

## VII

# Sex Roles in the Military

PATRICIA M. SHIELDS

A striking characteristic of the modern U.S. military is its increased reliance on women, an unplanned consequence of the draft's demise. Currently, American women serve their country in unprecedented ways and numbers. No other industrialized nation has ever used women as extensively. As peacetime soldiers, they are unlike their historical sisters who were called to meet the challenge of war.

Overall, women make up approximately 10 percent of the active force, representing more than a fivefold increase since 1970. Not only is this growth unmatched in history, women are also assigned to an increased variety of occupational specialties, including combat support. According to reports, women also tend to raise the quality of the armed forces; enlisted women, on average, have more education and score higher on standardized tests.<sup>1</sup>

Some view the new widespread use of women as a better and more equitable military personnel policy.<sup>2</sup> Others view the trend with alarm. Skeptics, who see the increased proportion of women as a radical step, fear that readiness and combat effectiveness will be sacrificed in favor of an ill-conceived social experiment.<sup>3</sup>

Wherever the truth lies, female participation is unlikely to return to prevolunteer force levels (under 2 percent). Indeed, official U.S. armed forces projections suggest greater reliance on women.<sup>4</sup> Hence, an understanding of the appropriate use of women is critical in arriving at an effective military human resource policy. What kinds of values and norms do women bring to the military? Are they economically motivated, joining the

---

Many thanks to Tim Carr, Daniel Hesser, Capt. Mary Gueurts, and Bill Childers for their comments on an earlier draft. I would also like to thank M. B. Freels for her research assistance.

military to maximize their long-run earnings stream, or are they like their dedicated, loyal counterparts of the 1940s and 1950s?

Another important set of questions addresses the effect of their increasing numbers in the military. Will swelling numbers of women alter traditional military norms and values? Does the institution help a woman feel a part of a team with an important mission, or is she shut out, alienated by an organization steeped in male tradition? Clearly, the answers to these questions are evolving. However, two issues emerge: one concerns the values of women as they enter and remain in the military; the other focuses on the organization and how it shapes these values.

This chapter will address the role of military women in light of these issues, and two findings become clear. First, women do not consider the military as just another employer; rather, they are attracted to unique aspects of the military institution, such as discipline and adventure. Second, women soldiers are not fully supported in their institutional identities. Institutional attachment—often eroded by family responsibilities—is diluted because the military does not really accommodate women.

Women's presence has been expanding in both the military and the work force. For example, in 1962 only 37 percent were members of the labor force; more than half were full-time homemakers. By 1982 these proportions had reversed: 35 percent were keeping house and 53 percent were employed or looking for work. Further, between 1972 and 1982, as female labor force participation grew, there was a dramatic jump (57 percent) in households headed by women. One in six families is now maintained by women.<sup>5</sup>

Historically, women's association with the labor force has been continuous but limited. In the civilian sector, women have never been totally excluded from paid employment. Female military participation, however, has been more sporadic. During wartime, women have enlisted, performed traditional female tasks, and freed men for combat. At war's end, all but a few invariably returned to civilian life.

Because revolution, invasion, and violent world conflict demand that citizens work together and sacrifice to ensure survival, reluctant military institutions have sometimes called on women to add their talents to war efforts. However, women's participation in the military system of industrial societies has been narrowly limited to traditional fields and activities, where their presence did not threaten men or male traditions.

For example, women were first allowed to contribute by nursing the wounded (e.g., England during the Crimean War). Later, during World War I and World War II, women freed men to fight by taking on other traditional jobs such as typing, sorting mail, and laundry. (We should note that during war, these traditional tasks differed from peacetime civilian equivalents.) Women recognized that their work contributed to the war effort, and they were committed to something much larger than just a job. Military duty was not easy; however, despite long hours, dangerous and sometimes filthy

working conditions, poorly designed and ill-fitting uniforms, smear campaigns, living quarters that approached house arrest (in the South Pacific), and patronizing and harassing men, women served their country with dedication.<sup>6</sup>

After World War II, American women were excluded from service directly by quotas and indirectly through policies that mandated their discharge upon marriage or pregnancy. These policies resulted in first-term attrition rates sometimes as high as 80 percent during the 1950s.<sup>7</sup> The small cadre of women who remained developed a strong attachment to the institution.

