A Description of the Articles of the Past Five Years of *Armed Forces & Society*

By Nathan Sexton

An Applied Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Public Administration

Texas State University
Fall 2003
Political Science 5397
Dr. Patricia Shields

Faculty Approval

_____

_____

Abstract

The purpose of this Applied Research Project is to describe the substantive content of recent articles in *Armed Forces & Society*. This paper uses the framework of Guy L. Siebold (2001) to analyze the content of 117 *Armed Forces & Society* articles from the past five years.

The settings chapter gives a background of the journal and information about each editor. Guy L. Siebold (2001 pp. 143) identifies four areas of military sociology that require attention. The four areas include (1) the military as a profession of arms, (2) the military as an institution or organization, (3) civil-military relations, and (4) military relations with other governmental agencies and militaries (Siebold 2001 pp140). The key facets of military sociology as set by Siebold are used to classify the content in the journal.

The results found that the most discussed topics in the journal are historical development; education or training; recruitment or promotion; social issues or innovation, demographics; goals, ways of operating or the I/O debate, and the degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation as related to civil-military relations.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

Military sociology has been studied for years. Military sociology is an outgrowth of World War II and has been developing since then. Sociologist Morris Janowitz started the journal *Armed Forces & Society* in 1974. *Armed Forces & Society* is one of the leading scholarly outlets for military sociologists. Over the years authors have been doing their best to try to cover the vast topics of military sociology. Most authors build upon the works of earlier authors and sometimes build on their own work. Morris Janowitz is one of the fathers of military sociology, and authors today have used his writings as foundations for their contributions. Morten Ender and Ariana Olldashi have contributed to a tradition of studying the journal. Ariana Olldashi described the content and methods used in recent *Armed Forces & Society* articles that dealt with civil military relations in emerging democracies. Her results found that the cases in general did not discuss theory of civil-military relations substantially. This paper continues the tradition of studying the journal.

Purpose

Guy L. Siebold maintains that research on the military misses a generally accepted core such as central issues and theory. The study of military sociology also lacks focus (2001 p. 143). "The fear is that without such a center, the sub-field will dissipate when its current leaders retire, as less funding and recognition are available, and as fewer and fewer sociologists have enough experience with the military to adequately

define the scope of pertinent research" (Siebold 2001 p. 140). He identifies four areas of

military sociology that require attention. Siebold provides a framework used to classify

the fields of military sociology that require attention. The four areas include: (1) the

military as a profession of arms, (2) the military as an institution or organization, (3)

civil-military relations, and (4) military relations with other governmental agencies and

militaries (Siebold 2001 p140). The purpose of this Applied Research Project is to

describe the substantive content of recent articles in *Armed Forces & Society*. The

Siebold framework for military sociology is used to classify the content. Finding what

areas of military sociology are covered in *Armed Forces & Society* is important because

these areas can give contributors and the editor of the journal some insight as to what

trends the journal is following and what areas require more diversity. Some topics may

be overlooked and this research identifies those topics lacking attention and areas

demanding greater focus. The study of the military is important because the scientific

study of a society would be grossly incomplete without including the study of the military

(Siebold 2001 p. 140) This applied research project was inspired by Dr. Patricia Shields

who is the editor of the *Armed Forces & Society* journal.

Summary of chapters

Chapter two is a brief setting chapter giving some background information about

the journal and its origins as well as some facts about military sociology in general.

The third chapter is a literature review covering works from *Armed Forces &*

Society journal, as well as books and other scholarly journals. The review of the

literature elaborates on the nature of military sociology and gives an overview of the

literature written in relation to the four areas of military sociology set by George Siebold. The Siebold model was used because it is one of the more recent models and encompasses several of the past models.

Chapter four covers the methodology used to gather research and explains the choice of content analysis as opposed to other methods of gathering and analyzing data.

Chapter five is a results chapter with all the content analysis broken down into percentages and figures to show the various areas of focus within the journal. Chapter six draws conclusions from the results and provides recommendations for diversity in the journal.

Chapter Two

Setting

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to give a background on the *Armed Forces &
Society* journal and its origins, significance, and examples of the tradition of its study.

Modern military sociology has descended in a fairly straight line from pioneering
work done during and immediately after World War II.[1] The study centered on the
causes and consequences of variations in morale. The Pentagon funded the study because
it promised immediate and practical results (Schwartz 1999 p22).

Morris Janowitz, one of the fathers of military sociology, established the journal
Armed Forces & Society in 1974 and served as its editor through 1983. This journal is
one of several that serves as an outlet for scholars interested in military subjects (Ender
2001 p623).

Armed Forces & Society is the leading peer reviewed interdisciplinary and
international journal publishing on military establishment, civil-military relations, the use
and limits of force in armed conflict and peacekeeping operations, security and other
related topics. It publishes empirical, theoretically-informed articles, research notes,

---

[1] Pioneering books of military sociology include *The American Soldier* by S.A. Stouffer, *The Soldier and
the State* by Samuel Huntington, *The Professional Soldier* by Janowitz, and *The American Enlisted Man* by
Charles Moskos. The first major textbook was *Military Sociology: A Study of American Military
Institutions and Military Life* by C.H. Coates and R.H. Pellegrin.

book reviews and review essays. Dr. Patricia Shields, at the political science department of Texas State University, is currently the editor (*Armed Forces & Society* 2003).

Morten Ender, following the tradition of studying the journal, did a review of authorship and affiliation to see where the articles were coming from and found that 79 percent of the articles contributed to *Armed Forces & Society* were from the United States. The closest contributing country was Israel with only 3.3 percent illustrating the overwhelming majority of articles with domestic affiliations (Ender 2001 pp 630). Thirty percent of the articles came from political scientists followed by sociologist contributions at 18 percent (Ender 2001 pp 634).

Siebold (2001) notes that research in the military has contributed to such fields as attitude research, small groups, race relations, social change, the family, professions, and political economy. According to Siebold (2001), the study of the military has not been able to define any central issues or arrive at a general theory.

Editor Tenures[2]

Major domestic and world events have affected the content of the journal since its inception in 1974. Each editor has had to deal with new topics, new ideas, and events that changed the way military sociology is viewed. The journal first started with sociologist Morris Janowitz in the fall of 1974. The tenure of Janowitz began right about the time the military in the United States had become an all-volunteer force and his tenure ended in 1983. In addition, barely ten years had passed since all branches of the military

---

[2] This section uses information gathered from the International Biennial Conference of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society held in Chicago, IL in October 2003. Attending the conference was Patricia Shields, David R. Segal, Claude Welch Jr., Jay Stanley, James Burk, and Mark Eitelberg.

completely desegregated. The Inter-University Seminar (IUS) started with 6-8 scholars

and was an exchange of ideas in the Chicago area. Chicago had several schools that

could contribute. Today the IUS on *Armed Forces and Society* is a forum for the

interchange and assessment of research and scholarship in the social and behavioral

sciences dealing with the military establishment and civil-military relations (Website of

Armed Forces & Society 2003).

Sociologist David Segal, from the University of Maryland, was the second editor

and a student of Janowitz. He is currently the president of the IUS. In addition he is a

professor of sociology, an affiliate professor of government and politics and of public

affairs, and the director of the Center for Research on Military Organization at the

University of Maryland College Park. His tenure began in the fall of 1983 with volume

10 and went until 1988. Segal's tenure was highly influenced by the Cold War and

nuclear threat was a hot topic. He was the last editor to have a tenure completely

immersed in the Cold War. His focus was on clarity of allies and roles and a sense of

desire to internationalize.

Political scientist Claude Welch took over the responsibilities of editor of the

journal in the fall of 1988 starting with volume 15(1). The tenure of Welch saw the end

of communism in the Soviet Union and the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989. The Cold War

ended and the topic and focus of a lot of the articles from the field of military sociology

changed. Welch was also witness to Desert Storm in 1991. Welch took an interest in

civil military relations in Africa and developing countries. Certain countries were closed

off to study so most of the study was western relations. He wanted to expand this to

include west and south (including Africa and South America). He is from SUNY (State

University of New York) Buffalo. Welch also has an affiliation with the government and politics department.

The fourth editor of *Armed Forces & Society* was Jay Stanley. He took over in the fall of 1992 with volume 19(1). His focus was on peacekeeping and he had a recognition of postmodern armed forces. He is from Towson College.

Texas A&M sociologist James Burk was the fifth editor. His tenure began in the fall of 1995 with volume 22(1). Burk was most influenced by two main events both of which stemmed from the Cold War.

"The first was the emergence of peacekeeping as a frequent and important military mission. We did a special issue on this topic, drawing on the work of scholars from a number of different countries, providing a useful variety of perspectives on the matter. The war on terror has overshadowed the importance of this topic for the moment, but I suspect it will not do so forever. The second was the growing dissatisfaction with the classical approaches to civil-military relations theory (Janowitz vs. Huntington). I think we published more articles on this theme than any other single theme during my tenure as editor" (Burk interview).

During Burk's tenure, the people at Transaction thought the journal looked "tired" and out-of-date. With the help of his brother, a commercial artist, Burk revised the cover and the current design is based on this revision (Burk interview).

Mark Eitelberg was the sixth editor of the journal. His tenure went from the fall of 1998 with volume 25(1) to 2001. Eitelberg also had a focus on postmodern military and had a special issue about media and education in the U.S. civil military. Eitelberg works at the Department of Systems Management at the Naval Postgraduate School. He has a background in public policy as well.

Patricia Shields is the most recent and the current editor of *Armed Forces & Society*. Shields' tenure has been high influenced by the events of September 11 and her tenure has also focused on democratic theory interspersed with civil military relations.

She says there is more of a globalization since enemies are now allies and there is more of a problem of rogue states. She has a background in political science and public administration and is from Texas State University-San Marcos. Her time as editor has seen such events as September 11th and the U.S. attack on Iraq.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown the tradition of studying *Armed Forces & Society* and this description of the substantive content of recent articles shows it is continuing that tradition. The chapter has also given a brief history and background of the journal's editors.

Chapter Three
Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to review and define four aspects of military sociology as set forth by Guy L. Siebold. The Siebold framework for military sociology used to classify the content will allow for the description of the substantive content of the *Armed Forces & Society* articles in later chapters. There are four themes which include (1) the military as a profession of arms, (2) the military as an institution or organization, (3) civil-military relations, and (4) military relations with other governmental agencies and militaries (Siebold 2001 p140). The first two topics are internal factors while the second two are external factors. Military literature covers a vast array of topics, but this study is limited to military sociology as defended by these four categories. There is a brief history of military sociology, and leading scholars also add suggestions to the study of the field. The dilemma of civil-military relations is also addressed by trying to find a medium between the need for a military strong enough to defend our country and a military still controlled by the civilian sector.

Siebold (2001 p.140) says that military sociology is the sociological analysis of the military. Siebold defines the military as a "formally organized entity or set of entities responsive to the governmental leaders heading a nation state; the military's use of arms functions to defend that nation state, or to further its policies in its relations with other nation states or large collective entities. According to Coates and Pellegrin (1965 p. 3), military sociology is a field or branch of its parent discipline, sociology. In addition, military sociology focuses attention on the military establishment in the same manner as other fields of sociology examine the areas of interest with which they are mainly

concerned. The only thing that distinguishes military sociology from regular sociology is its analysis of military topics (Coates and Pellegrin 1965).

Military sociology is an outgrowth of World War II and the Cold War. Research in the military has contributed to such fields as attitude research, small groups, race relations, social change, gender integration, the family, professions, and political economy. Siebold (2001 p.140) maintains that a generally accepted core, such as central issues and theory, is missing from military research.

Sociology itself can be defined as the systematic study of social behavior and human groups (Schaefer 1986 p. 5). Berger (1963 p.31) claims that the perspective of sociology involves seeing through the outside appearances of people's actions and organizations. Sociology can also be defined as the scientific study of social relations, institutions, and societies (Smelser 1994 p. 3). Spencer (1969 p. 7) defines a society as a collective name for a number of individuals. The society observed in this paper is the military.

Smelser (1994) identifies levels of analysis that sociologists use to describe and explain phenomena. These levels include the demographic, the social-psychological, the group, the social-structural, and the cultural. The demographic refers to the size and composition of human populations. The social-psychological refers to the attitudes and behaviors of individuals in relation to their social environment and the interaction among persons. The group refers to the structure and behavior of purposive collectivities, with individuals as members. Groups can cover the allocation of wealth and power among groups. The social-structure refers to the enduring patterns of relations among individuals and groups. Finally, the cultural refers to systems of values and beliefs that regulate,

legitimize, and give meaning to social institutions and social behavior (1994 p. 4).

Smelser (1994 p. 8) admits the scope of sociology is very large and there is a sociology of

virtually everything under the sun. The focus in this paper is the military. The first of the

two factors that are internal to the military is the military as a profession of arms.

Internal Factors

The Military as a Profession of Arms

This section defines the military as a profession of arms and sets forth pertinent

subcategories by which to identify it. Siebold (2001 p. 143) proposes the military

profession can be viewed in the context of other professions that exist at a given time and

in a given society, as well as how the context has changed.   He adds that professions and

groups within professional institutions can be ranked in terms of power, prestige, and

compensation[3]. Associated with the professions are popular images of those profession's

values and ways that the professionals interact with each other and the wider society.

