards consisting of other Admirals or Generals, and although anecdotal, it is my understanding that they use their knowledge of the individual to accept or reject the nominee. The "top brass" in the military, i.e., Chief of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Army and Air Force Chiefs of Staff, are appointed by the Secretary of Defense or the President himself, and is based not only on the person's record, but whether the nominee is perceived to support the policies of the particular civilian chain of command.

Elite women must also straddle the line between not behaving in either a too feminine or too masculine manner (Herbert 1998). They must be strong, independent women, yet not be too intimidating. By the time they have reached the top, executive women have learned how to work effectively and supportively with subordinates, peers, and bosses, and have been open to being coached, groomed, and mentored. Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum found that it is "hard to get to the top solely on our own" (1988: 29). They must negotiate the issue of working for, or being the boss of, men who have never worked with women. Yet, even this type of challenge can be positively used to teach perseverance (Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum 1988). Kennedy (2001) indicates that it teaches humility, but also provides a model for how things ought not to be done. Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988: 40) also indicate that an outstanding performance is not enough to continue to propel an aspiring executive upward. Office politics must be mastered.

Similar to corporate women, military women face informal barriers that include lack of peer support and mentoring, and their token status results in unique pressures including high degrees of visibility, isolation, gender-stereotyping, sexual harassment, and blocked mobility. They are also rarely allowed entry into informal male networks that may assist with career success and advancement (Davies-Netzley 1998: 341).

Leaving the Job: Voluntary Attrition

Most of the studies discussed did not address the issue of leaving the job. However, this is an important aspect of work in the military, as there are various retention decision points along the way, in addition to forced retirement by 35 years of service, or age 60, whichever is earlier. There is roughly a 10% attrition rate at the highest corporate

67

levels for both men and women, but because so few women make it to the top, any departure is noticed (Yang 2005: 169). *Fortune* magazine asked six women who previously had been on their list of most powerful women, why they, as "ambitious women, would step off the corporate ladder" (Yang 2005: 169). Two of the six left due to life-changing accidents. It made them realize that life was not all about work. Two left to take care of children, but went back to work, again in an elite position, after about two years. One left to travel, and is not sure whether to go back. The sixth left because her company was downsizing, but she found a new job in an entirely different field (Yang 2005: 169-170). Yang's conclusion was that the single thread that tied these women together was that "taking control of one's own life can feel as bold as wielding power in a corporation" (Yang 2005: 170).

Military personnel have several points in their careers when they must decide whether to "stay or go". Retention is a combination of both promotion selection and individual decisions. Failure to be promoted and subsequent discharge is what I consider involuntary attrition. Decision points come in two to four year increments, depending on the branch of service and the promotion point reached. The first decision point is after their initial commissioning obligation, usually 2 to 4 years of service. Ninety-five percent of all female officers stay at this point (OSD 1998). Several retention and promotion points occur in the next 8 to 10 years. The combined retention/promotion rate for women who attain the rank of Major or Lieutenant-Commander (O-4) is 37.9%, which is comparable to the retention/promotion rate for male officers (OSD 1998). However, when analyzed separately by race, it was noted that marriage may have a different effect on retention for male versus female officers. Married men were more

likely to stay in the service and be promoted than single men, while the opposite seemed true for women. Marital status was also an indicator for retention at the senior ranks (O-5 and O-6). By the time this point was reached, 90% of men but only 55% of women were married (OSD 1998).

Senior officers often go on to a civilian high status position once they leave the military. At a panel discussion, two retired GFOs, Brigadier General Evelyn P. "Pat" Foote and Vice Admiral Pat Tracy, discussed their reasons for leaving. General Foote left because she was not going to be promoted, and also because of her age, and Admiral Tracy left because she knew she would not be promoted further, but also so another woman could be promoted (Foote 2005; Tracy 2005). Both of these women continue to serve in quite visible positions, both as volunteers and consultants.

General Foote, who retired in 1989, was recalled to active duty in 1996 to serve as Vice Chair of the Secretary of the Army's Senior Review Panel on Sexual Harassment. She retired again in 1997, but remains active as a Presidentially-appointed Commissioner for the American Battle Monuments Commission, serves on the Board of Directors of the National Women's Party, the Board of Visitors for Wake Forest University, and is the President of the Alliance for National Defense, an advocacy group for military women.

Admiral Tracy retired in 2004 and established an independent consulting firm focused on working various projects within the Department of Defense, and professional development of Navy executives. She just completed a job as a Special Consultant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for the Quadrennial Defense Review. Other notable military women retirees include Rear Admiral Marsha Evans (USN), who was President and CEO of the American Red Cross following her position as CEO of the Girl Scouts of

America. General Wilma Vaught (USAF) is the President of the Board of Directors, Women in Military Service for America, and General Claudia Kennedy (USA) (who wrote a book about her Army experiences) now serves as a military analyst for CNN. This is a small sample of the talent, and continued service, that elite women bring to our country.

Summary

This chapter examined the literature on women in executive positions in both the corporate and the military settings, and made comparisons between the two. Several researchers found cohort differences and noted that strategies for negotiating the work-family balance include focus on career in lieu of marriage and/or family. If married, women may rely on an egalitarian relationship, delay having children, or delay career establishment. Many women opted not to have children and the others worked with their partners to accommodate the children's schedules. They also used childcare facilities, live-in help, and rationalized the limited time with their children. Moore (1988) found that women in elite positions tend to come from a higher social class than their male counterparts.

Other research has found cohort differences in work-family strategies of college graduates in general. Goldin's (2004) study of the changes in attitudes of college women toward work and family during the 20th century found similarities to the findings of Blair-Loy in that the different cohorts used varying strategies within the cohort to work out this issue. All of the women, regardless of race or ethnicity, indicated interpersonal support in extended families and/or spouses, their mothers as role models, the influence of

teachers when young, and the importance of mentors. They valued intrinsic rewards above extrinsic rewards.

Civilian women in elite positions appear to depend on three factors that account for their success (Davies-Netzley 1998). In addition to individual motivation and career aspirations, the first is the ability to concentrate on work, either foregoing family formation or assuming a "provider" role rather than a "caretaking" role. The second is attaining higher educational attainment than their male peers. The third is the ability to break into existing social networks and to develop similarities with male peers.

Although sexism can manifest itself through discrimination, lack of opportunity and prejudice, many of the women overcame these structural and cultural obstacles through perseverance and determination that was helped by social support from family, spouses, and mentors. This contributed to being able to turn negative situations into positive ones. This was especially true for women of color, who relied on internal standards and intrinsic values to distinguish themselves. Comparisons were generally made between civilian and military women based on the existent literature. The next chapter provides a more thorough look at the history of structural and cultural impediments to women in the military.

CHAPTER 4

WOMEN IN THE MILITARY

The previous chapter described many of the structural and cultural issues that women face in the work place. Intertwined in that narrative were also comparisons to barriers faces by women in the military. This chapter provides a more complete background on the legal and structural barriers military women have faced since their formal inclusion in the military during the 20th century.

The advancement of women in the military to the elite cadre of GFOs has been a result of some legal and structural barriers being lifted at different times over the last 40 years. From a theoretical perspective, it would appear that women in the military would have to prescribe to the work-devotion schema, rather than the family-devotion schema (Blair-Loy 2003). In order to succeed in the military, they would be expected to perform as ideal workers, and reduce or deny their expected roles as familial caretakers. In other words, their loyalties would be expected to focus on their work in the military rather than a "normal" family life. Indeed, in earlier times in this period, the laws and policies gave them no choice!

Additionally, they faced legal and institutional discrimination as well as individual and gendered harassment. Kanter's (1977a) work on corporate culture and management theory informs this discussion. Her analysis of the growth of a masculine ethic in management, corporate hierarchies, pressures of conformity, loyalty to the corporation, and the exclusion of woman in management positions based on gendered assumptions, aptly describes the military model in which the current active duty population of women GFOs progressed. Many impediments have been rescinded, but

some remain, notably the policy of not assigning women to direct ground combat units, to submarines, or to Special Forces.

Women also face, and must overcome, an underlying skepticism about their military abilities based on assumptions of gendered norms. As a male-centric and male-dominated institution, it is believed that, in times of a national emergency, men have a responsibility to serve. In contrast, women must prove themselves for the right to serve. The resistance to women's presence in the military is manifested in various ways, but the most insidious is what is known as gender harassment. Gender harassment does not have sexual content, but is discrimination on the basis of gender. It causes distress, reduces morale and performance, and creates a hostile work environment. The verbalization that women as a group do not belong in a certain occupation or cannot perform certain tasks is one type of gender harassment. Other forms of gender harassment of military women identified in research are: being subject to subversive behavior (such as gossip and rumors), sabotage, feigning ignorance, constant scrutiny, and indirect threats (Miller 1997: 33). How women respond to and overcome this skepticism and resistance is what separates those who succeed from those who do not.

The literature on women in the military deals with issues ranging from integration and how women's expanding roles have or have not affected the military in terms of military readiness (Goldman 1982; Harrell and Miller 1997; Reardon and Reardon 1999), military readiness and motherhood (Landrum 1979), and personnel issues that arise as a result of women in the ranks: male attitudes, rape, sexual harassment, fraternization, pregnancy, exclusionary policies, discrimination, dual-military couples, etc. (See Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2001; Miller 1997; Zimmerman 1995, among others). In the Navy,

73

research has focused on how women's presence and behavior impact ships' effectiveness (Garcia 1999), and on the effect of shipboard pregnancy (such as reported in Thomas and Uriell 1998).

There is a growing biographical literature (Barkalow 1990; Danner 1995; Wingo 1994) as well as histories of women in the services (See Andersen 1995; Ebbert and Hall 1999 and 2002; Godson 2001; Holm 1993). There are also numerous critiques of the military vis-à-vis women (for example, Franke 1997; Stiehm 1996; Zimmerman 1995), primarily from a feminist standpoint that deride the hyper-masculine norms of the military. The little research that focuses specifically on women officers either highlights individual women's achievements (Fagenson-Eland and Kidder 2000; Medwick 2001) or deals with the work-family balance issues of junior to mid-grade officers (Roffey, Wood, Price and Kallett 1989; Stoddard 1994). There is some biographical work on General and Flag Officers (GFOs) (Adams-Ender 2001; Billings 1989; Kennedy 2001). However, there is little research on leadership strategies for military women or strategies for success in this primarily male environment. Hosek et al.'s (2001) study is one of a very few that has analyzed empirically the differences in career progression by race and gender. Their findings are helpful in explaining the social and structural reasons behind women's higher attrition, leaving a smaller population from which to promote to the GFO ranks. This is especially true for minority women.

<u>Legal Barriers</u>

Women were formally admitted into the military in the early part of the 20th century: first as nurses in the Army (1901) and the Navy (1908); then as enlisted Navy Yeoman (F) and Women Marines in World War I. In the latter capacity, they filled and

performed clerical and other support-type jobs "freeing the men to fight." After the war, when they were no longer needed, the enlisted women were discharged and the nurse corps drastically reduced their rolls (Holm 1993).

During World War II women were crucial to our nation's success, working in both the civilian and military sectors. In the military, women started in traditionally female roles of communication, administration, and support, but the types of jobs soon expanded due to the need for men to fight overseas. Women performed in every possible position except those involved in actual combat on the ground, at sea, or in the air (Holm 1993). Over the course of the war, over 400,000 women served in the U.S. military (Manning 2005). Once again, when the war was over, plans were made to discharge all but a core number of military nurses (Holm 1993).

There were two important pieces of legislation that affected military women post-World War II. In 1947, the Army-Navy Nurse Act was passed, which established the Army and Navy Nurse Corps as permanent staff corps of the regular Army and Navy, and integrated nurses into the officer ranks of their respective branches. That same year Congress heard testimony on the efficacy of maintaining a permanent cadre of military women from the Navy, Army, and Army Air Corps,[22] and established women's permanent status in all the armed forces via the Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (Holm 1993).

Although milestones in women's military history, these laws placed many restrictions and limits on women's service. The legislation specifically excluded women

---

[22] The U.S. Air Force as a separate branch of DoD was established in 1947 (Segal 1989).

from serving on Navy vessels (except hospital ships and transports[23]), and on aircraft

engaged in combat missions in the Navy and Air Force (Manning 2005: 4).[24] It defined a

separate women's corps for the Army[25] (Holm 1993: 119), and imposed a 2% ceiling on

the proportion of enlisted women on duty in each of the service branches, with the

number of women officers no more than 10% of the number of enlisted women (Manning

2005: 4).[26]

It limited each service to one woman, temporarily appointed (for a maximum of 4

years) as a line colonel or Navy captain (O-6). She could retire as an O-6, but had to

revert to O-5 if she chose to remain in the military. It set a 10% limit on female officers

who could serve as permanent lieutenant colonels or Navy commanders (O-5) and a 20%

limit on women serving as majors or Navy lieutenant commanders (O-4). There was no

authority to promote women to GFO ranks. These promotion ceilings and representation

limits were not abolished until 1967 by legislation signed by President Lyndon Johnson.

This was the first major policy change affecting service women since 1948, and paved

the way for women to become General and Flag officers (Holm 1993: 118-120, 192).

---

[23] This provision was added so that nurses (women only at this time) would not be precluded from serving on hospital ships in the medical wards. Holm (1993) notes that there was no intent to allow women to serve on board these ships as crew members. In 1953 Congress allowed hospital corpswomen to serve aboard Military Sealift ships, and in 1961 a woman line officer was assigned to a transport ship (Holm 1993). In 1972, then CNO Admiral Zumwalt allowed non-medical personnel to serve on the hospital ship USS Sanctuary, and in 1975 Navy JAG decided that women could be assigned to non-oceangoing tugs and harbor craft (Holm 1993). The pressure on the Navy to allow women on ships grew, and the exclusion law was changed in 1978 by Public Law 95-485, which allowed women on non-combat vessels, or on temporary duty to combat vessels not expected to engage in combat. The statutory restrictions on the assignment of women in the Navy and Marine Corps was completely rescinded by Public law 103-160 in 1993.

[24] This was repealed by Public Law 102-190 of December 5, 1991 for both Air Force and Naval aviators, except naval aviators could not be assigned to air wings or air elements assigned to a combat vessel.

[25] Women's Army Corps (WAC). All women not members of the Nurse or Women's Medical Specialist Corps were required to be members of the WAC. No other service branch had a separate women's corps. The WAC was disestablished in 1978 (Holm 1993).

[26] Subsequent amendments in 1956 (P.L. 585) and 1967 (P.L. 90-130) changed these limitations to allow for a more robust career path for women officers, but neither of these laws addressed the issues of sea or air duty for women.

The 1948 legislation also established separate female officer promotion lists in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;[27] set the minimum enlistment age at 18, with parental consent required for women under age 21 (as compared to requiring parental consent only to age 17 for men); and provided blanket authority for the service Secretaries to terminate the Regular commission or enlistment of any servicewoman under "regulations proscribed by the President," an authority not granted with regard to male members (Holm 1993:120). Spousal benefits for women were also denied, unless it could be shown that the husband depended on their military wife for over 50% of their support. The Coast Guard was not included in this legislation, though some women remained in the Coast Guard Reserve (Manning 2005: 4).

The nurse corps' were also limited in rank attainment, with Lieutenant Colonel/Commander as the highest permanent ranks. They were authorized one O-6 billet. The Nurse Corps Directors were authorized to hold the temporary rank of Colonel/Captain (Manning 2005: 4). The Air Force Nurse Corps, Army Medical Specialists Corps, and the Air Force Medical Specialists Corps were established in 1949, bringing the total number of women's components to nine[28] (Holm 1993: 108-109). As a side note, it took almost as long for men to be accepted into the nurse corps as women's acceptance into the regular military. In 1955, President Eisenhower signed an amendment to the Army-Navy Nurse Act of 1947 authorizing reserve commissions for qualified male nurses (Sarnecky 1999: 297).

---

[27] Air Force women were integrated into male promotion lists in all grades below Colonel (Holm 1993: 120)

[28] The WAC was the only separate non-nursing women's component, although the acronyms used to define women in the Navy (WAVES) and women in the Air Force (WAFs) facilitated this misconception. However, there were support systems developed by each of the branches that exercised control and influence over the women's programs (Holm 1993: 121)

The 1970s saw significant changes for women in uniform. The passing of the Equal Rights Amendment by Congress in 1972 and the end of the draft in 1973 had the unintended consequence of increasing the numbers of military women. The Gates Commission, which designed the All Volunteer Force (AVF), never envisioned using women as an alternate source of personnel (Segal 1989), but because there was a dearth of eligible men enlisting, women soon filled the vacancies. In addition, there were a number of changes in personnel policies and legislation as well as court cases that opened the way for women to pursue military careers in male-dominated specialty areas, such as at sea and as aviators (Holm 1993). Also in the 1970s, women began to be promoted to the upper levels of the military as Admirals and Generals.

Although many legal barriers have been abolished, some institutional barriers for women remain. While approximately 94% of all military occupations are currently open to women, there are restrictions regarding women in combat, and collocation with combat troops. As a result, fewer positions (about 81%) are open (Manning 2005). Women can serve in most combat jobs at sea or in the air, but are prohibited from serving in direct ground combat jobs. This has an impact on the ability of women, especially in the Army and Marine Corps, to reach the highest ranks in those services.

Social Structural Barriers

Women are a rarity at the highest echelons of the military services. Since they traditionally have been in either the professional, technical, or support communities, they have held three-star rank (O-9) in all branches of the military, but there has yet to be a woman four-star Admiral or General. The four-star ranks are reserved for "war fighters", those who are in the combatant arms on the ground, in the air, and at sea. Women have

entered the operational or "line" community as combatants only since 1993-1994, and there are a growing few who have progressed within the line community to O-7.

Women GFOs comprise a very small percent of the total officer force (Regular, Reserves and Coast Guard), less than .003%, while men GFOs make-up approximately .4% of the force. Some of this can be explained by voluntary attrition, as women are more likely to leave the military after their initial service obligation to pursue other careers or to start a family. Attrition for women after completing their initial commissioning obligation is about twice that of their male peers (BUPERS 2000; Roffey et al. 1989; Stoddard 1994), and have been whittled down to about 30% of their commissioning cohort by the time they reach O-4 (Hosek et al. 2001).

In addition, women retire earlier in their careers than men. Of those eligible for retirement at O-4, about 53% of both men and women retire at 20 years of service. However, almost 52% of career women officers retire at 20 years of service at the rank of O-5, as compared to about 33% of men at the same rank and time in service. This may be because they feel they are not promotable, they wish to spend more time with or start a family,[29] or they feel they have served their time and wish to pursue other goals. An additional 32% of women and 36% of men officers retire between 21 and 23 years of service (DoD 2006), when it is obvious they will not be selected to O-6. Thus about 82% of women, as compared to about 70% of men, retire as O-5s at the same career points.[30] Thus, the actual percentage of women who are eligible for promotion becomes much

---

[29] Most officers are between 21 and 25 years of age when commissioned. At 20 years of service, some women may still be in their early 40s. With current fertility technology, they may opt to give birth to children at that point, or adopt. Alternatively, if they had their children while in their 30s, they would still have pre-teen or teen-aged children at home.
[30] Women who were promoted to 0-6 tended to retire at key time-in-grade salary points of 20, 24, 26 or 30 years, while men's retirement peaked at 26 and 30 years of service (DoD 2006).

smaller than for men at the more senior pay grades, which may partially explain why women are underrepresented at the higher levels of the military.

The social structural barriers also inhibit one's ability to balance work and family in the military. The military's reliance on an ideal worker who is willing to put duty to country over his or her duty to family is the primary barrier. The work requirements of the military are often in conflict with the family obligations of women.

Career and Family Issues in the Military

There are a number of structural constraints that women face as a result of the cultural construct of women as the primary caregiver of the family and the ideal worker norm of the military. These include the work devotion schema, differential policies vis-à-vis women and men, differential benefits for non-military spouses, family formation expectations, and the career continuance requirements and expectations.

The nature of military duty, along with the normative values and constraints, make the military a greedy institution (Segal 1986). In addition to the ideal worker norm inherent in a military career, military personnel also face other demands, which include risk of injury or death. In addition, personal desires almost always are subsumed by the needs of the military if there is a conflict. While civilian corporations expect that there are no other loyalties in the worker's life while on the job (Kanter 1977b: 15; Williams 2000), the military demands a full time commitment. They must be available when needed, whether it is on nights or weekends; they must be available to travel frequently, and at short notice, or deploy on a scheduled rotation, which may require family separation for up to 12 months during peacetime, longer during wartime; the demands of

the job may also require relocation every two or four years, either to bases within the United States or overseas.

Similarly, the family is a greedy institution. Both the military and the family make great demands in terms of commitment, loyalty, time and energy. Segal argues that the family is greedier for women than for men (Segal 1986). This is one of the reasons that the role of women in the military has been so controversial. Since women have the added expectation of being the primary caretakers of the family, the ideal worker norm for mothers in the military is perceived as problematic.

As a result of family polices and regulations that were differentiated by gender, women in the early cohorts who stayed in the military through the 1970s remained childless. In many cases, women were discouraged from marrying, although the marriage bans had been rescinded. In keeping with the mores of the time, DoD policies were based on the assumption that a woman's primary responsibility was as a mother, which was inherently incompatible with her military duties, and whenever they came into conflict, the former would take precedence. Women were forced to resign as soon as they had children to care for, regardless if they were acquired biologically, through marriage, or by adoption.[31] Benefits for family dependents were also inequitable. A woman officer could receive benefits for siblings or parents designated as dependents, but not for her husband or children, unless she could prove they depended on her for over

---

[31] During World War II, it was an accepted practice to discharge pregnant women, whether married or unmarried. A dishonorable discharge was given to unmarried pregnant women. Abortion was cause for dishonorable discharge whether the woman was married or unmarried. During the war, although none of the services wanted women with children, it became necessary to allow married women with children to join the military. The ban on pregnancy and children was officially made by Executive Order 10240, issued on 27 April 1951 (Holm 1993: 125) and rescinded by DoD in 1975 (Holm 1993: 297).

one-half of their support (Holm 1993: 289-291). This was ultimately reversed by the

Supreme Court in *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 1973.

During the early 1970s many women who became mothers, either through

marriage or pregnancy, petitioned for the ability to stay on active duty to take advantage

of retirement or other benefits. These were approved on a case-by-case basis until the

ban finally was lifted in 1975, when the Department of Defense dictated that the policy

for all the services would be that separation due to pregnancy and parenthood was strictly

voluntary (Holm 1993). It also became evident that with the personnel needs of the All

Volunteer Force that the military could no longer afford to discharge women solely

because they became mothers. By 1982, a woman might be required to stay in regardless

of parenthood status, if she had benefited from unique educational opportunities, such as

pilot training or nursing school. In 1989, the Navy changed their pregnancy policy and

directed that it would not normally be an acceptable reason to release a woman from

service (Ebbert & Hall 1999: 199). This is not true in the other branches, where

voluntary separation for pregnancy is still authorized, per DoD's 1975 regulations.

A 2000 survey of Naval officers in paygrades 0-1 to 0-3 (Ensign to Lieutenant)

indicated that more women (64%) than men (43%) planned to leave the Navy after their

initial obligation because of their desire to start a family (BUPERS 2000). In fact, in a

number of articles, military women expressed concern that balancing family

responsibilities and military duties would be problematic (Hosek et al. 2001; Reeves

1995; Roffey et al. 1989; Stoddard 1994). These studies reflect the perception that the

military in general is not family friendly, especially for military women.

In a study of the first women graduates from the Air Force Academy, class of 1980, Roffey et al. (1989) contacted and interviewed 46 of the 97 total female graduates. Interviews indicated that balancing family responsibilities with military duties was one of the concerns that affected their career decisions. At the end of their 5-year obligation, women in non-flying specialties chose to leave the Air Force at a rate twice that of their male peers (21.1% versus 10.4%). The authors concluded that the more the military adapts to family needs, the more committed the members, whether male or female, will be to the institution.

Roffey et al. (1989) also found that 30% of the interview sample was single and 70% were married. Of those married, 31% had children. Interestingly, 97% of the married women were married to men who were or had been in the military. Of the single women who were seriously dating, engaged, or divorced, all reported they had been, or were involved with, someone in the military. In fact, the authors found that most participants in their study did not perceive marriage to a civilian as a workable option. This was due to the unique demands of the military, but particularly the requirements to relocate every two to four years, and the possibility of remote, unaccompanied assignments. There was also a concern about asking a civilian husband to forego a career to follow his wife. The respondents seemed to think that they could better manage both a career and marriage if their spouse was also in the military (1989: 26).

Marriage patterns for women who are executives or in the military differ considerably from those of men. Williams (2000: 71) indicates that women who are on an executive schedule must choose between work and family while men can usually have both. In the civilian sector, one-third of women in senior positions never marry

compared to 6 to 8 percent of men; and only 30% have children as compared to 90% of men. As of 2002, in the flag and general officer ranks, women are much more likely to be single (36.4%) than men (2.8%), while only 21.2% of active duty women GFOs have minor children as compared to 58.6% of men (DMDC 2003). In other ranks the differences are not as distinct, but women, especially women officers, are still less likely to marry and have children than men (Hosek et al. 2001; Segal & Segal 2004).

Consistent with what Roffey et al. (1989) found, military women are more likely to be in dual military marriages. The Military Family Resource Center found that in 2005 12.7% of married military personnel were married to other military members. Approximately 49.6% of married military women are in dual military marriages as compared to 7.5% of men, and the majority of these couples have no children (MFRC 2006). Of these, almost one-half of enlisted women and more than one-third of married female officers were married to other service members in 2002 (Segal and Segal 2004). Because officers make up only about 15% of the total personnel in the military, the results of marital status are highly skewed by the preponderance of enlisted personnel.

Dual service couples may cause personnel management issues because of joint assignment desires. For example, the Navy's policy is to *try* to accommodate family needs for joint domicile, but the needs of the Navy always come first. Even if the couple does manage to reside together at the same duty station, one of the two of them may be on sea duty while the other is ashore. This in essence causes one of the military members to become like a single parent when the ship departs, with little or no family support from the spouse. Dual service couples are more likely to be separated due to work requirements than other married military personnel; and married military women are

more likely to be separated from their spouses due to their military duties than married military men (Segal 1986).[32] This can exacerbate marital stress, which may be a reason why more women leave service than men, or why fewer women marry than men.

A final structural impediment to work-family balance for military women is the requirement for a *continuous* career. Many business women have choices as to when they can start pursuing a career with regard to family obligations. They can start a career, take some time off for childbearing, and then return to work. They can have a family first, and then start working. They can decide never to have children (Blair-Loy 2003; 2001). Women in academia can plan their childbearing around their scheduled sabbaticals (after receiving tenure), summer breaks, or can take leave without pay. Women in the Coast Guard also have a leave of absence option, something that is not available in any other military service. Age and family status policies for initial commissioning also are impediments to starting a family and then pursuing a military career. Women who want to pursue a military career have three choices: they have a career and no children, they can find a way to work children into a family-unfriendly work environment, or they can leave the active service but remain in the ready reserves.

Summary

Women officers continue to face structural barriers to their advancement in the military. As in the civilian workplace, gendered attitudes, workplace structure, and family commitments make it more difficult for women to achieve high-ranking positions. Unlike the civilian workplace, military women officers must also face wartime deployments and there are institutional policies that preclude women from pursuing some

---

[32] This is because there are a greater percentage of military women married to other military men who also may be deployed or on temporary duty.

career paths, such as special forces, submarine warfare, or ground combat positions, which may hinder their promotion opportunity to the highest GFO rank, O-10.

Little research similar to that concerning civilian executive women has been conducted on elite military women. The literature on women in the military mostly shows the hindrances women face in a military career. Women who want to pursue a military career have three choices: they have a career and no children, they can find a way to work children into a family-unfriendly work environment, or they can leave the active service but remain in the ready reserves.

The women in the Reserves can be compared to part-time professional workers. The reserves are an option for those who do not wish to perform military duties full time, 24 hours a day, seven days a week (24/7), those who wish to continue to serve their country but on a part-time basis, and for those who wish a more even balance between work and family commitments.

The literature on women in the military has been limited to research on women moving through the ranks, and the issues they face therein. Much is known about the issues military women face with regard to marriage and family, but there are few research studies on women Generals and Admirals and what led to their success, including their leadership strategies. Although anecdotal and from a personal perspective, Lieutenant General Claudia Kennedy's memoir *Generally Speaking* addresses many of the issues that are found in the literature on civilian women executives. The next chapter will take a closer look at her observations.

CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDY: LIEUTENANT GENERAL CLAUDIA J. KENNEDY, U.S. ARMY

In her book *Generally Speaking*, retired Army Lieutenant General Claudia Kennedy discusses many of the aspects of becoming a general officer that I analyze in my study. The purpose of this chapter is to analyze General Kennedy's experiences and leadership strategies as a possible model of success for military women. It will serve as a comparison for the experiences and strategies of the other women who have broken through the brass ceiling and become general or flag officers.

General Kennedy became the Army's first three star female general officer in 1997. She retired as the highest-ranking woman in the Army in 2000, after 31 years of service. At that time she shared the honor of reaching three star rank with Vice Admiral Patricia Tracy, U.S. Navy (now retired); Lieutenant General Leslie F. Kenney, U.S. Air Force (also retired); and retired Lieutenant General Carol A. Mutter, U.S. Marine Corps (Kennedy 2001: xii). There are six other active duty women who have achieved this rank. They are Vice Admiral Ann Rondeau and Vice Admiral Nancy E. Brown, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Ann Dunwoody, U.S. Army; Vice Admiral Vivien S. Crea, U.S. Coast Guard; Lieutenant General Frances C. Wilson (USMC); and Lieutenant General Terry L. Gabreski, U.S. Air Force.

Kennedy states, "No woman in the Army [or in any other branch] has ever worn four stars because that rank has always gone to men from the combat arms, from which women remain excluded" (p. 24). This remains true only with regard to women in the Army and Marine Corps, because women in the Air Force and Navy have been serving in combat since 1994. Thus, theoretically, a woman in the Navy or Air Force could

compete for that rank in the not so distant future. As will be shown in subsequent chapters, there are several "women of the line" who have already joined the elite GFO ranks, so it may just be a matter of time.

Family Background

General Kennedy was the first-born child of a career Army Colonel and stay-at-home mother. She received a direct commission into the Women's Army Corps (WAC) as a 21-year-old second lieutenant in 1969, at the cusp of many changes for women in the military. As an "Army brat" she understood the lifestyle demands, and felt that joining the Army would be a good way to get a head start on her career. Like most young women, she looked forward to marriage and family life. She married as a Captain (0-3), just as she was transitioning from being a WAC to being a military intelligence officer. Pondering a life in which her husband would follow her in her military career, downplaying his own career ambitions, just as countless wives had followed their spouses, they soon found it "impossible for us to reconcile our joint personal and professional needs" (Kennedy 2001: 50), and they divorced. She remained childless and unmarried for the remainder of her military career.

The lesson, she says, was, "The higher a woman aspires in the leadership pyramid, be it military or civilian, the greater the sacrifices she must make in her personal life" (2001: 51). However, she also notes that the social norms about proper family roles for women and men prevalent in the 1970s, when she was a young married woman aspiring to a successful career, are changing, with less of a stigma attached to men staying home with the children (2001: 52). She believes that finding the solution to balancing work and family "is not just the responsibility of individual men and women,

but rather should be shared by their employer's policymakers" (Kennedy 2001: 54). In the military, however, she notes that the trade off for less family disruption is less career success. Her view is that if a woman aspires to GFO, she must embrace the work devotion schema in which work must comes first, family second or not at all.

<u>Military Career</u>

Kennedy entered the military for reasons that are common among both men and women. She was patriotic, but she was also interested in travel, wanted a job with leadership opportunity, felt it would look good on her resume´, and it seemed like a good idea (Kennedy 2001: 14). Additionally, the country was involved in the war in Vietnam, and Kennedy came to believe that it was important for both men and women to accept the responsibilities of citizenship through military service (Kennedy 2001: 13).

Kennedy began her service when the military was undergoing great change, especially for women. In the late 1960s, many of the stringent limitations on military women as a result of the Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 were still in effect (See section 2). The ceiling on women's promotion was removed in 1967 (Holm 1993: 192). Two and a half years later, in June 1970, the Army promoted its first women to Brigadier General, Anna Mae Hays, an Army nurse, and Elizabeth P. Hoisington, the WAC Director (Holm 1993: 203).

The military was also making plans to eliminate the draft and return to an all-volunteer force (AVF). At the time of Kennedy's entrance into the WAC, there were only 1,000 women officers and 10,000 enlisted women. Plans for the AVF included increasing the number of women on active duty by almost 80% to provide personnel for jobs that would otherwise remain unfilled. This opened the door for expanded

opportunities for women in many billets previously barred to them (Holm 1993), including Military Intelligence, the field to which Kennedy transferred in 1975. In 1978 the Women's Army Corps was abolished and the women were incorporated into the regular Army (Holm 1993; Kennedy 2001).