Helen Rogan interviewed and observed former members of the Women's Army Corps (WAC). Her account suggests that these women were proud of the WAC. They described an element of "super giant, good military bearing with everything right. It is when you are dressed . . . , polished, and spit-shined at all times."<sup>8</sup>

Rogan maintained that women of the army corps had an allegiance to an institution within an institution. The small, isolated WAC world was unlike the world of work. It became part of a woman's personality in a way that no civilian job could. "The sense of mission suffuses her work. Women of the Army Corps had little in the way of status or recognition to sustain them, [and] this tended to make their sense of mission even stronger."<sup>9</sup>

After World War II, the assumptions surrounding national security changed. The highly technical nuclear era led to new national security goals such as containment and deterrence. This dictated a shift to immediate readiness as an armed forces policy goal. Immediate readiness necessitated a large standing force, a mighty war machine whose effectiveness is judged by its ability to maintain peace through power. During the 1950s and 1960s, the armed forces relied upon the draft to meet its large manpower needs.

The young all-volunteer force, experiencing a manpower shortfall, began to rely increasingly on womanpower. At the same time, the 2 percent ceiling on female participation was lifted. Armed forces personnel demands opened the doors for female integration. Early on, the separate women's services were dismantled. Although fast paced, integration had many false starts and setbacks. By the mid-1980s, only a small percentage of military jobs were closed to women due to combat restrictions. Col. Evelyn Foote, a WAC officer who lived through the changes, described them as "evolutionary changes in a revolutionary time frame."<sup>10</sup>

## **INSTITUTIONAL OR OCCUPATIONAL ORIENTATIONS OF WOMEN**

When the military dropped conscription and allowed individuals to freely choose the military, it also adopted a labor market recruitment model. Under this model, the military became an employer competing for human resources

in the marketplace; the soldier became a rational employee who chooses the military *occupation* to maximize long-term earnings. Wages, in this context, are assumed to be the critical enlistment motivator.

Clearly, the labor market model contrasts sharply with traditional military recruitment systems. Traditional methods used institutional values—duty, honor, country, and esprit de corps—to motivate enlistment and maintain quality recruits. The draft, the cornerstone of the institutional model, met staffing demands directly and motivated enlistment as well. In addition, military service was viewed as an obligation. Public support for the draft rests upon citizen acceptance of service as a national obligation.

When the Vietnam War eroded public support for the draft, it ushered in the use of labor supply models. Paradoxically, when the military relied upon the draft, it held its most institutionally oriented segment—women—at arm's length. The military employer, on the other hand, opened doors to women and used them in ways unparalleled in history.

The traditional and labor market frameworks (discussed previously) have been described as the institutional-occupational dichotomy by Charles Moskos. Although little survey evidence distinguishes men from women along I/O dimensions, women have historically been very institutional. Obviously, the women soldiers of World War II met WAC leader Oveta Culp Hobby's challenge of a "debt to democracy" and a "date with destiny."<sup>11</sup> Further, in their separate and tiny women's service corps, the career women of the 1950s and 1960s are assumed to have had a strong institutional attachment. (How many male career service personnel would there be if marriage resulted in dismissal?)

The notion of self-sacrifice is not alien to women. In their role as mothers, women understand this concept all too well. In addition, traditional occupations such as nursing and teaching have been viewed as callings. The former is a prime example of a traditional female vocation compatible with military institutional values. Indeed, the concept of nursing as a calling has been used and acknowledged by the armed forces. When describing American nurses during the Spanish-American War, Nicholas Senn depicted nursing as a woman's "special calling. . . . Her sense of duty of devotion was seldom matched by men."<sup>12</sup> Recruitment posters during World War II gave military nurses nunlike qualities; captions termed them "Greatest Mothers in the World."<sup>13</sup>

Historical evidence that female soldiers treat military service as a vocation is strong. These women, however, represented only a fraction of available American women. Indeed, during World War II, the military was unable to meet its female recruitment goals. Nurse shortages were so severe that President Roosevelt called for and the House passed a nurses' draft.<sup>14</sup> Further, the high attrition rates during the 1950s and 1960s indicate that 70 percent to 80 percent of the women initially attracted to the military did not find the feeling of obligation or mission strong enough to complete their first tour of

duty. Hence, although historical evidence supports the notion of a calling, it also suggests that the military cannot rely on this factor alone to attract and keep the number of women it requires in the late 1980s and the 1990s.