The profession of arms has its own subcategories, which include historical development,

socialization, responsibility, control, accountability, recruitment, education, training,

promotion, compensation, prestige, power, and expertise. The first issue identified by

Siebold (2001 p.143) is the historical development of the military profession. This idea

of "professionalism" crosses categories, since it is a safeguard to proper civil military

relations. Sorensen (1994 p. 604) asserts that any redefinition of the concept of military

as a profession should take into account empirical facts, the need for conceptual

---

[3] Smelser (1994) identifies the allocation of wealth and power among groups as part of the group level of sociology.

clarification, the acceptance of countervailing or anticipated reactions, a conscious choice of level, and avoidance of the cause-effect relation.

Historical Development of Profession

Many factors have influenced the military's current status. Within United States' military history, several periods of enormous activity required fielding an army consistent with the demands of the crisis at hand. The United States acknowledged the need for programs to provide large standing ground forces in time of peace, so it created those necessary forces. This was in response to a love affair with strategic air power bearing nuclear weapons after the Korean War. It has been easier to justify standing naval forces in peacetime due to the time required to build, launch, and fit out ships. The notion that the navy is the first line of defense and that response time of the navy would take longer are reasons the U.S. Navy has done better in trying to get resources than have peace time land forces (Jessup and Ketz 1994 p.471).

Professional military historians looked at the circumstances and outcomes of ten early important battles in wars. The purpose of this, to gain experiences and lessons that could be applied to better prepare military forces to fight the first battles of the next war (Heller and Stofft 1986). Key points are identified that were overlooked by the losing side in each of the ten battles. Those points include: communication, a common set of tactics and operational concepts, a lack of logistical support, training of units as units rather than individuals, and commanders did not have an understanding of political goals.

Issues such as these can be learned from and have been focused on as needing change thereby shaping the military today (Heller and Stofft 1986).

Charles Moskos, John Williams, and David Segal (2000 p.1) discuss the transformation of the military from Modern to Postmodern. The modern military that emerged fully in the nineteenth century was inextricably associated with the rise of the nation-state. The modern military organization was never a pure type; its basic format was a combination of conscripted lower ranks or militia and a professional officer corps. The modern military organization was war-oriented in mission, masculine in makeup and ethos, and sharply differentiated in structure and culture from civilian society. There are stages in the transformation of the Modern military to the Postmodern military.

The Modern type dates from the nineteenth century to the end of World War II. This period was marked by the concept of the citizen soldier entering the European continent. The second stage, the Late Modern, went from the mid-twentieth century into the early 1990s and coincides with the Cold War. Mass-conscripted armies and the accentuation of military professionalism in the officer class identify this stage. Prior to this, military officership was usually determined by lineage. The final, or Postmodern stage, began with the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and Easter Europe. The Western states did not have to buttress armed forces anymore. This caused the military in such countries to emphasize patriotism, the globalization of finance, trade, and communication (Moskos et al. 2000 p.2).

Historical development of the military profession can include things like non-professional aberrations in the treatment of civilians and conquered countries, or compensation in the military. Siebold (2001 p. 143) provides an example of an

aberration with military compensation. Historically, military compensation came in the form of plunder, but this was not consistent with the social control; therefore, salaries were substantiated. The form and amount of compensation reflects the tensions and concerns within the military profession and between the military and its wider society (Siebold 2001 p.143). The compensation received by the military professional in the 1970s was a function of rank, seniority, and need and was not really for professional expertise (Moskos 1977 pp 43). Compensation also pertains to rank and reflects a position's prestige.

Prestige, Power or Characteristics of Professionalism

Siebold (2001 p.143) expresses the need for theoretical development about the relative power and prestige related to the profession. Specifically he focused on the following: 1) the military profession in a society, 2) managers of that profession (officers) 3) specially skilled members compared to the average, and 4) military members more subject to hazards or difficult situations than others, with amount and form of compensation as dependent variables. According to Janowitz (1960 p. 3), in the United States the military profession does not carry much prestige. Military officers are only dimly perceived as persons, decision makers, and political creatures. The professional, as a result of prolonged training, acquires a skill which enables him or her to render specialized service (Janowitz 1960 p. 5) The emergence of a professional officer corps has been a slow and gradual process with many interruptions and reversals. A small portion of men within the military profession can be thought of as elite. Samuel

Huntington (1957 p. 8) identifies the three essential elements in military professionalism as expertise, responsibility, and corporateness.

Responsibility or Expertise

Siebold (2001 p.147) asserts that the professional military lays claim to a distinct field of expertise: the management of violence. He uses Huntington, Coates and Pellegrin to support this assertion. Huntington notes that the profession of the military focuses on the skill and capability to apply violence. Coates and Pellegrin agree saying the violence is that which is applied in carrying out the monopolistic responsibility for the military security of the larger society (Siebold 2001 p.147). The military has a concept of professional responsibility as well, in which officers apply their specialized military knowledge in their capacity as public servants (Lang 1972 p. 29).

A comparison was done regarding the intelligence and preparedness of the U.S. military. The comparison was between Pearl Harbor and the events of 9/11, with a focus on the responsibility of the military. There were two men, Admiral Kimmel and General Short, who could have taken measures to mitigate the magnitude of American losses on December 7, 1941 (Borch 2003 p.859). The more recent events of the World Trade Center and Pentagon were not the faults of the military. This is because a military leader would have had to have the mission and responsibility to prevent a terrorist attack, or to mitigate its effects, however this was not the case (Borch 2003 p.859). Lieutenant Colonel Richard A. Lacquement Jr. of the U.S. Army submits that military professional expertise is no longer the management of violence. He says a better definition would be "The core expertise of American military officers is the development, operation, and

leadership of a human organization, a profession whose primary expertise is the organized application of coercive force on behalf of the American people." An abbreviated definition would be, "Expertise is leadership of Army soldiers in the organized application of coercive force." (2003 p.61). The professional military is an organization that operates under the concept of corporateness; the concept is unique from other organizations and is similar to socialization.

Socialization

Socialization in the military is the process by which the military man or woman acquires professional attitudes, values, and behavior patterns according to uniforms, codes, and everything else (Coates and Pellegrin 1965 p. 224). The professional military has a corporate identity. Things that separate the military from other professions include customs, codes, traditions, lore of the military way of life, the clubs and associations officers belong to, and the uniforms and insignia they wear (Lang 1972 p. 29). Schools such as West Point are used to socialize young officers. People can also become officers through R.O.T.C. (reserve officers' training corps) in college, through specialized schools, or even though the OSC (officer candidate schools) for those who already have a college degree and meet qualifications to apply for commission.

Boot camp socializes the privates or enlistees. Boot camp creates high-pressure scenarios that test the recruits' teamwork, leadership skills, and creativity. These boot camps promote team building (Flink 2001 p. 36). Bachman notes that military socialization is not limited to the first year or two of service (Bachman et. al 2000 p.577).

Historically, common soldiers were led by their social superiors. Officers had to be born to command, but there has been a change in this since the turn of the century with lower and lower middle class people qualifying more readily, so long as they have the requisite education. As of the 1970s, officers at all ranks were somewhat more representative of the general population than in the past (Lang 1972 p. 34).

Military socialization establishes cognitive referents such as values, norms, and attitudes that soldiers learn to invoke to guide their operations, decisions and behavior. A cadet's identification with the military and with their country is likely to influence his of her commitment to the mission, and how they perform in the mission will depend on how they understand it. If the other members of a cadet's reference group (the other military officers or enlistees) share the meaning of the mission, then motivation and performance will be high (Franke 2000 p.178). This is one of the reasons that socialization is so important to the military as a profession of arms. In Franke's (2000) study, women cadets were found to have a few differences in the socialization process. During the second and third years of training, cadets learn to apply basic soldier skills. Competitive academic and physical program requirements, combined with training emphasis on warrior skills and martial values are likely to enhance the potency of cadets' "combat-masculine-warrior" identity. This could cause female members of the reference group to have a different meaning or interpretation to the mission and cause a lack of performance as a group (Franke 2000 p.193).

Professional socialization is a continuous process. Coates and Pellegrin (1965 p. 225) show how the topics of education, recruitment, and socialization run together.

Education or Training

Formal military education is the principal means of socializing the would-be military professional. The faculties of military schools and Reserve Officer Training Corps (R.O.T.C.) units in college and universities are similarly staffed with a core of military professionals (Coates & Pellegrin 1965 p. 224). As a part of the continued socializing process of military indoctrination, mottoes and slogans with themes of courage and honor are committed to memory and prominently displayed on flags and crests to epitomize, for the individual, the spirit and ideals of his or her particular unit or branch of service. West Point emphasizes "Duty, honor, and country," while the Marines emphasize "Semper Fidelis," meaning always faithful (Coates & Pellegrin. 1965 p. 226). This summarizes the moral precepts to which military professionals adhere. Duty refers to obedience, obligation, and the willingness to make sacrifices (Shields 1993 p. 517).

The daily round of activities in a military organization continues the socialization process for the individual (Coates & Pellegrin p. 226). Cadets of West Point only experience slight changes in their orientation towards professional roles and in perspective with which they view the use of force in international relations. There are different professional orientations and strategic perspectives between cadets with civilian backgrounds and those with military backgrounds, but these differences diminish through the general cadet experience. The value system of the academy environment has been increasingly varied and diffused since the end of World War II (Janowitz 1964b p.120).

Don Snider, Robert Priest, and Felisa Lewis found that military professionalism was not covered in the core curricula when they visited each military academy and several Army ROTC detachments. They also noted the core curricula does not require a

civil-military relations course, making it difficult, if not impossible, for the cadets to integrate on their own a coherent understanding of the officers' role in American civil-military relations (Snider et al. 2001 p. 268). The authors also claim that values of cadets do change over their four-year academy experiences in good and bad ways. Positive changes were attributed to the academy socialization process and the reinforcement of previously held values rather than introduction and reorientation to new ones. Negative changes of values and attitudes in cadets were consistent with findings at civilian educational institutions and can be attributed to growth in maturation, independence, and self-assurance of those making the transition from teenagers to adults (Snider, et al. 2001 p. 254).

War colleges exist for career officers after they attain their undergraduate degree. There are six war colleges. Two are joint colleges: The Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College. The Marine War College has few students. The final three are the Army, Air, and Naval College. Students are typically around age forty and faculty are usually active duty officers (Stiehm 2001b p.274). The US Army War College is the senior institution in the Army educational system. It has the responsibility of preparing carefully selected students from all military services and branches of government for senior positions within the military and national government. The main purpose of the College is "to produce graduates who understand how to operate in a strategic level, to recognize the strategic ramifications of a given issue, to make sound, well-reasoned decisions, and to render advice on the military implications associated with a particular national policy" (Barber 1992 p. 4). The mission of the War College is "to prepare selected officers and civilians for senior leadership responsibilities in a strategic

environment during peace and war and to study the role of land power, as part of a joint or combined force, in support of the US national military strategy." (Barber 1992 p. 4).

Even though military academies and war colleges receive the most attention in literature, there are other steps to the education of a military officer. In the Army, education requirements are satisfied by both the Army's military schools and civilian instruction. The Officer Basic Course and the first phase (OAC of the branch Captains Career Course include training specific to an officer's branch. The Command and Staff College (CSC) and Senior Service College (SSC) provide opportunities for advances military and leader development training. There are other services and elements of the Federal Government that offer courses that support officer professional development. Advanced education may consist of resident and/or nonresident courses. Functional area training gives officers the necessary skills and technical qualifications to perform the duties that are required in a functional area. Courses of study leading to graduate degrees at civilian colleges and universities can meet these needs. The Army's objective is to have all officers receive instruction qualifying them in their functional area (Department of the Army 1998 p.16).

As an officer advances, he or she must develop the appropriate skills and perspectives necessary for higher management, or lose out in the competition for promotion (Lang 1972 p. 44).

Recruitment or Promotion

This section is covers the history of recruitment and promotion and concludes with recruitment and promotion practices of the current military. The usual process of

promotion from officer ranks to those of the enlisted men or vice versa was completely different, and it was often referred to as "the caste division of the armed forces"[4] (Coates et al. 1965 p.248). The way people are recruited into the military could affect the way they are promoted. The maintenance of an enlarged military establishment during the Cold War required a fundamental "democratization" of the officer recruitment base. The services recruited officers from academy graduates, selected enlisted men (officer candidate school), and from college graduates serving their military obligations (reserve officer training corps) to fill overall officer requirements (Janowitz 1964b p. 257). Academy graduates enjoyed a formidable advantage in the competition for promotion (Janowitz 1964b p. 44). There was competition for the services of young college and university graduates of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air force with the private sector (Coates et al. 1965 p. 229).

Career enlisted men of the four branches were popularly called "professional soldiers," (Coates et al. 1965 p. 234) yet the majority of the resignations by regular officers were by relatively junior officers. If an officer remained on active duty voluntarily beyond any period of legal obligation, he or she seemed quite likely to desire to remain in the service until he or she is eligible for retirement. Those enlisted men who selected to remain beyond their initial enlistment obligation were likely to remain in service until retirement, unless their life situations changed dramatically. While most of the appeals to career personnel have been rather directly economic in nature, this emphasis has been defended as necessary to make military income competitive with incomes from related civilian careers. Janowitz says that assimilation into the military

---

[4] This is from *Military Sociology: A Study of American Military Institutions and Military Life*, which is from the pre all voluntary force era.

establishment operates on the assumption that personnel selection procedures are able to locate those persons with the required level of mental, emotional, and physical abilities for military training and service. For this reason the armed forces are deeply concerned with scientific screening devices (Janowitz 1959 p. 56). The regular officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps epitomized the military professional in the sense of following a higher calling rather than an ordinary vocation (Coates & Pellegrin. 1965 p. 227). Charles Moskos reiterated this as a trait of members of an institution (Moskos 1986 p. 378).