Staying in the Army

Kennedy's decision to remain in the Army after her initial obligation was a result of several factors. She yearned for challenge and she got it. She aspired to a leadership position and she was given company command. At the six year point, when Kennedy was a Captain (O-3) and indecisive about continuing in the Army, she was selected for Military Intelligence. It was then that she became committed to an Army career of at least 20 years. Thus she was able to take advantage of new occupational opportunities as they became available, and she rose to the challenge of being one in the cadre of women who started in the Women's Army Corps and trailblazing in a formerly all-male specialty in the Army.

Kennedy continued to excel as an Army intelligence officer. She was selected early for Major, which is a signal that her record appeared stellar to the promotion board. She followed the normal career path for her specialty area, being selected for positions that were required to continue to be promoted. As with her male peers, she commanded both a Battalion and a recruiting command as a Lieutenant Colonel, and commanded a Brigade as a Colonel. Unlike her peers, she was selected early for Brigadier General in October 1993, after serving as a Colonel for only two and a half years. Kennedy served as a Brigadier General for 3 years, but only 7 months as a Major General before her

selection and promotion to Lieutenant General. This is somewhat unusual in the GFO ranks, but not unheard of. Her career ended with 31 years of service in 2000.

Career Challenges

Kennedy's career was not without challenges. As a company commander, 1973-1975, she was one of the first women to command men. This was not an easy task, as there were discipline problems in the barracks that included disrespectful behavior, using drugs, gambling, holding all-night parties, and bringing women into the barracks from town. These problems stemmed from disciplinary problems that existed prior to her assignment. She took control by working with her Command First Sergeant, the military police, and using the disciplinary tools at her disposal. By the end of her tour, absenteeism had been reduced to almost zero, disciplinary problems were gone, and morale was high. This is a very good example of how a trusted subordinate can help an officer overcome leadership challenges through mutual respect and support. Interestingly, the Command First Sergeant was also a woman, who managed her networks and subordinates through supportive interpersonal relationships formed with the military police.

A second major challenge occurred when she commanded an intelligence brigade in Hawaii as a Colonel. Her Brigade was scheduled to re-organize as a joint Military Intelligence facility, incorporating the Navy and Air Force intelligence commands into the Brigade, with an Army Colonel in Command. The Lieutenant Colonel in command of the Air Force facility was uncooperative, contradicted her orders, and openly challenged her authority. She took control of the situation, again using legal means and calling upon trusted advisors for counseling and advice, but it eventually ended in a draw,

with Kennedy having to refer the situation to higher authority. Her perception is that her authority was challenged solely because she was a woman. Although she had the full support of her Army bosses, the Air Force hierarchy did not support her and continued their program of "subversive behavior" through whispered rumors about her judgment within the Air Force intelligence community. This might have derailed a less confident woman, but Kennedy persevered, with the help of the positive support of her superiors and her confidants.

A third challenge was her belated disclosure about a sexual assault incident that occurred with another General Officer in her Pentagon office. She chose not to disclose this right away, thinking that because it was a "he said, she said" situation, her complaint would not be taken seriously, and would somehow "harm the cause of women soldiers who came forward to report sexual misconduct" (p. 167). However, when the perpetrator was being considered to become the Deputy Inspector General, a post that requires evaluation of programs that evaluate sexual harassment, she felt she had to speak out. What ensued was a classic form of "harass the victim," while allowing the perpetrator the benefit of the doubt. Still, she saw the entire situation to the end.

Kennedy tries to draw lessons from these events in order to help future women leaders. But there is another lesson, and that is one that Kanter (1977a) addresses in her work on token women. Kennedy was put in the position of the "Iron Maiden", both through her own ideas about how men would react to her as a woman leader, and by the challenges to that authority by her male colleagues. She knew that she could not allow others to dispute her authority, but because of her visibility had to act in a manner that was totally within military standards and law, sometimes appearing more "militaristic"

than she would otherwise prefer (Kanter 1977a). However, Kennedy also was able to draw on the support and confidence that her superiors in the Army had in her, which helped her to work through the leadership challenges.

As discussed earlier, civilian women have begun to form their own networks to help address some of these issues, and there appears to be an effort by both military women and the individual service branches to support formal and informal networks. For example, in 2007, the Air Force sponsored an Air Force Women's Training Symposium, honoring its 60th anniversary and the 60 years that women have been in the United States Air Force. In 2006, all of the federal service academies held celebrations on the anniversary of 30 years of women at the academies. But during General Kennedy's era, there were few military women at the top, and those informal, same-sex networks were neither available nor supported. Although she had the formal support of her chain of command, it appeared that she was in a very isolated situation, without a system of informal support that would defend her against those whispered comments. She discussed her options with the military lawyer, but did not divulge any informal discussion she may have had with close friends or mentors. And she did not have a spouse with whom she could share her concerns and ask advice. As Kanter suggests, this may be a pervasive problem for women in highly visible situations, who may feel that they have only themselves on whom to rely, and that it would show weakness to call on others for advice and support.

Strategies for Success

The titles of her book chapters outline her strategies for success very clearly: Persistence, devotion to duty, mentoring, self-discipline, loyalty and ethics, fairness and

equity, mental, physical and spiritual fitness, and leader as Coach. What is also clear throughout her book is her emphasis on working hard and a commitment to excellence. The strategies are straightforward. At a recent conference on military women, a panel of military flag officers was asked to discuss their success tactics, and what made them successful. All of them gave similar answers to General Kennedy: challenge yourself and others, commit to excellence, work hard, have a positive attitude, take the initiative, and have moral courage and the strength of your convictions. Most of all, understand that life is not fair, and when it hands you a bowl of lemons…make lemonade! My favorite, along this same line of thought, was "Bloom where you are planted" (Academy Women 2006).

Playing politics, or as Kennedy put it, playing "Pentagon hardball" is also a necessary part of being a senior officer. As a Brigade Commander in Hawaii, she dealt with insubordination. Her experiences at the Pentagon taught her both the appropriate and the inappropriate uses of power, particularly with regard to her sexual harassment case. As with others faced with this type of moral dilemma, she chose the high road, which sometimes results in a long, hard fall down a steep cliff. Although criticized for the belated disclosure of her experience, she ultimately retired from the Army with both her dignity and her three stars. Finally, Kennedy had access to supportive advisors, who helped to guide her through the leadership challenges she faced. Although she did not name them as such, her story tells us of her reliance on that network to overcome the problems, and her ability to remain on track for further promotion.

<u>Words of Advice</u>

Throughout the book, Kennedy's enthusiasm for the Army, devotion to duty and to the Army, and her integrity in ensuring her actions were less about her career than about supporting the Army came through very clearly. Her leadership lessons come from her personal experiences and observations. She notes that women can act in their own self-interest while remaining loyal to their organization and values. She advises that to succeed, a person needs to have "innate talent and be willing to devote one's full energy to each job for many years." She goes on to say "If a position of high leadership is your goal, you must lay the groundwork early and not waste time. In the military, that means choosing your branch of service carefully, so that you have the opportunity to attend professional schools and earn command." Finally, she notes "the basic attributes of diligence and persistence [are] important as factors in success" (Kennedy 2001: 25).

Kennedy offers a wealth of information for those who aspire to higher authority in the military. She discusses the necessity of being flexible, learning as much as possible, listening to your NCOs, making the best of the situation you find yourself in, doing the job well, and looking forward to more challenge in future assignments. She discusses the need for physical fitness, a smart military appearance, and the need to avoid any perception of impropriety. She covers integrity and the need to maintain high standards for both yourself and the institution.

She challenges women to use their own leadership style, drawing on their own abilities, individual character traits and personal history, but also to develop the sense of entitlement that seems to come naturally to men. She stresses the need to be a team player, but also to manage your own professional life actively. Finally, she notes that

"the higher a woman aspires in the leadership pyramid, be it military or civilian, the greater the sacrifices she must make in her personal life" (Kennedy 2001: 51). Women in the military can balance work and family, she says, while remaining in middle management, but not if they wish to wear stars.

Summary

The previous chapters briefly discussed the theoretical issue of structures of opportunity and barriers for women in the workforce. They briefly discussed the findings from executive women in the civilian workplace, the structural requirements of a military career and the military culture, and how they negatively affect women. They also addressed work and family issues in the workplace as it pertains to women in both corporate and military settings. This chapter presents a case study of one of the highest-ranking women in the military at the time of her retirement, Lieutenant General Claudia Kennedy, U.S. Army. Her story helped to define the model that I used to develop the survey questions for this study of elite women in the military.

Kennedy's experiences clearly align with some of the findings from executive civilian women. She notes the difficulties in being a woman in a man's world, and the effect on her personal life. With regard to work and family, she notes that women can have both, but not military women who aspire to GFO. She faced discrimination, insubordination, and other subversive tactics, but managed to survive due to her work ethic, moral standards, and trusted confidantes and mentors. She sought counsel and used the system to do the right thing. The result was a memoir that helps provide a model for the strategies that might be necessary for women aspiring to higher rank.

CHAPTER 6

METHODOLOGY

This research project is a qualitative study of a population of women who are now or who have been General or Flag officers in the United States military. Women were first selected to these ranks in 1970, and the numbers have slowly increased since then. This project looks at women across all branches of service, including the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, as well as those who are in the National Guard, the Ready Reserve forces, and those who are retired.

Methodology

I conducted a qualitative study of active duty and retired female flag and general officers. This study consisted of a four-part design.

(1) Analysis of official and other personal biographies (downloaded from the Internet, or obtained from the individual) for common themes. I analyzed them for similarities and other issues that help to provide a biographical baseline. The variables I chose to analyze were: Branch of Service, status (regular or reserves), rank, year group, year selected for GFO, year retired (if applicable), occupation, source of commissioning, educational attainment, military professional schooling, joint duty, command duty, and combat duty (including support forces in country).

I compiled the names of 246 women who have been promoted (or selected) to General or Flag officer, and found biographies of 241 of them. Of the 5 for whom biographies were not available, I found some information, such as rank and branch of service. Thus, numbers may vary depending on the data obtained from the biographies and other sources. I continued to find more names as I searched for additional

biographical information. I do not claim that this is a comprehensive list, but my

research shows that it is close.

Not all biographies contained the same information, so I used other means to

obtain the information, such as asking the respondents directly, or searching the Internet.

This was the initial look at the respondents, and a way to get information about them

without asking it on the survey. Thus, through these biographies, trends can be seen,

such as the racial distribution of the women and the numbers in each branch of service.

(2) Pretest of questionnaire. I actually conducted two interviews as "pretests" and

adjusted both my interview technique and some of the survey questions based on the

answers given by these two GFOs, one a Navy Reserve Admiral on active duty, and the

other a retired Air Force General. I incorporated the information they provided on their

surveys into my analysis, but not the interview responses.

(3) Self-Administered Paper Surveys (See Appendices B, C and D) were provided

to as many active duty, reserve, and retired GFOs as I could find and contact. This

questionnaire provides basic information on their lives and careers, including birth family

background, marital and family history, and military career history. The respondents

completed the surveys prior to the interview.   The questions, concepts, and format were

taken from various sources, including the Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and

miscellaneous other sources, such as the application form for the United States Military

Academy; concepts from Blair-Loy (2003), Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988), and

Kennedy (2001); and applicable questions from survey questions in Herbert (1998) and

Moskos (1988). The questionnaire was not anonymous, but they were confidential, as

each was coded, and I had the only cross-reference list. Not all respondents who completed the surveys were interviewed.

The survey included both multiple choice questions and open-ended questions. There were areas for comments. Many of the respondents wrote comments adjacent to closed-ended questions if the question seemed ambiguous or the respondents wanted to further explain their answers. In this way, I was able to get a much richer understanding of what and how the respondents managed their careers and personal lives.

I sent out 207 surveys, and the survey results are based on the receipt of 153 completed questionnaires (74% return rate), 95 from the regular component (out of 135, a 70% return), and 59[33] from the reserve component (out of 73, an 81% return). Numbers may vary depending on the data obtained from the biographies and the surveys. I did not send surveys to the newly selected officers, but I did get their biographical information, and included them in the demographics section of Chapter 7.

(4) Lastly, I conducted in-depth, taped interviews with selected respondents. Interviewees were selected based on branch of service, occupation (including line, medical, combat support, and combat service support), race, and marital/parental status. Interviewees were also chosen based on their willingness to be interviewed, their availability, and their proximity to the D.C. metro area.

Interview Sample

I interviewed 21 from several branches of service, 10 Naval officers (3 reservists, 3 retired and 4 active duty); 2 Army officers (1 active duty, 1 retired); 6 Air Force Officers (3 retired, 2 active, and 1 retired reservist); 1 retired Marine Corps officer; 1

---

[33] I filled out one of the surveys myself based on a published biography written about one of the officers.

retired Army National Guard officer, and 1 active duty Coast Guard officer. They ranged in rank from one to three stars, and entered the service between the years of 1942 and 1981. Two of the interviews were by telephone, the others were in person. Four were line officers, 12 were support, 4 were medical (2 nurses, 1 medical doctor, 1 dentist), and 1 JAG officer. All are white but one.

The interviewees were not a random sample. I chose the interviewees in order to represent the various branches of service, by year group, by military status (active or retired), and by family status (married or not, children or not). Four of the interviewees were never married, 15 are currently married, 7 have been married more than once, and 2 are divorced. Twelve are currently married to a spouse who is or has been in the military. Only three who were ever married had never had a military spouse. Eight have children, 1 is a divorced single mother. Eleven of the 21 have served in a combat area, from World War II to the current conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

All but three of those interviewed lived in the greater Washington DC metro area, primarily due to my inability to travel far or for very long because of job commitments. Although the interviewees do not proportionately reflect the demographics of the total population of female GFOs, I believe there is enough diversity for them to have provided a variety of responses. They constitute a good cross section of survey respondents. I also was able to contact many respondents who were not interviewed if I had further questions about their survey responses, or required supplemental information.

The interviews usually took from 1 to 2 hours. In some cases they went a bit longer, due to a camaraderie that developed between the respondent and me. The interviews usually started as conversations, then a review of the survey questions, with

discussion of family and career issues, and progressed from there. I asked a few broad questions but for the most part the interviews were fairly non-structured (See Appendix E for a list of the types of additional interview questions asked). All of the respondents were happy to participate and none refused to answer even one question, although several told me things that they caveated with a request not to use the information, which I acknowledged and respected.

The interviews expanded on issues found in the survey, to cull out issues that may not have been revealed, or needed further discussion. I started the interviews by going over the survey questions, and then requesting further information. These included reasons for decisions about work and family, career strategies, decision points, career challenges, mentoring, and leadership advice. I use the interviews to give voice and greater depth to their experience, not to provide quantitative data.

Sample Bias, Respondent Bias, and Selective Recall

Sampling bias occurs when a researcher selects a sample of a population that does not reflect the whole population, with regards to their demographic constitution. The use of a random sample is supposed to help alleviate this bias (Babbie 1989). In this study, I did not select a random sample. Instead, I chose to contact everyone in the population that I could. While it could be argued that there is bias because less than 100% of those contacted chose to respond, the results still closely matched the demographics of the population. Thus, there was little sampling bias. However, there was some concern that there might be a problem with respondent bias.

Respondent bias occurs when the responses of the group one is studying are skewed or misrepresent the subject being studied. For example, "the diaries of well-to-do

gentry of the Middle Ages may not give you an accurate view of life in general during those times" (Babbie 1989: 321). Thus, my study group may have a respondent bias in favor of the military, or may misrepresent the actual lived experience of being a woman in the military. To alleviate this, Babbie (1989) recommends obtaining data from a variety of sources representing different points of view. He also notes that "protection lies in replication" (p. 321) and corroboration. The key, then, is getting replication in answers from the sample. In surveying women from the different branches of the military, I hoped to get a variety of experiences and points of view.

Another issue with regard to respondent bias is that this is a very select group of women. These women managed to "go through the gauntlet" relatively unscathed and in a position of power. They are a self-selected group, opting to stay in the military rather than leave, perhaps because they were able to overcome perceived obstacles, or they had a less negative experience. They are the "success" stories. Thus, like the diaries of the Middle Ages gentry, their views of the military system and their experience with it will be somewhat skewed.

Additionally, there is a bias inherent in retrospective reporting, or selective recall. With regard to selective recall, respondents may have forgotten some of the problems or setbacks they encountered, thus providing a "rosier" picture of their service than in actuality. On the other hand, they may have become more pragmatic about their experiences, and decided that any negative experiences would be used as lessons on how not to behave. It appeared that the women were honest about their challenges when asked, and yet were realistic about their experiences. In the end, all of these women

are/were successful by any standard, and they were able to overcome obstacles and work with them to their own benefit.

There is an under-representation of women of color in this population. All of the active duty female flag and general officers in the Marine Corps and Coast Guard are white. There are women of color GFOs in the Army and the Air Force, and the Navy recently selected only its second African-American woman Flag officer. Since I contacted what I felt to be the entire population of female Flag and General Officers, I did get responses from a representative mix of both white and black respondents. The real issue is that there is such a small population that differences by race or ethnicity cannot be addressed.

I did not ask direct questions about an officer's sexual orientation; however, I did ask questions regarding partnerships and children. The family issue is one of the variables I am studying, but I did not want to jeopardize their current or future careers. Studies on elite women in the corporate world also have avoided this possibility. This issue, however, did not come up. Only a few were unmarried, or never married, and it appeared that most of those who were ever married are of a heterosexual orientation.

Identifying the Members of the Population

The first task in conducting research on a particular group of people is to find the members of the group. There was no known all-inclusive list of women General or Flag officers, of all services (DoD and Coast Guard), that included retired, reserve and regular officers. Thus, to develop a list, I used a combination of active duty rosters, official military web sites, the General and Flag Officer Management Offices (G/FOMOs),

books, personal networks, and Internet searches. Once that list was developed, I had to find the contact information for each woman.

This was fairly easy for those women who were on active duty as regular officers or in the reserves, as I could contact them via their last known duty station. It was more difficult finding the retirees, but with the help of the General/Flag Officer Management Offices, networking, and Internet searches, I found contact information for the majority of the retirees. None of the General/Flag management offices would give me the contact information directly, but the Navy Flag Management Office allowed me to send the surveys to them for further forwarding to the members. They also gave me a list of the active, reserve, and retired women admirals for comparison of names I had already found.

The Air Force public affairs office also forwarded surveys that I sent them, but I still received some back as undeliverable. On my behalf, the Army Reserve GOMO contacted those retirees for whom I did not have a current address, and sent me the officer's email address if the retiree responded positively. The National Guard Office was particularly unhelpful. The Army relied on a limited password-only accessible website, and referred me to it for information. The downside to this was that not all the information I needed was available through that site.

I contacted the women for whom I had contact information in November 2006 by sending a letter requesting their participation in my research, and including an informed response form and a pen and paper survey that I asked them to return via a self-addressed stamped envelope (See the letter, informed response, and survey examples in Appendices B, C and D). I sent a second bulk mailing in early December 2006. It consisted of surveys sent to the Navy GOMO and Air Force Public Affairs office for forwarding to

the retired officers. It also included surveys for those for whom I subsequently had found addresses. At that time I also sent a reminder notice to the first group, requesting a return date of December 31, 2006.

I continued to send survey packages throughout January, as many women contacted me because they received the reminder, but had not received the original survey. I continued to search for names and addresses, and as I found them, I would send the survey package. If I found an email address, I would pitch my project via email, and would send a survey if they responded positively. The last bulk mailing of surveys was completed in late February 2007, with a requested return date of 15 March 2007. This group consisted of those who had not previously answered my request (I included a hand-written request for reconsideration), and new names that had been added to my list. I received the bulk of the survey responses by the end of December 2006, but I continued to gather survey data through the end of March 2007. I also sent thank you notes to those who responded to the survey and, of course, to those who I interviewed.

Finding the General and Flag Officers for the Study

Prior to starting my study, there was no complete list of women General and Flag officers. I started developing a list of names by contacting my network of military friends and acquaintances. I asked them for names of women GFOs for whom they might have worked or knew. I also received a 2004 roster of all (active and reserve) General/Flag Officers from one acquaintance, and a 2006 list of Air Force General Officers from another. I went through these lists looking for the names of women. In most cases, they were easily recognizable. In a few cases, the gender of those with first

names like "Dana", "Francis/Frances" or "Leslie," was more difficult to determine. I did

have two surveys returned to me by the targeted GFOs due to "wrong gender."

I downloaded the biographies of General and Flag officers that were posted on the

Internet by the General/Flag Officer Management offices. Each service has a General or

Flag Officer Management Office (GOMO or FOMO), which keeps track of the GFOs for

their service.[34] Each of these offices has a web site, with access (though sometimes

limited) to the officer biographies. Biographies for Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps,

Air Force, and National Guard are accessible by the general public. Biographies for

Army and Army Reserve officers are accessible through the Army Knowledge Online

(AKO) website, which requires a military affiliation and a password. This is a security

precaution that was placed in effect after 9/11/2001.

The majority of the biographies include a photo, so gender could easily be

determined. This was also the system I used for determining race, if the photo or

biography did not indicate race (e.g., "the first black woman to be selected for Brigadier

General in the Army"). If there was no photo, then I tried to find more information on

the individual through an Internet search by name (i.e., "Googled" them at google.com).

This also helped if an official biography was not available, which was more likely to

occur for those who retired prior to the Internet boom.

I also searched the Internet for individual names by using the generic "women

admirals" or "women generals." This helped me to find retired officers who were not on

the rosters. I also searched books, like Doris Sterner's *In and Out of Harm's Way: A*

History of the Navy Nurse Corps, which has the abbreviated biographies of the Directors

---

[34] Unfortunately, the GOMOs did not always have a complete list of names, especially retirees, nor did they have current contact information.

of the Nurse Corps (NC) from 1972 to 1987,[35] Smolensky et al. (2005), which is a chronology of the Air Force Nurse Corps and lists all of the Chiefs of the Air Force Nurse Corps, as well as their Mobilization Assistants (Reserves), and Mary Sarnecky's *A History of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps,* which lists the Superintendents and Chiefs of the Army Nurse Corps from 1901 to 1996.

The "Googling" method also became a sort of snowball sample in itself. For example, in a search for information about a General or Admiral by name, documents would come up in which other names were listed. A specific instance of this was when I was looking for information on BG Dorothy Pocklington, NC, USAR (ret). I had originally found her name as the "first woman to achieve general officer rank in the Army Reserve" in an article on "Women in the Army Reserve", from *The NCO Journal,* (spring, 2000), which I found on the Internet. I also discovered that she was the author of a book *The Heritage of Leadership: Army Nurse Corps Biographies*, which presents the biographies and formal portraits of all its superintendents and corps chiefs. I requested her official biography from the Army Reserve GOMO, but it was not available. So I searched the Internet again. When I entered her name in Google, I came upon a site that listed the chronology of the Army Nurse Corps. Within that site, I found the following entry:

"**Mar 1992** Col. (P) Sharon K. Vander Zyl was selected as the first Special Assistant to the Chief, Army Nurse Corps, for Mobilization and Guard Affairs. This position was critical to the integration of the Total Force concept" (Pg 64).

When I Googled the heretofore-unknown BG Vander Zyl, I discovered she was the first female general officer in the Army National Guard (from Wisconsin). I also

---

[35] Prior to 1972, the Director of the Nurse Corps was a Navy Captain (O-6). Alene Duerk, USN, NC, was the first woman in the Navy to be promoted to Rear Admiral (O-7).

found the name of the first African American female general in the Army National Guard, BG Rosetta Burke, who eventually retired as a Major General. Once I found a name, I would continue to search to find an address to where I could send a survey or inquiry about her. Thus it went for many of the names on my list. This continued until I finally decided, in March 2007, that I had to end any further research on finding retiree addresses. Thus, although I am sure I have a very good list of the population of female Generals and Admirals in the armed services, I cannot say that the list is all-inclusive. Another method I used to find previously unknown names was to ask for verification of my list from the GOMOs. I got a list of Navy Flag officers, retired, reserve, and active, from the Navy Flag Officer Management office, and compared it to the list I had developed, and there were at least 3 names I did not have, primarily reserve officers. They also provided the retiree biographies they had available. I contacted the Army Reserve GOMO, and they were also able to give me the biographies of most of those I requested. While the Navy and Coast Guard sites show only active duty biographies, the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps websites have the biographies (or résumés) of both reserve and regular officers, retired and active, although I found they are not complete lists, as they rely of the officers to send them their biographies, and some GFOs from the earlier cohorts are not listed. The National Guard Bureau also has names and biographies of most of their General Officers. In some cases, the names were on the list, but no biography was available. The NG-GOMO was of little help in my requests for information, but did advise me that if they did not have the biography, it was because the General had not submitted one.

When the official biographies were not available, I found as much information as I could from my Internet searches, or other sources such as books. In this way, I sometimes managed to fill out an abbreviated survey instrument from those who did not or could not respond. For example, I used this method for RDML Grace Hopper, who is deceased, using her biography *Grace Hopper: Navy Admiral and Computer Pioneer* by Charlene W. Billings. On the Internet I was also fortunate to find transcriptions of oral histories, interviews, and articles about my target population that served to supplement or even substitute for survey data, as I did with RDML Hopper.

I mailed or e-mailed surveys to all known living GFOs, either through their commands, their home addresses if available, or through the GOMOs. There were 28 GFOs for whom I did not have addresses (9) or to whom I did not send surveys (19) because they were discovered after I had completed the survey collection. Just before I was ready to start compiling my data, a new list of GFO selectee results were published for the Army, Air Force, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Army Reserve. I also found the name of one National Guardsman who was promoted in June 2007. I was able to obtain the names of all except the Army, because my access to the web site had expired. After March 2007 I sent no further surveys.

Data Processing and Analysis

The data from the biographies were documented on an Excel spreadsheet, divided into four groups – regular active duty, retired active duty, ready reserve, and retired reserve. The variables obtained from the biographies and placed on the spreadsheets were: branch of service, rank, year entered the service, year selected for GFO, year retired (if applicable), occupation and occupational category (nurse, professional,

109

support, or line), race, commissioning source (Academy, ROTC, OCS/OTS, Direct, or Other), highest education level (Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate or equivalent), professional military education completion, Command completion, and whether or not they served in a combat zone. I was able to manipulate the data on the spreadsheets to analyze the demographics by different variables, such as year group cohort, branch of service, marital and parental status, regular or reserve status, and retirement status.

The survey required some assistance in documentation. An assistant helped with entering the data on Excel spreadsheets for the multiple choice questions of the survey. This was merged with the biographical data from the biographies. Again, the data were divided into the four groups above, but I also further divided the data by branch of service, year group, or status (regular or reserves) for further analysis. Having an assistant provided a more rigorous system of checks and balances than if I were inputting the data myself, as I verified all of the entries once she provided the spreadsheets.

The open ended questions were also documented on Excel spreadsheets, pulling out key words and phrases which were marked in columns next to the respondent's code number. For example, for the question, "To what do you attribute your success as a military officer?" I went through each survey and developed headings, such as "hard work", "mentors", "perseverance", "outstanding performance", in a kind of grounded theory approach. The most prevalent answers were then compiled and analyzed.

Respondent Confidentiality

An individual survey was sent to each respondent with an informational letter, my biography, and an informed consent form (See Appendices B, C, and D). The surveys were individually numbered, but once removed from the consent form, there was no

name correlated to a survey. When the assistant took the surveys for data input, she only knew a number not a name.

The interviews were transcribed by a professional. The names were not withheld from the taped interviews, however. The transcriber is a professional who returned all voice tapes to me, and who destroyed all transcriptions once I had the hard copies. I hold the only copies of these documents.

Limitations

Qualitative studies are generally thought of as not being "generalizable" to the greater population, due to the possibility of subjective interpretation. Since my population was relatively small, fewer than 250 women, I opted to try to contact as many of the women as I could, rather than select a random sample of the population. It was my understanding that a return rate of 30% for a pen-and-ink survey is considered acceptable. Thus, with an anticipated return rate of about 30%, I would have had about 75 surveys returned, which would have been acceptable, but not generalizable. As it turned out, my return rate of 74% was more than double what was anticipated. As a result, I believe that the patterns described in this study can be generalized to the greater population, even with the additional limitations described below.

I neglected to take into account the life course perspective to its full advantage. For example, I did not ask at what point an individual got married, how long she has been married, when she started having children, the current ages of her children, etc. These are all valid questions, but outside of the scope of my research. I assumed that if they had children, they would have had them while they were junior to mid-grade officers, so my questions were geared to that focus.

111

There were also some errors of omission on the survey instrument, the most blatant being the absence of a question about whether or not a woman's husband was also in the military. A final limitation was the time it took to interview the respondents. I wish I could have interviewed every single one of them, as they are all fascinating women with a fabulous story to tell!

CHAPTER 7

WHO ARE THE WOMEN WHO HAVE BROKEN THROUGH THE BRASS CEILING?

This chapter presents the social demographics, or descriptive statistics, derived from the official biographies and respondent answers from the surveys. Social demographics are important in that they allow us to summarize and describe data, which then allows comparisons of one group to another. Grouped data also provide a way to better understand the information collected (Agresti and Finlay 1999). Demographics are important for this study because we want to know the basic information about the women for several reasons. We want to know the social composition of this highly select group of women who have succeeded in the male dominated military institution. It is important to know their background information in order to be able to compare them to male GFOs, future women GFOs, or senior military women who have not been promoted to the flag ranks. These are baseline data that provide the information that can later serve for that analysis. The data also provide a source of comparison to the research on civilian executive women that was reviewed earlier.

A Demographic Look

The data from the biographies and the survey responses were sorted by the following variables: status (regular or reserves; active or retired), year commissioned (year group-in decades), branch of service, rank, race, year selected to GFO, occupation, occupational category (nurse, other professional, support, and line), commissioning source, educational attainment, military professional education attainment, joint duty

assignment, command assignment, family background, marital status, and parental status. I compared many of these variables by both branch of service and year group cohort.

Table 4 shows the total number of active and reserve GFO billets in each service, the number of women GFOs in each service, and the percent women GFOs constitute of each branch of service, as well as within the total GFO community. It provides the breakdown of women GFOs by status (regular, reserve), branch of service, and whether active or retired. I could not compute the percentages for the retirees because I do not know how many male GFOs were in service over the past 37 years. Thus, we see that of 934 active GFOs, 65 (7%) are women, while in the reserve force, of 604 GFOs, 56 (9%) are women.

| | | | | Table 4 | | | | |
| Female GFOs by Status and Branch of Service | | | | | | | | |
Status	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps	Coast Guard	ANG	ARNG	Total
Regular active	18 of 319* 6%	13 of 221* 6%	26 of 273* 9%	3 of 80* 4%	5 of 41 12%	-	-	65 of 934 7%
Regular retired	26	27	34	3	0	-	-	90
Ready reserve	15 of 123* 12%	9 of 53* 17%	8 of 78* 10%	1 of 10* 10%[36]	0	14 of 152* 9%	9 of 188* 5%	56 of 604* 9%
Retired reserve	10	6	8	0	1	7	3	35
Total	**69**	**55**	**77**	**7**	**6**	**21**	**12**	**246**

*Source: Population Representation in the Military Services, FY 2005 (OSDPR 2007).

Although there have been more women in the regular forces to achieve GFO rank than in the reserves, the percentage of women GFOs in the reserves is higher than in the

---

[36] The Marine Corps female reserve percentage as compared to its active duty component (10% versus 4%) is deceiving because there are only 10 General Officers in the reserve force. The one woman who is a Marine Corp Reserves General is the first woman in the Marine Corps to achieve that position.

regular forces. The reasons for this are not clear, but it may be because the reserves were limited to support occupations, the occupations in which women were much more likely to be assigned, rather than line occupations. Women also entered the reserves as an option to combine work and family, without having to have an outside career. This may have given them more time to devote to their reserve positions, thus able to be more productive than their male peers who, also had to compete in the civilian sector. This may also be the reason why in the Naval Reserve, the percentage is almost triple that of women in the regular Navy (17% compared to 6%).

Table 4 also shows that in the regular forces, the Air Force has promoted the most women to GFO, even though it is smaller than the Army in number of GFO billets, while the Marines Corps has promoted the fewest women generals of the DoD services. Not only do the Marine Corps have the smallest number of women GFOs over-all, they also have the most restrictions in job categories available to women, with only 62% of positions open to women. The Air Force numbers reflect the fact that they have the highest percentage of women (19.6%) of all the service branches, and the least restrictive assignment policy, with 99% of positions and occupations open to women. In contrast, although the Army is the largest service, with the highest allowance of General Officers (302), only 6% of them are women. Women are restricted from 30% of Army positions. The Coast Guard is a much smaller service, and yet has a high percentage of women Admirals (12%), reflecting the policy that women have had no job limitations in the Coast Guard since 1977 (Manning 2005).

Women were not promoted for General or Flag officer ranks until the early 1970s. The women who were deemed "suitable" to be the first women GFOs were appointed by the senior leaders in their respective services, and did not require Congressional approval, as they do now. Many of these women also served during World War II, and were part of the group of women who were retained in order to maintain a basic core of experience for women in the military. During the 1950s and 1960s, there were few women who joined the military (during that time women were less than two percent of total military personnel, Holm 1993), and this is reflected in the GFO numbers. Women could not join the National Guard until 1957 (Listman 1998). In the 1960s, other professional options, besides nursing and support, became open to military women, including JAG corps in 1961 (DEOMI 2002).