What of the modern woman soldier in the new integrated military? Does she consider the armed forces a vocation or occupation? At first glance, the average woman recruit would appear to be motivated by occupational norms. From an employment perspective, little practical distinction should exist between the military and civilian sectors because, for women, the military and civilian occupational structures closely mirror one another.<sup>15</sup> This alone, however, does not imply that women are attracted to the armed forces for occupational reasons. If women are occupational, they will enlist out of self-interest to maximize their net economic advantage. In other words, they will enlist to take advantage of relatively high wages, fringe benefits, and job security.

According to the occupational thesis, variables such as wages and unemployment are critical in explaining enlistment, attrition, and reenlistment. If these variables are effective at predicting female military participation patterns, they would certainly support the contention that women are attracted to the armed forces for occupational reasons.

The military's wage package is very attractive to women because in the civilian workplace women tend to be clustered in low-paying occupations. Further, because job security in the military is greater than in civilian life, a woman can expect higher long-term earnings in the armed forces.<sup>16</sup> The military also offers an attractive training package. As the country's largest training institution, the armed forces provide both on-the-job and formal instruction to enlistees. Curricula include technical fields with significant civilian transferability, such as electronics.<sup>17</sup> Unemployment is another variable to be considered. Obviously, periods of unemployment erode the net economic advantage of civilian employment. When the U.S. economy is losing ground, the military is a source of steady employment. Not surprisingly, during periods of high unemployment, the AVF has found recruiting quality soldiers easier. Historically, women's unemployment rates have been higher than men's.<sup>18</sup> Hence, the entire package of relatively higher wages, job security, and training should make the military an attractive employer to women.

## **Enlistment**

Women's enlistment rates cannot be used to assess their occupational orientation because it is influenced by military demand. It does not incorporate the number who want to enlist but are turned away. The desire to enlist or enlistment intention is a more accurate measure of occupational orientation.

Given the clear net economic advantage associated with military

employment, the occupational model would predict enlistment intention rates equal to or greater than overall labor force participation. The evidence, however, fails to support the occupational model. Women expect to enlist in percentages that are a small fraction of female labor force participation. Between 1976 and 1982, the proportion of female high school seniors who expected to enlist ranged from a high of 7 percent (1976 and 1982) to a low of 5.4 percent (1979 and 1980).<sup>19</sup>

What of the women who do enlist? Are they motivated by occupational factors? In a study of a large national sample of enlisted men and women, "pay" and "unemployment" were tied for last (among 12 choices) as the reason for female enlistment.<sup>20</sup> Accordingly, these women rejected occupational values as enlistment motivators. Further, these women cited "to better myself in life" as the major enlistment motivator. What do young women mean when they check "to better myself in life"? Obviously, they were not referring to training or educational benefits because both were included as choices in the questionnaire. The discipline and structure of the military institution both seem of special interest to young women.<sup>21</sup>

Recent field interviews also suggest that pay is not the primary reason women enlist. Moskos found that army women on field duty in Honduras gave reasons for enlisting such as "sense of adventure" or "get away from boring community."<sup>22</sup> Men, on the other hand, listed economic incentives. In another exploratory study among army, marine, and air force women, Shields discovered that military women do not like to classify or rank their reasons for joining. Instead, they said they were attracted to the military because it offered new and exciting challenges. They enjoyed the thought of seeing the world and viewed themselves apart and different from civilian women. Theirs was *not* just another job—it offered excitement, adventure, discipline, and structure. They seemed to be attracted to the military because it had institutional qualities unlike civilian employment. Nevertheless, despite the chance for an exciting life, a large part of their enlistment decision rested with the need to find employment, support themselves, and enter the adult world.<sup>23</sup>

## Reenlistment Decisions and Attrition

Like enlistment decisions, reenlistment decisions and attrition rates of women are important indications of their institutional or occupational orientation. Compared with men, women are more likely to leave the military before the end of their first tour. Approximately 45 percent of the enlisted women who entered in 1981 did not complete their first tour. This compares with 34 percent for men.<sup>24</sup> Perhaps this is not surprising because women have traditionally had higher labor turnover rates than men.<sup>25</sup> However, military women's turnover rates are lower than those of their civilian counterparts, who are twice as likely to leave their employers in a given year.