Things have changed post Vietnam with the AVF (all voluntary force) era. The draft ended and the conversion to AVF occurred in the mid seventies. With increased pay, significant advertising, and full national support, the initial implementation of the AVF was successful (Meese 2002 p.102). Most applicants to the Army seek service for personal benefit, which is usually monetary, and not for service-based reasons. Financial assistance to secondary education is widely available and the number of graduating high school seniors going directly into college is at an all time high.

Major Keith B. Hauk and Colonel Greg H. Parlier (2000 p. 74) contend that the Army must transform its recruiting practices. Today's American military is really an "all-recruited force" rather than an all-volunteer force. The two problems pointed out by the two authors are to first, change the recruiting practices and accession policies and reinvent themselves (the American military) within the marketplace to successfully recruit qualified men and women. The second is the inability of the US armed forces to meet their military manpower acquisition requirements, which has put a binding, strategic

constraint on the military's ability to support the national security strategy. All branches

of the military continue to miss their targets for recruitment.

The authors suggest that the military could appeal to the college youth market by

offering to bundle lower initial pay and a short term of service with complete post-service

educational benefits including tuition, room and board, books and stipend (Hauk &

Parlier 2000 p.75). Maintaining an all-volunteer force is expensive, difficult to manage

and requires significant attention from strategic leaders (Hauk & Parlier 2000 p.76). The

authors also claim that conscription is an industrial-age concept well suited to manning

mass armies, but is of little use in manning a force to conduct warfare in the information

age. Almost every western power has either moved or is transforming its military to a

recruited, as opposed to conscripted, force (Hauk & Parlier 2000 p.79).

Michael Meese adds that the creation of the all-volunteer force was one of the

most difficult peacetime changes that the American military has ever conducted. The

AVF changed numerous things, such as the source of enlisted soldiers, compensation,

contract lengths, advertising, morale, soldier duties, training, officer procurement, and

many other variables (Meese 2002 p.101).

Norman Baldwin (1969) examined whether race and gender were proportionately

represented in the promotion of military officers. Baldwin found that those promoted and

considered for promotion in the Army are disproportionately men and Caucasian, and

these disproportions also increase with rank. He did add that the promotion record can be

viewed as good or bad. Conservatives often argue the pattern does not indicate problems

and does not violate "Uniform Guidelines." Those with strong equity values can say

there is reason to be concerned over the under representation of women and minorities in

the Army's middle-officer ranks and over the performance of the Army relative to some

public agencies (Baldwin 1996 p. 205).

Remo Butler did a study that investigated why black officers failed. In the

opinion of several of the black officers interviewed, the biggest problem for black junior

officers is the poor military education that many of them receive before coming to active

duty. Black officers who graduate from West Point or a predominantly white institute

have a higher chance of succeeding than those black officers who graduate from

historically black colleges. The other three reasons other than education were

developmental assignments, lack of mentoring, and a clash of cultures (Butler 1999 p.

59).

In examining the profession of arms, Siebold (2001 p. 143) says that the study of

the military needs to be explicit about the unique characteristics of the military

profession. One of the main unique characteristics is the application of lethal violence,

which requires professional control and accountability (Siebold 2001 p. 144).

Control or Accountability

The military is hierarchical as a means of control. Siebold points out several of

the controls set up throughout the military (2001 p. 144).

The military contains formality, and formality reinforces control. The military is

also heavily socialized to instill internal control. The military is full of explicit rules,

regulations, checks, and counter-checks, which serve as external controls. Huntington

(1957 pp 89) maintains that military professionalism should be promoted and objective

civilian control should be maximized as a response to blurred civil-military boundaries

and declining efficiency. Even though objective civilian control is more of an external idea, it demonstrates the idea that control and accountability of the military needs to be somewhat limited to allow the military professional to do his or her job better. With "objective civilian control," the power of professional soldiers is minimized, and the ideal soldier is one who remains true to him or herself and serves with silence and courage according to the military method (Huntington 1957 pp 89).

The military is controlled on two organizational levels. The first is a colleague group that oversees the internal cohesion of the officer corps as a professional and social group. The group follows its own standards of personal behavior and professional conduct. The second level is an external source of control and discipline: the hierarchy of authority. Professional methods and conduct are judged by the faithfulness with which the officer follows directives from above. Professional status and advancement are awarded according to the officer's behavior, both as a professional and bureaucrat. Historically the most important attributes of the professional soldier were bravery and discipline. Professionals of the 1940s needed to be bureaucrats as well. Management and strategy are important skills to have. When there is a lack of control, disintegration can occur. Shils and Janowitz (1948 p. 282) discuss different types of disintegration. The first is desertion, or going to the enemy's side on purpose. A second form is active surrender, which is deliberately deciding to give up to the enemy as he approaches, and taking steps to facilitate capture. The third is passive surrender- either non-resistance or token resistance- by either individuals acting alone, or a plurality of uncoordinated individuals. The fourth is routine existence, or effective execution of orders as given from above with discontinuance when the enemy becomes overwhelmingly powerful and

aggressive. Finally, "last-ditch" resistance ends only with the exhaustion of fighting

equipment and subsequent surrender or death.

There have been more recent developments in the field of control in the military.

The Commission on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice has

brought on a series of retrospectives, as well as critiques of various aspects of the present

administration of justice. The commission was created through the efforts of the National

Institute of Military Justice. The Commission produced a report making four

recommendations including modifying the pretrial role of the convening authority in the

court-martial process, changing the responsibilities of the military judge, implementing

additional protection in capital cases, and modeling the prosecution of criminal sexual

misconduct after the Model Penal Code (Murphy 2001 p.3). The Uniform Code of

Military Justice serves as an institution grounded in traditions. The recommendations

have been criticized for placing the commander in an adversarial relationship with any

military subordinate including an accused. This a distortion of that relationship, and has

a corrosive effect on the discipline and unity required to achieve the military mission

(Murphy 2001 pp 5). The Uniform Code of Military Justice is one of the numerous

statutes that creates a separate military society. The scope of the executive authority here

is much broader than in the civilian environment. The Court of Military Appeals and the

Supreme Court recognize that the military is a society different and separate from civilian

society and has different and separate needs and requirements (Miller 2000 p.2).

The Judge Advocates General and the Court of Military Appeals have shared the

responsibility for the supervision of the military's criminal justice system. "Military

criminal justice is designed to serve the need for discipline in a structured, ordered

military force. Its distinctiveness is as basic as the Constitution" (Miller 2000 p. 1). There are even Rules of Engagement that dictate what soldiers can do in the field of battle. Rules of Engagement are mission specific and are the tool of the individual commander (Hoege III 2002 p. 1).

The first of Siebold's (2001 p. 144) important issues in examining the profession of arms is the need to get beyond simple description, so that research identifies associations, makes predictions, and posits satisfying explanations. The second is to be explicit about the unique characteristics of the military profession and their impact on the profession (Siebold 2001 pp143). The topic of the military as a profession often overlaps with the topic of the military as a social institution.

The Military as an Institution or Organization

The area of the military as an institution or organization is a shift in theme from the military as a profession of arms, but it is still an internal category because it relates only to issues inside the military and is not about dealings with the outer society or other nations or militaries. Even though this category overlaps to some degree with the military as a profession, its subcategories are unique. The area of the military as an institution or organization can be studied in many ways, but in this section examines beliefs, norms, structures, functions, patterned behavior, and adaptation for change. This section focuses on the subjects of values, ethics, organizational structures, goals and ways of operating, demographics, stratification and roles, the nature of workers, and management. The military as an organization or institution can be studied in terms of how it deals with general issues of the day or as a large organization in terms of such

features as bureaucracy, intra-preneurship and innovation, and the impact of technology (Siebold 2001 p. 145).

Social Issues or Innovation

As the complexity of military technology increases, so does the need for educational levels in the armed forces to operate and maintain this new technology. There are more educated soldiers in the armed forces today because of the increased complexity of military technology (Shamir et al. 2000 p. 46). One difference between the various services is the faster paced technological development in the Air Force and Navy as compared to the Army and Marine Corps (Moskos 1977 p. 44). Technology has produced such a high level of specialization that men and women are likely to think of themselves as members of a specific skill group rather than of a social class (Moskos 1977 p. 7).

Successful innovation for the military has been difficult over the past one hundred years due to the reality that military organizations are rarely willing to learn from the past. The military organizations study what makes them feel comfortable about themselves while not focusing on the lessons of the past. This causes militaries in combat to have to relearn the lessons learned at the end of the previous conflict (Murray 2001 p. 122). Innovation is a benchmark against which one can measure the trends and attitudes of his or her officer corps and senior leadership.

"Part of the problem is that the service personnel systems are so constrained by laws drawn up in the late 1940s, as well as by more recent service practices and congressional mandates, that it is virtually impossible for young officers to find time and opportunity to attain the broad spectrum of historical knowledge, language training, and

cultural awareness that the twenty-first century is going to demand" (Murray 2001 p. 128).

This leaves a pessimistic view for the ability of the officer corps of the U.S. armed services to be capable of adapting and innovating in the face of diverse threats and emerging challenges (Murray 2001 p. 128).

Over the past few decades, the personnel makeup of many forces has become much more diverse in terms of ethnicity, race, and gender. Social issues arise every so often to give the military society something new to deal with, such as homosexuality or abortion. This year is the ten-year anniversary of the1994 National Defense Authorization Act also known as the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" act. This act does not allow the military to ask enlistees if they are gay but it does stipulate that service members who disclose their homosexuality are subject to dismissal. Known homosexuals are not allowed to serve in the US armed forces (Belkin 2003 p. 109). Social issues, such as race and gender, can fit into their own category of demographics.

Demographics

The category of demographics in this section includes gender, race, and nationality. Moskos and Butler (1996 pp 3) note that the Army is not a racial utopia and it is susceptible to the same kinds of interracial suspicion and resentment that exist in civilian society. Blacks in the civil service are nearly two and a half times more likely to be fired than white (Moskos & Butler 1996 p. 6). The authors point out that the argument that blacks were used as cannon fodder was untrue, since black fatalities were only 12.1 percent of all Americans killed in Southeast Asia; this was proportional to the number of

blacks in the U. S. population of blacks in the Army at the close of the war (Moskos &

Butler 1996 p. 8). In conversations with black enlisted men, John Butler (1980) found

there was a consensus that the Army was the only place where "true equality" exists.

They are forced to attend the same churches, send their kids to the same schools, and live

in the same quarters.

Blacks in the military prior to World War II, had a very marginal presence. At the

beginning of World War II they were either excluded or admitted in small numbers, and

black personnel were confined to a handful of units and occupations. "Compulsory racial

segregation and other forms of official discrimination prevailed both in the Army and the

Navy. Widespread, strongly held beliefs about black inferiority supported restrictions on

the recruitment and assignment of black military personnel and raised serious doubts

among both blacks and whites about whether blacks would be fully incorporated into the

approaching national mobilization" (Mershon and Schlossman 1998 p. 1).

In July of 1948, an executive order was issued that prohibited racial

discrimination in the military and created a monitoring vehicle named the Fahy

Committee, which oversaw the process by which the Truman administration's decision to

desegregate the armed forces was gradually translated into actual organizational policies

and practices. However, complete desegregation was not completed on the eve of the

United States entry into the Korean War. The Army, Marine Corps, and the Steward's

Branch of the Navy were still segregated (Mershon and Schlossman 1998 p. 188). Major

desegregation of the entire military began during the Korean War in response to

personnel shortages and racial tensions. Desegregation started in the Far East but spread

to other Army commands in the United States and around the world as experience

(supplemented by social-science research) showed the officer corps that implementing the Army's nondiscrimination policies were feasible and desirable. "The Army and the Marine Corps at last followed the lead of the Navy, the Air Force, and the Fahy Committee by equating formal racial integration with military efficiency" (Mershon and Schlossman 1998 p. 219).

In the early 1960s, off-base discrimination began to dissolve because of military officers and external observers pointing out the tremendous damage it was doing to military readiness and morale (Mershon and Schlossman 1998 p. 273). The military has historically demonstrated a fundamental conservatism and resistance to social change. Mershon and Schlossman draw four conclusions about the integration of blacks into the military.

"First, they claim that major changes in the military were thoroughly political in nature…Second, leadership mattered greatly in determining the extent and pace of the change in military and race relations…Third, ideas about how race affected military performance had a powerful impact upon the choices that policymakers made…Finally, the focus of racial reform was on changing the behavior, not the underlying attitudes of military personnel" (Mershon and Schlossman 1998 p. 308).

"Up to a point, the history of African Americans in the military provides a rough microcosm of race relations overall in the United States" (Astor 1998 p. 499).