Starting in the 1970s, women began to serve in greater numbers, especially after the United States converted to an All-Volunteer Force (AVF) in 1973. The 1970s were a time of greater opportunities for women in the military, as a variety of career positions were opened, including medical fields besides nursing, technical support such as chemical, ordnance, and signal corps, and in the line community, aviation and surface ships. However, this was also a time of turmoil for the military as a result of gender integration. There was ignorance and pessimism about the changing roles of women, and how they could or could not contribute to military readiness. In the thirty-plus years since the AVF began, women have performed to the standards required without decreasing military effectiveness, but there still are some who challenge this premise.[37]

---

[37] See Iskra 2007 for a history of arguments for and against expanded roles for women in the Navy.

Women who were commissioned in the 1980s are now "in the zone" for promotion to GFO. This includes the first women who graduated from the service academies: the Military Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy in Annapolis, the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and the Coast Guard Academy in New London. Women who were selected for flag ranks in 2006 and 2007 came from Year Groups (YGs) 1977 through 1985. Since women who were commissioned in 1980 now have almost 27 years of service, it will become more common to see selectees from the early to mid-1980s in the very near future. The full impact of the growing numbers of women beginning in the 1970s is still to be seen in the GFO ranks. As the opportunities for women opened up, culminating in the opportunity to fight in combat aircraft and ships starting in 1993, more women will be eligible for the senior-most rank of O-10 (Admiral and General).

Table 5
Women General and Flag Officers by Year Group (Cohort) and Branch of Service

	1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	Total	%
USA	6	3	8	20	7	44	18
USAR	0	0	3	18	4	25	10
USN	1	5	6	25	3	40	16
USNR	1	0	3	7	4	15	6
USAF	3	6	8	26	17	60	25
USAFR	0	2	3	10	1	16	7
USMC	0	1	2	3	0	6	2
USMCR	0	0	0	1	0	1	.4
USCG	0	0	0	4	1	5	2
USCGR	0	0	0	1	0	1	.4
ANG	0	0	4	9	8	21	9
ARNG	0	0	1	7	4	12	5
TOTAL	11	17	38	131	49	246	
%	4	7	15	53	20		*

*Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

Table 5 shows the numbers of women Generals and Admirals by cohort and branch of service, both regular and reserves. For the purposes of this study, the years when the officers were commissioned (year group) are grouped together in 10-year increments to form cohorts by decade. The numbers of women promoted to GFO has steadily risen over the years, with a large increase for women who entered in the 1970s, when many occupational limitations were lifted as a result of the All Volunteer Force.

Table 6 shows numbers of women GFOs by decade promoted to GFO and branch of service. Over half of the total women GFOs promoted have occurred during the past 7 years, during the decade of the 2000s. Again, this is due to the structural opportunities that opened for women in the 1970s and 1980s. Over all cohorts, there have been a total of 155 women promoted to GFO from the regular branches, and 91 promoted to GFO in the reserve branches.

Table 6					
Women General and Flag Officers by Decade Promoted and Branch of Service					
	1970s	**1980s**	**1990s**	**2000s**	**Total**
USA	7	8	9	20	**44**
USAR	0	1	6	18	**25**
USN	4	5	15	16	**40**
USNR	0	1	4	10	**15**
USAF	5	8	14	33	**60**
USAFR	0	3	4	9	**16**
USMC	1	1	2	2	**6**
USMCR	0	0	0	1	**1**
USCG	0	0	0	5	**5**
USCGR	0	0	0	1	**1**
ANG	0	0	6	15	**21**
ARNG	0	0	2	10	**12**
TOTAL	**17**	**27**	**62**	**140**	**246**

Women were first appointed to the ranks of Brigadier General and Rear Admiral starting in 1970 and 1972, respectively. These were women who had entered the military in the 1940s, and were either Chiefs of their respective Nurse Corps or Heads of their Women's Corps. The Navy did not appoint its first non-nurse to Flag until 1976 and the Marine Corps did not promote its first woman to Brigadier General until 1978. The first woman in the National Guard to be promoted to Brigadier General was in 1992, and the first woman to be promoted to Rear Admiral in the Coast Guard was in 2000. The first woman promoted to Major General/Rear Admiral (O-8) in 1973 was a non-nurse in the Air Force, and the first woman promoted to Lieutenant General/Vice Admiral (O-9) was a Navy woman more than 20 years later, in 1996. As yet, no woman has been promoted (or selected) to four stars. Appendix G lists a number of women "firsts" as General or Flag officer. This is not an all-inclusive list, but shows the variety and timing for some basic accomplishments.

Since the military is a hierarchical organization, there are more personnel at the lower ranks than at the top. This allows the military to theoretically draw from the most qualified for promotion. Of course, there is a self-selection process that occurs; the most qualified might voluntarily attrite to pursue other goals, find that in their occupational specialty their opportunity for promotion is limited and leave the service, or especially for women, might separate due to family issues. Thus, structural issues also play a part in who is available for promotion. Table 7 shows the number of women GFOs by rank and by branch of service. As can be seen, the vast majority (66%) are in the one-star category. About 30% have become two-stars and about 4% are three-stars. There are no

O-9 women officers in the reserve forces. Most of the GFOs are in the regular

component (155, 63%). The Air Force has the highest number of women GFOs, which

reflects the fact that they have the highest percentage of women of all the service

branches.

Table 7 Women General and Flag Officers by Rank and Branch of Service					
Branch	**1-star**	**2-star**	**3-star**	**Total**	**Percent**
	Active/Retired	Active/Retired	Active/Retired	N	%
USA	13/18	4/7	1/1	**44**	**18%**
USAR	11/6	4/4	0/0	**25**	**10%**
USN	7/12	4/14	2/1	**40**	**16%**
USNR	7/4	2/2	0/0	**15**	**6%**
USAF	23/23	2/10	1/1	**60**	**24%**
USAFR	5/5	3/3	0/0	**16**	**7%**
USMC	2^/2	1/0	1/1	**7**	**3%**
USCG	2/0	2/1^	1/0	**6**	**2%**
ANG	9/3	5/4	0/0	**21**	**9%**
ARNG	7/3	2/0	0/0	**12**	**5%**
TOTAL	**162**	**74**	**10**	**246**	**100%**

^Includes one reservist

Race

There was a color bar for women officers in the United States military until the

later years of World War II. African-American women were segregated within their own

WAC units in the Army. The Navy simply did not recruit them. When a few were

finally commissioned in the Navy, they were integrated with other women officers, but

their numbers were so small it hardly mattered (Holm 1993). It was not until 1945 that

the Army and Navy Nurse Corps lifted the ban on African American nurses (DEOMI

1999, 2002), and they were only able to care for African American men and Prisoners of

War (POWs). The Air Force was not established as a separate branch of the Department

of Defense until 1948, and the Air Force Nurse Corps was not established until 1949.

When established, the Air Force was both racially and gender integrated (Holm 1993).

| Table 8 | | | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity Representation for Women Officers, by Rank | | | | | |
Paygrade	White (Non-Hispanic)	Black	Hispanic	Other[38]	Total (N)
O1 to O3	15642 66%	3653 15%	1367 6%	3017 13%	23679
O4 to O5	6896 75%	1520 16%	368 4%	796 9%	9250
O6	1060 81%	144 11%	40 3%	70 5%	1314
Total Percent	68.6%	16.7%	5.4%	14.7%	

Source: DEOMI 2006

Still, with the large strides that women have made towards equality in the

military, women of color are under-represented at the upper echelons. Table 8 shows the

diversity in the officer ranks that was taken from data distributed by the Defense Equal

Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI 2006). As seen below, the junior officer

ranks are more diverse than the senior ranks, and show that minorities are over

represented as compared to the civilian population of the United States. According to the

2000 Census, there are 75.1% whites, 12.3% Black and 12.6% Other in the total

population of the United States. Hispanics make up 12.5% of the total population. Of the

women in the officer corps in the pay grades indicated in Table 8, whites and Hispanics

are under-represented, and racial minorities are over-represented.

---

[38] The categorization of race is White, Black, and Others because there are so few women GFOs who are minorities other than black.

	White	Black	Other	Total
Table 9 Women GFOs by Race and Branch of Service[39]				
USA	37	7	0	44
USAR	23	1	1	25
USN	37	2	1	40
USNR	15	0	0	15
USAF	53	4	3	60
USAFR	14	0	2	16
USMC	6^	0	1	7
USCG	6^	0	0	6
ANG	16	4	1	21
ARNG	5	3	1	9
TOTAL	212	21	10	243[40]
	87%	**9%**	**4%**	**100%**

^Includes 1 reservist

The diversity in the population of women military officers shows a higher representation for college educated women of color than in the general U.S. population. In the U.S. population, approximately 10% of black women attained their bachelor's degree between 1990 and 2005 (NCES 2006), which approximately equates to the same timeframe as when the women in pay grades O-1 thru O-5 received their degrees. Table 9 shows the diversity of women in the GFO ranks, from all year group cohorts. It appears that the percentage of Black women GFOs is about the same as Black college graduates in the United States, but other minorities and Hispanic women remain under-represented. However, about 8% of black women in the U.S. earned their bachelor's degrees between 1976 and 1980 (NCES 2006), which approximates the bachelor degree attainment years of the majority of women GFOs who are currently on active duty or in

---

[39] Ethnicity is not included as there are only two Hispanic women who have attained GFO rank; they are included in the "other" category.
[40] There are three officers of unknown race or ethnicity. I did not include them.

the reserves. When they are analyzed separately, the statistics show a lower representation of racial and ethnic minorities. Of 65 GFOs in the active force, 60 are white (92%), 3 are black (5%), and 2 are other (Hispanic and Asian-3%). In the reserve component, of 56 who are currently active, 48 are white (86%), 4 are black (7%) and 4 (7%) are other (2 Asian, 1 Native American, 1 unknown).

One of the women I interviewed, who is black, had this comment on the lack of women of color in the GFO ranks:

> "We have a reasonably diverse women population, but there have only been [a few] African American [GFOs]... And it begs the question for me, when we have a very large nurse population, that is almost demographically representative of the U.S., and one of the first communities that had [GFO] opportunities, why have there been [so few] minority women [GFOs] out of that community? And so it gets down to, what are the factors? And that is what [the military] is looking at." Interviewee/Active A35.

Hosek et al. (2001) found that for both white and minority women who remained in the service, the percentage of women who reached O-4 rank was about the same, there were no racial differences. However, they also found that black and other minority females were 39% more likely to fail to be promoted than white males, as compared to 30% for white females (p. xv-xvi). Statistics show that women of color are not making it to the top of the military in proportion to their representation in the officer corps, and Hosek et al. indicate that it may be a structural phenomenon. This is something that the Navy is looking at very closely (Scutro 2006). With diversity in the enlisted forces and in the junior officer ranks at or higher than the civilian demographic profile of the United States, the GFO leadership neither reflects the diversity of the military nor of the nation.

The Army and Navy nurse corps have the most enduring legacy for women in the military. The first women to gain official military status were women nurses, 1901 in the Army Nurse Corps and 1908 in the Navy Nurse Corps. Nurses have maintained a steady presence in the military even though their numbers rose and declined with war and other military operations. It was during World War II that women officers performed in other support roles, but after the war their numbers and the types of jobs they could perform were greatly reduced. Legislation permitting expanded roles, numbers, and promotion opportunity for women began during the Vietnam era. After the beginning of the AVF in 1973, more occupational opportunities opened in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Holm 1993), with the opening of non-combat sea and flight duty. This status quo was maintained until the mid 1990s, when air and sea combat opened to women. There are still a few occupational specialties in each of the services that are closed to women due to their proximity to direct ground combat.

As a result of the occupational closures of the 1940s through 1960s, the earliest cohorts of women show a higher percentage of nurse GFOs. This is especially true in the reserve components, as there were far greater restrictions for women in the reserves and National Guard than there were for women in the regular military. As more women entered the military beginning in the 1970s, they became eligible to compete for GFO billets in the support functional areas. Opportunity for women to become GFOs in other than nursing and support occupations was non-existent until the 1990s, when women in professional occupations began to be promoted (Table 10).

It was not until the 2000s that any line officers were promoted to GFO. This is

due to the structural impediments that women faced with regard to both occupational

specialty and the number of billets allowed as they rose through the ranks. For women

who would become GFOs in the 1970s, there could only be one Chief Nurse or Head of

Women's Programs for each of the services, and these opportunities came only once

every two to three years. As more job opportunities opened, such as JAG, Medical

Officer, and Chaplain, women in the professional fields began to be promoted. Women's

roles in the support fields continued to expand, especially in the Army where women

remain ineligible for direct combat positions. Women line officers promoted in the 2000s

were primarily aviators (19 out of 23), and were commissioned in 1973 to 1982.

Table 10 Occupation of Women GFOs by Decade of Promotion					
Regular	**Nurse**	**Professional**	**Support**	**Line**	**Total**
1970s	11	0	6	0	**17**
1980s	7	0	15	0	**22**
1990s	9	3	28	0	**40**
2000s	3	8	51	14	**76**
Total	**30**	**11**	**100**	**14**	**155**
Reserves*					
1970s	0	0	0	0	**0**
1980s	2	0	3	0	**5**
1990s	15	0	7	0	**22**
2000s	14	5	35	9	**63**
Total	**31**	**5**	**45**	**9**	**90**
GRAND TOTAL	**61**	**16**	**145**	**23**	**245***
PCT OF TOTAL	**25%**	**7%**	**59%**	**9%**	**100%**

*1 unknown occupation

Women GFOs in the Regular Active Forces are represented by many occupational specialty areas. Occupational specialty areas for women GFOs include 30 nurses, 14 line officers, 11 professionals (medical, JAG, chaplain), and 100 in the technical and support category. Women GFOs in the active component are primarily in the support and technical areas (65%). Only 9% of the Regular women GFOs are in the line community, but the number of women selected annually from the line communities continues to grow. Only in the last 7 years have any women in the line communities (Regular or Reserve) been promoted to GFO.

Nursing is no longer the largest single category for regular women GFOs as more line and support positions have opened in the past 3 decades. There also has been a restructuring of billets in the medical community. The Surgeon General integrated the medical and dental communities to require senior officers to have a more generalized health care focus, rather than a specific set of skills. So now nurses compete with medical officers, dental officers and medical service corps officers for some senior billets, including command of major medical facilities (Interviewee A65). While this has opened more opportunities to nurses, it also means more competition for those billets, and may account for why there are fewer GFO nurses on active duty, although the other professional medical personnel have made up the difference.

For Reserve GFOs, the number of nurses selected to GFO as compared to support personnel was higher in the 1990s. This stemmed from an early policy that nursing was the only officer occupation open to NG women in the 1960s and early 1970s. Nurses in the National Guard also are able to perform in senior billets that may not be nursing billets, such as Adjutant General. That decade, all but one of the National Guard GFOs

selected were nurses. Career opportunities for women in the reserves grew in the late 1970s and 1980s, as they did in the regular forces. This can be seen in the great expansion of GFO promotions in the support and line fields in the 2000s. As in the regular force, the vast majority (all but 1) of the reserve line GFOs are aviators.

Women GFOs in the Reserve Forces are not represented in all occupational specialty areas to the same depth as their active duty peers. Occupational specialties for the reserve female GFOs include 31 nurses, 9 line officers (surface warfare and aviators), 5 professionals (medical and JAG), and 45 in the technical and support category (1 unknown). Even though nursing was the original specialty area at one time for all of the service branches, and it continues to be important in the reserves (34% of all reserve female GFOs are nurses), it is apparent that more non-traditional occupations are becoming the norm. Eight of the 55 Ready Reserve GFOs (15%), for example, are line officers. In the 1980s year groups, only 3 out of 21 GFOs (14%) are nurses.

Commissioning Source

Until the mid-1970s, women entered the service primarily through direct commissioning or Officer Candidate/Training Schools (OCS/OTS), when ROTC opened to women just after the beginning of the AVF, and the federal service academies opened to women in 1976. Most medical and other professional personnel still enter through direct commissioning, although nurses now can enter through ROTC. Of course, it takes at least 4 years of college before the ROTC and Academy officers would get commissioned, unlike OCS/OTS where the officers entered as college graduates and only needed 12 to 16 weeks of training to become officers. Additionally, in the early 1980s,

when the military was expanding during President Reagan's escalation of the Cold War, it was easier to expand training via OCS.

There were limits on the number of women who were selected for the Academies and ROTC because some occupational opportunities were not available. For example, women were not authorized to be assigned to ships until 1978; the first two cohorts of women at the Naval Academy who would ordinarily be assigned to sea during their first summer cruise (1976 and 1977) were not able to do so due to the legal restriction. Additionally, when women were authorized to be assigned to ships, it was to non-combat surface ships, primarily repair ships that rarely got underway. The numbers authorized were very small, both due to the limited number of ships available, and the limited number of female berths available on each ship. After all, if the nation were to go to war, the women would have to be taken off the ships if there were any chance the ship would head to a combat zone. So, commissioning source is an important indicator of how women were viewed by the services.

Women were not authorized at the service academies until 1976 because the Academies' missions are to train career combat officers. Even when women entered the service academies, only a few were authorized to go into non-combat line positions at sea and in aviation. All other women were able to choose a non-combat specialty. This was not available to the male graduates, the majority of whom had to choose a combat career specialty, unless they were found not physically qualified or selected for special programs.[41] Until 1994, the proportion of male graduates of the Naval Academy going

---

[41] One cast that comes to mind is the assignment of Naval Academy basketball star David Robinson to recruiting duty, and then as a Supply Officer, because he was too tall to be assigned to Navy ships.

into specialties from which women were excluded was especially large because of the exclusion of women from combat ships.

Therefore, the policy restrictions on the occupational specialty areas that were open to women created a double standard in which women could get the benefit of a fully funded college education without the subsequent responsibility of fighting our nation's wars. Undoubtedly this created a situation in which the women, through no fault of their own, were resented. This was exacerbated by a now notorious 1979 article by ex-Marine and Naval Academy graduate James Webb, published in the *Washingtonian*, entitled "Women Can't Fight." His credibility became further enhanced when he was chosen as Secretary of the Navy during the Reagan administration.

Nevertheless, women withstood the cultural storm this created, and now are a growing part of all of the service academies, up to 25% of the student body. Women officers in the Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard are now allowed in the vast majority of occupational specialties. Table 11 shows the known commissioning sources of the women GFOs in this study.

Table 11 Commissioning Source of Female GFOs by Cohort.						
Cohort	**Academy**	**ROTC**	**OCS/OTS**	**Direct**	**OTHER**	**Total**
40s	0	0	3	5	3	11
50s	0	0	4	10	3	17
60s	0	0	20	17	1	38
70s	0	22	58	33	17	130
80s	17	11	5	9	4	46
TOTAL	**17**	**33**	**90**	**74**	**28**	**242***

* 4 unknown

The GFOs from the 1970s cohort show the changing dynamics of both the increase in women entering the military during that decade, and the option for women to

enter via ROTC for the first time. Women who graduated from the service Academies in the 1980s are now in the zone for promotion to GFO. So far, 17 Academy graduates have been promoted. Thirteen of the 17 Academy graduates promoted to GFO were from the Air Force Academy (from year groups 1980 to 1983). Anecdotally, at the Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI) conference of 2007, I was told that this is because the Air Force has a culture of early promotions, and therefore the earliest women graduates of the Air Force Academy were screened for GFO well before their peers from the Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies. So far, two women from the Military Academy at West Point (year groups 1980, 1981) and two from the Naval Academy (year groups 1980 and 1982) in Annapolis have been promoted to GFO. There have been no Coast Guard or Marine Corps female GFOs promoted whose commissioning source was an academy.

Education and Joint Professional Military Education (JPME)

Educational attainment was one of the key elements for civilian women who aspire to compete with their male peers for senior positions. In the military, a Master's degree is all but required in order to be promoted to the senior ranks, as is the completion of Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) (Hosek et al. 2001: 22). Attaining a Master's degree can be accomplished either through individual completion at a non-military University, through the Naval Post-Graduate School (which takes members from all the branches of service), or through completion of the Army, Naval, Air Force, or National War Colleges, or the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF). Going through one of the senior military colleges has a dual advantage; not only does it provide an advanced degree, but it also "punches the ticket" for JPME.

The accomplishment of this requirement varies by service (Table 12). The Navy has the lowest completion rate of JPME. Only 8 of 13 (62%) active duty Navy Admirals have completed JPME, as compared to 100% of Army Generals, 77% of Air Force Generals, 100% of Marine Corps Generals, and 80% of Coast Guard Admirals.

Table 12 Female GFOs by Status and Highest level of Education (Active/Retired)										
Status	BA/BS		MA/MS		Doctorate		JPME		Total N= 155	
Regular	Act.	Ret.	Act.	Ret.	Act.	Ret	Act.	Ret.	Ac.	Ret
USA	*	*	15	22	3	2	18	19	18	26[1]
USN	1	6	10	17	2	4	8	13	13	27
USAF	*	3	23	29	3	2	24	29	26	34
USMC	*	2	2	1	1	0	3	2	3	3
USCG	-	-	5	-	-	-	4	-	5	-
Total	1	11	55	69	9	10	57	63	65	90
	8%		80%		12%		77%		100%	
Reserves									N = 88	
USAR	*	*	13	4	2	6	15	8	15	10
USNR	3	1	5	5	1	1	1	3	9	7
USAFR	*	1	7	5	1	2	8	8	8	8
USMCR	*	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
USCGR	-	*	-	1	-	0	-	1	-	1
ANG	1	2	9	2	3	3	12	7	13	7
ARNG	*	1	5	2	1	0	6	2	6	3
Total	4	5	40	19	8	12	43	29	52	36
	10%		67%		23%		82%		100%	
Grand Total	5	16	95	88	17	20	100	92	N =243	
Percent	9%		75%		15%		79%		99%	

*all officers in this category had at least a Bachelor's degree.
[1]Two officers had no college degree.

The lesser importance of JPME is even more apparent in the Naval Reserves, where only 1 of 9 (11%) Admirals have completed JPME. Interviewee 14R, a Navy reservist, noted in e-mail correspondence,

"Navy has only recently added serious career emphasis to get JPME in the last 5 years. A hard requirement to have it for Flag has not existed…but we are getting there, and it already helps as a tool in one's toolbox for promotion at any level. Partly the historical context was the difficulty of getting Navy leaders thru [sic] this with sea shore rotation challenges in the line career path…The other services have had requirements like War College, Command Staff College, etc. for certain milestones…even to make O-6 for decades. Navy is in the catch-up mode on the Joint Training."

There appears to be little time in a Naval officer's career to take a year or two off to accomplish the educational and JPME requirements for a senior officer. In my position as assistant director of a Master's degree program for junior naval officers, I have noted that many of the students are pursuing their JPME requirements at a much more junior rank than I observed from my data. Thus, it appears that the Navy may be making the accomplishment of these requirements more of a priority for promotion.

Since the advanced educational requirements were not in place until relatively recently, I would expect that fewer of the earlier cohorts had advanced degrees or JPME. It is surprising, however, that the majority of those women (73%) did accomplish those milestones. It is also quite interesting that there is a higher percentage of doctoral-level accomplishment in the reserves (23%) than in the regular component (12%). I attribute this to the ability of the reservists to pursue this degree while not on active duty. The women on active duty who had doctoral degrees were primarily physicians and lawyers.

Wartime Service

For men, combat service has been the raison d'être of a military career. It is also an advantage when it comes to promotion. For women, the opportunity to serve in a combat arena has been, and still is, limited. Nevertheless, women have been assigned to combat theaters, and have been in harm's way, even though they have served primarily in support roles rather than direct combat. Since 1993, when Navy and Air Force aviators

were authorized to fly combat aircraft, and 1994 when Naval officers were authorized to serve on combatant surface ships, women have ventured into harm's way as combatants. In addition, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan do not delineate between "combatants" and "non-combatants" and women in support roles carry weapons and fire at the enemy when needed. This is a sea change from previous conflicts.

Some of the GFO biographies indicated whether a woman had served in a combat area. Another criterion used to indicate service in combat was denoted by their awards. If they had received, for example, a purple heart, SW Asia Medal, Kuwait Liberation Medal, etc., even if the action was not noted in the biography, then I discerned they participated in the conflict. I also asked this question in the survey, so I ensured the respondents who answered in the affirmative were also included in the table above.

Table 13 Female GFOs Deployment to Conflict Area by Entry Cohort[1]								
Cohort	WWII	Korea	Vietnam	Persian Gulf '91	War on Terror	Other[2]	None/ PCT	N
Regular								
40s	7	2	4	0	0	0	1/10%	10
50s	0	1	9	0	0	0	5/33%	15
60s	0	0	5	0	0	0	20/83%	24
70s	0	0	0	9	7	7	64/82%	78
80s	0	0	0	7	13	4	14/50%	28
Total	7	3	16	16	16	11	104/62%	155
Reserves								
40s	0	0	0	0	0	0	1/100%	1
50s	0	0	0	0	0	0	2/100%	2
60s	0	0	6	1	0	0	7/50%	14
70s	0	0	0	11	12	7	33/57%	50
80s	0	0	0	4	4	3	12/63%	19
Total	0	0	6	17	16	10	55/64%	86

[1]Combat experience not mutually exclusive categories; "none" is a mutually exclusive category.
[2]Includes operations in Kosovo, Bosnia, Grenada, Panama, Lebanon, etc.

Overall, 38% of women GFOs in the regular force and 36% of women GFOs in the reserve force participated in one or more of the conflicts in the combat theater listed in Table 13. The percent is higher for active duty women GFOs of the 1980s cohort, where 14 of 28 (50%) women have served in Kuwait, Iraq or Afghanistan. In the reserve force, the participation rate is only slightly higher than the overall figure, with 7 of 19 (37%) women GFOs in the reserves having served in Kuwait, Iraq or Afghanistan. With the media emphasizing the sacrifices the reserves are making in the War on Terror, there appears to less of a necessity for women reserve GFOs to deploy to be promoted.

Almost all of the women GFOs who came into the military in the 1940s were assigned to a combat theater, 5 of 7 were nurses in World War II. Only one woman who was in the service during World War II did not deploy to any conflict. This trend started to decrease for the 1950s cohort, but 59% (regular and reserves combined) participated either in Korea or Vietnam, 6 of whom were nurses. A similar pattern can be seen in the reserve cohort of the 1960s; 4 of the 6 who deployed in support of the Vietnam War were nurses. Obviously, many nurses deploy to combat areas, but only a few are selected to GFO. It appears that, at least for nurses eventually selected for GFO, participation in the combat theater of the era may be expected, noted, and rewarded.

Participation in the combat theater begins to decrease over the cohorts, with the highest percentage of non-deployers from the cohorts of the 1960s and 1970s, during Vietnam. Although a great percentage of women participated in the first Gulf War, that conflict was over so quickly that few of the GFOs selected from the 1970s and 1980s cohorts participated (15%).

Now that the country is engaged in the War on Terror in Iraq and Afghanistan, women from the cohorts of the late 1970s and 1980s are again deploying to the combat theater. Even though the reservists are participating in the current war on terror to a greater extent than in the past, this is not reflected in the selection to GFO as it is in the regular forces. It is apparent that, as for men, as women begin to take on operational roles in the line community, their participation in combat deployments is expected and rewarded. Of the 11 active duty women in the 1980s cohort who participated in the War on Terror overseas, 6 of them are aviators, only 1 is a nurse, the remainder are support personnel.

Joint Service and Command Experience

In the military, "command experience" equates to leading an organization as a department chair or dean in academia, being the mayor of a town, or the manager of a major department in business. It could also equate to being a president of a university, CEO of a business, or governor of a state. There are levels of command based on one's rank and experience, and there is some autonomy, but there are always other people to whom the leader is responsible. Leadership in the military is something that officers at all levels must do. It is a function of being a "middle manager" even at a junior level.

Command is usually considered a prerequisite to advancement and promotion. However, there are a few caveats, especially for the early cohorts, the reserve force, and for medical personnel. Until 1968, women could only have command over other women. The first service to put women in command of mixed-gender units was the Air Force in 1972, followed by the Navy, also in 1972, and the Army in 1973 (Morden 1990). It was not until 1990s that nurses could command at all. For the purpose of this study, I am

135

including the Directors of the various women's branches as having "command" and the

Chiefs of the various nurse corps as having "command" although in reality they worked

within the larger personnel system. I have not included Deputies to the Directors, or

Mobilization Assistants to the Directors as command billets.

Command usually requires a selection process, either by a Board or other means,

and is given to those officers who have exhibited the highest performance. That is not to

say that all those in command are good leaders. But up to the point they were selected,

their performance records indicated that they met or exceeded the military's standards,

and they had shown the appropriate good judgment and leadership traits. Command can

be the difference between a successful career and a non-successful career. It is tied to

promotion, and retention, and further promotion. As Kennedy (2001) explains with

regard to an Army career progression:

> [After basic officer courses within their branch area of specialty], Army
> lieutenants might then lead a platoon of roughly thirty soldiers. Their first
> command would be a company of about 200 troops, which comes after
> promotion to the rank of captain. On promotion to major, officers can
> serve on a battalion staff or in a larger command. About one third to one
> half of all promising majors of each branch are chosen for a year in
> residence at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth,
> Kansas. A very small percentage of lieutenant colonels are selected to
> command a battalion, usually composed of three to five companies. This
> command is of pivotal importance in an Army career. It is often followed
> by increasingly responsible staff positions in a division or one of the
> regional joint headquarters. The next critical hurdle is attending senior
> service college, usually the Army War College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
> Promotion to full colonel occurs at the rate of about 44 percent of
> lieutenant colonels eligible. A very select number of colonels are chosen
> to command a brigade, composed of several battalions. Less than 2
> percent of colonels are promoted to brigadier general (one star) and higher
> command or staff positions of greater responsibility" (p. 21-22).

This format is mirrored within the different service branches. Likewise, having

"joint" experience, to which Kennedy refers above, is a requirement of the Goldwater-

Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, which set the criteria for joint positions in the Defense Department (DoD 2007b). This law was intended to ensure that the separate branches of the military were able to work together, communicate with each other, and set policy and doctrine for war fighting. This was to ensure that command, control, and communications would not be stove-piped within the different branches. Thus, a designated Joint command is one in which individuals from each of the services work together to set policy and doctrine, conduct combat operations, or other types of military duties that require coordination among the different branches.

In order to be a qualified Joint Qualified Officer (JQO), both JPME and experience in a joint billet are required. As of Oct. 1, 2008, an active component officer is required to complete a full joint duty assignment and be designated a joint qualified officer for appointment to the rank of general or flag officer (DoD 2007b). Individual officers will need to ensure they have that criteria accomplished if they desire to pursue the highest ranks in the military.

As previously shown in Table 12, fewer of the regular women GFOs (77%) than the reserve women GFOs (82%) have the education portion of this requirement fulfilled, even though it is a "requirement." According to Interviewee 14-R, it will soon be a requirement for reserve officers as well. One of the issues with the reserves, however, is that there are no JQO coded billets for reservists. However, as of 1 October 2007 (DoD 2007b), there will be two ways to acquire the JQO specialty: through the traditional path of JPME education and joint tours or through the "experience path." This ensures that joint service and joint experience is acknowledged and credited, no matter how or where the experience was gained.

137

Table 14
Female GFOs by Cohort, Branch of Service, and Joint or Command (CMD) Experience

	1940s N=11		1950s N=17		1960s N=35		1970s N=130		1980s N=47	
	Joint	CMD	Joint	CMD	Joint	CMD	Joint	CMD	Joint	CMD
USA	0%	100%	33%	100%	86%	100%	75%	95%	86%	100%
USN	100%	100%	20%	100%	33%	100%	72%	100%	67%	67%
USAF	0%	100%	50%	100%	57%	86%	85%	85%	82%	88%
USMC	-	-	0%	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	-	-
USCG	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	100%	0%	100%
USAR	-	-	-	-	0%	67%	39%	78%	75%	100%
USNR	0%	0%	-	-	33%	100%	29%	86%	50%	100%
USAFR	-	-	100%	50%	33%	67%	50%	60%	0%	0%
USMCR	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	100%	-	-
USCGR	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	100%	-	-
ANG	-	-	-	-	0%	50%	44%	78%	38%	75%
ARNG	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%
Total	1	10	7	16	15	30	76	111	30	40
Percent	9%	91%	41%	94%	43%	86%	58%	85%	64%	85%

Table 14 show the percentage of joint qualification and command experience for women GFOs. It indicates the effect that Goldwater-Nichols had on officer career requirements. In the population of female GFOs that I studied, fully 64% of the regular component but only 33% of the reserve component had met the Joint requirement. Of the most recent cohort (1980s), 82% of the regular and 44% of the reserves had met the requirement. The data also show that command is a very important part of being or becoming a GFO, regardless of cohort, especially in the regular components.

One may wonder how, if command is so important, some GFOs never had command. In some cases, their specialty area did not provide the opportunity or have the requirement to do so. In other cases, especially with reserve nurses, the highest job to which they could be assigned, especially in earlier cohorts, was the reserve coordinator to

the Head of the Nurse Corps, who would always be an active duty regular. These jobs were still important, but could not be considered independent command. Still others were honorarily promoted to GFO, such as with Grace Hopper, who had neither command nor a joint specialty tour (although she did attend the Naval War College), yet her work was vitally important to the Navy (Billings 1989).