Virtually the entire difference in attrition between military men and women

is attributable to women's increased likelihood of leaving prematurely for pregnancy and parental responsibilities.<sup>27</sup> For example, among women who entered in 1980, 13 percent left for family responsibilities; only 2 percent of the men, on the other hand, felt fatherhood was incompatible with enlisted life. Significant numbers of enlisted women appear to find mixing children and military life (be it vocation or occupation) difficult.<sup>28</sup>

Women of the army and marines have the highest attrition rates, perhaps because these services are most closely associated with hand-to-hand combat and other disamenities not usually found in the labor market. Female attrition is the lowest in the navy, approximately that of men.<sup>27</sup>

The situation is different for women who complete their first tour of duty. Women's first-term reenlistment rates have consistently run somewhat higher than men's and have been increasing since 1981. However, career women reenlist at rates substantially lower than career men. For example, in 1983, approximately 90 percent of the career enlisted men reenlisted, compared with only 72 percent of their female counterparts.<sup>30</sup>

The evidence that economic incentives motivate women to complete their first term or to reenlist is mixed. Kim found that job satisfaction was the only significant variable positively associated with first-term reenlistment intentions. Good pay was ranked as the most important component in job satisfaction, followed by learning valuable skills and pleasant physical surroundings, ranked second and third, respectively.<sup>31</sup> The larger role of military pay is perhaps not surprising. Reenlistment implies that the military is considered a career, not just a place to "get away from a boring community" or to learn about discipline and structure. These goals would have been fulfilled in the first tour. The importance of pay overall, however, should not be overstressed.

In a study that looked at the determinants of first-term reenlistment intentions, job satisfaction was found to be statistically significant, while pay itself was not.<sup>32</sup> Hence, pay appears to influence reenlistment intentions indirectly through job satisfaction. Thus, although not a primary factor in explaining commitment to the institution, pay is more important later than at initial enlistment. In addition, women planning to leave do not cite poor economic conditions as their primary source of dissatisfaction. "Unpleasant physical surroundings" is ranked number one.<sup>33</sup>

Reenlistment decisions provide further evidence that women find it difficult to balance family and military responsibilities. Controlling for other factors such as job satisfaction, marriage, and traditional values, Kim found that the presence of a child decreases reenlistment probability by 69 percent.<sup>34</sup> As one might expect, enlisted mothers with traditional attitudes are not interested in combining a military career and children. Children are enough of a stressor that, for traditional and nontraditional women alike, on average, their reenlistment propensities decline.

Most of the studies discussed above dealt with enlisted women. Relevant

literature on officers is more limited. One would expect officers to hold institutional values because they are members of the military's leadership. For example, the much-studied female academy students evidence strong institutional attachment. In a recent survey of Fort Hood women officers, pay proved to be a relatively unimportant enlistment motivator. Although the respondents felt military compensation was adequate, a majority believed that their long-and-short-run earnings would be higher if they were civilians. Other factors were more important, for example, they trusted their leader and were satisfied with the challenging work. Moreover, the overwhelming majority favored regulations regarding dress and appearance, valued discipline, and felt they were members of a prestigious organization.<sup>35</sup>

Institutional orientations tend to be strongest among career military. Although women are currently underrepresented in the higher ranks, they—like their male peers—will probably become more institutional as they move up. Another factor that may affect women's orientation is their specialty. Because women are excluded from combat specialties, where even among the career force institutional values are highest, one would expect future institutional values to be weaker among women even if they are relatively senior.

Results of enlistment, reenlistment, and attrition studies suggest that female soldiers are not concerned exclusively with net economic advantage. Pay is important, but pay alone does not determine whether a woman enters or remains. Trends in female attrition and reenlistment suggest that the military is weeding out those who are dissatisfied, those who fail to meet minimal criteria, and those who are unwilling or unable to balance both family and military responsibilities.

The evidence presented here, although not conclusive, leads one to believe that military women, in general, do not enter or remain primarily for occupational reasons. They are attracted to an institution, not an employer. They tend to view the military as a special institution offering unique benefits, such as discipline and adventure. The behavior and attitudes of men, on the other hand, are more consistent with the occupational theses. However, a small but significant number of men do hold strong institutional values. They are primarily career soldiers in combat-related specialties. Hence, with the exception of males in combat roles, female enlistees probably hold values more compatible with the institutional mode.

## **THE EXPERIENCE OF WOMEN IN THE MILITARY**

The armed forces have their roots in time-honored masculine traditions. The uniforms, rituals, and authoritarian structure that permeate military life help transform boys into effective men soldiers. Many traditions and practices of the male-oriented institution clash with effective female assimilation.