The military must also deal with gender issues such as gender discrimination. Judith Hicks Stiehm (2001 p. 73) points out that in recent years the discussion about the proper military roles for women has shifted from their physical strength to the presumably negative effect that they have on effectiveness and cohesion. The impact of gender integration on military effectiveness is a serious issue (Snyder 2003 p. 193). Snyder insists that American military policies should not undermine the basic democratic values that all American citizens need to share if we are to remain a vibrant democracy

(Snyder 2003 p. 199). Women are allowed to have limited involvement in the military in countries such as Germany, Italy, and Spain (Dandeker & Segal 1996 p.29). The main factors that affect women's military roles include: military variables (such as national security situation, military technology, combat to support ration, force structure, and military accession policies); characteristics of the social structure (including demographic patterns, women's positions in the labor force, economic factors, and family structure); and various cultural considerations involved in the social construction of gender and family (such as social values about gender and family, public discourse regarding gender, and values regarding ascription and equity) (Dandeker & Segal 1996 p.30). Women are now permitted in over 90 percent of the all active-duty job categories in each of the services (91 percent Army, 93 percent Marines, 96 percent Navy, 99 percent Air Force, and 100 percent coast guard). Media attention to women's military participation is likely to increase the number of girls and young women who see the services as opportunities viable jobs careers for them. The services have received a lot of attention for sexual harassment and other issues of military gender integration. Even though these are negative issues, it has increased the visibility of women's military service. (Segal et al. 2001 pp.49-50). Since the beginning of the all-volunteer force, the percentage of women in the U.S. military has increased from 1.6% in 1973 to 8.5% in 1980 to 11.8% in 1993. There are currently about 200,000 women who serve in the active duty military and 70,8000 of these serve in the Army (Rosen & Durand 1996 p.537). Patricia Shields maintains that female participation is unlikely to return to pre-volunteer force levels (under 2 percent). Shields found that women are attracted to unique aspects of the military such as discipline and adventure. She also found that women soldiers are not

fully supported in their institutional identities. The military does not really accommodate women (Shields 1988 pp.99-100). Moskos and Wood address the American trend of increasing reliance on female service members. This reflects both the increasing numbers of women entering the work force and the end of the draft, with the resulting expansion of the recruitment pool to include women (Moskos & Wood p.284).

Women continue to not be allowed to participate in combat. Anna Simmons (2001) points out that there are many arguments for why women should be allowed to fight, which include the following: new post-Cold War missions require finesse, not brawn; twenty-first century technologies are gender-neutral; equal opportunity to serve is every American citizen's right; cohesion does not require that soldiers bond socially, but only that they accomplish their tasks effectively; and our European allies are opening their combat units to women so we should join them in doing so (Simmons 2001 p. 89) Critics argue that the intent of women trying to get into combat units is not for equity or justice but for the chance to compete directly against men for a shot at positions of higher command. The evidence of this is no one lobbies for all-female units. Proponents of women in combat units do not explain the price paid for the absence of women in combat nor do they explain any positives that would be gained by this. Those who argue women should not be in combat units assert that women are either lacking speed, strength, or stamina; complain they can have babies, menstrual periods, and breast milk; or that they presumably need more showers, different facilities, and privacy (Simmons 2001 p. 92). The issue of physical abilities would be removed if the standards that women were held to were the exact same as for men, which they have never been. The standards would also have to be as strict as they have ever been. The issue of woman's reproductive

capabilities presents an issue that is unique, since women cannot just dismiss the pain.

There is no comparable disability.   Men are convinced that a women's gender would

excuse her from work at some point and this can affect unit cohesion. To address the

third issue that women need more showers, different facilities, and privacy, combat

soldiers argue that women deserve no more privacy than they have from each other.

With proper training people can be taught to look beyond gender and be able to sleep

together and shower together, regarding each other as only fellow soldiers and nudity

should not be an issue (Simmons 2001 p. 93). One former Special Forces soldier said

"Men don't sit across from teammates and think about sleeping with them." Intimacy

cannot be a prelude to sex and that is why it is argued that this will be the case as long as

heterosexual men are separated from women. Women automatically alter the chemistry

of an all-male group (Simmons 2001 p. 95). It should be noted that women have

successfully fought alongside men in places like Greece, the Soviet Union, Israel,

Vietnam, and Eritrea.

There are four main factors that led to integration of the women in the British

armed forces (Moskos et al. 2000 p.41). The first is pressure from the wider society. A

second factor is that the armed forces have been responding to pressure for better career

opportunities from women already in the service. Women have been generally

underutilized (Moskos et al. 2000 p.41). The third reason is the technological changes in

the armed forces have led to a relative decline in the emphasis on physical strength and

aggressiveness as factors essential to an effective military. The fourth and final factor is

that the attitudes of policy makers, military and civilian officials, and politicians have

helped changed the policy. These new people in power have been less resistant to the

demands for more equality in the military (Moskos et al. 2000 p.42). The European

experience of lifting the ban like in Germany and Great Britain should give us something

to study (Simmons 2001 p. 92).

Stratification, Roles, or Management

The study of the officer corps is an overlapping between management of the

military as an institution and the functions of responsibility and accountability among the

military, as well as characteristics of professionalism.   This subcategory falls under the

military as a social institution, because the military is being studied as any other primary

social institution would be studied: by the roles of those in it. The focus here is on what

makes the military different from other institutions and the way it is done in this section

is through the description of stratification, roles, and management. Officers are looked at

because they are the mangers of all the enlisted men and women and are trained to be

managers. The modern officer corps is a professional body and the modern military

officer is a professional man or woman. Professionalism distinguishes the military

officer of today from the warriors of the past (Perlmutter et al. 1980 p. 37). The vocation

of officership meets the principal criteria of professionalism (Perlmutter et al. 1980 p.

38). Perlmutter says the duties of the military officer include (a) the organizing of

equipment, (b) the planning of its activities, and (c) the direction of its operations in and

out of combat (1980 p. 39). A good leader should look after his men and make sure this

unity exists (Homans 1946 p.295). The role of leaders of the armed forces becomes more

characterized by internal tensions, contradictory demands, and multifaceted

responsibilities (Shamir et al. 2000 p. 56).

"Since the Second World War, the military establishments of the industrial democracies have taken on a host of new duties and assignments. 'Peace operations,' for example, refers to a number of types of operations some harking back to conventional military tasks, some involving policing and control of civilians, and others including negotiation and mediation" (Shamir et al. 2000 p. 57).

The role of the U.S. military has changed even more since the end of the Cold War. For the first 40 years of the Cold War, the peacekeeping operations were limited and simple in nature. The need for larger and more complex operations became apparent in the 1990s. Under the Clinton Administration, our government moved to aggressively assist the UN Secretary General's peacekeeping initiatives (McClure 1999 p.102). The U.S. military will likely find itself more involved in conflicts around the world with the lack of United Nations' peacekeeping ability. The United States intervention can be for humanitarian reasons or simply for vital national interests. However, there is concern that all the peacekeeping missions could dull the war fighting skills of tactical units (McClure 1999 p.103). Armed Forces participated more in humanitarian and environmental projects over the past twenty years. They are more heavily involved in disaster relief during floods, earthquakes and fires. The armed forces also have the new role of "environmental security" which is the conservation and protection of environmental resources and defense of national interests against environment protection bodies (Shamir et al. 2000 p. 58).

Roles of the military can address the level of responsibility that the military should have in peacekeeping and control of terrorism post September 11. This ties into the earlier sections and to repeat, the recent events of the World Trade Center and

Pentagon were not the faults of the military. This is because a military leader would have had to have the mission and responsibility to prevent a terrorist attack or to mitigate its effects, but this was not the case (Borch 2003 p.859). Rachel Bronson asserts that soldiers are taking more of police type role. The Bush administration has recognized the importance of U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan. She argues that the U.S. has not developed the right tools for promoting stability and this is due to continuing to have a Cold War mentality.

"Fighting the Soviets required deploying massive heavy equipment throughout the European theater, not crossing narrow and fragile bridges (as has been necessary in Kosovo) or dispersing mobs (as was required in Haiti). Policymakers planned "day after" scenarios based on thoughts of nuclear winter, not nation-building or pacifying disgruntle villagers."

The second reason Bronson gives for the U.S. not being able to promote stability is the U.S. experience with constabulary forces in postwar Germany and Japan, which suggested that great caution must be exerted when designating military forces for operations other than war. American constabulary forces were specially created and did a good job keeping the peace after World War II, but were ill prepared when their mission suddenly changed to combat in Korea. Bronson believes that it is time to rethink the roles and missions of the U.S. military and related civilian organizations but says that appropriate restructuring will not begin until Washington develops a greater appreciation for the fact that intervention entails not simply war fighting, but a continuum of force ranging from conventional warfare to local law enforcement (Bronson 2002 pp.122-125).

Values or Ethics

In December of 1985 Secretary of the Army John O. Marsh Jr. and Army Chief of Staff General John A. Wickham stated, "Values are the heart and soul of a great Army...From values we draw purpose, direction, vitality and character--the bedrock of all that we do in the Total Army" (Matthews 1998 p. 50).

Siebold states the primary orientation of the military, as an institution and as a set of organizations, is to take "raw materials" such as recruits and make them capable combat units. Siebold maintains that military sociology should ask exactly how this process of conversion should be addressed in the planning of values to teach its recruits (Siebold 2001 p. 145). Several authors have contributed their ideas as to what constitute good values, beliefs, and virtues to be taught to military recruits. Notably, ethics are normative and are more guidelines for behavior. Yet values do not have the same normative overtone; Values are principles, standards, or qualities considered worthwhile or desirable.

According to Huntington, the "supreme military virtue is obedience," and "the purpose of obedience is to further the objective of the superior" (1957 p.6). Disruption of the military organization caused by disobedience to operational orders will outweigh the benefits gained by such disobedience. In other words, it does not matter if good things come from the disobedience. Huntington asserts that the superior officer is more competent and knowledgeable than the subordinate (1957 p. 75). "U.S. officers today are acculturated to mute overt declarations of this element in their conception of honor, sublimating it most often as patriotism or professional pride, which are real and essential values" (Matthews 1998 p.53). There used to be an ideal that those in the armed forces

should refrain from affiliating with particular political parties and from voting so they could remain loyal to serving the nation, regardless of political changes. This has changed over the years in that voting is promoted as long as the ideal of the "apolitical" officer serves loyally and impartially regardless of the party in power (Matthews 1998 p.54).

Watson (1999 p. 58) adds his ideas for ideal values and virtues. He claims that courage is important, but high mindedness is a more encompassing virtue. Those who are small-minded think of themselves as undeserving and do not pursue great things. Those who are vain-- vanity being a vice not uncommon in the military-- think they are great when they are not. The high-minded person thinks him or herself great and actually is great. A high-minded person is concerned with the greatest of external goods: honor. He or she has also perfected the virtues such as courage, justice, moderation, generosity, etc. Watson uses Abraham Lincoln and Winston Churchill as examples of high-minded men. High mindedness is said to be the crown of the virtues and might also be the perfect expression of the military ethic.

There are other opinions of how the military should instill values into its recruits. Friedrich Nietzsche damns good will and celebrates action that overcomes all conventional, egalitarian moralities. In his belief, aesthetics replace morals and self-expressive individualism emerges full-blown. Nietzsche (1976) believes most individuals share a contemptible herd morality of self-preservation, and only in times of war are they reminded of the need for strong individuals to rise above the pack. Bradley Watson, a professor of political philosophy, disagrees with Nietzsche and suggests that the warrior can have, should have, and in some cases, must have an essentially

Aristotelian moral compass that is to develop a moral character out of repeating good actions. He posits that only if the military can maintain ethical standards that are more demanding than those of the civilian world but not in conflict, can it maintain its professional independence. The military draws from, and is a reflection of the society of which it is a part (Watson 1999 p. 70). Patricia Shields (1993 p.511) argues that the current model for military policy treats a soldier as an employee and ignores moral elements and is thus flawed. This should not apply to members of the armed forces who are expected to kill or support a killing machine and she proposes replacing neoclassical economics with socioeconomics, which is a more complete picture. She maintains that neoclassical economics neglect sacrifice, duty, and community (Shields 1993 p.525).

"Socioeconomics broadens the view. It provides a language and framework which incorporates both self-interest and sacrifice"

Since sociology is the study of human social behavior, especially the study of origins, we are studying the preferred human social behavior of the military and its attempt at developing an ideal military society. The military repeatedly tries to find a way to instill the values into its recruits to develop their full potential, so that they may develop better ways of operating to achieve their goals.

Goals, Ways of Operating or the I/O Debate

Siebold (2001) describes the Institutional/Occupational (I/O) Thesis as the only major theoretical debate in military sociology. This makes it one of the few, easy to

identify debates in the field and has been written about extensively.[5] The I/O debate

deals with the question of whether or not the military is becoming less institutional in

nature and more occupational. Terminology, levels of analysis, and lack of explicit

causality plague this debate (Siebold 2001 p.141). This debate is one to determine which

way the military should operate. The debate looks at the features of an institution and an

organization and presents the arguments from both sides. The military society and those

who study it are trying to find similar ways of operating and a common set of goals. The

I/O debate occurred after the draft ended, and the military was an all-volunteer force.[6]

The debate deals with values and norms.

There are several differences between an institution and an occupation. Charles

Moskos says that values and norms legitimize an institution. As stated earlier, members

of an institution, are viewed as following a calling and generally regard themselves as

being different or apart from the broader society and are so regarded by others. When

grievances are felt, members do not organize themselves into interest groups. The

military has had many institutional features, such as extended tours abroad; fixed terms of

enlistment; liability for 24 hour service availability; frequent movements of self and

family; subjection to military discipline and law; and inability to strike, resign, or

negotiate over working conditions. A paternalistic renumeration system has evolved in

the military corresponding to the institutional model: compensation received in noncash

form, subsidized consumer facilities on the base payments to service members partly

determined by family statutes, and deferred pay in the form of retirement benefits

---

[5] Authors that have contributed to the I/O debate include: Siebold 1999' Janowitz, 1971, 1977; Moskos, 1973,1977,1986,1988; Moskos and Wood, 1988; Segal and Blair, 1978; Shields, 1993; Sorensen, 1994; and Tremble and Brosvic, 1987.
[6] Motivations for individuals to become a member of the armed forces are located in the recruitment and promotion section.