<u>Family background</u>

Family background as a variable is important because of the opportunity structures available to those from a socio-economic background that would be considered "middle class" rather than "working class". The socio-economic status (SES) of the family is either a structural impediment or enhancement that influences the ability to pursue one's goals, and even what one chooses as one's goals. It is based on both economic and educational achievement of parents, and it determines where one lives, goes to school, what one eats, what activities one pursues, and even what health care one receives. Necessary life skills are learned, such as knowing how to dress, speak, and behave. It is a culture in and of itself that also infers privilege, with a greater potential for mobility, to those who fit in (Landry 2000).

Although the American family is changing from the stereotypical "nuclear family" ideal of the 1950s, many of the women GFOs in this study came from such a family. Given that the majority of women GFOs entered the military in the 1970s, when they were between 20 and 25 years old, their parents probably would have married in the 1950s. Coupled households for both white and black families was quite high in the 1960s, with almost 90% of white household and 77% of black households of the "nuclear" type (Landry 2000:8).

139

The vast majority of both regular and reserve component GFOs came from intact families (94% and 90%, respectively, Table 15). Most had stay-at-home moms (56% and 61% respectively). For the regulars, 69% said their fathers had served in the military, and about a third indicated it had influenced their decision to join. Only about 26% of fathers were of sufficient rank to assume they were career military. Of the 68 who indicated their fathers were in the military, there were fewer officers (27) than enlisted (41). Only 5 (5%) said their mothers had been military, only one of whom said it influenced her decision to join. A large majority (94%) had siblings, (41%) were the eldest child, and six (6%) respondents were only children. Others had from 1 to 12 siblings, the mode being 2 siblings, median 3 siblings.

The high percentage of women GFOs who came from intact families and had stay at home moms is similar to findings of Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988) for high ranking civilian women, specifically that they have an advanced degree, a mother who did not work, average financial status as a child, and first in the family birth order.

As with the regular respondents, many of the female reserve GFOs came from families with a military background. Thirty-eight (64%) indicated their fathers had been in the military, 32% of whom indicated it influenced their decision to join. Only 10 of those were officers. Twelve (20%) of the fathers were of sufficient rank to assume they were career military (E7 and above or O-5 and above), as compared to 26% of regular respondents. A few (7%) said their mothers had been military, half of those said it influenced their decision to join. Like the regular respondents, virtually all (97%) had siblings. Twenty-three (43%) of the reserve respondents were the eldest child, and two

(4%) were the only child. Respondents had from 1 to 10 siblings, the mode being 2 siblings, the median 2.8 siblings.

For both the Regular and the Reserve GFOs, almost 50% were the eldest child or the only child in their family. Single children also have many of the general traits of first-born children. In general, first or only children have a tendency towards high achievement, they often pursue positions of leadership, and they often follow in their father's or mother's professional footsteps (University of Maine 2007). This has interesting implications for the women GFO respondents. Being the de facto leader of siblings may have given many of the respondent's skills they were later to use effectively in their work.

Almost half of the regular component GFOs had parents who attended college, compared to about two-fifths of the reserve GFO respondents.   Of 98 regular GFO respondents, 49% of their fathers attended college, with 90% completing their degree. Twenty-one of the 48 (44%) fathers who attended college had post-graduate degrees (15 Masters, 6 Doctorates). Mothers were only slightly less likely to attend college than their husbands (45%) but only 70% received a degree. Of those, 9 (41%) had post-graduate degrees (8 Masters, 1 Doctorate.). Mothers of the regular GFO respondents were almost as likely to attend college as their husbands, but were less likely to complete a degree.

Most of the reserve GFO respondents had parents who did not attend college. Of 59 reserve respondents, 39% of their fathers attended college, 95% of whom received their degree. Nine of the 21 who attended college (43%) had post-graduate degrees (6 Masters, 3 Doctorates), about the same percentage as the reservists' fathers. Mothers were less likely to attend college (29%); 81% of those who attended competed a degree.

Of those, 6 (38%) had post-graduate (Masters) degrees. As compared to the regular

respondents, reserve respondents parents were less likely to attend college, but more

likely to complete college than the regular respondents parents.

Table 15 Family Backgrounds of Regular and Reserve Women GFOs		
	Regular (N=98)	**Reserves (N=59)**
Intact Family	94%	90%
Stay-at-home Mother	56%	61%
Mother Military	5%	7%
Mother College (any)	45%	29%
Father Military	69%	64%
Father Career Military	26%	20%
Father College (any)	49%	39%
Siblings	94%	97%
Mode # of Siblings	2	2
Median # of Siblings	3	2.8
Only child or First born	45%	46%
Athletic as child	52%	59%
Athletic now	95%	90%

Spain and Bianchi (1996) found that the more highly educated the parents, the

more highly educated their children are likely to be, and the mother's educational

attainment has a particularly strong effect for women (p. 64). In general, however, they

noted that completion of college for women has increased from 5.8% in 1960 to 12.9% in 1980 (p. 55). For women who were between the ages of 25 to 34 in 1980, the percentage of college completion increased to 20.7%. That would have been the age group of most of the currently active regular or reserve female GFOs. So it is not so surprising that in this group, the female GFOs have a far higher educational attainment than their parents. However, the respondents' parents are still in the highest quartile of educational attainment, according to Spain and Bianchi. Although parental education would indicate that many respondents came from a high SES family, father's occupation, and a higher percentage of enlisted fathers, especially in the reserves, indicate a more working class background. Thus I would characterize the average female GFO as coming from families of a middle class SES.

Spain and Bianchi (1996) note that it is widely understood that education is the key to one's ability to compete in America's economy. As a result, even those whose parents did not attend college probably valued education knowing it was a way for their children to get ahead, i.e. increase their human capital. Even so, the rates for women earning their college degree lag behind men. In 1980, 12.9% of women compared to 20.4% of men completed 16 years of education (Spain and Bianchi 1996: 55). Some of this difference may have been due to structural barriers, such as the unequal access to attend many of our nation's colleges, which affected the earlier cohorts of this study, until Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 was passed, which prohibited sex discrimination in public and private institutions that accept federal funding.

However, the ability to attend college was also highly dependent on the economic and cultural forces women faced (Spain and Bianchi 1996: 53). In 1980, 13.6% of white

women aged 25 and over were college graduates, compared to 8.3% of black women and 6.0% of Hispanic women (Spain and Bianchi 1996: 73), and it is only slowly increasing for racial minorities. One's racial and ethic status influences high school and college graduation rates. One's gender influences the type of occupation to which one aspires, and women are more likely than men to interrupt their education by early marriage or early family formation (Spain and Bianchi 1996: 76).

Being physically active as children, a "tomboy," may also have played a part in their selection of career. About half of the regular GFO respondents were active as children (52%); of those, 78% indicated they had participated in individual sports, 81% were active in team sports, and 42% said they participated in other activities or hobbies. Once they entered the military, even those who were not active as children became so. This is probably due to the physical fitness requirement levied on all personnel in the military. The percent of respondents, both active and retired, who indicated they are currently physically active, is 95%. Activities for both groups included walking, jogging, weight lifting, golf, yoga or Pilates, and other mostly individual activities.

> Interviewee/Retired R29: "I was a tomboy all the time. And it helped when you had to fend for yourself in a world like that and play on teams and the give and take of that. I think it gave me a lot of confidence."

Many of the reserve GFO respondents also were active as children (59%), 72% of whom indicated they had participated in individual sports, 61% of whom were active in team sports, and 58% said they participated in other activities or hobbies. Once they entered the military, however, even those who were not active as children became so. Ninety percent of respondents indicated they are currently physically active. As one respondent, retired reservist R-122R, put it, "it just became a way of life." Retired

144

interviewee R29 indicated that even in retirement she works out every day. "I use it or lose it," she said.

Thus, the women who joined the military and forged highly successful careers are a self-selected group who appear to be embrace the work-devotion schema. Most of them are white, most of them are from middle-class, intact families, and a higher than average percent came from families in which one or both parents attended college. A small majority were physically active even before they joined the military, indicating that they were not averse to the rigors of military service. They were privileged and able to benefit from the structural opportunities afforded by their family's SES status.

Marriage & Family

Marriage was banned in the Nurse Corps until World War II (and cause for dishonorable discharge in the ANC), but marriage for the other branches was neither banned nor cause for discharge, though the work structure and culture discouraged the early cohorts of women from marrying (Holm 1993). Pregnancy, on the other hand was cause for discharge and in some cases punitive action, if the woman was unmarried. The women's branches, especially the Nurse Corps, wanted women of high moral integrity (Holm 1993). Furthermore, if a woman married, and her new husband had children, she was discharged. This was in keeping with the social mores of the time that women belonged at home taking care of their families and that marriage and family for women were incompatible with military service (Holm 1993). Many of the women I interviewed in the early cohorts indicated that marriage and family were grounds for dismissal, and some had to decide between family and career. It sometimes was a difficult choice to make.

145

Interviewee Retired R44: "When I was a LtCol, I was dating a man who was a two-star General. He was a widower with two children. He wanted to get married, but I couldn't, because I would have had to get out. They were <u>his</u> kids, but I would have been the one to go. That's just the way it was back then."

Interviewee Retired R29: "You could be married, but you couldn't have children. You couldn't have a family. I had a friend…18 years in the Army…a Lieutenant Colonel…who at that point married a widowed Colonel who had two grown children. She immediately became pregnant, and at just under 18 years, she had to resign her commission. Never got military benefits. To this day, I think that was so wrong."

Marital Status

Table 16 shows the marital status of the respondents, both regular (reg.) and reserves (res.). Of the 98 regular GFO respondents, I found that 23 never married (23%), a much higher percentage than in the reserve component, in which only 6% never married. Of the regular respondents, 58 are married (59%), 11 are divorced not remarried (11%), and 6 are widowed (6%) (I included widows in Table 16 next to "married"). Of those ever married, 26 (35%) have been married more than once; of those, 16 (61%) are currently married. Most women (75%) either changed their surname to their husband's, or hyphenated it with their birth name when they married. Fully 25% maintained their birth name when they married.

Women who remained unmarried through their military did not necessarily do so because they did not want to get married. When asked why they did not marry, several gave the same sort of answer:

Interviewee/Retiree R77: "Somebody asked me… 'When did you decide not to marry?' I said, 'I never decided not to marry." But early on in my time in [the military] it was very anti…if you married you pretty much had to get out. There were no provisions made for couples being together."

146

Interviewee/Retiree R29: "First of all, I was almost 30 when I came in the Army. If up to that point Lochinvar[42] hadn't ridden up on a white stag, why should I think he was coming? So, I'd better take care of myself, and I proceeded to. As the years went on, I dated but I never would be interested in marrying them. Most of the good ones were taken already."

Interviewee/Retiree R93: "I was looking for Prince Charming. I was convinced there had to be one out there…I had fallen madly in love a couple of times, only to realize, thankfully, that my Prince Charming was a toad or an ogre…I was able to leave those relationships with my personal integrity intact... Unlike being 30 years old and feeling the biological clock, I don't fell particularly drawn towards having guy-dirt in my life…I'm very content with my life…since I don't need it, I certainly don't want it. Life is pretty good."

Of the 75 regular respondents ever married, I was able to learn spousal military information from 50 of them. Of the 50, 41 (82%) were or had been married to men who were, or had been, in the military.

Active A21: "I socialize almost exclusively with military people, and met my husband while we were both serving on active duty."

Interviewee/Active A35: "We were stationed together."

Of the 62 Reserve GFOs for whom I have marital data, 4 never married (6%), 46 are married (74%), 11 are divorced (18%), and 1 was widowed. Of those ever married, 11 (21%) have been married more than once; of those, 3 are remarried. Of the 54 reserve GFOs for whom I was able to get spousal military information, 36 (67%) were or had been married to men who were, or had been, in the military/ reserves. In keeping with social tradition, and perhaps also due to their more traditional social values, the vast majority (93%) of Reserve GFOs changed their surname to their husband's when they married or hyphenated it with their birth name. Only 7% did not change their names.

---

[42] Knight Lochinvar on a steed. Romantic poem by Sir Walter Scott, 1808.

| Table 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| Marital Status of Respondents by Cohort and Branch of Service | | | | | | | | | |

Cohort	1942-1969		1970-1974		1975-1979		1980s		Totals	
	Reg.	Res.	Reg.	Res.	Reg.	Res.	Reg.	Res.	Reg. N=98	Res. N=63
Army										
NM	3	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	6	2
M/W	1/2	0	3/0	4	9	4	3	0	16	8
D	2	1	1	1	0	4	1	1	5	7
Navy										
NM	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	0
M/W	2/1	3	7/0	2	5	4	2	4	14	13/1
D	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	1
Air Force										
NM	7	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	1
M/W	2/2	1	4/1	4	8	2	6	1	19	8
D	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0
USMC										
NM	1	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	2	-
M/W	1/0		0		1				2	
D	0		0		0				0	
USCG										
NM	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0
M/W				1	2		2		4	1
D				0	0		0		0	0
ANG										
NM	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	-	1
M/W		2		1		3		4		10
D		1		0		0		0		1
ARNG										
NM	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
M/W		0		0/1		4		2		7/1
D		1		0		0		0		1
TOTALS	28	11	23	15	31	25	16	12	98	63
NM	14	1	4	1	3	1	2	1	23	4
M/W	6/5	6	14/1	12/1	25/0	19	13	10	(23%)	(6%)
D	3	4	4	1	3	5	1	1	58/6	47/1
									(65%)	(76%)
									11	11
									(11%)	(17%)

NM= Never Married; M = currently married; D=divorced not remarried; W=widowed
Reg. = Regular; Res. = Reserve

It appears that the regular components seem to have a more stable marital life than the reservists. For example, in the Army Reserve, across all cohorts, more than 50% either never married, or divorced and did not remarry. This is the highest percentage of all the branches. The lack of spousal support had an effect on marital relationships, and in some cases were cause for divorce, or leaving active duty for the reserves.

> Reservist 10R: "My former husband was Navy. I got off of tour when we married. Overall, I attained a higher rank than he was when he retired. Not sure if jealousy kicked in on his part. He was not supportive in my career."

> Reservist 21R: "It was a different era. It was hard to be in a leadership role and have all of the 'wife' responsibilities. Something had to give. It was my marriage."

> Reservist 38R: "Spouse #1: Vietnam Vet, enlisted; had difficulty with my commission and personal growth as I grew into my role as an officer. Jealous of time away."

> Retired reservist R111R: "Husband became progressively more resentful of my military career with my increasing rank and responsibilities."

> Reservist 7R simply said, "Gone a lot."

In the Air Force reserve, 1 never married, 8 are married, with none divorced. Only 1 of these respondents had multiple marriages, married three times in fact, but who ultimately found a soul mate. In the National Guard (both branches), 1 never married, 16 are married, and 2 are divorced. In the Naval reserve, 13 are married and 1 divorced (from the 1942 year group). Only one of the 13 had been married more than once, early in her career. In her interview, she indicated that her husband had an affair with an enlisted woman while she was deployed (Interviewee Reservist 28R), and that was the end of that marriage. She is currently remarried to a civilian. Thus for most reserve

149

officers, there was high marital stability, with the exception of the Army Reserve. Overall, of 63 reserve GFO respondents, 47 are married, a 75% rate, as compared to 47% in the Army Reserve.

Other divorced reserve and regular component GFO respondents had similar complaints about the lack of support from their spouse, and that, along with jealousy or resentment created problems. Comments include:

Retiree R30: "I was successful. He was not."

Active A10: "My career was seen as secondary to whatever assignments my husband had."

Active A25: "Competition in a successful career was too difficult on 1st husband's ego."

Active A58: "The large amount of time apart is a factor that must be actively addressed by both spouses."

Reservist 128R: "First spouse had difficulty with mates who reported to me, calling for advice/guidance or leaving phone messages for me. Time away was also a source of tension."

Of the 8 Army Reserve GFOs who are currently married, 1 married, divorced, and then remarried the same man. In her response to the question "Did your career affect your personal relationships?" Reservist 5R wrote,

"Yes: [It was] difficult to maintain balance. [As an] Army Reserve soldier with two careers-lost focus on personal relationship."

In fact, 64% of respondents indicated that their military careers did have an effect on their personal relationships. Some indicated their relationships were positively influenced.

Active A43: "Strengthened the relationship."

Reservist 38R: "Spouse #2-helped me grow/refine my officership [sic]."

Reservist 36R: "It also made me more inclined to one or two strong friendships quickly rather than cultivating many."

Retiree R57: "My husband and I were both in the Navy-this was a strong common bond which added to our understanding and tolerance of each other's goals/achievements/assignments."

Retiree R25: "Shaped my circle of friends, from which emerged my husband."

Alternatively, for many, the military adversely affected relationships, both with friends and spouses/boyfriends. The most common complaint was that deployments and separations made it difficult to sustain relationships. Others felt that as they got more senior, it was difficult to begin or sustain a romantic relationship because men were intimidated by, or jealous of, their rank.

Active A35: "Difficult to meet/sustain relationships during deployment."

Retiree R2: "Many men were intimidated by my rank and/or position. Men often saw the need to compete with me."

Active A6: "Time away from family; middle of the night phone calls; excessive travel (times that it became wearing, stressful beyond the period just away from family)."

The literature on military women has documented that they are less likely to marry than their male peers. Senior military women report that either their spouses become jealous of their success, and thus become unsupportive, or as they rise in rank, their selection of mates decreases because of the intimidation factor. Yet, many of the respondents indicated that spousal support was extremely important in their ability to navigate the challenges of a military career. Thus, respondents who did not marry, or who were divorced, had to rely on other avenues of social support to succeed in their military careers. For most, this included mentors or other family members.

<u>Family Formation</u>

In 1975, the Department of Defense ended the involuntary discharge of pregnant woman and mothers from the military (Holm 1993). These policies impacted both the women who stayed in the regular military and the women who transferred to the reserve forces.

More than half 52% (39) of the ever-married regular GFOs did not have any children, by birth, marriage, or adoption. Of 98 respondents, only 27 had birth children (28%), while 9 had stepchildren, and 3 had both. The reserves have been seen as an option for those who wish to remain affiliated with the military, but do not wish to continue on a full-time basis. Of the 79 GFO reservists, 50 (63%) entered the military as active duty officers and transferred to the reserves later in their careers. Even when marriage and motherhood became authorized, the military establishment still frowned upon married women in the military. Many of the women in the reserves (59%) transferred from active duty due to this attitude and the unwillingness to "give up" this most basic of human desires - companionship - and, for some, motherhood.

> Interviewee Reservist 30R: "I was a very senior Lieutenant Commander. I had gotten off of active duty and gotten into the Reserves…I was trying to have children, and had a very difficult time with that, and needed to spend…frankly, I had to spend five years with the doctors to make that happen. So I needed something that would get me flexibility to do that. Even though the Reserves were not very flexible at that time, I was in small enough units that they were gracious enough to let me kind of bend the rules around a little bit."
>
> Retired Reservist R17R: "I left active duty after 8 years and joined the reserves to be transferred with my husband and raise my children."
>
> Reservist 124R: "[I left active duty] due to family concerns; my husband and I were both on the same sea/shore rotation and had a young son."

There are striking differences in marital status and parenthood status between GFOs in the regular forces and the reservists during times when women in the military would have been able to marry and have children, starting in the 1970s (Table 17). Of 86 regular respondent GFOs in cohorts of the 60s, 70s, and 80s, 27 (31.4%) had birth children as compared to 32 (61.5%) reserve respondent GFOs. In other words, half as many regular GFO respondents had birth children as reserve GFO respondents. Being a parent in the military can be a daunting task as these women must balance both the military and family, and in some cases, another full-time civilian job.

> Reservist 42R: "Very busy balancing home, civilian job and reserve job."

> Retired Reservist R26R: "My military career was "part-time" plus a full-time civilian career which did not leave me with an abundance of free time. It complimented [sic] my civilian career and vice-versa, especially how to work in a male-dominated environment."

| | | Married | | | Divorced | | | Widowed | | |
| | | Children | | | Children | | | Children | | |
Component	N	None	Birth	Step	None	Birth	Step	None	Birth	Step
Regular	**86**	**25**	**26**	**8**	**9**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**2**
Reserves	**52**	**15**	**25**	**5**	**4**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**
Total	**138**	**40**	**51**	**13**	**13**	**7**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**2**

Table 17
Marital and Parental Status by Component

Note 1: 40s and 50s cohorts not included as they could not have children and remain in the military
Note 2: Birth and stepchildren categories are not mutually exclusive.

For those who had no children, 16% of Reservists could not have children and 13% never wanted children. Of Regular GFOs, 56% said either they or their husband did not want children, 33% wanted to concentrate on their career, and 23% could not have children. The percentage of both reserve and regular GFO respondents who reported that

they could not have children is very high as compared to the general population.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, in 1995 7.1% of married

couples could not have children. It is unclear if the work devotion schema for these

women is a result of the inability to have children. For those who never married, or who

did not have children, the work devotion schema became a way for them to be able to

take care of themselves or feel that they were making a difference in the world.

Some did not have children because they were never married, were married too

late in life, or wanted to focus on career. Others wrote/said:

Retired Reservist R8R: "Remarried, gained 2 stepdaughters"

Retired Reservist R26R: "My husband had 3 children from a previous marriage,
so in fairness to them we wanted to wait a couple of years-then my career seem to
be predominate [sic] and we just never 'got around to it'."

Reservist 27R: "Joint decision between husband and me."
 Retiree R79: "My husband and I were both active duty military and experienced
long separations which stressed the marriage and complicated our plans for
children."

Interviewee/Retiree R44: "Service policies that militated against normal family
relationships in areas of marriage, maternity, minor children, dependents,
allowances, housing and assignments, etc." "[Having children] would have ended
my career!"

Active A24: "It was hard to develop a long term relationship since I moved every
2 years. However, it was worth waiting for Mr. Right! I found him after 16 years
in the military…I always had wanted to have children but when we were engaged
and married I found the desire not to be a burning one, so we chose to spoil the
nieces and nephews."

Cohort Comparisons

When marital and family status are analyzed by cohort, patterns emerge that are

similar to those noted by Goldin (2004). Comparing Goldin's civilian women cohorts

and my data by cohorts as close as possible as defined by Goldin (2004), those in the

154

earliest commissioning cohorts (1942 to 1969) were much less likely to ever marry than

their civilian peers (Table 18). Of the 28 GFOs in that cohort, 54% never married. Of

the 46% who were ever married, 3 were married once and widowed, 77% were married

once, and 30% of those divorced and did not remarry. Twenty percent were married and

divorced twice, and 10 percent were married more than twice, and remain remarried. In

the end, only 4 of 25 (16%) had successful, lasting marriages.

Table 18							
A Comparison Between Female Civilian Cohorts and Female GFO Cohorts							
*Cohort/ College Grad Years (Civilian)	*Family/ Career Path	*Non-marriage (by age 50)	*No child (by age 40)	Commissioning Years (Military)	Family/ Career Path	Non-marriage (ever)	No Birth Children (ever)
Cohort 1, 1900-1919	Family or Career	>30%	>50%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cohort 2, 1920-1945	Job then Family	15%-20%	30%-35%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cohort 3, 1946-1965	Family then Job	8%	17%	1942-1965 (N=28)	Career, no family	54%	88%
Cohort 4, 1966-1979	Career then Family	12%	28%	1966-1979 (N=105)	Career and Marriage	9%	56%
Cohort 5, 1980-1990	Career and Family	**	26%	1980-1986 (N=29)	Career and Family* **	7%	46%

* SOURCE: Goldin (2004: 22-23); ** Too young at time of analysis; ***A possible trend, but premature to definitively conclude.

Thus, as a result of self-selection and military policies, these women focused on

career, and were unlikely to form long-term marital relationships. In this way, they were

similar to Goldin's Cohort 1, focusing on career and foregoing family. Of course, this is

an unfair comparison, because the military group did not have a choice of having family then career, as with their civilian peers because of the career progression requirements of military service. It was either one or the other, much like the women at the beginning of the 20th century.

The policies regarding childbearing started changing in the early 1970s, with the services granting waivers of discharge for those who sought it. The actual DoD policy did not change until May 15, 1975. Only the Army resisted (Holm 1993: 300-301). There were 3 women commissioned in the early 1960s who managed to have birth children while in the reserves or on active duty. (A fourth woman had a child before she joined the military, but gave up custody when she joined; her parents raised the child.) Two of the three were nurses. Assuming that they joined the military right out of college, they would have been in their 30s when the law changed. Only one of the three respondents gave any clue as to how they managed to do this.

> Retired Reservist R116R: "I had my son after I left the military as a major with 13+ years."

This means she would have left the regular military in 1973, when waivers for pregnancy discharges routinely would have been given. I e-mailed another of the respondents, and asked her about this as well. She answered:

> Retired Reservist R46R: "You are correct, the rules were changing during 1973-1974. In my case, since I had two miscarriages, I was reluctant to resign from active duty (in case I did not carry them to term), and elected to reject release from active duty for reason of pregnancy. I figured that I would resign my regular commission if I would be blessed enough to have a second child. This is exactly what happened-our [first] daughter was born April 1974 (I was 32) and our [second] daughter was born [in] October 1975 at my age 33. The [military] held me on active duty until early October and I picked up my reserve status the next day…I believe that I was only the second woman to have a child while on active duty…"

156

For the cohort described by commissioning years 1966 to 1979 (Cohort 4), a much different picture emerges. In this group, the childbearing restriction policies were still in effect until 1975, but many of then would have been of childbearing age when the pregnancy restrictions were lifted. The option of Goldin's Cohort 4, career then family, was possible for this group only for those who transferred to the Reserve. Overall, of the 105 respondents in this cohort, 9% never married, and 74% remained married to their first spouse. In this group, 19% did not find a suitable mate even after marrying more than once. In this cohort, 44% of the GFOs have birth children, 58% of whom are Reserve and 41% are Regular GFOs.

This was still a time when women transferred to the reserves so they had the option of having both a part-time military career and motherhood. Since about 40% of the mothers were Regular female GFOs, it indicates that family formation was important for these women, even as they pursued a career. Those who stayed on active duty and had children needed other arrangements to consider, which is discussed later.

In the last military cohort, a full analysis cannot be formed until the women from commissioning year groups 1980 to 1990 are completely through their GFO promotion opportunity windows. Of the female GFOs selected in 2006 and 2007, there were still a number of women who were from year group 1979, in all services except the Air Force. So for the final analysis on whether or not this group manages to do as Goldin's Cohort 5, combine a military career and family formation, another 10 years or so must pass. Yet, this is the only group in which the whole cohort will have benefited fully from the change in military marital and family policies that occurred in the late 1970s.

I can look at the patterns and make a preliminary analysis. Of the 28 GFO respondents in this cohort, it appears that they are trending in the same direction that Goldin found in Cohort 5, managing a career and marriage. Only 2 (7%) of the last cohort have not yet married, and 4 of 26 (15%) divorced and remain unmarried. Of those who ever married, 58% were married once, and 87% of those remain married; 36% were married twice and 90% remain married. It appears that as far as marriage is concerned, there is little difference between this cohort and the one before it.

However, there is some difference with regard to children. In this cohort, 15 of 28 (54%) have birth children, 56% of the Regular GFOs and 50% of the Reservists. It appears that these women are figuring out how to balance career and family to a greater extent than in the previous military cohorts. Goldin (2004) indicates that for her Cohort 5, it worked because of a more egalitarian marriage and willingness of the husbands to take on more of the child-rearing responsibilities.

Summary

The respondents have both similarities and differences from their civilian peers with regard to their demographic profiles. Table 19 delineates the typical executive women's demographics as found by Blair-Loy (2001), Moore (1988), Davies-Netzley (1998), Gomez et al. (2001), Richie et al. (1997), and Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988) as compared to the regular and reserve respondents in this study. I did not include Goldin (2004) in this review as her results are discussed by cohort, which I addressed in the previous section.

It is difficult to make comparisons when not all of the studies reported the same findings. As is clear from above, most of the studies focused on white women, primarily

158

because minority women are under-represented at the highest levels of both the military and corporate America. Family SES is also very consistent. Although I did not have the economic data to conclude that military women primarily come from a specific social strata, the evidence that I used is the level of education of the parents, the military background of the fathers, and father's occupation to conclude that most come from a middle-to-high SES background. Civilian executive women appear to come from an SES that is slightly higher, but interestingly, the military women overall have a higher educational attainment than their civilian peers.

Parental educational attainment appears to be similar, as reported by Moore (1988). Similarly, the executive women in Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum (1988) were "typically" first born and had stay at home mothers, strikingly similar to the military respondents.

The marital statistics are interesting, as the military has both the highest (23%-regular) and lowest (6%-reserves) percentage of never married executive women. However, military women also have the lowest divorced-not-remarried percentage. The percentages range from 25% to 30% not remarried for civilian women to 11% and 17%, respectively for regular and reserve military respondents.

The percentage of women who are birth mothers also shows a similarity, with civilian women mothers ranging from 38% to 77%, and military mothers ranging from 31% to 62%.   However, the main difference between the two is the racial differences in the groups. The group with the highest percentage in the civilian studies is the group that is equally racially mixed, while the highest percentage in the military group are the part-

time workers. However, active duty military women still show a lower percentage

overall than any of the other research groups.

	Blair-Loy N=56	Moore N=25	Davies-Netzley N=9	Gomez et al. N=20	Richie et al. N=18	Collins et al. N=160	GFO Regular N=98	GFO Reserves N=59
Race	98% White	Not noted	100% White	100% Latina	50/50 White/ Black	Not noted	88% White	87% White
Education **Bachelors**		72%	100%				99%	100%
Post-Graduate	86%		55%	Median 18 years		Typical	92%	90%
Family SES	Mid to high	"Privi-leged"		Upper		Middle	Middle to high	Middle to high
Mother College grad		29%					30%	24%
Father College grad		36%					44%	37%
Stay at home mom						Typical	56%	61%
First born						Typical	45%	46%
Never Married	16%			10%		14%	23%	6%
Married	59%	52%	55%	60%	66%	66%	65%	76%
Divorced	25%			30%		18%	11%	17%
Birth children	38%		55%	55%	77%	65%	31%	62%

Table 19
Executive Women Demographics

The possibility of alternative sexual preferences may also be a deciding factor in whether or not one gets married. There are, of course, structural barriers to same-sex marriage, both in the civilian world and in the military. In the military, same-sex marriage is grounds for dismissal, regardless of rank. Sexual orientation was not included in this research in deference to those still on active duty, because of the policies in place that preclude disclosure. I did not bring it up at all in the interviews. Only two of the interviewee even mentioned it, both of them from the earliest cohorts.

> Interviewee Retiree R77: "I must say I never really was that hung up on getting married. Some people will say, 'Well, you're either a whore or a lesbian.' It was a lot of nastiness about that whole thing. If you didn't date a lot or really push the issue about wanting to get married, and all that stuff, then you had to be gay. They didn't call you gay at that time, you had to be queer. I wasn't queer, but I never had that strong push to be married, so I was somewhat in this limbo."

> Interviewee Retiree R44: "Regardless of what you do, people are always going to think you're sleeping with somebody because it seems like sex is on everybody's mind. So even if you had a couple of girlfriends, they might think you're a lesbian. Or if you dated, obviously it was the repercussions of the double standard between men and women. So it is a very difficult place for women Generals to be."

With regard to the similarities and differences between the regular and reserve respondents, it appears that there were few major differences overall (Table 15). Their family backgrounds were very similar, coming from intact families, of which 20% to 25% came from career military families. Almost 50% were first-born children, who tend to be self-starters and highly motivated. They usually came from families with modest backgrounds and resources, although a substantial minority had college educated parents. Most of the respondents' parents, however, apparently encouraged the higher educational attainment for their children.

The primary difference between the reserve and regular component was family formation. Almost a quarter of the active duty women did not marry as compared to only 6% of the reservists. Additionally, the percent of marriage among military women as compared to civilian women is fairly consistent, with the reserve respondents having the highest percentage. As far as children are concerned, most active duty women did not have children, while just the opposite was the case for reservists. Although it is becoming more likely that those in the active component can have a career in the military and a family, it is still difficult. The option of using the Reserves as a part-time career while pursuing other careers or a full-time family is becoming less likely as the world security situation shifts, and the United States continues its involvement in the conflict in the middle east.

In sum, the backgrounds of the women who have become executives are similar, with regard to family background, education level, and family formation. The differences noted are probably due to the small sample sizes of the studies on civilian elites. More research on these comparisons is clearly indicated. The next chapter will delve into how the military respondents managed career and family, and the strategies they used to succeed in the military organization.

CHAPTER 8

PERCEPTIONS OF SUCCESS BY ELITE MILITARY WOMEN

In the previous chapter, I presented a demographic look at the women who are active duty, reserve, and retired General and Flag Officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. In seeking some commonalities in background and motivation, I discussed and analyzed the differences and commonalities between the reserve and regular GFOs, and also compared them to civilian executive women. In this way, I was able to present a demographic and sociological picture of the women who have been successful in the military, as defined by their promotion to GFO ranks.