Taken as a whole, men of the armed forces have resisted and been hostile



toward attempts at gender integration. The need to use women is often recognized first at the top of the command structure. Historically, however, initial attempts at female integration have not been accepted at the day-to-day level. Generally, the rank and file have resisted and obstructed integration. During World War II, a spontaneous campaign arose among American GIs to sabotage the new women's military corps, and military men engaged in a slander campaign against their female counterparts, targeting morals and character.<sup>36</sup> Hence, initial integration was resisted by men, even when women were assigned to traditional tasks such as nursing, typing, and filing.

Scholars speculate that men resist initial integration because they find it threatening. The very fact of a woman succeeding in the military dilutes time-honored male rituals and reflects poorly upon the concept of the dominant male. Essentially, they have invaded an elite (perhaps mystical) male testing ground.<sup>37</sup>

Among the potentially most debilitating obstacles military women face is sexual harassment. In an extensive study of Signal Corps women in Khaki Town, West Germany (comprising four American army bases), Michael Rustad describes its devastating effects. He found sexual harassment to be pervasive, constant, and demoralizing.<sup>38</sup> Obviously, people treated as sexual objects are seldom accepted as part of a cohesive team. Sexual harassment erodes institutional loyalty and undermines values.

In the modern, volunteer military, the most severe problems of integration occur when women work in nontraditional specialties. Unlike their counterparts in pink-collar jobs, these women experience all the problems common to tokens. The male enlisted culture is a working-class machismo—in Rustad's Khaki Town, the adventure comic book was the number-one best-seller—women in nontraditional assignments threaten this culture.

Women in nontraditional MOSs (military occupational specialties) often find themselves in a double bind: when they succeed in their work role, their femininity is questioned; when they fail, their womanliness is affirmed at the expense of their work role. The problem is described very well by a maintenance specialist in Rustad's Khaki Town.

To me, men really can't handle women in jobs like these. They try and instill an attitude in the females that they don't know what they're doing. Once this is done, they come in and offer help. Then they say women can't do the job.<sup>39</sup>

Given the hassles associated with nontraditional jobs, it is not surprising that women in these slots, on average, score lower on scales of job satisfaction and are more likely to leave the institution.<sup>40</sup> In the first place, enlisted women generally are not attracted to nontraditional jobs. Typically, they value a cheerful, cleanwork environment; they are less interested than men in working outdoors, with their hands, or with machines. In reality, the typical

young woman is less prepared than the average man, both psychologically and physically, for any of the traditional male occupational specialties.<sup>41</sup>

Today, a number of factors have helped to create a more supportive environment in the military and to reduce tension between the sexes. They include time, increased numbers of women, better matching of physical capabilities with jobs, changing expectations of youth cohorts, a greater sense of patriotism, more egalitarian attitudes toward women's role in society, and explicit military programs and directives dealing with sexual harassment.

With fuller integration, people are more likely to judge one another as individuals. Day-to-day integration is working. It is "creating new levels of mutual trust and confidence."<sup>42</sup> Two recent studies examined female integration under rigorous and dangerous field conditions.<sup>43</sup> Field assignments have few civilian employment counterparts. Almost by definition, successful field activities rely on institutional values. Field success and survival depend, in large part, on unit cohesion, which is fostered through institutional values such as fellowship, trust, and esprit de corps.

The authors of both studies observed that the men and women worked well together. Over the course of field training, women were increasingly judged as individuals. Buddy or brother-sister relationships were the norm, not romantic attachments. Men and women built cohesion through shared experiences. The distinction between insiders (those within the unit) and outsiders was more important than that between the two sexes. Individuals were judged by how effectively they performed the task and were prized for their knowledge.<sup>44</sup>

Within units, there was little sexual harassment. Hence, under the very conditions in which sexual harassment could be most devastating to the military mission, it did not seem to be a problem. Nevertheless, men outside the immediate unit, particularly those with low-status jobs (e.g., cooks) and poor educational backgrounds, continued to harass women. Although sexual harassment seems to be less of a problem, it has not disappeared completely.

Nonetheless, many of the issues that alienated women and eroded institutional values in the 1970s have been addressed, and young women soldiers of the 1980s are more likely to have experiences consistent with institutional values. The big issues yet unresolved for military women in this decade seem to be pregnancy, child care, and combat exclusion, all of which affect the utilization of women in the military.