(Moskos 1977 p. 42). In 1986, Moskos added to his earlier paper that an institution is vertically organized, while an occupation is organized horizontally. To illustrate this, Moskos says that people in an occupation tend to feel a sense of identity with others who do the same kind of work and receive similar pay. Horizontal identification implies that reference groups are external to the organization. In an institution, however, the conditions under which people live and work create the sense of identity that binds them together (Moskos 1986 p. 380).

According to Moskos, an occupation is legitimated in terms of the marketplace, such as prevailing monetary rewards for equivalent competencies. In a modern industrial society, employees usually enjoy some voice in the determination of appropriate salary and work conditions. Responsibility to meet contractual obligations counterbalance those right. The occupational model implies the priority of self-interest rather than that of the employing organization. Traditionally, the military has sought to avoid the organizational outcomes of the occupational model (Moskos 1977 p. 43). The armed forces have had and will continue to have elements of both the institutional and occupational types (Moskos 1977 p. 44). Moskos asserts that a shift in the military's rationale toward the occupational model implies organizational consequences in structure, and perhaps compromises the function of the armed forces (Moskos 1977 p. 45). Janowitz disagrees with Moskos; he argues that Moskos' formulation that the United States Military is moving from an institution to an occupation has no analytical or empirical basis. Janowitz claims that the concept of profession continues to apply to the military for three reasons: a high level of skills, an important degree of self-regulation, and a strong element of corporate cohesion. To shift from an institution to an occupation,

the officer corps would have to undergo a number of changes, most of which are unlikely (Janowitz 1977 p. 52).

Moskos maintains that the more institutional a military, the wider the span of the military justice system. The more occupational the military is, the more likely offenders will be tried by civilian courts (Moskos 1986 p. 381). Frank Wood later adds that social institutions are subject to pressures for social change imposed by the societies in which they are immersed, and they must change to survive (Wood 1988 p.27). According to Moskos (1988 p.19), the end of the draft might be seen as a major thrust to move the military toward the occupational model. He does, however, reiterate that both elements of an organization and an institution will always be present in the military system (Moskos 1988 p. 15).

According to Moskos and Wood (1988 p.281), the I'O thesis must be understood on three levels: micro, macro, and the organizational level that lies between. These levels continuously interact with one another and each has different substantive concerns.

"Micro-level focus on the orientation and attitudes of individual members relates best to survey methods. The macro-level approach, which focuses on civil-military relations in the broadest sense, is congenial with social historical studies. The intermediate organizational level, which addresses the structural aspects of groups within the military, is served best by the case-study method and by in-depth interviewing of selected small samples of relevant military persons."

Moskos and Wood conclude that institutions are primarily value-driven entities while occupations are calculative enterprises and a society needs both types of organizations, depending on what need is being served. They say that building institutionalism does not mean that all aspects of occupationalism must be discarded nor is it necessary to treat the I/O thesis as producing detailed policies of change to cover all

contingencies. Moskos and Wood maintain the I/O thesis provides military leaders with a place to stand while trying to gain leverage against policies that foster exaggerated occupationalism (Moskos & Wood 1988 p.290).

Sorensen discusses the differences between the Moskos and Janowitz arguments. He asserts that even though there are differences between their I/O models, that Moskos and Janowitz generally agree (Sorensen 1994 p. 598). Siebold concludes that the general consensus is that the military is becoming more oriented toward business and economic principles while still remaining substantially institutional as an organization (2001 p. 141).

These internal factors study the way of life of the military and their environment with differing opinions on such things as values that should be taught, the roles of the military, and the way the military should be socialized. There are far more internal than external factors, but the military dealing with its surrounding environment is very important as well.

External Factors

Civil-Military Relations

External factors are the issues outside the military society, the most discussed of which is civil-military relations. This is a huge shift from the other internal factors, because the issues discussed now involve the society outside the military and foreign nations as opposed to just the military society alone. Civil-military relations are the relations between the military and the wider society in which it exists. This section

discusses civil-military relations in terms of mechanisms of control and degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation. The topic of civil-military relations is concerned with control by the sovereign over the military, including military changes in relative power, prestige, and funding. Siebold claims that civil-military relations need to be more clearly defined.

The stratification system of the military tends to be compatible with that of the society of which it is a part (Coates & Pellegrin 1965 p. 246). The military is functionally interdependent with the civilian sector and the interdependence is more than economic. It also applies to internal arrangements of the military, which must be attuned to the civilian social structure (Lang 1972 p.83). Former Secretary of Defense William Cohen said that there was "a chasm…developing between the military and civilian worlds, where the civilian world doesn't fully grasp the mission of the military, and the military doesn't understand why the memories of our citizens and civilian policy-makers are so short, or why the criticism is so quick and so unrelenting" (Feaver 2001 p. 1). Civil-military relations is an area that overlaps with political science[7].

According to James Burk, civil-military relations include direct and indirect dealings that people and institutions have with the military, legislative haggling over the funding, regulation, and use of the military, and complex bargaining between civilian and military elites to define and implement national security policy (2002 p. 7). Liberal and civic republican theories are two distinct democratic theories in civil-military theory. Liberal theory argues that the first priority of the democratic state is to protect the rights and liberties of individual citizens. Civic republican theory contests this liberal notion,

---

[7] Key individuals such as sociologist Morris Janowitz and political scientist Samuel Huntington have been adopted by both fields and are both heavily quoted in military sociology.

and argues that priority should be placed on engaging citizens in the activity of public life. Janowitz saw the problem of how to preserve the ideal of the citizen-soldier in an era when the changing nature of war no longer required mass participation in military service, but did require the state to maintain a large standing force of professional soldiers. Janowitz is more of a civic republican theorist while Huntington is more of a liberal theorist (2002 p. 12).

Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz are considered the founders of modern civil-military relations theory. Huntington identifies several varieties of civilian control. Subjective civilian control maximizes civilian power by maximizing the power of civilian groups in relation to the military (Huntington 1957 p. 80). Civilian control by governmental institution originated in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and was controlled by the Crown. Currently, both Congress and the President are fundamentally concerned with the distribution or power between executive and legislative rather than between civilian and military (Huntington 1957 p. 81). Civilian control by the social class was a battle between aristocratic or liberal interests in the armed forces. Civilian control by constitutional form says that only a specific constitutional form--such as democracy-- can ensure civilian control (Huntington 1957 p. 82). Finally, objective civilian control maximizes military professionalism by distributing political power between military and civilian groups, which is most conducive to the emergence of professional attitudes and behavior among the members of the officer corps (Huntington 1957 p. 83). Janowitz has a short list of control measures and falls back on the professionalism-equals-civilian control theory by Huntington. Janowitz claims that the

military will obey in part out of Huntingtonian "self-imposed professional standards" and in part out of "meaningful integration with civilian values."(Feaver 1996 p. 160)

Peter Feaver gives the difference in perspective between sociologists and political scientists:

"To political scientists, institutional civilian control is the heart of civil-military relations. To sociologists, civil-military relations is about the integration (or the absence of it) of civil and military institutions" (Feaver 1996 p.160).

According to Feaver, differences between the civilian and military sects are necessary and desirable, since military institutions must subordinate the individual to the group and personal well being to mission accomplishment (Feaver & Kohn 2001 p. 1). Civil-military relationships conflict as long as the military and its leaders want more prestige and power than the civilians want to give them (Lang 1972 p.105).

Degree of Conflict, Harmony, or Cooperation

The problems of civil-military relations are more prevalent as civilians take over a large number of tasks related to military management, including the development of strategy and tactics. The inner workings of the military are not a complete mystery to civilians anymore (Lang 1972 p.113). Interservice rivalry decreases the chances of conflict between representatives of the armed forces and either the executive or legislative branch of civil government (Lang 1972 p.118). Philip Kronenberg argues the tensions between security and democracy create a complex matrix of problems involving the development of consistent policy and the reliability of its execution (Lovell et al. 1974 p. 321). In a democratic society, armed forces are either directly or indirectly involved in politics (Sarvas 1999 p.99). Andrew Cottey, Timothy Edmunds, and

Anthony Foster argue that the debate on the relationship between democracy and civil-military relations needs to be reconceptualized in terms of democratic governance of the defense and security sector. This reconceptualization shifts the focus away from the control of the military in domestic politics and towards the wider problem of the democratic management and implementation of defense and security policy. It is a shift from the first generation problem of reforming core institutions for the political control of armed forces to a second-generation problem of establishing effective structures for the democratic governance of the defense and security advisors (Cottey et al. 2002 pp.31-32).

Charles Moskos has two ideological attitudes of American armed forces. The first attitude concerns those who see the military as a reflection of the dominant societal values and as entirely independent of the leadership of civilian decision makers. The second attitude stresses how much military values differ from the larger society and see the military exerting an independent influence in civilian society (Moskos 1973 p. 255). Supporters of the military organization argue both for and against greater congruence between civilian structures (Moskos 1973 p. 256).

Bland cites four problems of civil-military relations. The Praetorian problem is the need to curb the political power of the military establishment (Bland 1999 p.12). The second problem is ensuring this "armed disciplined body" behaves in ways that safeguard the state without bringing harm through indiscipline, misadventure, or the exaggeration of threats to governments or citizens. The third is protecting the armed forces from the "double problem" of the subordination of military force to the political government and of a government in possession of such force. However, this is only a problem in

democracies. Finally, the fourth problem concerns the relationship between the expert

and the minister (Bland 1999 p.13).

Janowitz tells a story of conflict and harmony amongst a story of a group of men

at the Department of War. They tried to educate the Department's soldiers just after the

United States entered World War II, and found that the biggest obstacle they had in

training was the diverse opinion of society and the Army's responsibility for nonmilitary

training. Some people believed the military had the right and duty to use every medium

at its disposal to keep the soldiers focused; others thought that no army in a democracy

should have the right to select news on behalf of its personnel, even if it is all true

(Janowitz et al. 1983 p. 252). This brings up the control that the state has over the

military.

Mechanisms of Control

The democratic controlling institution has the responsibility of deciding how to

meet the needs of its armed forces. The basic legitimacy of the armed forces rests in the

constitutional framework, political supervision, and acceptance of the public (Sarvas

1999 p.99). Shields reinforced this legitimacy, arguing that legitimacy in a democracy

comes from the consent of the population, so military institutions are more likely to

maintain consent if the population can identify with the institution. Consent will weaken

if the military is isolated from the larger society. Legitimacy is strengthened to the extent

that the warrior ranks are filled with citizen soldiers (Shields 1993 p.6). To create a

favorable environment, militaries in democratic societies have developed a variety of

formal and informal channels that enable them to mediate their problems and influence

political decision (Sarvas 1999 p.100). Andreski (1968 p.108) notes that war and the

threat of war can lead to a diminishment of constitutional freedom. Militancy

accompanies the extension of governmental regulations.

The precautions written into the constitution were to divide and rule the military.

Political and military functions were mixed, making direct civilian control more difficult.

Direct access of military authorities to the highest levels of government was permitted,

resulting in struggles between the military and civilian agencies of the government,

which has continued on for centuries (Ackley 1972 p. 82). Feaver and Kohn (2001 p.2)

note that the framers of the Constitution divided control over the military between the

three branches of government and preserved a separate citizen-soldier militia to ensure

the civilian control of the military necessary for liberty, and to avoid reliance on a

professional military which they knew to be different from, and a threat to, society.

Military-to-External Agents

According to Siebold, military-to-external agents look at relations with other

military, governmental, and non-governmental organizations, including relations with

coalition partners and adversaries. Agents also looks at cohesion, inter-penetration,

creation of a joint working culture intertwined with operational effectiveness, and

problems with military to military relations (Siebold 2001 p. 147). Multinational forces

share some of the same organizational problems faced by multinational corporations and

civilian organizations operating across national borders (Elron et al. 1999p. 74).

Multinational forces have been in existence for thousands of years and embrace the use of

mercenaries by political powers, the armed forces of multiracial states, recruitment of colonial troops, or various military alliances (Elron et al. 1999p. 73).

Since the purpose of this paper is to describe the substantive content of recent articles from *Armed Forces & Society*, it is only fitting to look at the work done by Ariana Olldashi. Olldashi (2002) looked at civil-military relations in emerging democracies as found in the articles of *Armed Forces & Society*. She found that a typical article discussed objective control substantially as part of civilian control of civil-military relations but a typical article does not discuss civil military problematic in general. Institutional structures were found to be discussed in a majority of the articles but professionalism and military was discussed little or not at all (Olldashi 2002 p.55).

Problems with Military to Military Relations

Elron, Shamir, and Ben-Ari (1999 p. 82) address four main problems with multinational forces. The first concerns issues with missions and circumstances; the more diverse the work force, the more difficult coordination becomes in crisis situations. The second problem involves organizational and authority structures in which multinational forces are interorganizational structures. These structures are often characterized by high levels of conflict and are likely to increase the challenge of cross-cultural management. The third problem involves time frames. Multinational forces are often created with a sense of urgency to deal with a temporary problem. Many countries simply lack the time for joint training with the other armies so they must establish "swift trust" for at least the first stages of operation.   The fourth problem addresses transient personnel. Multinational forces are temporary structures. In more permanent or stable

forces, a frequent relation of commanders, officers, and soldiers exists. The personnel

get to know each other better and relate to each other better. The rotation of personnel

makes the situation even more challenging since commanders, officers, and soldiers do

not get to work with each other for very long, nor do they establish trust or relationships

from which they can build. Little pressure exists for global integration (Elron et al. 1999

p. 83). Even with all these problems, armed forces of different counties, unless at war

with each other, share a common ethos, or ways of doing things (Elron et al. 1999 p. 84).