In this chapter, I present and analyze the various perceptions about their success as reported by the respondents, and analyzed through structural, cultural and interpersonal lenses. I also address such issues as why they joined the military, why they stayed, and how they negotiated their career paths, in a sometimes non-traditional fashion, to be one of the few who achieved GFO rank. The quotes from the surveys and interviews presented in these findings are examples of the types of answers to various open-ended questions asked, rather than a listing of all the relevant quotes. Many of the women had similar views and answers to questions, and I chose the ones that were the most eloquent or the most interesting. I do not use all of the comments because there were so many, but I use those comments that express a common theme across cohorts and status (active or retired, regular or reserves). The comments that follow are in answer to both closed and open-ended survey questions.

Section 1: Overcoming Structural and Cultural Barriers

In the previous chapter, I found that about a third of the regular respondents, and about 60% of the reserve respondents were both married and had children. One of the most difficult structural barriers for women in the military has been managing both a military career and family. For many years the military services discouraged women from staying in the military if they also had children living at home by forcing them to resign. Today's military women have more choices in negotiating the balance between work and family.

Balancing Work and Family

Being the primary caregiver of the household is difficult when one or both of the parents are in the active military or the reserves. In attempting to balance work and family, both regular and reserve GFO respondents used similar techniques. Overcoming the cultural expectation of wife-as-primary-caregiver required a family support system, such as a supportive spouse, other family members, and/or willing children. When the Regular GFOs were at work or deployed, 72% relied on daily child care providers, 52% relied on their husbands, live in help (41%) or made other arrangements (38%); most used a combination of two or more. In contrast, when the Reserve GFOs were at work or deployed, 72% primarily relied on their husbands, but they also relied on other family members (48%), live in help (22%) or made other arrangements (27%).

In answer to the question, "Who was your children's primary caregiver?" the Regular GFOs were fairly egalitarian; 24% answered that they were, 24% answered their husbands were, and 31% indicated it was shared responsibility between them and their husbands. A few (14%) relied on a live-in nanny or au pair. In contrast, the majority of

164

the Reserve GFOs (72%) answered that they were, 12% answered that their husband's

were, and 12% answered that they shared that responsibility.

> Interviewee/Active A15: "We have had live-in childcare from the time our oldest
> was a year old. We've had some breaks because certainly this isn't like Fort Polk
> in Louisiana. There are no jobs for military spouses. So I ran an ad in the post
> newspaper … I got a great military spouse who showed up at my house at 0600
> every morning; I went to PT, came back, she helped me take the kids to school;
> she came back for the school bus; she picked up the kids from school [and] she
> would stay with them until one of us got home."

Many of the women used a nanny or au pair, although it was more common with

Regular GFOs (41%) than Reserve GFOs (22%). A combination of caregivers (husband,

child care providers, or other arrangements) would require more of a juggling act to make

it come together. This respondent with children "outsourced," almost everything:

> Retiree A25: "[My] second husband has been very supportive. However, the time
> demands of a busy career takes its toll on a marriage. Therefore we outsource
> everything but sex & cooking - & now cooking is next to go 'contract-out'."
> "Have had same nanny for 18.5 years. She's 82 years old and has been a key
> person in my military success."

The reluctance of some women to live-in help perhaps was the issue of having

someone you don't know live in your household. And after "nanny-gate' in the early

1990s in the Clinton administration, some were worried about hiring illegal immigrants

to care for their children. For example, this respondent still had young children at home,

and her job requirements in the Reserves required more time once she became a GFO.

> Interviewee/Reservist 14R: "My husband said, 'Well, why don't we, for the first
> time, hire somebody full time.' So we hired somebody full time. I was very
> nervous about it … who was going to be this influence on my children? [A friend
> said] 'Get an au-pair.' She had had terrible experiences with au pairs. Some of
> them were great; some of them were very immature and they're driving your
> children and … I didn't want anybody who lived in the house with us. We found
> a wonderful woman. And I had to find someone legal. So for about three years
> she was full time and then about 30 hours a week…but then she got sick…and

now I'm in the world of 'oh my goodness'… because I'm the substitute teacher, you know, if my boss can't go, I get vectored out. She was making dinners…she kept the laundry going … she sang songs, she was just perfect. So now, we have a new world and we're still figuring it out."

There were a variety of answers to the survey question "How did you balance work and family?" For example:

Active A4: "My husband and I were both military (active). When we married and had children my husband retired from the U.S. Marine Corps and I remained in the USAF."

Interviewee/Retiree R57: "I have two step-children who, at 11 and 13, were a great help when my son was born."

Reservist 18R: "Missed a lot of sleep– organized everything. Everyone had tasking in family, even children. I missed very few children's events, but husband and mother stood in when I couldn't be there."

Retired Reservist R69R: "There [was] certainly a sacrifice to be made by all family members–missed birthdays, recitals, soccer games, etc. More [responsibility] for father– not always appreciated. My children took it in stride and [were] more understanding than my former husband."

Retired Reservist R31R: "Early in my career, we were a service couple. However, when we left the service in 1981, I stayed in the USAR and my husband did not. Over the next 25 years, he provided the stability on the home front while I served in both reserve and active status. That inevitably impacted our relationship as a couple and our roles as parents…We are pretty flexible about roles, we have a high degree of personal trust and he is very secure in his manhood, which is why we've worked through raising our daughter who has chronic medical problems, coping with ill and dependent parents, and dealing with the inevitable ups and downs of life."

Active A68: "Waited until later in life/career to have a child; better able to balance priorities; take each day and work to establish best balance; started the day my daughter was born, she's nine years old now and I'm still using this philosophy."

Active A70: "Husband and I did our best to take turns with demanding/high vis/career enhancing jobs. If it was my husband's turn to command a ship, I took whatever job I could get to be co-located. When it was my turn, he followed me."

166

At least one respondent believed that being a stay-at-home mom was almost a necessity for being able to balance work with the reserves and home responsibilities. She explained that in order to continue to advance in the military hierarchy, many hours of reserve work without monetary compensation were required (Interviewee/Reservist 14R). One other respondent echoed this observation (Interviewee/Reservist 30R).

Many of the respondents who had children still have young children at home to care for, so the work-family balance issue remains salient, especially once selected to GFO. Interviewee/Reservist 14R related a story that illustrates the result of later marriage and later childbearing that is common in career women.

> "Let me tell you a story. We have this wonderful Flag training where you self-assess and get coached and meet other Flag and SESs[43]. It's a great, great thing. Then the CNO had a questionnaire where he says, 'What are your biggest concerns about becoming a Flag Officer?' Without hesitation I filled it out and wrote, 'Family Balance." So, the CNO stood up and said, 'We have reviewed your personal questionnaires about what you all are most concerned about. Resoundingly, everyone writes family balance issues'. And the audience was SES, male and female [GFOs]. And the CNO went on to say, 'And I understand. It's a different world now. When I became a Flag, my kids were all grown and out of the house, and you all probably still have kids in high school.' The guy to my left elbowed me and said, 'How old is your youngest?' I said, '6.' His youngest was 2. I was sitting next to an SES who had a 3 year old. So the CNO was trying to understand, but didn't get that it was way younger. I mean, we are talking about still needing to supervise homework…"

Leaving Active Duty and Joining the Reserves

About 33% of the Reserve and NG Female GFOs joined the reserves and were never in a regular status. For the remainder (59%), the issue of work and family balance was the primary reason that they transferred from the active duty force. They had the opportunity to continue to serve their country, yet maintain a relatively "normal" home

---

[43] Senior Executive Service: equivalent to GFO rank in the civilian Department of Defense career structure.

life. Their reasons for leaving active duty range from their desire to move with their

husbands, to wanting to stay at home with their children. One of the respondents

indicated that in her experience, women who remain in the reserves love the military but

do not wish to forego marriage and family. Even though she left active duty before she

was married or had children, Interviewee/Reservist 14R states:

> "I could not see how, in the long run, to marry and have kids and [remain in the military]. I was not married when I transitioned to reserve status, but I still could not see how I'd ever do [an] active duty schedule and be present to a family." But she also noted "As a Reservist, I still consider the military my career."

> Others left because:

> Reservist 33R: "I have two children; both are disabled."

> Reservist 36R: "Married to serviceman-knew difficulty in joint assignments. Wanted more children and felt obligated to be with them more."

> Retired Reservist R34: "Before my second child was born (my husband and I were [stationed] at the same hospital), we realized the child needed one of us at home. With the same vested interest in remaining on AD, we tossed a coin and I lost the toss."

> Reservist 42R: "Followed husband who had an ROTC scholarship and got out to be a lawyer in a top law firm in New Orleans."

In the future, the increased reliance on the Reserve and National Guard

Components may make this option less attractive, or even possible, as they deploy to

Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere for months a time. Additionally, the demands of work

increase substantially once selected as a Flag or General Officer, whether one is active or

reserve. Some reservists have been recalled to active duty to work full time. Others may

have a part-time billet for which they actually put in full-time hours. Many enjoy the

flexibility of being able to telecommute from home while conducting their military work.

> Interviewee/Reservist 14R: "The traditional Reservist has been dead for over 15 years. The weekend warrior concept died since Desert Storm, [especially] in

Intelligence. Intelligence officers and enlisted average about 60 days a year, whereas the traditional Reserve contract is 36 – two days a month and two weeks a year. I always loved being in command…so when you're in command in the Reserves, the statistics show that to run an excellent command, you need to do a minimum of 20 hours a week, even though your command is responsible for drilling two days a month and two weeks a year. And then there's the world of email that has kicked, so you're constantly on it all the time. I would put in about 30 hours a week for free on my own time just leading, emailing, going in and doing little things."

"How can one expect to Command a unit only working 2 days a month?" Interviewee/Reservist 30R observed.

Twenty-seven percent of the Reserve GFOs left active duty due to work related reasons. Some indicated it was due to occupational restrictions, wanted to pursue other goals, or wanted more control of their careers, but wanted to keep their affiliation.

Retired Reservist R2R: "Tour was up; wanted to stay connected."

Reservist 5R: "I did not want to make the army a career. Felt I was falling behind my civilian counterparts both in professional development and compensation."

Reservist 125R: "Limited opportunities."

Reservist 19R: "Got off active duty to go to school. Missed the camaraderie of military, but with school and work, reserve component great option."

Retired Reservist R11R: "I wanted to teach nursing at the college level."

Reservist 8R: "Very limited opportunities at the time I left - 1981.

Interviewee/Reservist 14R "I was a SWO - we were limited to auxiliaries and it was not expanding as we had hoped to other ship types."

Others were disillusioned by the realities of being a woman in a man's world, yet they wanted to maintain contact with the military.

Reservist 34R: "No equal treatment of non-pilots regardless of ability. Too much good-old boy."

Reservist 7R: "AD [Active Duty] mentality was negative and peers were not as competent as I was expecting" but stayed in the reserves because "If I left, who would look out for those [soldiers that] others don't."

Retired Reservist R58R: "Left active duty as not fulfilling [but] missed military life, so evaluated National Guard service as option."

Overall, the issue of balancing marriage, family, and work for both Regular and Reserve respondents is one that requires planning and a robust family support system. Although a large, but decreasing, number of the regular GFO respondents did not have children, many of them did not because of their marital situation. They were married either late in life, or married and divorced early in their careers (similar to General Kennedy), but then re-married later when children were less of an option. Although there were several who married men who had their own children, none had adopted children, even if they were unable to have children of their own.

I do not have the data on whether or not the stepchildren lived with the couple, but respondents who had step-children indicated they did not, or that the children were grown by the time the marriage occurred. Only one of the interviewees had step-children who lived with her and her husband, a widower, and she considered them her own because they were very young when she married him. Those who had children had a variety of options, whether to stay in and depend on husbands, other relatives, or live-in nanny for childcare; or transfer to the reserves and take primary care of family, while working "part-time" as a Reservist for the military. But, as noted earlier, this is becoming less of an option, especially as one gets more senior in rank. Overall, marital and family status of women GFOs is similar to women executives in the civilian workforce who also rely on supportive spouses to be able to continue the work they do and manage a household.

There were a variety of reasons why these women first joined the military, and then stayed well beyond their expectations. As explained in Chapter 2, there were many structural impediments to a career in the military for women, not the least of which were the lack of occupational opportunity and promotion equity with their male peers until the 1970s. Yet, it did not seem to either hinder their desire to join, nor desire to stay in the service. Survey respondents were asked to pick their top three reasons for joining the military. Table 20 shows the most common results.

| **Table 20** | | | | |
| **Reasons for Joining the Military** | | | | |
Reason	**Regular Respondents (N=98)**	**Percent**	**Reserve Respondents (N=58)**	**Percent**
Wanted to serve my country/patriotism	47	48%	31	53%
Wanted to travel	24	24%	15	26%
Wanted adventure	25	25%	13	22%
Wanted to use my existing skills	7	7%	13	22%
Wanted a challenging job	30	31%	13	22%
Needed the money	11	11%	10	17%
Felt it was an obligation of citizenship	9	9%	9	16%
Needed a job	17	17%	7	13%
Seemed like a good idea at the time	11	11%	7	13%
Wanted a job with leadership opportunity	25	25%	6	10%
Wanted a change in my circumstances	15	15%	3	5%
Wanted a job with promotion opportunity	11	11%	1	2%

Note: Question allowed 3 responses.

The number one answer from both the regular and reserve respondents was "Wanted to serve my country/patriotism." I have to admit, this surprised me,

except for those women who served during World War II, and a few who served in Vietnam.   The post-Vietnam era was one in which the military was not a popular choice among young American males, and women and minorities filled the recruiting gap once the AVF was established. Segal (1995) notes that when there are shortages of qualified men, nations will increase military women's roles, but this appears to be a matter of military needs and a desire by women to take advantage of the economic parity the military offered, rather than patriotism. Since Vietnam, patriotism has taken a back seat to individualism in the United States, until September 11, 2001, when it surged. Plus, there is generally low propensity among women to join the military.

I suspect this result may be a matter of selective recall due to the socialization process that takes place during military indoctrination courses and continues throughout one's career. It also could be a matter of respondent bias towards socially desirable responses, foregoing the more practical, occupational reasons. On the other hand, respondents truly may have had a desire to serve their country, since many came from military families.

The other popular responses, "Wanted a challenging job," "Wanted to travel," "Wanted adventure," and "Wanted a job with leadership opportunity," all show that these women were not what could be considered "average" women. They appeared to want to challenge the status quo and the military seemed like an adventurous way to do so.

Besides these reasons, other reasons respondents gave for joining included educational opportunities/GI Bill/tuition assistance, possibility for both spouses to

have a career in the same field, and increased opportunities for women. Here are

some of the women's written responses:

> Retiree R50: "To repay USA for giving me and my parents a 2nd start after
> we immigrated as refugees."

> Retiree R53: "I majored in education. My parents were both educators. I knew
> what my life would be like, and I wanted something different."

> Retired Reserve R2R: "Wanted to experience the current events [Vietnam War]
> first hand."

> Retired Reserve R11R: "It paid for school. I didn't really 'need' the money, but it
> was attractive to have school paid for and have a monthly stipend."

> Reservist 11R: "Wanted to be a flight nurse."

> Reservist 19R: "Wanted to earn the education benefits for college."

> Reservist 27R: "I was married to an officer and he encouraged me to join."

> Reservist 31R: "Felt it was what I was called to do. Every personality test I took
> suggested "military officer" as a good fit for who I am."

> Reservist 33R: "Wanted equal pay for equal work. Wanted equal promotion
> opportunities."

It appears that the reasons for joining are a combination of "institutional" values

and pragmatic "occupational" realities (Moskos 1988). To the question, "What were

your career goals when you first joined?" the most prevalent answer from Regular

respondents was, "Get out after initial obligation" (61%) was the most popular, and "Stay

as long as it was fulfilling" (20%) was second. The most popular Reserve respondents

was "Stay as long as it was fulfilling" (47%). Twenty-six percent answered, "Get out

after initial obligation". A few (15%) planned to stay in until retirement. These two

answers were flip-flopped from those of the regulars. This makes sense, as once the

decision was made to transfer to the reserves, it no longer became the primary job and if

the going got too onerous, there would be no reason to stay. For those in the active duty force, once a decision is made to stay past the initial obligation, it becomes more of a commitment, as each year away from the civilian workforce impacts pay and retirement benefits available in the civilian workforce. Only 11% of the Regular respondents entered with the idea of staying until retirement.

Regardless of the respondent's reasons for choosing a career, staying in, however, appears to have been a combination of factors that add up to be something that is enjoyable and yet gives a sense of satisfaction. Most stayed because they loved almost everything about the military. When asked why they stayed, the most popular answer for regular respondents was "Enjoyed the leadership and other opportunities" (90%), but this was followed closely by "Enjoyed the challenge" (88%) and "Felt like I was making a difference" (85%). The least popular reason for staying for both the regular and reserves was "Enjoyed the benefits" (47%). For the reserve respondents, 84% stayed because they enjoyed the leadership and other opportunities, followed closely by "enjoyed the work" and "enjoyed the challenge."

Retiree R89: "Loved everything about it - perfect occupational choice for me!"

Active A4: "Quality people, dedicated to the mission and each other."

When asked when they decided to make the military a career, over half of the regular respondents said "other" than the answers available on the survey, and wrote in answers, some of which are noted below. About 29% said they decided, "After I made O-3." The reserve responses were slightly different, with 15% answering "When I came in", 15% answering "After I made O-3," and 11% answering "When I was offered my

174

second job/tour. A surprising number (24%) said they really had not planned on it, it just

happened. A few said, "After I made O-4"or "After 10 years." Other responses include:

> Active A16: "After 1st command as LT…decided to stay longer than 2
> years…went year by year after that."

> Active A24: "When I signed up for fully funded grad school + had a 6 year
> obligation taking me to 16 yrs svc – then did not make sense to get out before 20."

> Reservist 2R: "Never decided - just stayed for the experience."

> Reservist 5R: "I don't know that I ever made the conscious decision to make the
> military a career. I really like what I do."

> Reservist 21R: "When I passed 20 years."

> Retiree R71: "During 5th year while assigned in Korea. My commander
> appreciated the contribution I made and was encouraging."

> Retiree R74: "My third assignment was wonderful - felt part of a team and
> growing professionally."

> Retiree R80: "Not sure that I ever intended to stay 30 years - time just passed and
> I continued to love my work."

> Retiree R89: "After a one year civilian hiatus to please hubby #1, I came back in
> to make it a career."

Few of the GFOs ever imagined themselves as General or Flag officers. When

asked, "Did you manage your career with the goal of becoming a General/ Flag Officer?"

few of the GFOs answered yes. Of the regular respondents, 94% answered "No" and

83% of the reserve respondents said "No." Management of their career did not seem to

be uppermost in their thoughts. This may be due to the tenuous position of women in the

military for many years. Policies that opened up opportunities under one presidential

administration were threatened to be rescinded under another. This happened at the

beginning of the first Reagan administration at the urging of the Army (Holm 1993). It

also happened as recently as 2005 when a member of Congress wanted to restrict Army women from jobs they had been doing successfully. Neither of the threatened events occurred, but it does give women the idea that they are expendable personnel and therefore may not trust that their service will be continuous. Many of the Respondents seemed to stay the course only because they liked it, but did not think they had any chance for becoming a GFO.

> Active A5: "Did not think I was competitive - knew my performance was but did not feel my career path put me in the running."

> Active A1: "At no time did this cross my mind. My goal was to be a [Battalion Commander], retire at 20 and go to seminary. I was always told to take the tough jobs and good things would happen."

> Active A38: "Not something I thought about or concentrated my efforts toward. I did take advantage of every opportunity to grow personally and professionally."

> A highly unusual answer:

> Reservist 23R: "I knew from the time I was a 2nd LT that I could be a general. In selection for O-6 command I knew I would be."

Of course, women in the earlier cohorts (40s, 50s, 60s) were not eligible for GFO ranks due to the legal limitations on women's promotion opportunity until the late 1960s. Also, timing played a part, in that in some communities there may be only one General or Flag officer opening every two or three years, and the respondents may not have thought they were eligible when those positions were becoming vacant. This was a poorly worded question, however, as my intent was to get at the planning of a career with the focus on upward progression, rather than an end goal of GFO.

However, there did come a time when the respondents began to think that maybe becoming a GFO was a possibility, often with successful command tour as an O-6, a high

visibility job as an Executive Assistant or Military Aide, or early selection for one or

more promotions (in fact, about 15% indicated that they had been selected for early

promotion at least once in their careers). A better perspective on the subject was given

by the answers to the follow-on question, "At what point did you think you had a good

chance for selection to O-7?" Some typical answers follow:

> Retired Reserve R17: "When a Flag position was created for the Reserve Fleet Support Community. Before that I was competing against warfare qualified officers."

> Reservist 26R: "The opportunity for Army Nurse Corps-Reserve Component O-7 was not an option until 1991. At that time I began goal-setting for the opportunity to be competitive for this leadership role."

> Retiree R44: "November 1967 when President Johnson signed the law that rescinded the legal grade ceiling on military women."

> Retiree R79: "I recognized that I had as good chance as many/some of my contemporaries about three years before my selection. At that point I was selected for an assignment in a command that would 'boost your visibility'."

> Active A37: "All too early. After being the first woman [in a high level position at an academy], an academic All-American [athlete], and [other honors], others have had very high expectations for a very long time. As a [line officer] as well, I have enjoyed command opportunities in the squadron, group [and higher] levels."

> Active A40: "The day the list was released."

Many of the respondents did not think they were in the running at all for GFO,

and expressed their surprise when they were promoted, or were asked to submit a

promotion package to the Board. Some had already planned to retire until they found out

they were promoted.

> Reservist 24R: "I was surprised to get a request to take a position that came with promotion. I had actually planned to retire at my previous assignment."

> Retiree R26: "There was only one O-7 position for ANG Nurses & timing was not going to work out. I was preparing to retire as an O-6 when unexpectedly the

Adjutant General asked me to accept the position of assistant Adjutant General for Air. I had to leave the Nursing Career Field [to take the position]."

In the later cohorts, once the limitations for women were removed, many of the women realized that they were competitive. When they were promoted to O-6 and had taken jobs that included command, and met all of the other requirements, e.g. JPME, they felt they had as good a chance as anyone.

Reservist 20R: "Solid performance is the most reliable indicator of a person's potential."

Retired Reserve R111R: "When I made O-6, other [Colonels] and [Generals] told me I had a good shot, which opened my eyes to that possibility. Before, I was just focused on serving and doing my current job."

Reservist 8R: "As a Colonel I had had a great variety and diversity of assignments and had done all of the schools asked of me. I had successful command and joint experience. After that it's just luck and timing."

Reservist 10R: "When I was selected as Chief of Staff of a Regional Readiness Command… I realized I had at least a chance of being considered seriously."

Active A41: "As I became a more senior officer, people started to plant the idea in my brain that I could be eligible/competitive for Flag. I never had that goal. However, others seemed to see the traits in me. It never was about me!"

Active A46: "When I was promoted early to Colonel and later when I was selected for Wing Command."

Active A51: "When selected for O-6 in 1994. I was 6 years early and knew that O-7 was possible for early promotes to O-6. I was counseled by an O-7 at the time about how the process would work."

Thus, we can see that the women perceived a combination of performance, challenging jobs, and selection for command as indicators of promotion potential. However, clearly articulated in many of the responses was the support and encouragement they received from their superiors in the chain of command and others

who saw them as being competitive not only to be promoted to GFO, but who had the

skills and leadership ability to be a GFO.

<u>An Institutional Perspective</u>

Many of the women who were contacted for this project felt that "success"

defined by their rank in the military was focusing on the wrong thing. Many discussed

success from the perspective of making a difference, meeting the mission, taking care of

the troops, or just doing the best job possible at the job they were doing. All of these

perspectives show that these officers have a more institutionally minded standpoint, as

Moskos (1988) defined it: the job as a calling. While working hard and meeting the

mission seems to be not so much a strategy as common sense, it shows that in general,

the respondents have embraced the traditional perspective of the military as a profession.

Because it is not motivated by self-service, but of selfless service, it is recognized and

rewarded by the members of the institution.

> Active A4: "I measure success by those around me and rejoice in having a part in others success…Success is not necessarily making O-7, it's in the meeting the needs of the mission and people <u>each day</u>!"

> Active A6: "Did not think [making Flag] was primary to my career, so really never drove myself in this direction. I have enjoyed all of my assignments and feel quite fulfilled. Flag rank was simply the "icing on the cake."

> Active A32: "I truly believe my success as a military officer (and a person) is not based on the grade one achieves or how much money one makes. To me success means you've made a difference in someone's life. It might have been the enlisted person you took the time to recommend for officer training school who is now a Captain, or the young officer you mentored along the way that is now a field grade officer and a good commander. Success is all about growing your replacement over and over again, and investing time in people to help them achieve their potential. I'm successful because people along the way did that for me. I am a believer in servant leadership. When people see you working hard for them, they're going to work hard for you."

Reservist 6R: "My 'success' is about the team and not the result of individual achievement - I hope more than 'success' I have been a person of positive impact."

Turning Negative Situations into Positive Outcomes

One of the commonalities that is revealed throughout the survey answers is the passion these women say they have for what they are doing. They love their work, love the troops, love their branch of service, and love their country. They also have a wonderful attitude that translates into behavior that fosters teamwork. Many of the women whom I interviewed spoke of "the glass half full" perspective. Others used the old adage, "When life hands you lemons, make lemonade!" My favorite was "Bloom where you are planted." General Kennedy also spoke of the need for the ability to see the good in every situation in her biography (which was discussed in Chapter 5).

From the perspectives of these GFOs, I have concluded that a positive attitude may be the most important quality to being successful. You can be smart, you can work hard, you can be competent, you can meet all of the career milestones, but unless you have a good attitude and perform well under trying circumstances, then you are just not going to succeed in an organization like the military. The majority had such an attitude and it appears to have been a key to their abilities to do a good job, develop mentors and protégés, take opportunities when presented, as well as attain general/flag rank.

Retiree R107: "I considered negative tours - places I did not want to go or things I did not want to do - into positive tours."

Retiree R79: "Military supervisors/leaders - the good ones taught me how to be an effective and successful leader; the poor ones taught me methods/styles to avoid."

Active A4: "I celebrate the wonderful airmen I've served with and mentors who have trusted in and who have believed in me."

Active A43: "Every enlisted, civilian & officer I've ever worked for, good and bad."

Reservist 128R: "I have been extremely fortunate to have mentors (all male) who picked me out of the crowd and provided me with guidance and a valuable sounding board. Some were officers and some were enlisted soldiers."

What may have allowed the passion and enthusiasm of the respondents for their career and work in the military, and the ability to overcome negative circumstances, was the availability of social support networks and supportive interpersonal relationships. Many of the respondents' remarks noted reliance and support of others in helping them to meet their goals. The next section will examine this situation more closely.

Social Support: Mentoring and Networking

Mentoring appeared to be one of the most important aspects of an ability to be successful, and may be the second key to success for these military women. It appears that having mentors could be an advantage that others who do not have mentors do not enjoy. It made me wonder if the "good old boys" network was still alive and well, only now it includes some women. I spoke to only one woman who felt that she did not have a mentor or sponsor in her branch of service to advise her in her career, in fact, quite the contrary. But she did have people in other agencies supporting her in important ways:

Interviewee/Retiree R93: "No way. I don't think many people singled me out. It's interesting. There are many different worlds in the Navy... I was singled out as somebody to pay attention to because 'We don't want her to go too far.' I don't think that anybody really fostered my war fighting skills or ever really wanted me to succeed. I didn't make Flag because [of my community affiliation]. I made Flag because I'm an inter-agency specialist. I made Flag because of all my work [for organizations outside of, but related to, the Navy] and proving myself at that level... That's why I made Flag...within the inter-agency, people who were not Navy saw my talent and fostered me and promoted me through the system. The

181

year that I made Flag I think was a unique year. I think there were unique people on that selection board."

The vast majority of respondents, though, did have mentors, advisors, and sponsors who helped them navigate the system. Many indicated that they began to be "groomed" early on, with superior officers telling them they were "flag material". One interviewee was very candid and explicit about it:

> Interviewee Retiree R84: "If you are a serious contender for Flag, people tell you that. In fact, they do a really bad thing. They tell you that you're next. So there are a lot of signals that you're in the running for Flag. People advise you what jobs you should be taking or that you should take a particular job because it's important for you to have this experience. I think the number of people who are picked for Flag where there is no indication that they're even a serious contender are rare. It's not that it doesn't happen. I've been on boards where people who got that tour were clearly dark horses. Most of the people have been told that they have a good shot. A lot of people who have been told that they have a good shot for a long time don't make it."

For most women, though, they were surprised and grateful when they were singled out and given opportunities. Many of these women would probably have made it to GFO ranks had they not had mentors, but it appears to have helped a great deal, and may explain why they have such positive attitudes. They were both appreciated and told early in their careers how good they were. They were given outstanding evaluations. Their mentors guided them. They had doors opened for them through which they leapt.

> Active A60: "Good seniors who were willing to step out of the box and assign me to positions to keep me competitive with my peers."

> Retiree R10: "I had great teachers, one in particular… taught me never to go into a fight I could not win. In other words, get all your 'ducks in a row,' get a reputation for always winning and no one would take you on. You had to prepare and do the groundwork to make it happen, but for me it worked. Is winning important? You bet it is!"

> Retired Reservist R3R: "My success as a military officer resulted from having several forthright mentors who cared about me and took the time to guide me throughout my 26 year career."

Reservist 6R: "I had great leaders and mentors who taught me well and helped me to grow."

Interviewee Active A17: "I experienced a lot of positive mentoring and sponsorship throughout my career. It was presented in a number of different forms; occasions where they averted me from doing something that would have been damaging to my career but I only had a short-term view of success. [There were] times when proposals were conceived for me. Challenges for me to think about what I want and what was my path to articulate those properly and start thinking more strategically. There were a number of influences in my life where senior officers took the time to really talk through these types of issues with me. …What was communicated to me was, 'Here's a path you should think about. Here are some of my perspectives on success.' I just followed those."

Interviewee Reservist 30R: "There was a Captain-select in my unit, a supply guy, who I think had been trying to mentor me and I was not open to it. When the call came through [that I had not been selected for Commander], I was really impressed with him because he called me when it came through. You know how hard that is if you've had to tell somebody… 'You didn't get selected.' I was amazed that he could buck up and call me and tell me that news. I had to ponder it for a few days, and I finally called back and said, 'Alright, I'm ready to listen.' So he started me on the path, opening doors and helping me along the way."

Retiree R2: "I was chosen by a mentor, who guided me and my career. Later, I had other mentors, mostly men, who guided me into general-ship."

Many of the mentoring statements like the last echo General Kennedy's advice about mentors; they pick you out, not the reverse. As a result of their experiences with mentors, many of the women consciously mentor others, both men and women. In fact, all of the interviewees noted that they do not limit their protégés to women.

Reservist 12R: "I care about my staff and do all I can to create opportunities for them to excel. I see my role as one to remove barriers and ask about what ifs and possibilities."

Retiree R90: "I believe that it is important to network with people, both men and women. People can give you valuable information and they can teach you how to get things done. When I was a junior officer there were so few women who could help you and give you advice that it was especially important to network with both men and women. Now there are more women who have been through it all and can give you their perspective."

Interviewee Active A17: "I always felt a commitment to assisting young ladies who were coming up a professional path in an organization, which is still not reflecting women in leadership positions to the degree that one would hope or expect. So I've always felt like that was an important responsibility and commitment…But it's not just the women that I mentored. Frankly, the best mentors I've had have been senior male officers because there are more of them. I've mentored young men as well."

Due to the skewed ratio of men to women in the military, most of the female GFOs had male mentors. A few, though, had female mentors whom they specifically mentioned, probably because it was so rare when most of the respondents were rising through the ranks.

Retiree R90: "One of my mentors was one rank ahead of me. She was a very strong person with a clear idea of what women ought to be doing. I thought we worked well together and she was a great ally. She was also somebody who could help me think my way through my emotions to the issues, particularly when I was working on equal opportunity issues at the [Personnel staff]. When you see blatant discrimination, there are a lot of emotions. She was instrumental in helping me sift through the facts, put an argument together, and act."

Interviewee Reservist 30R: "[The first time] that anybody actually sat down and said, 'You have what it takes to go the distance' was [a] female [Reserve] Admiral, a line Admiral that I worked for. It was the first time anybody [had done any] mid-term counseling…for me. They just blew it off. [So, she called me in for mid-term counseling, and I brought all the information to report about my job] and she said, 'Put that aside. I've got things to talk with you about.' And she had a plan. I was flabbergasted because the rest of [my community's male Admirals] at that time that I worked with told me to forget it, that I did not have what it took. I didn't have any kind of glorious civilian job. They just said, 'No. The way we look at it is you have to have this great civilian job that we can crow about, and you can bring what you know from that into what we do in the Navy. You'll never make it. We won't pick you. You haven't had the kind of career path that we're looking for.' Everybody was telling me 'no'. She was the first one who looked at me and said, 'I think there could be a yes'."