Pregnancy and child care are two of the most controversial and emotional issues associated with female integration. Pregnancy is a very troubling issue for women in nontraditional jobs, particularly combat support and combat service support, because it has implications for deployability. Pregnancy disrupts unit cohesion and team effectiveness in a uniquely feminine way. These issues are likely to be viewed differently by men and women in the unit. Pregnant women are apt to be resented by men because of the special burden they bring to the unit: men may be fathers, but they do not bring their wives'

pregnant condition to work with them. They do not have poor balance, nor must they avoid heavy lifting or certain chemicals for several months. In short, whether or not men choose to have children does not affect their ability to perform tasks (unit cohesion) in the same way.

Focusing on lost time due to pregnancy is a false issue, according to Senator Proxmire. Men have lost more time for abusing drugs and alcohol than women have for drug and alcohol abuse and pregnancy combined.<sup>45</sup> From the deployability point of view, however, the man with a hangover and the pregnant women both present problems. Just as all men are not banned because some get hangovers, all women should not be banned because some get pregnant. Also, all pregnant women are not a burden in all (or most) jobs. Nevertheless, from a strict deployability standpoint, pregnancy represents a short-term burden in some military functions.

Parenting, a family function that is shared by men and women soldiers, has special implications for women. Motherhood takes more time and energy because women usually organize household activities and are responsible for a majority of childcare duties. (Both father and mother change diapers; mom, however, buys them.) Although large numbers of women choose to balance military careers and families, analysis of attrition and reenlistment trends show that motherhood is one of the major reasons women leave. In contrast, being a father increases a man's probability of reenlisting.<sup>46</sup> This evidence suggests difficulty for women in keeping up with the demands of military life and motherhood. Women, on average, are more likely to leave nontraditional career fields, which often have irregular hours. This suggests that the mixing of motherhood and a military career is most difficult when women work in an MOS that has unconventional hours and long trips away from home not compatible with accessible child care. When a women's specialty area has regular hours and weekends off (e.g., air force legal work) childcare needs would be similar to those of civilian counterparts. (In addition, such military mothers would have the support necessary to both advance in a military career and raise a family.)

Clearly, military women are young and in their childbearing years. They also tend to value children and family life. For example, Shields found, using a national sample, that over 95 percent of the enlisted women believed the ideal family contained two or more children. Moreover, 85 percent *desired* two or more children.<sup>47</sup> Motherhood is clearly a demanding, time-consuming activity. Hence, it is relevant to examine just how it might influence I/O orientations. One might speculate that mothers who are also soldiers would have a tendency to adopt occupational values. Such values would allow a woman to maintain the primary sense of duty to her family and treat the military as a job. On a day-to-day basis, satisfying both military duty and motherly obligation may be fairly easy. Small children, however, have suppressed immune systems and at day-care centers are likely to get more infectious diseases than children cared for at home or in small groups.<sup>48</sup> If

forced to choose between military responsibilities and a sick toddler, most mothers will choose the child. Moreover, single parents must take the time to deal with these problems without the support of a spouse.

Hence, child care for dependents of active duty personnel is an important issue among current military personnel.<sup>49</sup> In a group interview held at Kelly Air Force Base (February 1985), an interesting, very institutional, perspective was taken by career single mothers. These women lived on base and used the reasonably priced base day-care facilities. They also worked in traditional specialties with regular hours and had weekends off. They liked the air force because it was an "institution that took care of its own." They were patriotic and enjoyed being members of the armed forces. They emphasized the benefits of free, accessible medical care, job security, convenient day care, and the knowledge that they are safe on base. They never feared rape or attack while at Kelly. Given the desperate plight of many civilian single mothers, that these military mothers adopted this perspective is not surprising.

Women are integrated into almost every aspect of military mission except direct combat activities and draft registration. In the combat arena, women will probably die in proportion to their numbers in a major ground conflict. They will not, however, be among the "bands of brothers" who will be called to do the initial killing. Not surprisingly, the institutional orientation is highest among career combat soldiers. The values that tie these men together and produce unit cohesion are institutional. Hence, as long as women are excluded from this inner circle, their institutional orientation on average, will, not reach its full potential.