James Burk (1998 p. 116) notes that the since the balkanization of the former

Soviet Union into a series of increasingly contentious sovereign republics, the old

threatening structure has dissolved. This has caused an interest-threat mismatch and a

debate over the direction American national security strategy should take, which can

affect military-to-military relations.

The United Nations has had it's share of international issues. The power of veto

in the Security Council has prevented it from authorizing the use of force for collective-

security operations in all but three cases in the past half century. It is hard to imagine that

they can actually all vote on something together. Politics has also made the Charter

nearly impossible to amend. The council was designed to be a group of large powers that

would not work when they disagreed. Nye relates the power of the veto to an electrical

system.

"The veto is like a fusebox in the electrical system of a house. Better that a fuse
blows and the lights go out than that the house burns down." (Nye 2003 p.68).

Siebold (1999 p.155) lists problems with military-to-military relations, such as

lack of commitment to the mission, cohesion of the agents involved, fully resourcing the

commitments, cultural differences, different or hidden agendas, command and control,

interference by outside agents, new media distortions, dual allegiances, or squabbles among sovereigns.

Cohesion or Joint Working Culture

There are six mechanisms for integration, including joint operations and training, cross-culture training, internal division of labor, formal coordinating mechanisms, information flows and sharing of knowledge, and leadership and deliberate cohesion building activities (Elron et al. 1999 p. 87). Cohesion and a joint working culture are important in military sociology because they study how a military society interacts with another military in such things as coalitions and joint task forces conducting peacekeeping operations (Siebold 2001 p.156). Dinardo and Hughes (2001 p.166) describe four broad areas of coalition warfare: prewar planning, accommodations of goals and needs to those of one's allies, execution of plans and adaptation to wartime circumstance, and maintenance of trust and balance in the relationship.

Janowitz addresses inter-penetration and creation of a joint working culture, arguing that ability of the military to work together as a political coalition partner depends on the extent of its own economic base (Janowitz 1964a p.153). The army is called upon to give direction to an economic system when it becomes either a caretaker government or the ruling military oligarchy (Janowitz 1964a p.154). The military's contributions to political modernization are economic as well as serving as agents of social change (Janowitz 1964a p.156).

The world's great powers find themselves on the same side today following the events of September 11th. They are united by common dangers of terrorist violence and

chaos (Nye 2003 p.61). When other members of an international group have been consulted, they are more likely to be helpful with the example of NATO members doing much of the peacekeeping in the Balkans and in Afghanistan. NATO works to achieve the standardization and interoperability that allow coalitions of the willing to be more than groups for the situation and hand and no other (Nye 2003 p.68). In Iraq, American and British military forces won victory in Operation Iraqi Freedom. They are not faced with trying to establish a more durable framework for Persian Gulf security (Pollack 2003 p.2). Kenneth Pollack postulates the best idea would be for the United States to establish a formal defense alliance with the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states and a new government of Iraq instead of trying to form a middle eastern NATO because the members could have widely divergent security problems (Pollack 2003 p.11-12).

There seems to be more literature on the internal factors than external factors; even so, all four of the areas Siebold focused on are intertwined, and it is not easy to find a subject that can be compartmentalized into only one area. The subjects are often dependent upon each other, and this is just one attempt to differentiate the various areas to find a common core and focus of study.

Using the Siebold framework for military sociology, the next section provides the framework that will be used to develop the coding sheet for the descriptive content analysis of the *Armed Forces & Society* articles. The conceptual framework for this research is descriptive categories. These descriptive categories are arranged to describe the necessary components of military sociology. Table 2.1 illustrates the linkage between the descriptive categories and the literature sources used for them. The descriptive

categories are organized with the four main categories heading each section. There are

two internal and two external categories.

Table 2.1 Conceptual Framework tied to the literature [8]

Internal Factors: **The military as a profession of arms** -Historical development -Prestige, power, or characteristics of professionalism -Responsibility or expertise -Socialization -Education or training -Recruitment or promotion -Control or accountability	American Journal of Sociology (1946), Bachman 2000, Baldwin 1996, Barber 1992, Borch (2002), Butler 1980, Coates et al. (1965), Flink 2001, Franke 2000, Hauk and Parlier 2000, Hoege III 2002, Huntington (1957), Janowitz (1960), Janowitz (1977), Jessup and Ketz 1994, Lang (1972), Meese (2002), Miller 2000, Moskos (1977), Moskos (1986), Moskos et al. (2000), Murphy (2001), Perlmutter (1977), Perlmutter et al. (1980), Schaefer (1986), Shamir & Ben-Ari (2000), Shils & Janowitz (1948), Siebold (2001), Smelser (1994), Snider et al. (2001), Sorensen (1994), Spencer (1969), Stiehm (2001), Watson (1999), Weber (1958)
The military an institution or organization -Social issues or innovation -Demographics-gender, race, or nationality -Stratification, roles, or management -Values and ethics -Goals, ways of operating, or the I/O Debate	Belkin (2003), Butler (1980), Coates et al. (1965), Homans (1946), Huntington (1957), Janowitz (1964b), Janowitz (1977), Matthews (1998), McClure (1999), Moskos (1973), Moskos (1977), Moskos (1986), Moskos & Wood (1988), Moskos (et al (1996), Murray (2001), Nietzsche & Kaufman ed. (1976), Perlmutter (1977), Shamir et al. (2000), Shields (1988), Shields (1993), Shils & Janowitz (1948), Siebold (1999), Siebold (2001), Simmons (2001), Snyder (2003), Sorensen (1994), Stiehm (2001), Watson (1999)
External Factors: **Civil-military relations** -Degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation -Mechanisms of control	Ackley (1972), Andreski (1968), Bland (1999), Feaver & Kohn (2001), Huntington (1957), Janowitz et al. (1983), Lovell et al. 1974), Moskos et al. (1988), Shields (1993), Siebold (2001), Watson (1999)
External agent relations -Problems with military to military dealings -Cohesion and a joint working culture	Burk (1998), Elron et al. (1999), Dinardo (2001), Janowitz (1964a), Siebold (2001)

[8] This is a classification matrix for military sociology developed by Siebold.

Chapter Four

Methodology

Introduction

   This chapter discusses the methodology used for the description of articles from *Armed Forces & Society*. This section also gives reasons for the methodology used. The framework used to code the articles is included, which shows how the framework was operationalized.

Content Analysis

   Content analysis is the study of recorded human communications (Babbie 2001 p.304). Content analysis is suitable for studying books, magazines, Web pages, poems, newspapers, songs, paintings, speeches, letters, email messages, bulletin board postings on the Internet, laws and constitutions, as well as any components or collects thereof. Content analysis answers questions such as "Who says what, to whom, how, and with what effect?" (Babbie 2001 p.305). Content analysis is a coding operation. Coding is the process of transforming raw data into a standardized form. Communications are coded or classified according to some conceptual framework (Babbie 2001 p.309).

   The coding sheet (See Table 4.1) used in this paper is taken from Jensen, Jason and Robert Rodgers (2001 p. 241). The content of each article was reviewed in a search for subcategories that have been described by Siebold and expanded upon by other

authors. By simply reading the abstract of articles, the materials relevancy to the scope of military sociology is determinable. Some articles require further investigation than just the abstract to find all areas of military sociology present. After this determination has been made, the specific grouping can be made by reexamining the literature according to the descriptions of each subcategory to find which section addresses that topic. For example, gender and race issues are coded as demographics.

Each article was examined to find if it had an aspect of military sociology. If an aspect was present, it was determined to what degree this aspect existed. If the topic was the dominant topic in the article then it was SD, or strongly discussed. If the topic was mentioned briefly but not a main point of focus, then it was coded as LD, or limited discussed. If the topic was not discussed at all, then it was ND, or not discussed. The four categories of were broken up further into subcategories. The topic of the military as a profession of arms included: historical development, prestige or power, responsibility or expertise, socialization, education or training, recruitment or promotion, and control or accountability. Finally, the content analysis looks to find the origin of *Armed Forces & Society* articles to find whether they deal with American issues, or originate internationally. The strengths and weaknesses of content analysis are a background as to why this form is used for this research question.

Strengths of Content Analysis

Content analysis, like any form of research, has its strengths and weaknesses; it is used here because it is the only way the purpose can be achieved. Since the purpose is to describe recorded communication, content analysis is the most appropriate method for

this study. One advantage of content analysis is in terms of time and money. This method does not require a research staff or equipment. The only element required for content analysis is the access for the material to be coded. In content analysis, it is usually easier to repeat a portion of the study than it is in other research methods, making it safer to use. A portion of data may require recoding as opposed to the data in its entirety. A third advantage of content analysis is that it permits the study of processes occurring over a longer period of time. Finally, content analysis has the advantage of all unobtrusive measures: mainly that the content analyst hardly ever has any effect on the subject being studied (Babbie 2001 pp. 314-315).

Weaknesses of Content Analysis

However, content analysis does have disadvantages. Content analysis has problems of validity; these problems are likely unless communications processes are studied. The concreteness of material studied in content analysis strengthens reliability. The material can always be coded and recoded if necessary, making certain that the coding is consistent. In field research, by contrast, little that can be done after the fact in effort to ensure greater reliability (Babbie 2001 p. 315). This paper is not field research, so at any point material could be recoded to reliability. For these reasons, during this research, the material was accessible at any time for recoding if necessary, and the material has been studied to strengthen reliability.

Table 4.1

Coding sheet for reporting *Armed Forces & Society* articles

Research question: Does the article contain at least one element of military sociology as put forth by the Siebold article "Core Issues and Theories in Military Sociology and if so, which issue? Is the article an internal or external factor?
Secondary question: Are the articles American or international?
Research entity: Content of AF&S pertaining to military sociology.
Information breakdown:
 Internal Controls
-**The military as a profession of arms**

-Historical development	SD*	LD	N
-Prestige, power, or characteristics of professionalism	SD	LD	N
-Responsibility or expertise	SD	LD	N
-Socialization	SD	LD	N
-Education or training	SD	LD	N
-Recruitment or promotion	SD	LD	N
-Control or accountability	SD	LD	N

-**The military as a social institution or organization**

-Social Issues or innovation	SD	LD	N
-Demographics-gender, race, or nationality	SD	LD	N
-Stratification, roles, or management	SD	LD	N
-Values or ethics	SD	LD	N
-Goals, ways of operating, or the I/O debate	SD	LD	N

External Factors
Civil-military relations

-Degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation	SD	LD	N
-Mechanisms of control	SD	LD	N

External agent relations

-Problems military to military dealings	SD	LD	N
-Cohesion and joint working culture	SD	LD	N
-**Other**	SD	LD	N

* SD = Substantially discussed   LD = Limited discussed   N = None

Population

The population of this Applied Research Project is 117 *AF&S* articles from the past five years. The reason 117 articles were chosen, was because it was the entire population of articles for the past five years starting with volume 25(1) up to the point that the content analysis for this Applied Research Project was completed which was

volume 29(3). Articles that were clearly not military sociology articles were put into an "other" category. Table 4.2 is a full listing of the articles analyzed with their authors and volume number.

No.	Author Name	Volume, Issue	Year

No.	Author Name	Volume, Issue	Year
1	Karl W. Haltiner	25/1	1998
2	Charles T. Eppright	25/1	1998
3	Jerald G. Bachman & David R.Segal	25/1	1998
4	Robert F. Priest & Johnston Beach	25/1	1998
5	Jeffrey W. Riemer	25/1	1998
6	Brice Stone & Vince Wiggins	25/1	1998
7	Daniel N. Nelson	25/1	1998
8	Christopher P.Gibson & Don M. Snider	25/2	1999
9	Lauren Holland	25/2	1999
10	Paul T. Mitchell	25/2	1999
11	Gil Merom	25/2	1999
12	John W. Bodnar	25/2	1999
13	Robert Mandel	25/2	1999
14	Leora N. Rosen, Paul D. Bliese, Kathleen A. Wright, & Robert Gifford	25/3	1999
15	Stuart A. Cohen	25/3	1999
16	David R. Segal, Jerald G. Bachman, Peter Freedman-Doan, & Patrick O'Malley	25/3	1999
17	Donna Winslow	25/3	1999
18	Derek Da Cunha	25/3	1999
19	Robert S. Rush	25/3	1999
20	Bruce D. Bell, Walter R. Schumm, Benjamin Knott, and Morten G. Ender	25/3	1999
21	John W. Jandora	25/4	1999
22	Dale R. Herspring	25/4	
23	Kimberly Marten Zisk	25/4	
24	Juanita M. Firestone & Richard J. Harris	25/4	
25	Chris Bourg & Mady Wechsler	25/4	

volume 29(3). Articles that were clearly not military sociology articles were put into an "other" category. Table 4.2 is a full listing of the articles analyzed with their authors and volume number.