Of course, because of their visibility as one of a few women GFOs within their respective branches, they do get calls from women, looking to the female GFOs as role models and possible mentors. Many also get calls from their peers, asking them to help

184

out junior officers or senior enlisted, or the prospective protégé may work in the GFOs

command.   Finding protégés can be a combination of all of the above.

> Interviewee Active A63: "[Finding protégés is] very informal. I go out and kind of find some, and sometimes I'm approached. This particular one, I kind of offered. Somebody pointed out to me that she was in a challenging position. I had never even met her, so made a phone call and we played phoned tag and did emails. She said, 'Oh, I'm so glad I have someone to talk to.' So, it's like a combination."

But finding women protégés appears to be something the women GFOs really like

doing, especially because so many of them did not have that opportunity.

> Interviewee Active A5: "I actually have a Reserve Officer that I'm working with right now. It happens to be a woman that I think has tremendous potential. She second-guesses herself a lot. Her husband is in the Coast Guard; she's a working mom. She's a very talented woman. But I've probably been more active coaching her and just offering her some feedback, affording some opportunities. I've got her going to a strategic session right now to give her some exposure to some more senior officers and sort of broaden her out. I have looked for training opportunities. I've looked or opportunities on my own staff as leadership opportunities, training, recognition, and so forth. I've really tried to push things."

> Interviewee Active A63: "I actually had somebody recently who I mentored. She was in a very highly visible position. She is breaking new territory and felt very lonely going through the process. But it all goes back to truly being true to what your dreams are, true to yourself, being who you are because that's the most comfortable you can be, and going after the things you're passionate about, building your credibility with true, honest, hard work. But be honest to yourself and treat others well, to me, is the formula for living a good life. So figure out and learn about who you are, and adapt yourself to the environment you're in. Use some judgment."

> Interviewee Retiree R29: "I still have people come to me. There's a young West Point graduate, a Lieutenant Colonel, who sends me e-mails. I met her up at the Academy event last March when we were up there for the big 30th…But she asked me for career advice. I asked her, 'What are your goals? What do you want to achieve? What do you hope to have at the end of your service? What jobs do you want? What preparation are you into for those jobs? Do you think this is something you really want to do, or do you feel you're doing it because you have to do it? In other words, what's in your heart? What do you want?'"

One GFO explained not only how she picks protégés, but also how she helps them

along; and how they may or may not get dropped along the way. This is an inside look

into the whole process:

> Interviewee Reservist 30R: "You know the Captain select that I told you about?
> So when I finally got promoted he said to me something very interesting, and I
> tell everybody that is in this boat the same thing. He said, 'Now that this has
> worked for you and you've gone through this, you have to use this to help others.
> You need to mentor others to get through what you had to go through. I asked
> him the question, 'How am I going to know who I need to look after, who I need
> to mentor?' Because you really can't do it for everyone, you have to recognize
> that. He said, 'They will make themselves known to you. Don't worry, they will
> make themselves known.' And he is so right. The people just pick themselves -
> the ones who I really foster.
>
> It's not just the ones who work the hardest. It's kind of a combination. I have to
> see a spark in them, frankly. It's the ones not only who work hard, but who work
> smart, and who can maintain perspective and balance in things, and that I think
> are visionary enough to think beyond themselves. My motto is service above self.
> It's not about you. And anytime I see somebody working or trying to maneuver
> around because it's to their personal benefit, here's the one that I shun because I
> do not think that that's the answer. I think if you work for the greater good, it
> helps you in the long run, so you just have to get over yourself. As soon as I see
> somebody maneuvering in a selfish, egotistical way, they're off my radar. But the
> ones that show me that they can think well beyond their borders and well beyond
> what the 'as-is' [sic] is to what it could be, those are the ones that I'm looking for.
>
> So then what I try to do is just little bitty things. Much of it is way behind the
> scenes, just like I know [another Admiral] did for me. It's the quiet stuff that
> frankly they have no clue that I'm doing it, and I don't want them to know. You
> know, the whispering in the right ears that you do or the opportunities that you
> make available to them, but they just think kind of dropped in their lap. I wait to
> see if they take advantage of that. If I present them an opportunity so their foot is
> in the door, do they push the door open and go through, or do they just sit on the
> sidelines? If they sit on the sidelines, they're done. So I winnow them down that
> way. So then you get a handful that you really think have the potential."

Some found the lack of female role models, especially in non-traditional fields, to

be a detriment, and wanted to remedy the situation. However, it was not always looked

on as a good thing. Through the years mentoring meant "special treatment" that was

reserved for "the good old boys." When women try to establish networking

opportunities, they are often discouraged, either officially or through peer ribbing and

snubbing. As Kanter (1977a) suggested, when one is a token, the majority does not like

to see a group of "the other" together for fear of some sort of insurrection. What they do

not realize is that the minority are just trying to figure out how to navigate the system.

> Interviewee Retired R93: "I'm disappointed that when I was an O5, I didn't have more women friends and disappointed that as an O-6, I didn't have role models. It's that big of a disappointment. It's big. I was mentoring when I was an O-5; I was mentoring when I was an O-6 of the younger women. I tried really hard. When I became Flag, I was able to finally get that mentoring officially sanctioned by [the Navy]. I knew I had to be sanctioned, or I was going to be shot because I had been shot over the years by male seniors because I was fomenting insurrection among the women. I've got to tell you, that was really amazing how many times I took it in the side of the head, in the back, I mean, huge chest wounds from being creamed by 'why did the women have to get together?' I would have women's get-togethers at every opportunity. I would pay for it out of my own pocket. I would pay for a reception just to get women together and to see the faces…When the Ensigns came into the room and we all said where we were and what course we were in, it dawned on them that from Ensign to Major command, there were women. There weren't a lot of us, but there were women, and there was somebody at the top and there was somebody all the way down to them. That's when I knew that all of my energy spent in getting these women together was the important thing to do … that's my success, being able to each people who to do that."

The stigma of women networking together appears to be getting less common.

And the extremely negative reaction, such as described above, was not mentioned by any

of the other women I interviewed. Senior women, especially, such as the one above,

understand the need to network and mentor women, even if in a group.

> Interviewee Active A17: "So I've always developed a camaraderie, but a more formalized camaraderie amongst the ladies that I work with in whatever area I've been assigned. As a matter of fact, there was a kind of tongue-in-cheek name for it. I was called the SCGOGN [pronounced 'skoggin'], Supply Corps Good Old Gals Network. It started out as going to lunch and having a great social time, but it really always was, 'Let's talk about what is the meaning of professional success. How do we do that? How do we be successful professionally and personally as a woman and hold those things important that are meant by being a woman, too. You can be a very, very successful woman in an organization that is very male oriented, so how do you do that?'"

One interviewee realizes its importance, but has not participated in formal

networking.

> Interviewee Active A63: "I think the older I get, the more I think [networking] is important. I never have been very good at that. I've never been very good at formal networking per se. I think it's just because I've been so busy through my career that I've never thought twice about it; next, next, next, keep going. I think it's probably important for a lot of different reasons. We often don't realize how much we can give to each other or how much we can learn from each other, and all those are good things.

Others understand the need to network with the men, and work their way into

those groups when they have the opportunity.

> Interviewee Retiree RA10: "The thing is, there are a lot of opportunities for men to bond. They go and play sports; they go in the locker room or the men will bond [undecipherable], but the women are not given that same opportunity. When I went to Air Force conferences, in particular, this is a service joke, I know, but starting as a Major, every conference I went to had a golf tournament associated with it. If you don't play golf, if you don't get out on the golf course, you don't get to bond. It's a great opportunity to learn about people on the golf course - Guess who learned how to play golf? Not very well, mind you, but the fact that you're even out there. So what you need to do [is to] participate to be given the opportunity."

An important finding is that many of the married respondents indicated that their

spouses served as their mentors. This was a valuable asset, not only in helping

respondents balance work and family life, but in having an understanding partner when

that inevitable midnight call comes in and you have to get up and go to work. Being

married to a man who was, or had been, in the military was beneficial in many respects.

> Retired Reservist R26R: "Most helpful was being married to a man who was in the Reserves until his retirement, he understood the military and was totally supportive. He has never been intimidated by my rank and was comfortable in any environment he attended with me. My male peers were all envious as to how he accepted my status. He did travel with me, especially to the Washington DC social functions and participated in the female spouse activities."

Retired Reservist R3R: "My husband, also a reserve officer, I believe contributed the most to my career."

Retired Reservist R17R: "[The military enabled me to become] closer to my husband (also military) because of common goals/bond" and "My husband taught me to trust myself. Invaluable!!"

Reservist 20R: "Plenty of mutual support from spouse [and] family members."

Reservist A33R: "Great husband who shared responsibility and encouraged me."

Active A24: "I have a very supportive husband. So we try to create date time on weekends or during the week. We also communicate every night for 1 hour before going to bed even if we are deployed we email each other every day."

Active A56: "My husband was a mentor to me. He was and is my harshest critic and my staunchest supporter."

Retiree R5: "Husband very supportive. Met each other at various places if I was out of the area. Did this many, many times."

Another noted that her husband, a military retiree, was very supportive and even helped her by documenting her career, such as keeping track of awards and the circumstances surrounding their award. He also maintained her military résumé, with dates of service and job title. This way, she has an all the information ready for people like me, who wanted that information.

Interviewee/Active A35: "[My husband] is key to my success… He'll just do something that will help me, and he'll come home and say, 'hey, I was thinking about this and I did this for you.' And something as simple as, like when I was on the Joint Staff and we did an award ceremony. He called the scheduler in the front office and found out what award I was going to get, and had my ribbons re-done with the new award. So the General pinned me with the new award, and [my husband] came up right after the ceremony with this new set of ribbons. So at the reception I was in the right uniform with the correct ribbon set."

It appears that being married to another military member, or one who had experience in the military, was a benefit that cannot be ignored. Respondents who are divorced, or married more than once indicated that their marriage did not survive a

jealous and non-supportive husband. Their response was not to accept the lack of support, but to divorce them and continue their careers. The respondents who had military spouses felt it not only enhanced their personal relationship, but it also enhanced their career progression.

For those who never married, however, the military could become very isolating. A woman without a husband, or who does not date, becomes suspect as a lesbian. Perhaps their solitude was indicative of other issues, like being workaholics or being unable to figure out how to balance work and personal time. For those who never married in later cohorts, many just never found a suitable mate, or one who was supportive of her career intentions.

> Active A60: "More senior I became, fewer opportunities to meet/socialize - frequent moves."
>
> Retiree R93: "Constantly moving (every two years); long hours… deployments… all limited my ability to find and then nurture a lasting relationship. After a while, I just gave up on trying."
>
> Retiree R51: "Difficult to develop relationships when I moved 10 times in my first 14 years. When I was promoted early, I think I was seen as a threat."
>
> Reservist 24R: "I hesitated to commit to anything long-term due to pending location changes."
>
> Reservist 23R: "When you work on a military base it is difficult to make friends in the community. While in the Army Reserve the time spent with duty made it difficult to keep up with friends."
>
> Interviewee/Retiree R44: "When you're in command and you're not married you're very lonely. You really don't have anybody you can talk to. You don't have a spouse, and you can't have any girlfriends."
>
> Interviewee/Retiree R93: "It's very lonely in command…and there really isn't anybody to talk to. You had to be satisfied with very little other professional contact, and it was very lonely. I probably handled that by running. I was [deployed] all the time. So you are able to deal with it by being [deployed] and worrying about [doing your job]."

Thus, mentoring and being mentored are very important parts of the process of doing a good job, proving your worth, and overcoming barriers like negative work environments. If you catch the eye of a powerful supporter, you may be helped without even realizing it. He/she will work behind the scenes for you, and it is up to you to walk through the open door. Networking is also an important part of the process of "learning the ropes," building teamwork, and camaraderie. When you are known socially, or in a group of similar professionals, it may help not only in getting "good" jobs, but also in being selected as a protégé.

Not everyone gets mentored. If, as General Kennedy says, the prospective protégé cannot ask to be mentored, then what is the alternative? From what the interviewees told me, the answer is to work hard, take opportunities when given, get the mission accomplished, and make yourself known via networking. Apparently, if you have what it takes, someone will notice you. The whole process seems to be a bit like the "good old boys network" even though the respondents seem to make it a point to be gender neutral in their selection of protégés. On the other hand, even if you have all of the qualifications, but no one knows you, you may not be privy to that important opportunity. It appears it can be a somewhat unfair, but important aspect, of making it to the elite ranks of the military.

<u>Hard Work and Taking the Hard Jobs</u>

When pressed for their perspective on why they were successful military officers, hard work and technical competence were the top reasons given. Outstanding performance is related to this as well, as one cannot continue to be promoted if one does

191

not produce outstanding results. Other behaviors that they felt contributed to their

success were "perseverance," "tenacity," "discipline," "devotion to duty," "good work

ethic," and "mission accomplishment." Not being afraid of hard work, taking the hard

jobs, and doing well at them were all very important.

> Interviewee Active A63: "My very first assignment was not where I learned to bloom where you're planted, but there was something similar. It was, 'You always need to focus on the job you're doing and be the very best you can at that job.' So from day one, that's what I did. It's amazing when you do that how things take care of themselves. If you're focused on doing the very best that you can at what you have responsibility to do, there are lots of things. One, it makes you very good at your job. Two, that obviously helps the mission be successful. Three, for me it takes a lot of frustration away because I'm not looking around going, 'Oh, I need to be getting [this or that] rung of the ladder.' No, I need to be right here doing what I'm being asked to do and do it the very best I can and better."

> Retired Reservist R11R: "I was willing to take the hard jobs - jobs others didn't want because they demanded too much time/work. Those jobs/experiences taught me a lot and prepared me well for future leadership positions."

> Retiree R51: "I worked very hard at every job I had regardless of how important or unimportant it seemed at the time."

In addition, they felt they had to be much better than their male peers, to be able

to "break out" when it came time for evaluations and subsequent promotion. This

awareness of having to do it better crossed all cohorts, service branches, and whether

regular or reserve.

> Retiree R56: "I had to do it better, longer, stronger than male counterparts."

> Active A37: "Always exceeding the standards as well as (too often) the expectations of others."

> Active A55: "Hard work, an awareness I had to be "better" than the competition both on paper and in communication, relationship skills."

> Retired Reservist R116R: "Working harder, longer & smarter than my colleagues & being fortunate that the system does work sometimes for some people."

Active A48: "I always joked, I had to work harder to be equal. I joined the military in the late 1970s and women were not taken serious [sic] with respect to having a full Army career (20 years). I was frequently asked when was I going to get out. Geez. What happened to 'what are your goals, desires, what do you want to do in the Army?'"

Reservist 39R: "Yes - the "all male club" held me to a higher standard until I established myself."

<u>Integrity and Doing the Right Thing</u>

Many of the women were proud to say that they managed to make it to Flag or General Officer without being negatively labeled. They respected and protected their subordinates, taking the shots when things went wrong, and sharing the glory when the mission was successfully accomplished. "Doing the right thing" and "speaking truth to power" was important to the success of many respondents.

Retiree R32: "Basically living the golden rule, integrity…"

Retiree R36: "I didn't seek controversy but I was not adverse to taking a "different' tack [sic]. Honesty, integrity, loyalty, proactive - the country, the Navy (it's [sic] people) in that order."

Retiree R94: "Insisted on taking the right path - but gave those heading a wrong way a private way to reset course - this is about integrity, not politics."

Retiree R44: "Not care who got the credit when things went well and take the blame when they didn't."

Reservist 128R: "If a senior officer asked for my opinion, I gladly told them the unvarnished truth."

Reservist R3: "Being humble and not flaunting your successes will do more than imaginable to ensure respect and trust."

Active A21: "A willingness to listen and to learn from others, an ability to get along well with people, and an ego that is in check."

The "Right" Jobs

Along with hard work, having the right experiences in the right jobs, those that are hard, that involve command, that are high visibility, and are joint service, are also important. Many of the respondents indicated that once they had successfully accomplished their O-6 commands, or were selected for a high visibility job at the White House or the Pentagon, then they knew they had a better than even chance for selection.

> Retiree R93: "Taking the E-ring [Pentagon leadership location] and high visibility jobs in which you could learn "how things really worked." Having a willingness to be Joint[44] before the USN began to think about Joint."

> Active A3: "When I was selected (early) for O-6 it was clear I could choose to stay competitive by accepting certain jobs (and doing well in them). If I had not accepted the positions offered, I would have removed myself from the competitive pool of candidates."

> Retiree RA10: "Always choose a good job (and step-up jobs) over location. I learned more on remotes to Turkey and Korea, in a shorter timeframe."

> Active A42: "Ability to work well in Washington - not my favorite assignment but learned a lot."

> Reservist 26R: "Giving and serving in all areas of my military assignments. Accepting challenges and being a person who wants to make positive changes."

> Reservist A33R: "Delivering results ~ exceeding expectations. Taking difficult tasks and turning them into successes. Taking on a lot of additional duties. Attitude. Bold. Persistent. Luck."

> Retired Reservist 34R: "Integrity. Hard work. Practice at basic leadership. Super parents who were role models for fair, honest treatment; great work ethic and doing what's right even when not popular."

The People and Teamwork

Many of the respondents attribute their success as a military officer to their "troops" and subordinates. They state bluntly that success is not an individual

---

[44] A Joint command is one in which all branches of the military are assigned towards a strategic Department of Defense goal.

achievement but a team effort. They feel that if you take care of your soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines, then they will take care of you by getting the mission accomplished. Again, this is a social support factor that influences one's ability to be an effective leader.

> Retiree R53. "I was successful because of all the great soldiers and civilians with whom I served. I also enjoyed the heck out of being a soldier. Mission and purpose, doesn't get much better than that."

> Retiree R57. "I am very 'people oriented' and consider it an honor to lead an organization."

> Retired Reservist 34R: "Troops respected me. I spent time [with] subordinates during their mid-shifts; guard duties, etc. I truly care and DID/DO take care of my people."

> Active A16: "Took care of my people, tired to make a difference every day, kept sense of humor, could look at myself in the mirror every day."

> Active A24: "I love working with people, caring for the war fighter and building teams to solve problems & extracting the best out of folks."

> Active A45: "Building a good team and letting your team do what you hired them to do."

Leadership Challenges: Being a Woman in a Man's World

Being a woman in the military can be very frustrating; yet these women managed to overcome some of the more boorish behavior of their male peers and superiors and carried on. Many of the respondents had daily frustrations or challenges, but tried not to let it bother them. As mentioned before, they learned from the "bad" leaders as well as the good ones, and turned the tour into a positive experience. In most of the interviews I asked what challenges they faced as a woman in the military. There were a variety of responses, from feeling personally targeted, to just having to deal with issues that men may or may not have to face.

195

Retiree R76: "Throughout my career, I experienced male macho bonding, chauvinism, and various types of harassment. I was expected to over look it and understand it, but not mention or react to it. I managed and prospered because I chose to ignore that but I was very aware of it."

Several respondents offered to speak to me in person rather than write their thoughts down on the survey document. One wrote, "I would offer to speak to you about the change of treatment once I was promoted to O-7. There is a ceiling - disappointed to learn." I called her. It turns out that she was a victim of a vicious slander campaign that derailed her upward progression and forced her to resign. She said:

Interviewee Retired Reservist 34R: "There were 3 white males, reservists, who started these rumors about me, false allegations of wrong-doing, which started an investigation about me. I felt very isolated, no one would tell me what the problem was, no one would talk to me. Before I made O-7, I felt I was part of the team. People valued my opinions, I felt like was of equal standing. Afterwards, there was jealousy. I was always popular with the troops, took care of them. The men, they were just not good leaders. In the Air Force, if you aren't a pilot, you aren't shit, but who says that to be a good leader you have to be a pilot?"

A second woman also expressed her frustration at continually having to battle against the perceived negative attitudes of her male peers. Many of the respondents noted that they had to prove themselves again and again.

Interviewee Retiree R93: "[The attitude of having to prove yourself over and over] was very frustrating…it felt like, 'Here I am doing this all again.' I sent an email to my mother before I [deployed] - who had been a wonderful supporter throughout my whole life and still is, and said, 'I just don't know that I can do this again.' It has taken so much energy from me to constantly prove yet once again that I am 10 times, not 3 times, better than the next guy, and that much better than the guy I'm relieving… not only did I relieve him … but I turned the [unit] around … with tremendous accolades to my crew. They were phenomenal, but it was a team that had to be built."

Interviewee Retiree R77: "It was about acceptance. It was one of the things where you would say it was a negative, because [otherwise] I had a lot of good things to say about the Marine Corps. And I could answer that and say, 'Yes, they're still [not] at the level of acceptance [and] I don't know [that it] will ever come."

I asked one interviewee, an Air Force Academy graduate, if, when she was

at the Academy, she encountered any of the types of sexual harassment behaviors

that made the headlines in 2003.

> Interviewee Active A63: "Sure. Gosh, the first class. You turn a corner figuring out what's next. Sometimes it was a gauntlet just trying to figure out who is doing what to be mean, and who is doing what to take advantage, who is using their position and power over you, and who is not doing anything."

Most of the respondents took the fact of being a woman in a man's world in

stride, and dealt with it the best they good: with good humor, the ability to let it go, and to

understand that they, as women, bring different, but important, perspectives and

leadership abilities to their jobs.

> Retired Reservist 31R: "My husband said this - don't try to be 'one of the boys.' Perhaps it is what we now call 'emotional intelligence', but I am who I am and comfortable in being a wife, mother, grandmother and now retired Army general. I bring a unique perspective to situations and years of experience (and some painful lessons) have taught me how, when and where to make the contribution."

> Reservist 30R: "I finally came to grips with being a woman in a male environment & quit trying to be 'one of the boys.' When I allowed my female inclinations to show, to show that I put people first and truly cared about the, then everything fell into place."

> Active A32: "I grew up in a male dominated career field, and emerged as the first female general to be promoted from that field. It is a very tough career field…because of our various missions, but it taught me a lot. Bottom line, being a female didn't matter as much as being competent in my job and being committed to taking care of my Airmen. I have always downplayed the 'first female' role and concentrated on my job performance and that's contributed to my success."

There were other leadership challenges that provide some insight into what

women have to do on a daily basis or when deployed. Being in a highly visible job,

being "one of" can be a novelty, and could sometimes become quite comical.

Interviewee Active A63: "I can remember from the very beginning because we were a novelty, if you will. People would get on the airplanes to fly with us just because they wanted to see 'how a woman flew.' It's like they're looking at you like an animal in the zoo, you know, what is that third eyeball sticking between your nose? … It's hard. I think [there are] a whole different set of challenges than the men have in this venue because we are different. God made us different for a good reason. Once you recognize them, it certainly helps you deal with them, acknowledge them and work with them better."

Additionally, the spouses at home might be fearful of having a woman in a previously all-male command.

Interviewee A63: "And you didn't mention the other side of that, too: you're the only woman on the ship or deployed, and all the wives of the men, you have to deal with what the men are dealing with the wives who don't trust you and have their imaginations going wild, too, about what's going on, on the road."

Researcher: Did you have some of those issues?

Interviewee Active A63: "Always. Whether it was when I was the one or when I was in command and had the younger group. Yes, you've got to figure out how to handle all of those, but a man never has to. The wives don't worry about what the man is doing downtown or whatever. They just worry about the female officer or enlisted troop that might be with him. It's a double-edged sword. I think we have our work cut out for us that is a little more challenging."

Women also may have to adjust their leadership styles to accommodate what their superiors and peers think is the right way to be a military officer.

Interviewee Active A65: "I was always [raising my hand to take on new projects], and I had fun doing that. And then I realized I had a knack for it. So they would pick me for leadership roles then. It was interesting because someone had told me when I was a Lieutenant Commander, 'You're not right for a leader because you don't kick ass and take names.' I don't believe that, so I would use my methodology. It's interesting, when we were having the Covey Facilitation for Principal Center Leadership as one of the advanced courses, myself and the General, and a group of his primary staff, his Colonels - she [the instructor] was a civilian and she was looking at the collar devices. And she said, 'Do people follow you because of the collar device, or because you're you and what you represent to them?' She says, 'You want them to follow you because you're you. Collar device will change and that person will change.' That struck home. Here, she was talking to Generals like this, and the collar device means a lot to them. But I kind of took that message - 'Will they follow you because they trust you? Will they follow you because you show them the light they are looking for, not

just because you said so? You know, you can have people that command respect because of who they are, or [who] demand it, and I don't want to be the one to demand it. When it got back to that comment about 'You've go tot kick ass and take names to be a leader,' it just wasn't me."

Interviewee Active A17: "The personality profile for a successful Naval Officer is ISTJ [Meyers-Briggs personality profile]. That is the complete reverse of my personality. My personality is ENFP. There are whole different motivations and inclinations, but to be promotable and competent in my career field, I had to emulate that and I kind of had to suppress my natural tendencies to be an ENFP. But the management books also say that many successful senior executives have the same kind of personality that I have, which is extroverted, intuitive, caring about people and being able to perceive across an environment where things are not pure black and while. So, I am very gratified that I was able to master the skills that allowed me to get to a position that I think is going to be very accommodating to my natural ability."

Thus, the challenges that the respondents faced in moving through the military occupational structure not only included having special policies and laws directed at them as women only, but they also had to challenge the military's cultural norms as to what a military officer should be, and they had to be able to address the challenges to their authority and leadership in a tactful way so as not to offend or appear too much like an "Iron Maiden", too tough, too inflexible, and too macho.

Section 2: Taking Advantage of Structural Opportunities

All of the women who are currently General or Flag officers have seen tremendous changes in the military since the 1980s. Many of the non-traditional occupations opened in the mid-to-late 1970s, and these women were able to take advantage of that fact. In contrast, for women in the military in the 1950s through 1970s, the jobs to which they were assigned were considered traditional by civilian standards, although being in the military is non-traditional by anyone's standard. Being a woman in a man's world was not something to be taken lightly.

Active A5: "[In the] early years, I felt under the microscope and felt everything I did was watched. Later, I recognized I also got opportunities I may not have otherwise received."

Active A63: "The Air Force has been great as far as giving women opportunities and trying not to have blinders on. We have had great champions in our leadership, whether it be a Secretary of the Air Force … like Secretary Widnall being the first female Secretary, but also very capable intelligent person. Many of the men who came in from the corporate world understood the importance of taking advantages of all the sources you have, not based on gender. And we've had some very open-minded male senior leadership who have opened opportunities for women to compete based on their merits instead of artificially closing those opportunities. So in that way the Air Force has been very progressive."

Retiree R2: "I attribute my success as a military officer to several things. The first was that I made a decision early that I was going to be a career officer and that I would be the best I could be. I sought further courses and military and professional schools so that I would be well prepared. I took all assignments offered and did a variety of jobs."

Retiree R25: "Incredibly good fortune, good advice from mentors, interest in taking on tough jobs, changing circumstances for women in the military which opened up great opportunities…that I was then given."

Retiree R92: "I attribute some bit of my success to being in the *right place at the right time!* Had I not joined the Navy in the early 70s just as the Navy began planning for women to go aboard ships and; Had I not simultaneously begun to accept that my first marriage was a failure and I needed to move on, and had I not coincidentally been on the staff of a four-star who endorsed my request to go to sea as one of the early volunteers in the Women in Ships program, I might not have gone to sea and seen what the 'real Navy' was all about."

Thus, the respondents recognized the original limitations and were ready to move into new occupations when the military rescinded some of its structural barriers. The women responded by being ready to move into those positions when called upon to do so, and being prepared for more challenging jobs by attaining additional training or pursuing professional military education. They established personal relationships with people who could help them, mostly men due to the scarcity of senior women, and then established their own networks and mentoring relationships. They negotiated the work-family

dilemma by outsourcing housekeeping, childcare, and food preparation. They relied on the support of their spouses and family (both parents and children) to understand the importance of what they were doing. They made it work by using the tools that were available and being the best they could be within a system that originally viewed women as unsuitable for military service. They proved that women could do the job, and they made believers out of many skeptics. Plus, they are happy to share their "secrets" so that others may follow in their footsteps.

Advice from the Experts.

One of the last questions I asked the interviewees was: "What advice would you give other young officers who are coming through the ranks in terms of leadership, and career goals, and those sorts of things?" Many discussed the concepts already discussed, hard work, good jobs, mentoring, networking, being true to yourself as a woman and a person, having a sense of humor, passion, and building and taking care of your team. Here are some other comments.

> Interviewee Active A15: "You can never use your rank to avoid doing something that other people have to do. From a leadership perspective, [you should always be] thinking about the people you work with, thinking about how you're going to make them successful in what they do and how you're going to take care of them. You have to be willing to take that awesome O-3 or O-4 that's working for you, [who] makes your life so much easier because they are working for you, and help them move to another job. You have to give them up and let them go do other things, hard though it is sometimes. Because you recognize their talent, you recognize how easy they make your life. [Because then you'll] have to start all over with somebody new, [but] you've got to do that."

> Interviewee Active A27: "The things that I did that certainly helped were picking the jobs that I loved and being the most fun. For me, fun is something I can do, some I have a talent for as well as there is some novelty in. So picking up the jobs that are fun and know that you can apply your talents to, to have a high level of performance. Things I wish I had done that I think could have made me more successful would be paying deliberate attention to what my own core values were. I think one of the things that helps me survive today is that I make a deliberate

effort to try and pull in spirituality to my job, not of a religious sort, in fact, I'm not a church-goer, but if you don't know your core…if your core isn't strong, you're going to have bad problems. So if you have not examined yourself to know what your core is, from wherever you derive your strength, then when you need that strength the most, you won't know where to go to get at the strength. So those are the two things I would say. Focus on what you do well and have fun at and always be developing new strengths. I'm not a believer in "You should focus on your weakness." Screw that. Focus on your strengths, and you can find new strengths, too. Know from where you draw your strength. Those are the two things that get you promoted, [and] would make you successful.

I did ask one interviewee if she would encourage someone to join the Navy, and why. Here's what she said.

Interviewee Retiree R57: "I would absolutely encourage somebody to join the Navy. After having a career in the military and now being in the civilian community, there are a lot of pros when you're in the military that you don't actually see. You don't see the power of your teamwork, and you don't have that as much in the civilian community. You don't see the power of camaraderie that you have and that you can use in the military that I don't see as visible in the civilian community. I believe that we offer individuals a challenge, and we permit them to fail and help them turn that around into success. Much better than the civilian community because the civilian community can hire and fire at will, and we do not. Somebody signs a commitment, and they know that they're there for three or four years. Therefore, we work with individuals. I think our goal is that everybody will succeed because if everybody succeeds, we succeed. So I really think it's a fabulous opportunity. If individuals come into the military, even if they don't make it a career … if even they're in the military for one or two tours, that's something they will take with them forever. And I think that is the best leadership and management training they could ever get, especially early on in their careers. It might take them 15 years to acquire that in a civilian job what they get from maybe one or two tours of duty in the military. And the kinds of assignments that we have might seem like they're awful; but, do you know what? If you can get through the hard ones, you can get through anything. The hard ones are the ones that really teach you about life, teach you about yourself, teach you about others, and kind of make or break you, so to speak. Most of us when we look back on it can say, 'You never really had any horrible duties." When somebody asks me what were my best duty assignments, I want to say, "all of them and each one for a different reason.' I'd be a recruiter today."

That last statement is an example of the passion and the positive outlook the respondents exhibited. They looked at the whole of their experience and found something good and useful in each individual aspect. They learned from their

experiences but did not let the hard assignments get them down. They made lemonade out of lemons.

Summary

Being a woman in the military has had both its rewards and frustrations. Many of these women maintained their sense of humor, their sense of pride and their feeling that they were making a difference, throughout their career, even when at times it seemed an impossible task. The women GFO respondents embodied the institutional culture of selfless service, embraced the military as a profession, maintained its traditional standards, and most of all maintained an attitude that placed challenges in perspective of the bigger picture of doing their job, doing it well, and ensuring mission accomplishment.

Although not openly stated by the respondents, two aspects seemed to help the respondents in their successful attainment of GFO rank. The first was their ability to see the glass half-full, to take negative situations and make positive outcomes, even if it was to learn how not to do something. The second was the advantage they had in having mentors, people who guided them in their career and gave them advice when needed. The social support and interpersonal relationships formed with bosses, peers, subordinates, and supportive families was key to the ability to navigate the military culture and overcome many of the structural and cultural obstacles of being a woman in a man's world. Having the ability to call on a mentor or spouse for emotional support and advice seems to be a major reason these women were successful.

In sum, this is a self-selected and highly motivated group who joined the military and liked it. All of these women joined when opportunities for them were limited; even though some were able to participate in non-combat shipboard and aircraft duty. They

joined primarily when the United States was involved in a Cold War, but when life at home was relatively peaceful. Many women left the military due to attitudes that kept them from pursuing their dreams. Some of those joined the Reserves, and managed to have both a family life and a part time military career. Women GFOs in both the Reserves and Regular components found husbands with egalitarian attitudes who were very supportive of their careers.

This research project has shown that these women are special in their ability to manage their careers in a very masculine environment and still maintain their integrity and femininity. As the husband of one of the GFOs, a retired BG himself, put it:

"Reflecting on what sets his wife apart from other individuals, [he] said, '[My wife] has succeeded in a man's world yet has retained all of the feminine characteristics that I love her for. She always seems to fit in without sacrificing feminine assets for short-term benefits, and she always maintains her long-term objectives. To me, she has always been a living 'lesson in life' on how to work with people and get the most from each while having fun" (*Quill* on line).