In the United States, women have always been excluded from the draft. From an institutional perspective, the draft is viewed as an obligation to serve the nation. In the ideal sense, it forces a few (and motivates many) to serve their country. Today a male citizen of the United States has the obligation to register for the draft. Women do not. Neither the civilian leadership nor the military institution has asked women to view service as an obligation. Thus, the military is giving women a message that undermines female institutional values and, by implication, promotes an occupational orientation.

## **CONCLUSION**

Women today are an integral part of the U.S. armed forces. They do not view the military as a civilian employer. Their heritage is steeped in institutional values and they are institutionally oriented. Economic factors are important to them, but they are also attracted to the structure, tradition, rituals, discipline, and opportunities of the military. Further, the typical female enlistee is probably more institutionally oriented than her male counterpart. Reenlistment is also motivated by institutional values.

Women have not been easily assimilated into the military organization. There are still serious problems of adaptation. High female first-term attrition

(45 percent) is symptomatic. Perhaps the problem rests with a military organization that does not really welcome or accommodate women. Sexual harassment and poorly designed apparel (e.g., ill-fitting boots) are but two examples. In addition, problems are most apt to occur when women work in nontraditional specialties.

Motherhood also disrupts assimilation. This is particularly true when women work in occupations with irregular hours and extended absence from home. Women who want full careers in these fields will probably not be mothers. Motherhood is less problematic when women work in jobs with more regular hours.

The military has an opportunity to build institutional attachment among women (and all active-duty parents) by providing more family-oriented noncash benefits—such as expanded, flexible, quality child care and dependents' quarters. Using innovative institutional methods, the armed forces could nurture institutional attachment in the modern era of working mothers, but is that a choice they are likely to make?

## NOTES

1. Martin Binkin and Shirley Bach, *Women and the Military* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1977), p. 17.
2. See, for example, Nancy Goldman, ed., *Female Soldiers—Combatants or Noncombatants* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1982); Jeanne Holm, *Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution* (Novato, Calif.: Presidio Press, 1982); Helen Rogan, *Mixed Company: Women in the Modern Army* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1981); Mady W. Segal, "Women in the Military: Research and Policy Issues," *Youth and Society* 10 (December 1984): 33.
3. Michael Levin, "Women As Soldiers—The Record So Far," *The Public Interest* 76 (Summer 1984): 33.
4. Department of Defense (hereafter DOD); Manpower, Installations, and Logistics, *Military Women in the Department of Defense*, II (Washington, D.C.; April, 1984), 3.
5. Department of Labor (hereafter DOL), *Women at Work: A Chartbook* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1983).
6. Holm, *Women in the Military*, pp. 9–12.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 163.
8. Rogan, *Mixed Company*, p. 14.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
10. Evelyn P. Foote, "Army Leadership: One Point of View," in James H. Buck and Lawrence J. Korb, eds., *Military Leadership*, (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1981), p. 559.
11. Rogan, *Mixed Company*, p. 131.
12. Nicholas Senn, *Medico-Surgical Aspects of the Spanish-American War* (Chicago: Medical Book Company, 1901), pp. 318–319.
13. Philip Kalisch and Margaret Scobey, "Female Nurses in American Wars: Helplessness Suspended for the Duration," *Armed Forces and Society* 9, no. 2 (1983): 221.
14. Holm, *Women in the Military*, p. 109.
15. Carol Boyd Lean, "Working for Uncle Sam—A Look at Members of the Armed Forces," *Monthly Labor Review* 107, no. 7 (July 1984): 3.
16. Chongsoo Kim, et al., *The All-Volunteer Force: 1979 NLS Studies of Enlistment, Intention to Serve, and Intentions to Reenlist* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1982).
17. Army recruiters emphasize that the army issues certificates of completion for certain kinds of training. These certificates are valuable because they are acceptable as proof of mastery by civilian organizations.