Table 4.2 Listing of the Articles

No.	Author Name	Volume, Issue	Year
1	Karl W. Haltiner	25/1	1998
2	Charles T. Eppright	25/1	1998
3	Jerald G. Bachman & David R.Segal	25/1	1998
4	Robert F. Priest & Johnston Beach	25/1	1998
5	Jeffrey W. Riemer	25/1	1998
6	Brice Stone & Vince Wiggins	25/1	1998
7	Daniel N. Nelson	25/1	1998
8	Christopher P.Gibson & Don M. Snider	25/2	1999
9	Lauren Holland	25/2	1999
10	Paul T. Mitchell	25/2	1999
11	Gil Merom	25/2	1999
12	John W. Bodnar	25/2	1999
13	Robert Mandel	25/2	1999
14	Leora N. Rosen, Paul D. Bliese, Kathleen A. Wright, & Robert Gifford	25/3	1999
15	Stuart A. Cohen	25/3	1999
16	David R. Segal, Jerald G. Bachman, Peter Freedman-Doan, & Patrick O'Malley	25/3	1999
17	Donna Winslow	25/3	1999
18	Derek Da Cunha	25/3	1999
19	Robert S. Rush	25/3	1999
20	Bruce D. Bell, Walter R. Schumm, Benjamin Knott, and Morten G. Ender	25/3	1999
21	John W. Jandora	25/4	1999
22	Dale R. Herspring	25/4	
23	Kimberly Marten Zisk	25/4	
24	Juanita M. Firestone & Richard J. Harris	25/4	
25	Chris Bourg & Mady Wechsler	25/4	

	Segal		
26	Stephen J. Cimbala	25/4	
27	Douglas Bland	26/1	1999
28	Wray R. Johnson	26/1	
29	Bradley C. Watson	26/1	
30	Efrat Elron & Boas Shamir	26/1	
31	Stefan Sarvas	26/1	
32	Renato Crus De Castro	26/1	
33	Volker C. Franke	26/2	
34	Kisangani N.F. Emizet	26/2	
35	Regina F. Titunik	26/2	
36	Sheila Nataraj Kirby	26/2	
37	Yechezkel Dar	26/2	
38	Henning Sorensen	26/2	
39	Lynette Finch	26/3	
40	Lyle J. Goldstein	26/3	
41	David Pion-Berlin & Craig Arceneaux	26/3	
42	Robert E. Looney & Peter C. Frederiksen	26/3	2000
43	James Winkates	26/3	
44	Peggy McClure & Walter Broughton	26/3	
45	Sheila Nataraj Kirby, Margaret Harrell, & Jennifer Sloan	26/4	
46	Faris R. Kirkland	26/4	
47	Jerald G. Bachman, Peter Freedman-Doan, David R. Segal, and Patrick M. O'Malley	26/4	
48	Alon Peled	26/4	
49	Singh Bilveer	26/4	
50	Metin Heper & Aylin Guney	26/4	
51	Meyer Kestnbaum	27/1	
52	Deborah Avant & James Lebovic	27/1	
53	Brian J. reed & David R. Segal	27/1	
54	Michael von Tangen & M.L.R. Smith	27/1	
55	Joao R. Martins & Daniel Zirker	27/1	
56	Julian Schofield	27/1	
57	Peter D. Feaver & Richard H. Kohn	27/2	
58	Krista E. Wiegand & David L. Paletz	27/2	
59	Cori Dauber	27/2	
60	Howard Harper	27/2	
61	Don M. Snider, Robert F. Priest, &	27/2	

	Felisa Lewis		
62	Judith Hicks Stiehm	27/2	2001
63	Bradford Booth, Meyer Kestnbaum, & David R. Segal	27/3	2001
64	James J. Down	27/3	2001
65	Gregory D. Foster	27/3	2001
66	Robert M. Bray, Carol S. Camlin, John A. Fairbank, George H. Dunteman, & Sara C. Wheeless	27/3	2001
67	Jana L. Pershing	27/3	2001
68	Paul Richard Higate	27/3	2001
69	Jerald G. Bachman	27/3	2001
70	Lance Betros	27/4	2001
71	Douglas L. Bland	27/4	2001
72	Aaron Belkin & Melissa Levitt	27/4	2001
73	Volker Franke & Lindy Heinecken	27/4	2001
74	Larry L. Watts	27/4	2001
75	Morten G. Ender	27/4	2001
76	David K. Vaughan & William A. Schum	28/1	2001
77	Peter C. Boer	28/1	2001
78	Margaret C. Harrell	28/1	2001
79	Douglas W. Trefzger	28/1	2001
80	Victor D. Cha	28/1	2001
81	Robert Mandel	28/1	2001
82	Frank O. Mora	28/2	2002
83	Paul C. Forage	28/2	2002
84	Bariel Ben-Dor, Ami Pedahzur, & Badi Hasis	28/2	2002
85	Brenda L. Moore	28/2	2002
86	Walter Parchomenko	28/2	2002
87	Ryan Hendrickson	28/2	2002
88	Christopher D. Jones & Natalie Mychajlyszyn	28/3	2002
89	Mark Yaniszewski	28/3	2002
90	Marybeth Peterson Ulrich	28/3	2002
91	Daniel N. Nelson	28/3	2002
92	Natalie Mychajlyszyn	28/3	2002
93	David J. Betz	28/3	2002
94	Aminta Arrington	28/4	2002
95	Gerhard Kummel	28/4	2002
96	Joel E. Hamby	28/4	2002
97	Asifa Hussain & Ishaq Mohammed	28/4	2002
98	Boubacar N'Diaye	28/4	2002

99	Glenn A. Phelps & Timothy S. Boylan	28/4	2002
100	James Burk	28/1	2002
101	Andre Cottey, Timothy Edmunds, and Anthony Foster	29/1	2002
102	M.Taylor Fravel	29/1	2002
103	William Ruger, Sven E. Wilson, and Shawn L. Waddoups	29/1	2002
104	Elizabeth D. Samet	29/1	2002
105	Pavel K. Baev	29/1	2002
106	Thomas E. Hanson	29/2	2002
107	R. Claire Snyder	29/2	2003
108	David L. Leal	29/2	2003
109	Gregory Hooks	29/2	2003
110	Tanel Demirel	29/2	2003
111	Lindy Heinecken	29/2	2003
112	Leora N. Rosen, Kathryn H. Knudson, and Peggy Fancher	29/3	2003
113	Luis Hicks and Curt Raney	29/3	2003
114	Matthew J. Morgan	29/3	2003
115	Walter E. Kretchik	29/3	2003
116	Dominick Donald	29/3	2003
117	Uk Heo, Eben J. Christensen, and Tatyana Karaman	29/3	2003

Statistics

To describe the nature of the content, descriptive statistics such as percent distribution are used. This should better illustrate the distribution and concentration of topics being written about and discussed in *Armed Forces & Society*.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed methodology used to describe the substantive content of recent articles in *Armed Forces & Society,* with the help of the Siebold framework to

classify content. Content analysis was used for all the articles to try to assess the topics

discussed in the journal. The next chapter discusses the results and the breakdown of

articles from *Armed Forces & Society* to find what topics were discussed and to what

extent.

Chapter Five

Results

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the content analysis from the *Armed Forces & Society* articles. The chapter provides a summary of the findings including whether the article was American or international, as well as other pertinent categories of military sociology that the article pertained to. The four areas of military sociology Siebold identified (2001 p. 140) include: (1) the military as a profession of arms, (2) the military as an institution or organization, (3) civil-military relations, and (4) military relations with other governmental agencies and militaries. Some articles dealt with more than one area while other articles had none. The objective of the study involved more breadth of the articles of *Armed Forces & Society* rather than depth.

The military as a profession of arms

This is one of the two internal factors of military sociology. The topic of historical development and education or training was one of the more prominent subcategories (See Table 5.1). Charles Moskos, David Segal, and John Williams present the discussion of the Postmodern military that accounts for a large section of historical development (Moskos et al. 2000 p.1). Topics of recruitment and promotion (which mostly focused on the recruitment side) followed this. Coates and Pellegrin provide the classic *Military Sociology: A Study of American Military Institutions and Military Life*,

which has substantial discussion of recruitment and promotion even though they are dated. There is a more modern view from Michael Meese, Hauk & Parlier. Michael Meese (2002 p.101) adds that the creation of the all-volunteer force was one of the most difficult peacetime changes that the American military has ever conducted. Maintaining an all-volunteer force is expensive, difficult to manage and requires significant attention from strategic leaders (Hauk & Parlier 2000 p.76). The overall category of the military as a profession of arms was third out of the four in terms of how often it was discussed throughout the journal.

Table 5.1 The military as a profession of arms			
	Substantially discussed	Limited discussed	None	Total N=117
The military as a profession of arms				
Historical development	13%	7%	80%	100%
Prestige, power, or characteristics of professionalism	1%	3%	96%	100%
Responsibility or expertise	3%	1%	96%	100%
Socialization	7%	3%	90%	100%
Education or training	9%	3%	88%	100%
Recruitment or promotion	9%	2%	89%	100%
Control or accountability	0%	1%	99%	100%
Any of above topics discussed	23%	14%	63%	

Institutional or organizational

This was one of the more discussed of the four areas of military sociology. The articles had a big focus on social issues and demographics (See table 5.2). Some innovation was discussed. Innovation, which is a benchmark against which one can

measure the trends and attitudes of his or her officer corps and senior leadership (Murray 2001 p. 122), was found in 18% of articles along with the category of social issues. Social issues includes topics of the family, racial issues, or gender issues. Tied to this was the topic of demographics. Anna Simmons (2001) provides a very enlightening article about gender in the military while Sherie Mershon and Steven Schlossman (1998) give a history about blacks in the military. Nearly all of the articles that dealt with demographics were social issues as well but not all social issues dealt with demographics. Goals and ways of operating were discussed substantially in 10% of the articles. The I/O thesis is included in the section about roles and ways of operating. The I/O debate is one of the few, easy to identify debates in the field and has been written about extensively (Siebold 2001 p.141).

Table 5.2 Institutional or organizational				
	Substantially discussed	Limited discussed	None	Total N=117
Institutional or Organizational				
Values and ethics	8%	5%	87%	100%
Goals, ways or operating, or the I/O debate	10%	2%	88%	100%
Stratification, roles, or management	3%	2%	95%	100%
Social issues or innovation	18%	2%	80%	100%
Demographics - gender, race, or nationality	16%	2%	82%	100%
Any of above topics discussed	44%	14%	48%	

Civil-military relations

The topic of Civil-military relations was discussed in just over a third of the articles reviewed (See Table 5.3). Civil-military relations is broken into two categories. The first is degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation.   Philip Kronenberg argues the

tensions between security and democracy create a complex matrix of problems involving the development of consistent policy and the reliability of its execution (Lovell et al. 1974 p. 321). The second category is mechanisms of control. The democratic controlling institution has the responsibility of deciding how to meet the needs of its armed forces. The basic legitimacy of the armed forces rests in the constitutional framework, political supervision, and acceptance of the public (Sarvas 1999 p.99). These categories were two of the most prominent topics in all the articles reviewed, and the name of the journal is indicative of this. The degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation alone was found in 36% of the 117 articles, making it the most prevalent subcategory of all. Nearly every article that had mechanisms of control had the degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation as well but this was not vice versa. Many articles discussed the military and their surrounding society, but did not focus on mechanisms of control, that is why mechanisms of control are only discussed half the time that degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation is discussed.

Table 5.3 Civil-military relations				
	Substantially discussed	Limited discussed	None	Total
Civil-military relations				
Degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation	36%	3%	61%	100%
Mechanisms of control	15%	0%	85%	100%
Any of above topics discussed	39%	3%	61%	

External agent relations

The topic of external agent relations was only discussed in 15% of the articles reviewed, but it is only two categories (See Table 5.4). This is the lesser of the external categories. The majority of the discussion in this category was in cohesion and joint working culture with multinational forces such as NATO and UN efforts. Problems with military to military dealings has a list of problems from Siebold (1999 p.155) including lack of commitment to the mission, cohesion of the agents involved, fully resourcing the commitments, cultural differences, different or hidden agendas, command and control, interference by outside agents, new media distortions, dual allegiances, or squabbles among sovereigns. As for cohesion and a joint working culture, the environment post September 11th has changed. The world's great powers find themselves on the same side today following the events of September 11th. They are united by common dangers of terrorist violence and chaos (Nye 2003 p.61).

Table 5.4 External agent relations				
	Substantially discussed	Limited discussed	None	Total
External agent relations				
Cohesion and joint working culture	9%	1%	90%	100%
Problems with military to military dealings	3%	1%	96%	100%
Any of above topics discussed	9%	1%	90%	

Outside the topic of military sociology

Not all of the 117 articles had an aspect of military sociology. 14% of the articles discussed a topic outside the area of military sociology (See Table 5.5). Outside subjects included such things as poetry, policy making, privatization of security, and other

subjects that did not fit into the field of military sociology. Some of these articles still

discussed an aspect of the field, but their main focus was on something else.

Table 5.5 Outside military sociology				
	Substantially discussed	Limited discussed	None	Total
Other	14%	0%	86%	100%

American versus international

There was a secondary question to find whether most of the articles in *Armed

Forces & Society* were of American or international origin (See Table 5.6). 43% of the

articles over the past five years were American, while 51% were of international origin.

Table 5.6 American versus international articles		
	Number	Percentage
American	50	43%
International	60	51%
Neither	7	6%
Total	117	100%

Summary

This chapter summarizes the results found from content analysis over 117 articles

from *Armed Forces & Society* starting in the fall of 1998 with volume 25 number 1 and

ending in Spring 2003 with volume 29 number 3. The content analysis was done for the

purpose of finding what areas the journal has been focusing on over the past five years.

Chapter six draws some conclusions from the results found here.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter is an assessment of the results. Conclusions are drawn and a few recommendations are given.