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Senior women in the military are an under-studied group. This project was an exploratory study of the elite women in the military, how they are the same or different from each other in their demographic profiles and their career performance, and how they compare to the research that has been conducted on executive women in the civilian work force. This research focused on how women in the military overcame structural and cultural barriers to succeed in a masculine organization, analyzed work and family balance issues and strategies, as well as interpersonal challenges and social support. Although viewed from an individual perspective, the combination and similarity of answers showed patterns that are important in the interpersonal relationships and the behaviors they exhibited to be able to succeed. I call these "strategies for success."

Opportunity Structures and Structural Barriers.

The literature that was reviewed concerning civilian executive women showed similarities with military women with regard to the issues and strategies they used to reach the pinnacle of their careers. Kanter's (1977a) work on opportunity structure and power informs this discussion. For both groups there were structural impediments that prohibited access to high status jobs. Until the 1960s and 1970s, when labor laws and civil rights legislation were passed, laws, organizational policies, and the structure of the workplace made it very difficult for women to "break through the glass ceiling." Women stalled at the middle management positions.

In the military, the rules against women's promotion to the highest military ranks started changing about the same time as in the civilian workforce. Women who entered

205

the military in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s faced many legal barriers to their full participation in the military. There were limits on their numbers, on their promotion opportunity, and on the types of jobs they could fill.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, rules regarding military women's opportunity and occupational structure went through a radical change. The legal limits on numbers of women allowed in the military and the ceilings on promotion were eliminated in 1967. Three years later, in 1970, the first women GFOs were promoted. In the late 1970s, more occupational specialties were opened, and those structural opportunities continue to grow. Although women are still banned by policy from performing "direct ground combat" jobs, many women are in combat zones while serving in the War on Terror.

Of course, much of the literature on civilian women is focused on white, middle class women. It is easy to see the similarities due to the demographics of the women GFO respondents, who are overwhelmingly white. This study was not able to distinguish differences by race or ethnicity because of the lack of diversity in the female GFO ranks. Yet, there was clearly a difference in opportunity structure of the women who became GFOs. Women of color have a harder labyrinth to negotiate to reach the stars, but a small minority has managed to break through. In viewing the diversity of the rank structure, it will take some time before the demographics at the top of the military mirror the demographics at the base.

Other hindrances to opportunities for women are based in structural barriers, such as combat exclusion laws, and combat co-location policies that prevent military women from serving in certain occupations, or performing their jobs on a world-wide, fully deployable basis. This serves to prevent women from reaching the pinnacle of the

military hierarchy, four-star General or Admiral, which requires combat-trained or combat-experienced line officers to fill those jobs.

The women GFO respondents, however, managed to negotiate the military's power structure and work their way up the system. As in the civilian workplace, women officers face gendered attitudes, structural and institutional barriers, and family commitments which make it difficult for women to achieve high-ranking positions. Unlike the civilian workplace, military women officers also face wartime deployments and legal discrimination on their ability to pursue certain combat jobs.

Negotiating Structural, Cultural, and Interpersonal Boundaries

Davies-Netzley (1998) looked at the strategies a small group of executive women used to climb the corporate ladder. She found that success for civilian women executives appears to depend on three factors. The first is the ability to concentrate on work, either foregoing family formation or assuming a "provider" role rather than a "caretaking" role, a role reversal that goes against cultural norms. The second is attaining more education than their male peers, increasing their human capital and their value to the organization. The third is the ability to break into existing social networks and to develop similarities with male peers, using interpersonal contacts to increase their social support. Of course, success also requires high individual motivation and career aspirations, and the satisfactory accomplishment of their jobs.

Similarly, the military respondents noted that hard work and exceptional performance were expected. No one would get promoted otherwise. For military officers, post-graduate education is becoming a requirement of higher rank attainment for both men and women. However, the motivation to attend, and successfully complete,

Joint Military Professional Education (JPME) is up to both individual aspirations and "needs of the military." In many cases, especially in the Navy, attending military professional schools was secondary to performing well in the "hard" jobs. Thus, the criteria for higher education for women GFOs as compared to civilian executives are different, and have different functions. In the military, it is becoming a necessity for further promotion; in the civilian sector, it is a means of increasing one's human capital in order to stay ahead of the competition.

Role reversal was also a common pattern in the respondent's ability to negotiate the military system. The ideal worker norm is part and parcel of the work requirements for all service members, not just officers. Respondents reacted to this in different ways, some by foregoing marriage and family, some by transferring to reserve status, some by negotiating family chores with their husbands, and some by outsourcing household and child care tasks to a third party. However, by challenging the cultural and military norms, the respondents also had to "do gender," but in a complex manner. They had to maintain their femininity while proving they were as tough as their male peers.

Several respondents indicated that they "did not have a gender chip on their shoulder" or "never played the gender card," a common reaction to working in a male-dominated environment. Many of the women saw themselves as officers first, women second, but also realized gender boundaries in that they could not be like "one of the boys." They had to downplay their femininity (fairly easy when you have to wear a uniform to work every day) and accept some of the perils of being token women, such as increased visibility and loyalty tests. In the end, cultural expectations affected the daily

work behaviors of the respondents, forcing them to adjust their behaviors in order to "fit in" as a woman in a man's world.

As with female civilian executives, the ability to network and work with their male peers is imperative in the military. Networking has always been important in a man's ability to get ahead. Common references to "the good old boy's network" is an indication that social networking is necessary to make oneself known to members of the organization who can help one's career goals and aspirations. Some respondents mentioned that they learned to play golf, or attend social functions in order to develop and maintain working relationships. This type of social networking was perceived as necessary to show that they could be team players, taking time away from their families in order to demonstrate loyalty to the organization and their co-workers. In the Navy these are called "wardroom functions," intended to bring officers together socially who are assigned to the same unit, with the understanding that those who play together will work better together, building camaraderie and mutual understanding. Only occasionally are spouses invited to these events.

Overcoming Leadership Challenges

Interpersonal challenges with co-workers can create a negative environment for women in positions of authority. Although Kanter's (1977a) work on tokens did not directly address executive women, many of the women in both the civilian and military workplace have faced the same issues. These include visibility issues, in which women are constantly being noticed and criticized for small infractions, and not noticed or recognized when they have performed above expectations; loyalty tests, in which women must embrace the masculine culture and workplace dynamics, but not be either too

masculine or too feminine, lest their credibility is challenged. Isolation is also an issue for both military and civilian elites. Both have been excluded from informal networks and social events where men tended to gather and exchange information, yet were discouraged from forming their own "female" networks. Additionally, in the military, the perceived inability to develop female friendships, at the risk of being labeled a lesbian, was an issue, especially for women in the earlier cohorts of the 1940s and 1950s.

However, interpersonal support from mentors, people who counseled the respondents, gave career advice, and helped to open doors of opportunity, played an important part in their ability to navigate the cultural and structural barriers of the military. Many of these mentoring relationships were provided by senior male role models, supervisors, co-workers, subordinates, and even husbands.   Although mentoring is fast becoming a substitute word for what used to be called "taking care of your people," it is clear that not everyone is blessed with a mentoring relationship, and not all senior executives can or do mentor their "people."

The social support that mentors provide may be a key in respondents' attitudes towards their jobs, their ability to "bloom where planted" even when faced with structural, cultural, and interpersonal challenges, to "learn" from poor leaders, and then move on to the next "opportunity." Women who have mentors and sponsors have an opportunity structure that is not available to everybody. Many times the sponsor works behind the scenes to provide opportunities, and then adjusts his or her opinion of the protégé depending on how the protégé responded to those doors of opportunity. Thus, how and when that opportunity presents itself, and how the protégé responds to those opportunities are two very important keys to success.

Along with mentors, supportive spouses (and other family members) played a key role in the respondent's ability to handle stress and work through some of the leadership challenges they faced. Being able to seek advice on a problem from a trustworthy person, or seek support and comfort from a loved one, helps alleviate the personal distress that results from the many facets of being a token. Many of the respondents indicated that lack of social support from their spouses also provided a type of motivation. They realized that an unsupportive spouse was a hindrance to their ability to confront challenges to their leadership. When faced with an unsupportive spouse, many of the respondents divorced their husbands and found a brighter future and success in both their careers and personal lives.

Work and Family Differences and Similarities

Cultural constructs inform the difference between men and women executives. The cultural norms associated with the male breadwinner and female caretaker historically discouraged women from seeking full time careers, and pursuing the executive suite. Blair-Loy's (2001; 2003) research on the work-devotion schema and the family-devotion schema inform the cultural dimensions of paid work. Blair-Loy notes that in practice, these two schemas are not a dichotomy, but a continuum. So it has been shown in the military. For the respondents who maintained their military careers as regular active duty, the structural impediments inherent in a masculine organization primarily limited their family formation, forcing them into a work devotion schema. The GFO respondents knew and understood these implications, even if not verbalized. As Kennedy (2001:51) stated, "the higher a woman aspires in the leadership pyramid, be it military or civilian, the greater the sacrifices she must make in her personal life."

211

Women in the military can balance work and family, she says, while remaining in middle management, but not if they wish to wear stars.

Respondents who realized that the military lifestyle was not conducive to marriage and family left the regular force, but opted to stay in the military as part-time reservists. This way they were able to have a military career and family with children, an acceptable middle ground. The differences between Regulars and Reserves are becoming less divided, however, as the reserve forces increasingly are being utilized for more of the nation's national security and combat requirements. Although I did not pursue this course, it seems that those women who had a true "family devotion schema" left the military and cut all ties to paid work.

Family formation in the early cohorts was not possible due to the formal structural barriers imposed on women in the 1940s through the early 1970s. The traditional choice noted by Goldin (2004) of women in the early part of the 20th century of either career or family continued and was emphasized by military policy until well into the 1970s. However, this study shows that family formation was not necessarily abandoned by all the respondents, although there was a substantial minority who either never married, or married but had no children. For respondents who were married without children, their husbands had jobs that were portable, they endured geographic separations for a tour or two, or the husbands were fully retired.

The women who stayed in the regular forces and had children developed strategies, like civilian women, that ranged from "outsourcing" many daily tasks (such as child-care, cooking and cleaning), to becoming the sole provider with the husband becoming the primary caregiver. I had anticipated that many of the respondents would

use "nannies" or live in help as an option, but this was not the primary means of childcare for women who became GFOs, although it was used more by regular active duty respondents than reserve respondents. In many cases, husbands shared household and childcare responsibilities in an egalitarian relationship.

Thus, this research shows that the attitude about balance between work and family responsibilities is changing. If married, women may rely on an egalitarian relationship, delay having children, or delay career establishment. For the GFO respondents, delaying of career establishment was not an option, but the reliance on egalitarian relationships and delay in family formation was very prominent. Davies-Netzley (1998) found similar results. The GFO respondents, like civilian executives, used a combination of childcare facilities, live-in help, and rationalized the limited time with their children by telling themselves and their children that their work was for a greater good. Reserve GFO respondents were more similar to civilian executives in that they maintained the management of their household, while the Regular GFO respondents appeared to rely more on shared responsibility with their spouses or live-in help.

My findings of the three cohorts of military women are similar to Goldin's (2004) study of the changes in attitudes and strategies of college women toward work and family balance, in that the different cohorts used varying strategies. The similarity is especially salient within the last military cohort, of the 1980s, that appear to be trending towards the successful negotiation of career and family in an egalitarian partnership. In much of the literature on civilian women, researchers (Collins, Gilbert, and Nycum 1988; Davies-Netzley 1998; Moore 1988) noted the importance of supportive extended families and/or spouses, role models, mentors, the women's personal philosophies of intrinsic rewards

above extrinsic rewards, and being able to turn negatives into positives, which favorably compares to these findings on women GFOs.

<u>Reserves and the Work-Devotion Schema</u>

At the start of this study, I had some unconscious assumptions about the Reserves that as a result of the findings I have found to be erroneous. As a former active duty regular officer, my knowledge about the Reserves and National Guard was limited. I do not think I am unique in the "active duty" world to think of Reservists as those who could not "hack" it or who were in it for the money (good pay for a so called "weekend warrior" who only had to work two days a month and two weeks a year). I thought the Reserves and National Guard were a peripheral part of the military, hardly worth investigating.   I included them as a possible work-balance contrast to the active duty forces. I also thought that they could not possibly be as devoted to the military as their active duty sisters. I could not have been more wrong.

Even with this research, I still do not know all there is to know about Reserve or National Guard policies, but I think this study has found some interesting information about the people who participate in those organizations. They are every bit as devoted to the military as their active duty peers. They joined for similar reasons, but they transferred from active duty so they could continue to serve their country in uniform without giving up their own civilian career or family goals. In essence, they have successfully negotiated both the work-devotion schema and family-devotion schema. They were able to "have it all" in the words of Helen Gurley Brown of the 1970s *Cosmopolitan* fame, because of the flexibility of a Reserves career that appears to focus on results rather than "face time".

Of course, with the War on Terror continuing, and the DoD's reliance on the Guard and Reserves growing, this type of career path appears to be going by the wayside. Due to deployments that take an officer away from his or her civilian career and family for 12 or more months, it would be difficult for future members of the Guard and Reserve to think of it as an alternative to regular duty, and even more difficult to balance work and family than for the GFOs I studied.

<u>Comparison of Regular and Reserve Officers</u>

I found few, if any, differences between the regular component and the reserve component with regard to work ethic, strategies, or devotion to the military. The primary difference between the two was the Reservists' desire for family over career. In other words, the women who joined or transferred to a reserve branch had a more highly developed "family devotion schema" than a "work devotion schema". This is not to say that these two were mutually exclusive. A few of the reserve respondents indicated that they did not think they could perform their duties as reserve officers and also have a full-time civilian career. The 1980s cohort found a way to do both.

Women in the regular component had a higher "work devotion schema" than "family devotion schema", but again, this is not to say that they did not want a family. Many in both the regular and reserve components who did not have children mentioned that either they married too late in life to have children, or the time went by and before they knew it, it was too late to have children. Probably the group who had a more complete "work devotion schema" were the women in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s entering cohorts who really had to choose between the military and family by virtue of military policy.

The research found more similarities between the military women in the various branches of service than differences. There were also more similarities than differences between the Regular and Reserve respondents, with the exception of family formation. Not surprisingly, there were also many similarities in both demographics and successful career behaviors between civilian and military women. The primary difference between military and civilian elites is in the structure of the work force, an internal labor market versus a capitalistic labor market. The outcomes may be the same, success being defined as rising to the executive office, but the labyrinth in which they must navigate is very different.

Some of the respondents had broader definitions of success that reflected their philosophy regarding their place in the larger organization, even in larger society. They pursued their careers for both intrinsic and extrinsic reasons, and were successful, for the most part, at both. Finally, there were specific, and consistently common, strategies used by the respondents to attain their goals and succeed in the military. These strategies include taking hard or highly visible jobs and doing well at them; respecting and relying on their subordinates; building a good teamwork foundation and networking not letting frustrations derail personal or military objectives; and finally, being true to themselves and maintaining their integrity. Survey and interview participants also indicated that timing and "luck" played a part in promotion.

However, individual characteristics did not seem to be the primary reason why the respondents successfully broke through the brass ceiling to become General and Flag Officers. The key to navigating the structural and cultural barriers in the military was the

social support afforded by mentors, supportive families, and especially supportive spouses. I found that the most important behavioral characteristic that seemed to permeate all of the responses was the ability to turn bad situations into good ones, if for nothing else than to teach how not to do things. They worked hard to learn from their experiences, even if the situation was not comfortable. Being able to maintain a positive focus and use team-building behaviors appeared to make even the bleakest situation seem bearable. This, I believe, is the real secret to their success, but primarily possible because of the mentoring relationships to which they were privy.

In brief, here is what was found about these women who make a career out of the military and eventually become GFOs. This was true regardless of branch of service, status (regular, reserve, retired), or family status.

1. They were mentored (or sponsored) by many through the course of their career. In turn, they gave back to others as others gave to them, establishing networks and mentoring protégés.

2. They had a vibrant support system, which included mentors, family, and supportive spouses.

3. They exhibited behavior that expressed loyalty to the organization ahead of personal satisfaction. They "bloomed where they were planted."

4. They understood they are a minority in a man's world, which required a strong sense of identity and self-esteem. They never questioned their ability to succeed simply due to gender.

5. They maintained their integrity and focus when pressured to do otherwise.

6. They took advantage of opportunities as they arose. They rarely said "no" to a challenge. In fact, they sought challenge.

In my mind, all of these women are trailblazers. Yet, there are definite commonalities among them, regardless of cohort, branch of service, or status. There are both individual traits and the availability of social support which created a symbiotic relationship that resulted in career success. There may not be a definitive checklist for making it to Flag or General Officer rank, but there is a commonality in experience.

Limitations to this Research

Qualitative studies are generally thought of as not being "generalizable" to the greater population, due to the possibility of subjective interpretation. However, since my return rate was 74% of the total population, I believe that the trends described in this study can be generalized to the greater population of successful women officers, even with the additional limitations described below.

The survey instrument began as a massive and intricate questionnaire that attempted to explore each woman's life from cradle to grave. It would have taken an extraordinary amount of time and effort to complete. Thus, I was not able to take into account the life course perspective to its full advantage. There were some questions it did not ask, for example, at what point an individual got married, length of the marital relationship, at what age she started having children, the current ages of her children, etc. These are all valid questions, but within the exploratory investigation that this study turned out to be, outside of the scope of my research. Some assumptions turned out to be false, such as the assumption that the vast majority of the women would not be married,

and definitely not have children. However, it was found that marital rates were comparable to civilian elites, at between 65% for Regular and 76% for Reserve GFOs..

There were also some errors of omission on the survey instrument, the most blatant being the absence of a question about whether or not a woman's husband was also in the military. I managed to extract this information after the fact, but was not able to find the information from all of the respondents.

Respondent bias, which occurs when the responses of the group one is studying are skewed or misrepresent the subject being studied, is a limitation that I tried to alleviate by getting replication in answers from the sample. In surveying women from the different branches of the military, I hoped to get a variety of experiences and points of view. I believe that I did.

Another issue with regard to respondent bias is that this is a very select group of women. They are a self-selected group who opted to stay in the military rather than leave. The group was selected on the dependent variable of career success, thus there was no comparison with women who were not as successful, nor was there any comparison with male GFOs.

There may be also be a bias inherent in retrospective reporting, or selective recall, with respondents providing a "rosier" picture of their service than in actuality. In my opinion, the women were honest about their challenges when asked, and yet were pragmatic about their experiences.

I did not ask direct questions about an officer's sexual orientation. I think this is an important issue, however one that cannot be explored without jeopardizing careers.

The issue was alluded to in some of the interviews, but it was not pursued as a course of study. Studies on elite women in the corporate world also avoided this question.

Recommendations for Further Research

Each of these women has such an interesting story to tell. I wish I could have interviewed them all and published the collective wisdom. But the realities of this research mean that it barely scratched the surface as to what these women have accomplished as military officers. My study has been necessarily broad because I opted to study the entire population of GFOs, regardless of status or branch.

There are at least two other studies that I know about currently being conducted as dissertation projects that are looking at women in individual branches, specifically the Navy and the Army. These two projects, although not sociological studies, are also investigating the tactics and strategies of female generals and admirals. They may be able to bring forth a few more service-branch idiosyncrasies that I was not able to cull due to the broader nature of my project. Thus, a similar project on women in each of the branches of the military should be undertaken, with more specific and in-depth research questions, such as to discern if, for example, women GFOs in the Army and Marine Corps actually feel that their careers are stymied by the combat exclusion policies.

Many of the studies that I reviewed focus on women in the active military, and a few have undergone studies on women veterans. I found a paucity of research on women in the reserve forces, particularly the National Guard. I believe the reason why my study was so successful in obtaining a high response rate, was because no one had ever asked these women their opinions before, or why they decided to join the military! The reserve component has much knowledge, is not fully understood by almost anyone who is not a

member, and has a lot to offer as far as research is concerned. The issue of marriage and family is one that seems to be a stereotypical reason for women joining the reserve forces, but I found that women GFOs in the reserves are fully as patriotic and dedicated as their active duty counterparts. Thus, studies regarding the changes taking place for the Guard and Reserves, and how they impact retention and work-family balance, especially for women, are needed.

Women as a group have been disenfranchised and lack empowerment. They have been socialized to be deferential to authority, to be "nice." They are often told that they cannot do things simply because they are women, because in general, women are not as strong as men. Of course, this is slowly changing, but in the military, as in business, the institutional structure developed with a gendered standard that is effectively masculine. Thus, the women in this study felt they had to work harder to achieve the same level of respect as their male peers. They had to keep proving themselves, their worth, to their bosses, to their peers, and even to their subordinates. The increase in the numbers and the diversity of women now entering the military and civilian workforces, show that these stereotypes are changing. The women in this study entered the military over a period of 40-plus years, from 1942 to 1984. Differences between cohorts have been shown. It will be important to continue to study differences in goals, strategies, and tactics as younger cohorts, raised to be empowered and strong, enter the workforce and compete with men on an equal basis.

This could actually be divided into two studies. The first study could be conducted on the differences in attitudes and strategies for success between current male and female GFOs. Anecdotally, it is my impression that male officers aspire to the GFO

ranks early in their careers. I thought that I would find the same thing in the women, but that was not the case. The women seemed to take each job as it arrived, and it was not until they were O-6s that they began to foment the possibility of higher rank. The second could be a similar study, but 20 years later, to find differences in goals and priorities in an officer's career goals, between men and women, but also by cohort. Source of commissioning is also an important factor, as the service academies are more focused on developing career officers. Will the women who graduate from them have similar or different goals than their male peers as they progress through the military?

A comparative analysis of those who do make it to GFO and those who do not and retire at the rank of O-6 should be conducted. One of the early recommendations with my study was that I do this exact thing. However, I felt that an exploratory study of what it takes to become a GFO would give a baseline for comparison between those who made it and those who did not. Since few of the women in this study appeared to do anything but take it "one tour at a time", including General Kennedy, the issues of sponsorship, timing, "luck," and opportunities given and taken, might be the only things that separate those who make it and those who do not.

Finally, in order to measure changes in a cohort's perception of equality, career options, and life-family balance issues over the life course of both men and women, a longitudinal qualitative study of newly commissioned officers who think they might stay in the military for a career should be conducted. The study could start at commissioning, continue at the crucial "stay or leave" point of 8-10 years, again at the 20-year "stay or retire" point, and then at the end of their careers. There are currently differences by gender because of institutional policies and the skewed ratio of men to women. A

longitudinal study could compare how changes in policy, egalitarian attitudes, increased

numbers of women, increased diversity, and an increasingly non-linear combat arena

affect an officer's career, career goals, career achievements and the strategies used to

succeed. Finally, there could be a comparison between those who actually succeed to

GFO rank, and those who do not, and perhaps begin to understand more fully the work it

takes to achieve that goal. Are there differences by gender? Are there differences in

strategies? Do the women think they have as good a chance of promotion to GFO as

their male peers, or will they be like these respondents them and take it one tour at a

time?

One would hope that a study of this sort will show the evolutionary progress that

women and minorities can make in the workplace given optimum and equal treatment.

This would have to be undertaken by an organization such as RAND or other such

contractor, as it may be difficult to maintain continuity with a single researcher. The

resources needed to conduct such a study would be enormous.

There is still much to be learned about the motivations for, and the strategies used,

for success in military. It is an organization that has so many facets, and so many

different types of people at its helm that it can provide several generations of study for

researches of all disciplines. With this one small study, I hope to inspire others to pursue

that research.

Broader Research Implications

The findings here are relevant to work strategies and ethics for individuals in any

career field. They are also important in the interpersonal relationships that are required in

order for women to succeed in a male-dominated organization. Career women are likely

to view themselves as working towards the same goals as their male peers: achieving those career milestones that will enable them to continue to succeed at their work and be promoted. While not all women aspire to be GFOs, CEOs or other high level executives, the few who do may be considered special. After all, they have stayed the course through personal and professional milestones that many, male or female, fail to endure. The strategies and social support needed to navigate the labyrinth of obstacles that career women face, with regard to work opportunity structure, social barriers, and family commitment, are pertinent to women in all career fields.

This study contributes to the knowledge of broader areas of women and work, women and leadership, and work-family balance. The military work structure is more limiting in some ways than in other social institutions, but some requirements of the work structure are similar for law, religion, medicine, business, and academia. These careers require an "apprentice" period in which an individual must achieve certain career milestones within a defined period of time, such as passing the bar for lawyers and internships or residency requirements for doctors. All require hard work, effective work, and long hours throughout the career. This is especially true for those who achieve elite status. All require a work-devotion schema. Many have institutional structures that may inhibit the career goals due to one's race, class, gender, age, educational attainment or physical ability. For example, in the military, some combat jobs are closed to women, and the military still legally discriminates against recruits by age, educational attainment and physical ability. In many religions, women (Catholics) or homosexuals (many other religions) are barred from serving as priests.

The important piece in this work is how those who are faced with these structured challenges approached them, worked with or around them, and succeeded. However, that success was also contingent on interpersonal support from others in the organization; mentors who helped them negotiate those challenges, as well as the social and emotional support provided by spouses and family. The findings are not only useful to women who aspire to careers in the military, but also for those in other career fields.

This study builds on the body of knowledge about women and careers. It provides sociological insight into a group of high-achieving women, their commonalities and differences and the choices they made, or were forced to make, in order to succeed. Finally, it opens a new realm of research possibilities for those trying to understand how social structure and social support impact our everyday lives. It helps to lay the foundation for the study of how cultural constructs, organizational structure and interpersonal relationships compare for various social groups as they navigate the labyrinth to career success.

U.S. Military Rank, Insignia and Employment for Active Duty Commissioned Officers, January 2005

Grade	Insignia	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps	Total Employment by rank
O-10	4 silver stars	General	Admiral	General	General	34
O-9	3 silver stars	Lieutenant General	Vice Admiral	Lieutenant General	Lieutenant General	125
O-8	2 silver stars	Major General	Rear Admiral Upper	Major General	Major General	276
O-7	1 silver star	Brigadier General	Rear Admiral Lower	Brigadier General	Brigadier General	439
O-6	Silver eagle	Colonel	Captain	Colonel	Colonel	11,483
O-5	Silver oak leaf	Lieutenant Colonel	Commander	Lieutenant Colonel	Lieutenant Colonel	28,378
O-4	Gold oak leaf	Major	Lieutenant Commander	Major	Major	43,846
O-3	Two silver bars	Captain	Lieutenant	Captain	Captain	70,500
O-2	One silver bar	1st Lieutenant	Lieutenant (Jr. Grade)	1st Lieutenant	1st Lieutenant	30,853
O-1	One gold bar	2nd Lieutenant	Ensign	2nd Lieutenant	2nd Lieutenant	24,948
Total						210,882

Source: U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2006. "Bulletin 2600: Job Opportunities in the Armed Forces."

Appendix B

Sample Respondent Invitation Letter

Dear [General or Admiral _____],

I am conducting a research project for my doctoral dissertation in Sociology at the University of Maryland on gender and the military. I have included my biography as an enclosure to this letter so you have a better idea of who I am and the experiences I bring to this endeavor.

My research project, entitled "Breaking Through the Brass Ceiling: Elite Military Women's Strategies for Success," focuses on women like you who have made it to the upper echelons of the military as Flag and General officers. In the last few conferences I have attended focusing on military women, there seems to be a real interest in two areas: Balancing Work and Family, and Strategies for Success in Rising to the Top. My research intends to address both issues in a study that will compile information derived from surveys and interviews from high-ranking military women. This research is important due to the increasing numbers of women joining the military, their responsibility and combat experience, and the few female role models and mentors in the highest echelon of the military branches. No individuals will be identified (or identifiable), and all personal information will be kept confidential.

I hope you will agree to participate.

Please return the signed consent form and completed survey by _____. The first page of the consent form is for you to keep for your files, in case you need to contact my advisor, the Institutional Review Board, or me. You will note that the survey is coded. No names are used to protect your privacy, and no one but me will have a cross-referenced list of participants with their codes.

I understand you are a busy person, and I thank you in advance for considering this request. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Darlene M. Iskra
Commander, USN (Ret)
Ph.D. Candidate

Enclosures:
(1) Iskra Biography
(2) Informed Consent Form
(3) Biographical survey

DARLENE MARIE ISKRA, Commander, USN (ret)

Commander Darlene Iskra retired from the U.S. Navy in April 2000, after 21 years of service. While in the service, she took advantage of the opportunities the Navy had to offer in the expansion of women's roles that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s.

She was one of the first female line officers to graduate from the Naval School of Diving and Salvage in Washington, D.C. in May 1980, before attending Surface Warfare Officer School and reporting to her first ship, the USS HECTOR (AR-7) in December 1980. As Diving Officer she conducted many underwater repairs, including an underwater propeller change on USS TOWERS (DDG-5) in Yokosuka Harbor, Japan, which was a very innovative repair at the time.

She served on four salvage ships, working her way up the chain of command. She was on the pre-commissioning crew of the USS Grasp (ARS-51) as Operations Officer from 1984-1987. She next served as Executive Officer on the USS Preserver (ARS-8), and split toured as XO on the USS Hoist (ARS-40), deploying to the Mediterranean and performing various diving and salvage exercises and operations.   In May 1990 she was selected for, and received orders to the USS OPPORTUNE (ARS 41) as Commanding Officer. She assumed command in December 1990 in Naples, Italy, becoming the first woman commander of a commissioned Navy vessel. While in command, the ship served in Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and also performed Humanitarian Service during Hurricane Andrew relief operations in southern Florida in 1992. She subsequently served on several Navy staffs until her retirement.

She has Master of Arts degrees in National Security and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College (1996), and in Sociology from the University of Maryland (2003). In 2002 she worked for Senator Maria Cantwell of Washington state as a Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI) Congressional Fellow. During her fellowship, she helped staff and pass an amendment to the 2003 Defense Authorization Bill, which forbade the Department of Defense from requiring U.S. servicewomen to wear the abaya garment while stationed in Saudi Arabia. For this work, she was awarded the University of Maryland, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences Phillips Award in 2005. This award recognizes graduate student excellence in research most likely to affect public policy.

She was also awarded the Center For Teaching Excellence, Distinguished Teaching Assistant for Academic Year 2003-2004 and the Charles H. Coates Graduate Research Award, University of Maryland, 2000-2001, for her Master's thesis, which analyzed the arguments for and against expanding roles for women in the Navy, 1978-2000, with regard to serving in surface ships and submarines. At the University of Maryland, she is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Sociology, teaches, and is also the coordinator for a Masters degree program in Leadership Education and Development (LEAD) for prospective Naval Academy Company Officers. Her dissertation will focus on senior ranking women in the military and their strategies for success.

Enclosure (1)

<u>Keep for your records</u>

Breaking through the "Brass" Ceiling: Elite Military Women's Strategies for Success.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the strategies for career success of senior women officers in the military, and provide a sociological frame drawn from the compilation of individual experiences and motivations.

<u>Procedure:</u> You are being asked to complete a short biographical survey. This survey will be provided to all available women General and Flag officers, whether active or retired, regular or reserve, who can be contacted through a snowball sample. A snowball sample is one in which the researcher requests assistance in contacting individuals through social or official networks. Completion time for the survey is approximately 30 minutes.

You may also be asked to participate in a taped interview that will expand and clarify the issues addressed in the survey. The taped interviews will be conducted by the student investigator, and may last as long as you maintain interest and have time available. All digital recordings will be destroyed at the end of this project. Copies of transcribed interviews will be available upon request.

<u>Confidentiality</u>: This survey is entirely confidential. To help protect your confidentiality, you have received a code number. Only the student investigator has the cross-reference list, which will be maintained separately in a locked file by the student researcher. The final dissertation will not contain information that may personally identify you. There are no foreseeable physical or psychological risks to research subjects as a result of participation in this study.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact: **Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742; (e-mail) <u>irb@deans.umd.edu</u>; (telephone) 301-405-4212.**

Principal Investigator: Student Investigator:
Dr. Mady W. Segal   Darlene M. Iskra, CDR, USN (ret)
Department of Sociology   Department of Sociology
2112 Art/Sociology Bldg.   2112 Art/Sociology Bldg.
University of Maryland   University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742   College Park, MD 20742
msegal@socy.umd.edu   diskra@socy.umd.edu
301-405-6433   301-760-7507

Enclosure (2)

Informed Consent

I state that I am over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Professor Mady W. Segal and Darlene M. Iskra, Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park.

I understand that the data I provide will be grouped with data provided by others for reporting and presentation and that my name and other identifying information will not be used at any time. I understand that while this study is not designed to help me personally, my participation will help the investigators learn more about the challenges military women face and the strategies that help them be successful. This knowledge will be used to make recommendations that facilitate improvement in opportunities for military women. I am free to ask questions, withdraw from participation, or decline to answer any of the questions without being penalized in any way.

Date: _____

Name of Respondent: _____

Signature of Respondent: _____

May I contact you for an interview?
      a. Yes
      b. No

Please provide phone number or email address:_____

Please fax this form to the following person:

Darlene M. Iskra
301-760-7345

or use the enclosed envelope

Enclosure (2)

Appendix D

Breaking through the "Brass" Ceiling: Elite Military Women's Strategies for Success.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey!

The questions consist mostly of multiple-choice answers, with some short answer options. Please feel free to add whatever comments you like to enhance the information. You can opt not to answer a particular question if you feel it is too invasive, but I hope you will reconsider as the compilation of answers is what will give this research its validity. Additional comments may be made on back of survey or on another sheet of paper. Please ensure your comments are noted with the appropriate survey question number.

1. In what year did you graduate with your undergraduate degree? _____

2. What year were you commissioned? _____

3. What was your commissioning source?
    a. Direct Appointment
    b. Officer Candidate School/ Officer Training School
    c. Military, Naval, Air Force, Coast Guard, or Merchant Marine Academy
    d. ROTC
    e. Other (Please explain)

4. Are you prior enlisted?
    a. Yes
    b. No

5. What was your mother or female guardian's primary occupation?
    a. Administrative/managerial/executive
    b. Professional specialty (lawyer, doctor, professor, clergy)
    c. Sales
    d. Administration support
    e. Service and/or logistics, transportation
    f. Electrical/mechanical/equipment repair, production, or operator
    g. Farming, forestry, and fishing
    h. Engineering, science or technical specialties or support
    i. Health care
    j. Protective services (police, firefighter, military, etc)
    k. Homemaker
    l. Other (Please explain on back of survey or another sheet of paper)

6. Did your mother or female guardian ever serve in the military?
   - **a.** Yes (proceed to questions 7, 8, 9)
   - **b.** No (skip to question 10)
   - **c.** Don't Know (skip to question 10)

7. In which branch of service did she serve? _____

8. What was the highest rank she attained?_____

9. Did her service influence your decision to join the military?
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

10. What was your father or male guardian's primary occupation?
    - a. Administrative/managerial/executive
    - b. Professional specialty (Lawyer, doctor, professor, clergy)
    - c. Sales (Retail or Other)
    - d. Administration support
    - e. Service and/or logistics, transportation
    - f. Electrical/mechanical/equipment repair, production, or operator
    - g. Farming, forestry, and fishing
    - h. Engineering, science or technical specialties or support
    - i. Health care
    - j. Protective services (police, firefighter, etc)
    - k. Homemaker
    - l. Other (Please explain)

11. Did your father or male guardian ever serve in the military?
    - **a.** Yes (proceed to questions 12, 13, 14)
    - **b.** No (skip to question 15)
    - **c.** Don't Know (skip to question 15)

12. In which branch of service did he serve? _____

13. What was the highest rank he attained? _____

14. Did his service influence your decision to join the military?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

15. Did either of your parents attend college?
    - a. Yes, Father (please circle):   BA/BS   MA/MS   Ph.D. or equiv.
    - b. Yes, Mother (please circle):   BA/BS   MA/MS   Ph.D. or equiv.
    - c. No, neither

16. During the time you lived with your parent(s) or guardian(s) as a minor, were they
   a. Married
   b. Divorced
   c. Separated
   d. Never married
   e. Widowed
   f. Remarried

17. Do you have any siblings?
   a. Yes, sisters only
   b. Yes, brothers only
   c. Yes, both
   d. No

18. How many siblings do you have? _____

19. Are you the oldest child?
   a. Yes
   b. No

20. While in the military, were you ever married, or did you have a long-term relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No

21. How many times have you been married?
   a. Never (skip to question 24)
   b. One
   c. Two
   d. Three or more

22. **A**re you now married?
   a. Yes
         i. Is/was your husband also military? Yes   No
   b. No

23. Did you change your maiden name when you got married?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Yes and no-maintained my maiden name for professional purposes only.

24. Did any marital or committed relationship end in
   a. Divorce
   b. Separation

      c. Death

      d. Not applicable

25. Did your military career affect your personal relationships?
      a. Yes
      b. No (skip to question 27)

26. In what way? (Please explain)

27. Do you have any children?
      a. Yes, birth children (skip to question 29)
      b. Yes, adopted children (skip to question 29)
      c. Yes, step children (proceed to question 28)
      d. No (proceed to question 28, then skip to question 32)

28. What was your main reason for not having children?
      a. I never wanted children
      b. Husband did not want children
      c. Could not have children
      d. Wanted to concentrate on my career
      e. Other (please explain)

      PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 32

29. Who took care of the children while you were at work or deployed? (Circle as many as apply)
      a. My husband
      b. Other family member
      c. Live in help (nanny or au pair)
      d. Child care provider
      e. Neighbor/friend
      f. Other_____

30. Who was your children's primary caregiver?
      a. Myself
      b. My husband
      c. Other family member
      d. Live in help
      e. Child care provider

f. Neighbor/friend

g. Other_____

31. How did you balance work and family?

32. Thinking back to when you first joined the military, what were your top three reasons for joining? (Please number the top three in order or importance, 1 being most important)

_____Needed a job

_____Wanted to serve my country/patriotism

_____Wanted adventure

_____Needed the money

_____Wanted to travel

_____Wanted to learn a new skill

_____Felt it was an obligation of citizenship, for women as well as men

_____Wanted to use my existing skills

_____Wanted a challenging job

_____Didn't know what else to do with my life

_____Seemed like a good idea at the time

_____Wanted a job with security

_____Wanted a job with benefits (health care, vacation time, etc)

_____Wanted a job with promotion opportunity

_____Wanted a change in my circumstances

_____Wanted a job with leadership opportunity

_____Wanted to live overseas

_____Thought military experience would look good on my resume

_____Family tradition

_____Other _____

33. When you first joined the military, what were your career goals?

a. Get out after initial obligation

b. Stay as long as it was fulfilling

c. Stay for 20 and retire

d. Stay as long as possible and retire

e. Other _____

34. IF YOU ARE A RESERVIST, why did you transfer from the regular military or opt for reserves/NG?

35. Why did you stay in the military? (circle as many as apply)
    a. Enjoyed the work
    b. Enjoyed the travel
    c. Enjoyed the leadership and other opportunities
    d. Enjoyed the benefits (health care, vacation time, etc.)
    e. Wanted to serve my country/patriotism
    f. Enjoyed the challenge
    g. Felt like I was making a difference
    h. Other _____

36. At what point during your service did you decide to make the military a career?
    a. When I came in.
    b. When I was offered my second job/tour.
    c. After I made O-3.
    d. Other _____

    _____

37. Were you athletic as a child?
    a. Yes
    b. No (Skip to question 39)

38. In what types of activities or sports did you participate?
    a. Individual sports (walking, running, swimming, biking, hiking, weightlifting, etc)
    b. Team sports (softball, tennis, cheerleading, etc.)
    c. Hobbies (please list)_____
    d. Other (please explain)

    _____

39. Are you currently physically active?
    a. Yes
    b. No

40. List the activities in which you currently participate.

_____

_____

41. Were you deployed to any of the following armed conflicts? (circle as many as apply)
    a. World War 2
    b. Korea
    c. Vietnam
    d. Grenada
    e. Panama
    f. Desert Shield/Storm
    g. Somalia
    h. Haiti
    i. Bosnia
    j. Kosovo
    k. Iraq
    l. Afghanistan
    m. Other _____
    n. Not involved in any armed conflicts

42. In what year were you promoted to O-7? _____

43. In what year did you retire? _____ (If still active, leave blank)

44. Did you manage your career with the goal of becoming a General/Flag Officer?
    a. Yes
    b. No

45. At what point did you think you had a good chance for selection to 0-7? (narrative)

46. To what do you attribute your success as a military officer? (narrative)

47. While you were in the military, did you ever feel that you were held to a higher standard than your male peers? Explain.

Thank you for your participation in this survey!
Please return this survey to:
Darlene M. Iskra, diskra@mail.oiep.umd.edu or fax to 301-760-7345

Appendix E

Interview Questions & Protocol

All interviews started by introducing myself and explaining the purpose of the interview. I then reviewed the interviewees completed survey and asked for additional information on the answers to selected questions. Finally, we may have discussed any or all of the following issues:

a. Early cohorts: Why did you join the [branch of service] knowing the opportunities were limited?

b. Where were you stationed? Describe your military career.

c. Why did you never marry?

d. Why did you never have children?

e. How did you manage your career and family? Deployment issues?

f. General issues stemming from being a woman in the military, including sexual harassment, sexual orientation, dating, leadership challenges, isolation, stress, and how to deal with them.

g. What were some of the choices you made that you feel made you successful as a military officer?

h. Do you have any specific leadership philosophies?

i. Do you feel that as a woman you had to do things a little bit differently to achieve the same goals as your male counterparts?

j. What advice would you give to women who may want to make the military a career, to help them focus? To deal with family issues?

k. Did you have mentors, and do you mentor or network with other women?

l. If retired, what are you doing now?

Appendix F
Glossary

Active Forces	Members on active duty in the regular forces of DoD or USCG.
ANC	Army Nurse Corps
ANG	Air National Guard
ARNG	Army National Guard
BUPERS	Bureau of Naval Personnel
CNO	Chief of Naval Operations
DACOWITS	Defense Department Advisory Committee on Women in the Service
DHL	Department of Homeland Security
DoD	Department of Defense
DOPMA	Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act
FOMO	Flag Officer Management Office
GFO	General/Flag Officer
GOMO	General Officer Management Office
NC	Nurse Corps (Navy)
NG	National Guard
NROTC	Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps
JPME	Joint Professional Military Education
Regular	Full time active or retired members of the active forces
Reserves	Members of the Ready Reserve Component of DoD or Coast Guard; "part-time" status.
ROTC	Reserve Officer Training Corps
SECDEF	Secretary of Defense
SECNAV	Secretary of the Navy
SPARS	Acronym for "Semper Paratus-Always Ready", Coast Guard motto and nickname for Women's Coast Guard Reserve
USA	United States Army
USAF	United States Air Force
USAFR	United States Air Force Reserve
USAR	United States Army Reserve
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USCGR	United States Coast Guard Reserve
USMC	United States Marine Corps
USMCR	United States Marine Corps Reserve
USN	United States Navy
USNR	United States Navy Reserve
USPHS	United States Public Health Service
WAAC	Women's Army Auxiliary Corps
WAC	Women's Army Corps
WAF	Women in the Air Force
WAVES	Women Accepted For Voluntary Emergency Service (Navy)
WREI	Women's Research and Education Institute

Appendix G
Chronology of Female General and Flag Officer "Firsts"

Year promoted	Promotion rank and name	Branch, Corps	Significance
1970	BG Anna May Hays BG Elizabeth Hoisington	USA, ANC USA, WAC	First women appointed O-7 in any service.
1971	BG Jeanne Holm	USAF	First woman appointed O-7 in USAF
1971	BG E. Ann Hoefly	USAF, NC	First woman nurse appointed O-7 in USAF
1972	RDML Alene Duerk	USN, NC	First woman appointed O-7 in USN
1973	MG Jeanne Holm	USAF	First woman O-8 in any service
1976	RDML Fran McKee	USN	First non-nurse woman appointed to O-7 in USN
1978	MG Mary E. Clark	USA	First woman O-8 in USA
1978	BG Margaret Brewer	USMC	First woman appointed O-7 in USMC
1979	BG Hazel W. Johnson	USA, ANC	First African American woman general officer (O-7)
1983	BG Frances Mossman	USAFR	First woman O-7 in USAFR or any reserve component
1983	RDML Grace Hopper	USNR	First woman appointed O-7 in USNR
1985	BG Gail Reals	USMC	First women board selected O-7 in USMC
1985	BG Beverly Lindsey	USAFR	First nurse O-7 in USAFR
1985	BG Carmelita Schimmenti	USAF	First Hispanic-American woman O-7 in military
1988	RADM Robert Hazard	USN	First woman O-8 in USN
1989	BG Dorothy B Pocklington	USAR	First woman O-7 in USAR
1990	RDML Maryanne T. Ibach	USNR, NC	First nurse promoted to O-7 in USNR
1992	BG Marilyn J. Musacchio	USAR, NC	First woman O-7 in USAR
1992	BG Roberta V. Mills	ANG, NC (TN)	First woman O-7 in National Guard
1992	BG Sharon Vander Zyl	ARNG, NC (MI)	First nurse O-7 in ARNG

1993	MG Nora A. Astafan	USAFR	First woman O-8 in USAFR or any reserve component
1993	BG Irene Trowell-Harris	ANG, NC (NY)	First black woman O-7 in ANG
1994	MG Roberta V. Mills	ANG, NC (TN)	First woman O-8 in National Guard
1994 1996	MG Carol A. Mutter LtGen Carol A. Mutter	USMC	First woman O-8 in USMC First woman O-9 in USMC
1995	MG Marcelite Harris	USAF	First African American woman O-8.
1995	BG Tiiu Kera	USAF	First Asian-American woman general (O-7)
1996	VADM Patricia Tracy	USN	First woman in military to attain 3 star rank
1997	BG B. Sue Duiett	USAR	First non-nurse O-7 in USAR
1997	LtGen Claudia J. Kennedy	USA	Army's first 3-star General (O-9)
1997	MG Martha T. Rainville	ANG (VT)	First woman Adjutant General in the NG
1997	RDML Joyce Johnson	USPHS	First woman Admiral appointed from USPHS to USCG Health and Safety Directorate
1998	RDML Lillian Fishburne	USN	First African American woman O-7 in USN
1998	MG Irene Trowell-Harris	ANG, NC (NY)	First African American woman O-8 in any reserve component
1998	MG Tiiu Kera	USAF	First Asian-American woman major general (O-8)
1999	MG Celia Adolphi	USAR	First woman O-8 in USAR
1999	LtGen Leslie F. Kenne	USAF	First woman Lt Gen in USAF
1999	RDML "Mimi" Drew	USNR	First non-nurse woman board selected O-7 in USNR
2000	RDML Vivian S. Crea	USCG	First woman O-7 in USCG
2000	BG Betty L. Mullis	USAFR	First woman aviator O-7 in any service
2000	BG Coral Wong Pietsch	USAR, JAG	First Asian-Pacific woman and first JAG woman promoted to O-7 in USAR
2000	RDML Mary O'Donnell	USCGR	First woman O-7 in USCGR

2000	MG Marianne Mathewson-Chapman	ARNG, NC	First woman O-8 in ARNG
2001	RADM Karen Harmeyer	USNR, NC	First woman promoted to O-8 in USNR
2002	MG Donna Barbisch	USAR, ANC	First nurse promoted to O-8 in USAR
2002	MG Betty L. Mullis	USAFR	First woman aviator promoted to O-8
2002	RDML Mary O'Donnell	USCGR	First woman O-8 in USCGR
2002	BG Julia J. Cleckley	ARNG (DC)	First non-nurse and first black woman O-7 in ARNG
2003	BG Rose Loper	USAR	First woman aviator to be promoted to O-7 in USA
2003	RDML Deborah Loewer	USN	First woman surface line O-7 in USN
2004	RDML Wendi Carpenter	USNR	First woman aviator O-7 in USN or USNR
2005	RDML Carol M. Pottenger	USNR	First woman surface line O-7 in USNR
2005	BG Esther A. Rada	ANG, JAG (NY)	First woman JAG O-7 in National Guard
2006	Vice Admiral Vivian S. Crea	USCG	First woman O-9 in USCG
2006	RDML Michelle Howard	USN	First black female surface warfare and first woman USNA grad O-7 in USN.
2006	BG Angela Salinas	USMC	First Hispanic woman O-7 in USMC.
2007	BG Tracy L. Garrett	USMCR	First women reserve O-7 in Marine Corps Reserves
2007	RDML Nora Tyson	USN	First women aviator O-7 in regular forces
????	First female four star General or Admiral		

Note: List derived from various sources, including DEOMI 1999, 2001, 2002; Holm 1992; and individual biographies. Not all-inclusive.

REFERENCE LIST

Academy Women, 2006. "Rising to the Top: How to Posture for Success" panel

    presentation at the 2006 Annual Symposium. Washington, DC, October 20-22.

Adams-Ender, Clara, with Blair S. Walker. 2001. *My Rise to the Stars: How a*

    Sharecropper's Daughter Became an Army General. Lake Ridge, VA: ACPE

    Associates, Inc.

Agresti, Alan and Barbara Finlay. 1999. *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*, 3rd

    ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Anderson, Madelyn Klein. 1995. *So Proudly they Served: American Military Women in*

    World War II. New York: F. Watts.

American Sociological Association (ASA). 2004. "The Best Time to Have a Baby:

    Institutional Resources and Family Strategies Among Early Career Sociologists."

    ASA Research Brief. Retrieved 5 May 2006 http://www.asanet.org.

Antecol, Heather and Deborah Cobb-Clark. 2001. "Men, Women, and Sexual Harassment

    in the U.S. Military." *Gender Issues* Winter: 3-18.

Babbie, Earl. 1989. *The Practice of Social Research*, 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Barkalow, Carol. 1990. *In the Men's House: An Inside Account of Life in the Army by*

    One of West Point's First Female Graduates. New York: Poseidon Press.

Billings, Charlene W. 1989. *Grace Hopper: Navy Admiral and Computer Pioneer*.

    Hillside, NJ: Enslow.

Blair-Loy, Mary. 2003. *Competing Devotions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

    Press.

------. 2001. "Cultural Constructions of Family Schemas: The Case of Women Finance

      Executives" *Gender and Society* 15, 5 (Oct): 687-709.

Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS). 2000. Junior Officer Survey Results. Jan 2000.

      Http://www.bupers.navy.mil/pers41/josurvey.htm

Census Bureau. 2000. "Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics:

      2000. Retrieved 9 November 2007 http://censtats.census.gov/ data/US/01000.pdf.

Cohn, Carol. 2000. "How Can She Claim Equal Rights When She Doesn't Have to Do

      as Many Push-Ups as I Do?" *Men and Masculinities* 3, 2: 131-151.

Collins, Nancy W., Susan K. Gilbert, and Susan H. Nycum. 1988. *Women Leading.*

      New York: Penguin Group.

Danner, Dorothy Still. 1995. *What a Way to Spend a War: Navy Nurse POWs in the*

      Philippines. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

Danskine, William Bruce. 2001. "Fall of the Fighter Generals: The Future of USAF

      Leadership." Masters Thesis, School of Advanced Airpower Studies. Alabama:

      Maxwell Air Force Base. Retrieved 4 October 2007 https://www.afresearch.org.

Davies-Netzley, Sally Ann. 1998. "Women Above the Glass Ceiling: perceptions on

      Corporate Mobility and Strategies for Success" *Gender and Society* 12, 3 (Jun):

      339-355.

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI). 1999. "Women in Military

      Service" Year 1999 Calendar. Retrieved 6 February 2007

      http://www.deomi.org/DRN/clearinghouse/calendars.cfm.

------. 2001. "Celebrating Diversity in the Guard and Reserve" Year 2001 Calendar.

    Retrieved 6 February 2007

    http://www.deomi.org/DRN/clearinghouse/calendars.cfm.

------. 2002. "Multiculturalism in the Armed Forces in the 20th Century" Year 2002

    Calendar. Retrieved 6 February 2007

    http://www.deomi.org/DRN/clearinghouse/calendars.cfm.

------. 2006. *Annual Demographic Profile of the Department of Defense and U.S. Coast*

    Guard FY 2005. Retrieved 5 June 2007 https://www.deomi.org under

    "Publications."

DMDC (Defense Manpower Data Center). 2003. Unpublished statistics.

DoD (Department of Defense). 2006. "Fiscal Year 2004 DoD Statistical Report on the

    Military Retirement System." Arlington, VA: DoD Office of the Actuary.

    Retirement statistics by gender received from author via email in April 2006.

------. 2007a. "DoD 101: An Introductory Overview of the Department of Defense."

    Retrieved 28 June 2007 at http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/dod101/.

------. 2007b. Department of Defense Joint Officer Management Program Fact Sheet."

    Retrieved 4 August 2007

    http://www.defenselink.mil/pdf/JOM_Media_FactSheet20070707.pdf.

Eagly, Alice H. and Linda L. Carli. 2007. "Women and the Labyrinth of Leadership."

    Harvard Business Review, September: 62-71.

Ebbert, Jean and Marie-Beth Hall. 2002. *The First, the Few, the Forgotten: Navy and*

    Marine Corps Women in World War I. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

------. 1999. *Crossed Currents: Navy Women in a Century of Change,* 3rd ed.

      Washington, DC: Brassey's.

Fagenson-Eland, Ellen and Pamela J. Kidder. 2000. "A Conversation with Rear Admiral

      Louise Wilmot: Taking the Lead and Leading the Way." *Organizational*

      Dynamics, Winter, 28, 3: 80-92.

Foote, Evelyn BG. 2005. "Choosing to Serve: Reflections of Retired Military Women."

      Panel presentation sponsored by Women in International Security. Washington,

      D.C. March 1.

Franke, Linda Bird. 1997. *Ground Zero: The Gender Wars in the Military.* New York:

      Simon & Schuster.

Garcia, Federico E. 1999. *Women at Sea: Unplanned Losses and Accession Planning*.

      Alexandria, VA: Center for Naval Analysis.

GAO. General Accounting Office. 2002. "Military Personnel: Active Duty Benefits

      Reflecting Changing Demographics, but Opportunities Exist to Improve." A

      Report to the Subcommittee on Personnel, Committee on Armed Services, U.S.

      Senate. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Godson, Susan H. 2001. *Serving Proudly: A History of Women in the U.S. Navy.*

      Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

Goldin, Claudia. 2004. "The Long Road to the Fast Track: Career and Family." *The*

      Annals of the American Academy (AAPSS), 596 (Nov): 20-35.

------. 1990. *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women.*

      New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldman, Nancy Loring, ed. 1982. *Female Soldiers - Combatants or Non-combatants: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Gomez, Maria J., Ruth E. Fassinger, Joann Prosser, Kathleen Cooke, Brenda Mejia and Jeanette Luna. 2001. "Voces Abriendo Caminos (Voices Forging Paths): A Qualitative Study of the Career Development of Notable Latinas." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 48, 3: 286-300.

Harrell, Margaret C, Harry J. Thie, Peter Schirmer and Kevin Brancato. 2004. *Aligning the Stars.* National Defense Research Institute, prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Harrell, Margaret and Laura Miller. 1997. *New Opportunities for Military Women: Effects Upon Readiness, Cohesion and Morale*. National Defense Research Institute, prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Herbert, Melissa S. 1998. Camouflage Isn't Only for Combat. New York: New York University Press.

Holm, Jeanne.1993/1983. *Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution*. Rev. ed. Novato, CA: Presidio Press.

Hosek, Susan D., Peter Tiemeyer, Rebecca Kilburn, Debra A. Strong, Selika Ducksworth, and Reginald Ray. 2001. *Minority and Gender Differences in Officer Career Progression.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Hymowitz, Carol and Timothy D. Schellhardt. 1986. "The Corporate Woman (A Special Report): Cover --- The Glass Ceiling: Why Women Can't Seem to Break the Invisible Barrier that Blocks Them from the Top Jobs." *The Wall Street*

Journal (Eastern Edition). Mar 24: 1. Retrieved 17 September 2007

    http://proquest.umi.com.

Iskra, Darlene. 2007. "Attitudes toward Expanding Roles for Navy Women at Sea."

    Armed Forces and Society, 33, 2 (Jan): 203-223.

Jeffrey, Laura S. 2007. "Women in Uniform: Should you stay or should you go?"

    Decision Times, special section in *Navy Times*, 57, 1, Oct. 1: 4-5.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977a. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic

    Books.

------. 1977b. *Work and Family in the United States**.* New York: Russell Sage

    Foundation.

Kendrick, Carrie. 1998. *African American Officers' Role in the Future Army.* Senior

    research paper, Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College.

Kennedy, Claudia J. with Malcolm McConnell. 2001. *Generally Speaking: A Memoir by*

    the First Woman Promoted to Three-star General in the United States Army.

    New York: Warner Books.

Kimmel, Michael. 2004. *The Gendered Society,* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University

    Press .

Landrum, Cecile S. 1979. "The Conflicts Surrounding Family and Children Versus

    Mission Responsibilities." Paper presented at the IUS Regional Conference, May

    9-12, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.

Landry, Bart. 2000. *Black Working Wives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Liff, Sonia and Kate Ward. 2001. "Distorted Views through the Glass Ceiling: The Construction of Women's Understanding of Promotion and Senior Management Positions." *Gender, Work and Organization*, 8, 1 (Jan):19-36.

Listman, John W. 1998. "Women in the Army National Guard." The National Guard Educational Foundation. Retrieved 2 April 2007 http://www.ngef.org/tier.asp?bid=31.

Manning, Lory. 2005. *Women in the Military: Where They Stand.* 5th ed. Washington, D.C.: Women's Research and Education Institute.

Medwick, Cathleen. 2001. "Phenomenal Women: An Officer and a Gentlewoman." *O, The Oprah Magazine*, December 2001.

MFRC (Military Family Resource Center). 2006. "2005 Demographic Report." Washington, D.C.: Military Family Resource Center. Retrieved 28 July 2007 http://www.mfrc.dod.mil/stat.cfm.

Miller, Laura L. 1997. "Not Just Weapons of the Weak: Gender Harassment as a Form of Protest for Army Men." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60: 32-51.

Morden, Bettie J. 1990. *The Women's Army Corps 1945-1978.* Washington, DC: Center of Military History, U.S. Army.

Moore, Gwen. 1988. "Women in Elite Positions: Insiders or Outsiders?" *Sociological Forum* 3, 4 (Autumn): 566-585.

Moskos, Charles. 1988. "Institutional and Occupational Trends in Armed Forces." Pp. 15-26 in *The Military: More than Just a Job?* Edited by Charles Moskos and Frank Wood. Washington, D.C.: Pergamon-Brassey's.

NCES. National Center for Education Statistics. 2006. "Table 267. Bachelor's degrees

    conferred by degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity and sex of student:

    Selected years, 1976-77 through 2004-05." Retrieved October 29, 2007

    http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d06/tables/dt06_267.asp.

 National Guard Bureau. 2007. "About the National Guard." Retrieved 24 March 2007

    http://www.ngb.army.mil/About/default.aspx.

Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). 2007. Retrieved 1 July 2007

    http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/rg0704.pdf.

------. 1998. *Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers.* Washington, D.C.:

    author.

Quill. 2007. "Woman of Distinction Marianne "Mimi" Blackburn Drew." Retrieved 11

    April 2007 http://www.alphaxidelta.org.

Reardon, Kathleen K. and Kevin J. Reardon. 1999. "All That We Can Be: Leading the

    U.S. Army's Gender Integration Effort." *Management Communication*

    Quarterly, 12 (4): 600-618.

Reyes, Anthony D. 2006. *Strategic Options for Managing Diversity in the U.S. Army.*

    Military Fellow Research Report. Washington D.C.: Joint Center for Political and

    Economic Studies.

Reskin, Barbara and Irene Padavic. 1994. *Women and Men at Work.* Thousand Oaks,

    CA: Pine Forge Press.

Richie, Beth Sperber, Ruth E. Fassinger, Sonja Geschmay Linn, Judith Johnson and

    Joann Prosser. 1997. "Persistence, Connection, and Passion: A Qualitative Study

of the Career Development of Highly Achieving African American-Black and White Women." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 44, 2: 133-148.

Roffey, Arthur E., Frank R. Wood, Bridgett R. Price, Melissa R. Kallett. 1989. "Work and Family Issues Affecting Early Career Decisions of the First Women Graduates of the U.S. Air Force Academy". *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military*, VII, Fall/Winter: 25-40.

Rosen, Sherwin. 1992. "The Military as an Internal Labor Market: Some Allocation, Productivity, and Incentive Problems." *Social Science Quarterly,* 73, 2, June: 227-237.

Rostker, Bernard, Harry Thie, James Lacy, Jennifer Kawata, Susanna Purnell. 1993. *The Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980: A Retrospective Assessment.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Santana, Rebecca. 2006. "She's a general, not a gender." Associated Press. Retrieved 26 August 2006 www.Military.com.

Sarnecky, Mary. 1999. *A History of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Scutro, Andrew. 2006. "CNO: Diversity 'Critical' to Navy's Future." *Navy Times*, July 17.

SECNAV (Secretary of the Navy) Instruction 1412.6K. 07 May 1999. "Promotion of Officers to the Grade of Lieutenant (Junior Grade) in the Navy and to the Grade of First Lieutenant in the Marine Corps." Washington, D.C.: Author

Segal, David R. 1989. *Recruiting for Uncle Sam: Citizenship and Military Manpower Policy.* Lawrence, KA: University Press of Kansas.

Segal, David R., and Mady Wechsler Segal. 2004. "America's Military Population." *Population Bulletin*, 59, 4. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau, Inc., December.

------. 1999. "Changes in the American Armed Forces: Implications for Military Families." Pp. 1-10 in *Pathways to the Future: A Review of Military Family Research*, edited by Peggy McClure. Scranton, PA: Military Family Institute.

Segal, Mady Wechsler. 1986. "The Military and the Family as Greedy Institutions." *Armed Forces & Society,* 13, 1 (Fall): 9-38.

------. 1995. "Women's Military Roles Cross-Nationally: Past, Present, and Future." *Gender and Society,* 9, 6, December: 757-775.

Scott, Sir Walter. 1997 (1808). "Lochinvar" retrieved 26 November 2007 http://homepages.wmich.edu/~cooneys/poems/Scott.Lochinvar.html.

Smolenski, Mary C., Donald G. Smith, Jr., and James S. Nanney. 2005. *A Fit, Fighting Force: The Air Force Nursing Services Chronology.* Washington, D.C.: Office of the Air Force Surgeon General.

Spain, Daphne and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1996. *Balancing Act*. New York: Russell Sage.

Spangler, Eve, Marsha A. Gordon and Ronald A. Pipkin. 1978. "Token Women: An Empirical Test of Kanter's Hypothesis." *American Journal of Sociology,* 84, 1 (Jul): 160-170.

Sterner, Doris. 1996. *In and Out of Harm's Way: A History of the Navy Nurse Corps*. Seattle, WA: Peanut Butter Publishing.

Stiehm, Judith Hicks, ed. 1996. *It's Our Military, Too!* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Stoddard, Ellwyn R. 1994. "Married Female Officers in a Combat Branch:

    Occupational-Family Stress and Future Career Choices." *Minerva*, 12, 2: 5-14.

Thomas, Patricia J. and Zannette A. Uriell. 1998. *Pregnancy and Single Parenthood in*

    the Navy: Results of a 1997 Survey. San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research

    and Development Center.

Today's Military "Military Careers." 2005.   Retrieved 28 June 2005

    http://www.todaysmilitary.com/.

Tracy, PatriciaVice Adm. 2005. "Choosing to Serve: Reflections of Retired Military

    Women." Panel presentation sponsored by Women in International Security,

    Washington, D.C. March 1.

United States Coast Guard (USCG). 2007a. "About us." Retrieved 24 March 2007

    http://www.uscg.mil/top/about/.

------. 2007b. "Flag SES Bios." Retrieved 30 August 2007 http://www.uscg.mil/flag/.

U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary (USCGA) 2007. "Join the Auxiliary." Retrieved 24 March

    2007 http://nws.cgaux.org/visitors/ps_visitor/index.html.

U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2006. "Bulletin 2600: Job

    Opportunities in the Armed Forces." *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2006-07*

    Edition. Retrieved 12 April 2006 http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos249.htm.

University of Maine. 2007. "Birth Order." *Family Issues Facts: A Fact Sheet for*

    Families and People Who Work With Families. University of Maine Cooperative

    Extension Bulletin #4359. Retrieved 5 August 2007

    www.umext.maine.edu/onlinepubs/4359.htm.

Webb, James. 1979. "Women Can't Fight." *Washingtonian,* November.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society,* 1, 2, June: 125-151.

White, Harrison C. 1970. *Chains of Opportunity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Williams, Joan. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to do About it.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Wingo, Josette Dermody. 1994. *Mother Was a Gunner's Mate: World War II in the WAVES.* Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

WREI. Women's Research and Education Institute. 2007. Biennial Conference. Washington, D.C. May 2007.

Yang, Jia Lynn. 2005. "Goodbye to all that." *Fortune* 152, 10, November 14: 169-170.

Yang, Jia Lynn and Eugenia Levenson. 2005. "50 Most Powerful Women." *Fortune* 152, 10, November 14: 125-137.

Yellin, Emily. 2004. *Our Mother's War: American Women at Home and at the Front During World War II.* New York: Free Press.

Yoder, Janice D. 1985. "An Academic Woman as a Token: A Case Study." *Journal of Social Issues* 41, 4: 61-72.

------. 1994. "Looking Beyond the Numbers: The Effects of Gender Status, Job Prestige, and Occupational Gender-Typing on Tokenism Processes." *Social Psychological Quarterly* 57, 2: 150-159.

------. 2001. "Making Leadership Work More Effectively for Women." *Journal of Social Issues,* 57, 4: 815-828.

Yoder, Janice D., Jerome Adams and Howard T. Prince. 1983. "The Price of a Token."

    Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 11, (Fall): 325-337.

Zimmerman, Jean. 1995. *Tailspin: Women at War in the Wake of Tailhook.* New York:

    Doubleday.