18. DOL, *Women at Work*, p. 17.
19. Jerald Bachman, "American High School Seniors View the Military: 1976-1982," *Armed Forces and Society* 10, no. 1 (Fall 1983): 86-104; Vonda L. Kiplinger, David P. Boesel, and Kyle T. Johnson, *Propensity of Young Women to Enlist in the Military: A Report to Congress* (March 1985); see, for example, J. Hicks, "Women in the U.S. Army," *Armed Forces and Society* 4, no. 4 (Summer 1978): 647-657; Kathleen Durning, "Attitudes of Enlisted Women and Men Toward the Navy," *Armed Forces and Society* 9, no. 1 (Fall 1982): 20-32; Patricia Thomas, "Enlisted Women in the Military," in *Defense Manpower Policy: Presentations from the 1976 Rand Conference on Defense Manpower* (1978).
20. Chongsoo Kim, *The All-Volunteer Force*, p. 25.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
22. Charles C. Moskos, "Female GIs in the Field: Report from Honduras," *Society* 22, no. 6 (1985): 29.
23. Patricia M. Shields, "Women as Military Leaders: Promises and Pitfalls." Presented at the National Conference of the American Society for Public Administration, Indianapolis, Ind., 1985, p. 13.
24. DOD statistics.
25. Herbert Parnes, *Peoplepower: Elements of Human Resource Policy* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1984), p. 111.
26. Linda J. Waite and Sue E. Berryman, *Women in Nontraditional Occupations: Choice and Turnover* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand, 1985), p. 49.
27. DOD, *Military Women*, p. 51.
28. These conclusions appear to contradict the findings of Waite and Berryman. After controlling for marriage, birth, and branch of service, they found no significant relationship between military job turnover and work in nontraditional jobs. This study, however, did not distinguish between dirty, outdoor nontraditional jobs that require heavy lifting and indoor nontraditional activities, such as electronics.
29. DOD, *Military Women*, p. 53.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
31. Kim, *All-Volunteer Force*, p. 103.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 95.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
34. Chongsoo Kim, *Youth and Military Services: 1980 National Longitudinal Survey Studies of Enlistment, Intentions to Serve, Reenlistment, and Labor Market Experience of Veterans and Afters* (Columbus: Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University, 1982), p. 87. Since Kim's study, the armed forces have recognized and are dealing with the critical day-care issue in a more explicit manner.
35. Mary Geurts, *Career Intent of Female Officers at Fort Hood, Texas*. Applied Research Project, Southwest Texas State University, 1985, pp. (appendix) I:1-7. This study was performed by a woman army officer to fulfill a requirement for a master's degree. Because respondents were helping a fellow woman officer and knew the results would not be used for official army business, one would expect the answers to be honest. Unfortunately, the sample size was small. The random sample was drawn from Ft. Hood's list of officers. However, only 36 of the 75 who received the mailed questionnaires responded. This represents approximately 11 percent of Ft. Hood's women officers. The instrument was adapted from an Air Force Quality of Life survey.
36. Holm, *Women in the Military*, pp. 51-54.
37. See, for example, Rogan, *Mixed Company*, pp. 184-223; Janice D. Yoder, et al., "The Price of a Token," *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 11 (Fall 1983): 325-337.
38. Michael Rustad, *Women in Khaki: The American Enlisted Women* (New York: Praeger, 1982), p. 135.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
40. Robert H. Baldwin and Thomas Daula, "The Cost of High-Quality Recruits," *Armed Forces and Society* 11, no. 1 (Fall 1984): 164.
41. Mady Wechler Segal, "Woman's Roles in the U.S. Armed Forces: An Evaluation of Evidence and Arguments for Policy Decisions," in Robert K. Fullinwider, ed., *Conscripts and Volunteers* (Totowa, N.J.: Roman & Allanheld, 1983), p. 211.
42. Frank Partlow, "Womanpower for a Superpower: The National Security Implications of Women in the United States Army," *World Affairs* 146, no. 4 (Spring 1984): 289.

43. M.C. Devilbiss, "Gender Integration and Unit Deployment: A Study of GI Jo," *Armed Forces and Society* 11, no. 4 (Summer 1985): 523-552; Moskos, "Female GIs."
44. Devilbiss, "Gender Integration." pp. 542-544.
45. Holm, *Women in the Military*, p. 383.
46. Kim, *All-Volunteer Force*, p. 87.
47. Patricia M. Shields, *Women in the Military*. Report submitted to the Southwest Texas State University Organized Research Committee, 1982, pp. 18-19. This study used the 1978 NLS data.
48. A.V. Bartlett, et al., "Public Health Considerations of Infectious Diseases in Child Day Care Centers," *The Journal of Pediatrics* 105, no. 5, (November 1984): 683-701.
49. Child care for active duty personnel was a key agenda item at a recent meeting of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. Nonna Cheatham, "DACOWITS Holds Fall Meeting," *Minerva* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 2.