Summary

The purpose of the research was to use content analysis to review 117 articles from *Armed Forces & Society* from the past five years and using an article by George Siebold, find what aspects of military sociology are being covered in the articles. Percentages were drawn and proportions found for what were the most discussed areas of military sociology as well. Table 6.1 is a summary table of the most discussed sections of the literature. The literature does a good job of addressing issues in the field of military sociology and also provides solutions to these issues. The military as an institution or organization was a highly discussed area of military sociology. Social issues or innovation was one of the most discussed of the subcategories in this larger category, along with demographics and historical development. The focus on demographics shows the trend of authors checking up on equality in the military and delving deeper into social issues than they have in the past. The debate of women in combat is front and center, and the United States is looking at how it works for Great Britain before it is implemented here. The single most discussed subcategory was the

degree of conflict, harmony, or cooperation in civil-military relations, demonstrating the

trend of authors looking at not only the military, but the way it interacts with its

surrounding society. This overshadowed the mechanisms of control that should not be

overlooked. This is the extent of control and the ways that the government and officials

outside the military have for trying to balance the military, keeping it powerful enough to

do its job but not too powerful. For the most part, the subcategories set forth by Siebold

were pretty well covered in a diverse mixture of articles with an emphasis on the civil-

military side. This emphasis on civil-military relations is fitting since the journal is

Armed Forces & Society so it should discuss the surrounding society. The secondary

question was answered showing that international topics are just slightly more common

than American issues so this gives the journal more of a global perspective. Even though

Morten Ender found that the authors were more American, the topics of the articles were

more international in nature.

Table 6.1 Summary Table	
Profession of arms	37%
-Historical development	13%
-Education or training	9%
-Recruitment of promotion	9%
Institutional or organizational	52%
-Social issues or innovation	18%
-Demographics	16%
-Goals, ways of operating, or the I/O debate	10%
Civil-military relations	39%
External agent relations	10%
American versus international	
American	51%
International	43%
Neither	6%

Recommendations

Even though most subcategories are covered for the most part, a few things are not well addressed. A few topics did not fit into any category of military sociology, and this may be an issue that the journal would like to address. Prestige, power, and characteristics of professionalism are not discussed often, nor are topics of the responsibility and expertise of the military. Stratification, roles, and management are also not extensively addressed throughout the past five years. Control and accountability in the military is nearly ignored completely. Even though the trend is to discuss how the military interacts and harmonizes with its surrounding society, things such as control in the military and the responsibility and accountability of the military affect the outside society as well. Society would be curious to know how the how the military controls itself and how it makes itself accountable and not just the way the government controls it.

Bibliography

Ackley, Charles. 1972. *The Modern Military in Society*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.

American Journal of Sociology (ed.) 1946 *American Journal of Sociology* 51:359-508.

Andreski, Stanislav. 1968 *Military Organization and Society*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Astor, Gerald. 1998 *The Right to Fight: A History of African Americans in the Military*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press.

Babbie, Earl. 2001 *The Practice of Social Research* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bachman, J., P Freedman-Doan, D. Segal, and P. O'Malley. 2000 Distinctive Military Attitudes among U.S. Enlistees, 1976-1997: Self-Selection versus Socialization. *Armed Forces & Society* 26(4): 561-585.

Baldwin, J. Norman. 1996 "The Promotion Record of the United States Army: Glass Ceilings in the Officer Corps." *Public Administration Review*. (56) 2 199-206.

Barber, Herbert F. 1992 "Developing Strategic Leadership: The US Army War College Experience." *The Journal of Management Development*. 11(6): 4-12.

Belkin, Aaron. 2003 "Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Is the Gay Ban Based on Military Necessity." *Parameters: US Army War College*. 33(2): 108-119.

Berger, Peter L. 1963. *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. New York: Anchor Books.

Bland, D. L. 1999 "A Unified Theory of Civil-Military Relations." *Armed Forces & Society* 26(1): 7-25.

Borch, Fred. 2003 "Comparing Pearl Harbor and '9/11': Intelligence Failure? American Unpreparedness? Military Responsibility?" *The Journal of Military History* 67(3): 845-860.

Bronson, Rachel. 2002 "When Soldiers Become Cops." *Foreign Affairs*. 81(6): 122-132.

Burk, James. 1998 *The Adaptive Military: Armed Forces in a Turbulent World*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Burk, James. 2002 "Theories of Democratic Civil-Military Relations." *Armed Forces & Society* 29(1): 7-29.

Burk, James. Email. Interview, 23 November 2003.

Butler, John S. 1980 *Inequality in the Military: The Black Experience*. Century Twenty-One Publishing: Saratoga, CA.

Butler, Remo. 1999 "Why Black Officers Fail." *Parameters: U.S. Army War College*. (29) 3: 54-69.

Coates, C. H., & R. J. Pellegrin 1965 *Military Sociology: A Study of American Military Institutions and Military Life*. University Park, MD: Social Science Press.

Cottey, Andrew, Timothy Edmunds, and Anthony Forster. 2002 "The Second Generation Problematic: Rethinking Democracy and Civil-Military Relations." *Armed Forces & Society*. 29(1): 31-56.

Dandeker, Christopher and Mady Wechsler Segal. 1996 Gender Integration in Armed Forces: Recent Policy Developments in the United Kingdom." *Armed Forces & Society*. 23(1):29-47.

Department of the Army. 1998 Pamphlet 600-3:Commissioned Officer Development and Career Management. Washington, DC: U.S.

Dinardo, R.L. and D.J. Hughes. 2001. "Germany and Coalition Warfare in the World Wars: A Comparative Study." *War in History* 8 (2) 166-190.

Elron, E., B. Shamir, & E. Ben-Ari 1999 "Why Don't They Fight Each Other? Cultural Diversity and Operational Unity in Multinational Forces." *Armed Forces & Society* 26(1): 73-97.

Ender, Morten G. 2001 "Authorship and Affiliation in Armed Forces & Society: Volumes 1-25. *Armed Forces & Society* 27 (4): 623-638.

Feaver, Peter D. 1996 "The Civil-Military Problematiquea: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Questions of Civilian Control." Armed Forces & Society. 23(2):149-178.

Feaver, Peter and Richard H. Kohn. 2001 *Soldier and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Flink, John. 2001 "Teamwork Under Fire." Proceedings. 127(7): 36-41.

Franke, Volker. 2000 "Duty, Honor, Country: The Social Identity of West Point Cadets. *Armed Forces & Society*. 26(2): 175-202.

Hauk, Keith and Greg H. Parlier. 2000 Recruiting: Crisis and Cures. *Military Review* (80) 3: 73-80.

Heller, Charles E. and William A. Stofft. 1986 *America's First Battles, 1776-1965*. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press.

Hoege III, Howard H. 2002 "ROE…also a Matter of Doctrine." *The Army Lawyer*.

Homans, G. C. 1946 "The Small Warship. "*American Sociological Review* 11:294-330.

Huntington, S. P. 1957 *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Janowitz, M. 1959 *Sociology and the Military Establishment*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Janowitz, M. 1960 *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Janowitz, M. 1964a *Military Institutions and Coercion in the Developing Nations*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Janowitz, M. (ed.) *1964b The New Military: Changing Patterns of Organization*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Janowitz, M. 1977 "From Institutional to Occupational: The Need for Conceptual Continuity." *Armed Forces & Society* 4:51-54.

Janowitz, M. & S. Westbrook. 1983 *The Political Education of Soldiers*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Jessup, John E. and Louise B. Ketz. *1994 Encyclopedia of the American Military*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Lacquement Jr., Richard. 2003 "Understanding Professional Expertise and Jurisdiction." *Military Review* March-April: 61-65.

Lang, K. 1972 *Military Institutions and the Sociology of War: A Review of the Literature with Annotated Bibliography*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lovell, John P. and Philip Kronenberg. 1974 *New Civil-Military Relations*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Matthews, Lloyd J.1998 "The Evolution of American Military Ideals." *Military Review*. 78(1): 50-61.

McClure, Robert L. and Orlov II Morton. 1999 "Is the UN Peacekeeping Role in Eclipse?" *Parameters: U.S. Army War College*. 29(3): 96-105.

Meese, Michael J. 2002 "The Army Officer Corps in the All-Volunteer Force." *Contemporary Economic Policy*. (20) 2- 101-110.

Mershon, Sherie and Steven Schlossman. 1998 *Foxholes & Color Lines*. Baltimore, MA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Merton, R. K., & P. F. Lazarsfeld (eds.) *1950 Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of "The American Soldier*." New York, NY: Free Press.

Miller, William O. 2000 "Military Justice Supervision TJAG or COMA." *Army Lawyer*. 333: 1-3.

Moskos, C. C., Jr. 1973 "The Emergent Military. "*Pacific Sociological Review* 16:255-279.

Moskos, C. C., Jr. 1977 "From Institution to Occupation: Trends in Military Organization." *Armed Forces & Society* 4:41-50.

Moskos, C. C., Jr. 1986 "Institutional/Occupational Trends in Armed Forces: An Update." *Armed Forces & Society* 12(3): 377-382.

Moskos, C. and John Sibley Butler. 1996 *All That We Can Be*. Twentieth Century Fund Book: New York: NY.

Moskos, C. C., Jr., J. A. Williams, & D. R. Segal (eds.) 2000 *The Postmodern Military: Armed Forces After the Cold War*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Moskos, Charles. 1988 "Institutional and Occupational Trends in Armed Forces." Moskos, C. C., Jr., & F. R. Wood (eds.) *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* (pp.15-26). McLean, VA: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers.

Moskos, Charles and Frank R. Wood. "Institutional Building in an Occupational World."1988 Moskos, C. C., Jr., & F. R. Wood (eds.) *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* pp.279-291. McLean, VA: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers.

Murphy, Timothy W. 2001 "A Defense of the Role of the Convening Authority: The Integration of Justice and Discipline." *Reporter*. 28(3): 3-6.

Murray, Williamson. 2001 "Thinking About Innovation." *Naval War College Review*. 54(2): 118-129.

Nietzsche, Friedrich and ed. Walter Kaufmann. 1976 *The Portable Nietzsche*. New York: Penguin Books.

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. 2003 "U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq." Foreign Affairs. 82(4):60-73.

Olldashi, Ariana. Civil Military Relations in Emerging Democracies as Found in the Articles of *Armed Forces & Society*. 2002.

Perlmutter, A. 1977 *The Military and Politics in Modem Times: On Professionals, Praetorians, and Revolutionary Soldiers*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Perlmutter, A. and V. Bennett. 1980 *The Political Influence of the Military: A Comparative Reader*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rosen, Leora N. and Doris B. Durand. 1996 "Cohesion and Readiness in Gender-Integrated Combat Service Support Units: The Impact of Acceptance of Women and Gender Ratio." *Armed Forces & Society*. 22(4):537-553.

Sarvas, S. 1999 "Professional Soldiers and Politics: A Case of Central and Eastern Europe." *Armed Forces & Society* 26(1): 99-118.

Schaefer, Richard T. 1986 *Sociology*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Schwartz, T. P., & R. M. Marsh 1999 "The American Soldier Studies of WWII: A 50th Anniversary Commemorative." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 27(1): 21-37.

Segal, Mady W. David R. Segal, Jerald G. Bachman, Peter Freedman-Doan, and Patrick. 2001 "Gender and the Propensity to Enlist in the U.S. Military." *Women in the Military*. 49-70.

Shamir, B., & E. Ben-Ari 2000 "Challenges of Military Leadership in Changing Armies." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 28(1): 43-59.

Shields, Patricia M. 1988 "Sex Roles in the Military." In Moskos, C. C., Jr., & F. R. Wood (eds.) 1988 *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* (pp.99-113). McLean, VA: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers.

Shields, P. M. 1993 "A New Paradigm for Military Policy: Socioeconomics." *Armed Forces and Society* 19(4): 511-531.

Shils, E. A., & M. Janowitz 1948 "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12:280-315.

Siebold, G. L. 1999 "The Evolution of the Measurement of Cohesion*." Military Psychology* 11(1): 5-26.

Siebold, G. L. 2001 "Core Issues and Theory in Military Sociology*." Journal of Political & Military Sociology* 29(1): 140-159.

Simmons, Anna. 2001 "Women in Combat: It's Still a Bad Idea." *Parameters: U.S. Army War College*. 31(2): 89-100.

Smelser, Neil J. 1994 *Sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Snider, Don M., Robert F. Priest, and Felisa Lewis. 2001 "The Civilian-Military Gap and Professional Military Education at the Precommissioning Level." *Armed Forces & Society*. (27) 2: 249-272.

Snyder, R. Claire 2003 "The Citizen-Soldier Tradition and Gender Integration of the U.S. Military." 29(2): 185-204.

Sorensen, H. 1994 "New Perspectives on the Military Profession: The I/O Model and Esprit de Corps Reevaluated." *Armed Forces & Society* 20(4): 599-617.

Spencer, Herbert. 1969 *Principles of Sociology*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books.

Stiehm, Judith Hicks. 2001 "Army Opinions About Women in the Army." *Women in the Military*.

Stiehm, Judith Hicks. 2001b "Civil-Military Relations in War College Curricula." *Armed Forces & Society*. (27) 2: 273-294.

Watson, Bradley. C. S. 1999 "The Western Ethical Tradition and the Morality of the Warrior." *Armed Forces & Society* 26(1): 55-72.

Website of *Armed Forces & Society.* Retrieved July 1, 2003.
http://www.bsos.umd.edu/ius/Journal.html

Wood, Frank R. 1988 "Sex Roles in the Military." In Moskos, C. C., Jr., & F. R. Wood (eds.) 1988 *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* (pp.27-38). McLean, VA: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers.